ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1987-1988 8672
5341 SJUD HB 322

913

Section .215 DISCLOSURE OF CORPORATE PURPOSES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .215 is a reenactment without change of AS 10.05.259, as amended in 1980.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .215 perpetuates a decision of the Legislature made in 1980 which requires that a corporation disclose to the Department of Commerce and Economic Development the activities in which it will initially engage. This is not done for the purpose of limiting corporate activity. Under the ACC, incorporation can still be as general as the pursuit of "any lawful purpose." The information is elicited so that the state may obtain a clearer idea of the dimension of economic activity.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: Again, reflecting its lack of familiarity with the aspirations of the Alaska Legislature, the standard recommended text of the RMBCA contains no provision requiring disclosure of corporate purposes.

Section .218 EFFECT OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .218 is derived from AS 10.05.810.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .218 fixes the issuance of the certificate of incorporation as the point in time when the de jure existence of a corporation commences. In adopting this "bright line" rule, the ACC goes beyond Section 56 of the MBCA and AS 10.05.810 to expressly abolish the common law doctrines of de jure compliance, de facto incorporation, and corporation by estoppel.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 2.03 would also create a "bright line" event fixing the initial existence of a corporation. Under RMBCA Section 2.03, that event is "the secretary of state's filing of the articles of incorporation. . . ."

RMBCA Section 2.04 leaves the current body of conflicting and confusing common law on de facto incorporation and corporation by estoppel unreformed. This notwithstanding the official comment that: "Incorporation under modern statutes is so simple and inexpensive that a strong argument may be made that nothing short of filing articles of incorporation should create the privilege of limited liability." ACC Section .218 adopts that "strong argument".

Section .220 ASSUMPTION OF PURPORTED POWERS OF NONEXISTENT CORPORATION: LIABILITY

ORIGIN: ACC Section .220 is a modification of former AS 10.05.810, which had been predicated upon Section 146 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .220 determines the liability consequences of persons who assume to act as a corporation for which there has been no issuance of a certificate of incorporation (Section 218). Unless there is a written agreement, wherein a third party agrees to deal on a limited liability basis with individuals purporting to act for a corporation for which no certificate has been issued, those persons are jointly and severally liable.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 2.04 imposes joint and several liability on all persons purporting to act as or on behalf of a corporation who knew that there was no incorporation [effective filing with the secretary of state]. It does nothing to relieve the conflicting interpretations given to prior Model Act provisions dealing with the consequences of defective incorporation. See, e.g., Sherwood & Roberts-Oregon, Inc. v. Alexander, 269 Or. 389, 525 P.2d 135 (1974), which is in direct conflict with Heintze Corp. v. Northwest Tech-Manuals, Inc., 7 Wash. App. 759, 502 P.2d 486 (Div.One. 1972).

Section .223 ORGANIZATION MEETING

ORIGIN: ACC Section .223 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.267 and is based upon Section 57 of the MBCA. Language modifications have been made to coordinate with Section .210(3), which makes optional the naming of initial directors in the articles. Another modification is the phrase in the first sentence which is intended to preclude a construction of Section .223 as a precondition to the attainment of corporate existence.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .223 defines the transition by which the entity being formed passes from the control of incorporators to that of the initial board of directors. In a reform designed to facilitate corporate formation, the articles are competent to name initial directors in which case they, and not incorporators, hold the initial meeting.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 2.05 parallels the ACC and permits the articles to name the initial directors.

Section .225 POWERS OF INCORPORATORS BEFORE DIRECTORS' ELECTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .225 is new to Alaska law being predicated upon Section 210 of the GCL and Section 107 of the

General Corporation Law of the State of Delaware.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Since the naming of initial directors in the articles is optional, Section .255 defines the powers which incorporators shall have in the event that they, and not the initial directors, shall hold the organizational meeting.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 2.05(2) is in substantial accord with the California, Delaware, and ACC innovations.

Section .228 BYLAWS: ADOPTION, AMENDMENT OR REPEAL

ORIGIN: ACC Section .228 is taken from Section 211 of the GCL and works a major change in AS 10.05.135.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Under current Alaska law the power to adopt, amend, and repeal provisions of the bylaws is vested exclusively in the board unless reserved to the shareholders in the articles of incorporation.

Absent provisions in the articles, ACC Section .228 vests equal powers in the board and the shareholders with respect to determining the content of the bylaws. However, the articles are competent to restrict or eliminate the power of either the board or the outstanding shares. There are thus three possibilities: (1) concurrent, independent power in the board and the outstanding shares (the default rule); (2) an article provision restricting or eliminating the power of the board; or, (3) an article provision restricting or eliminating the power of the outstanding shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.20 provides a default rule identical to ACC Section .228. In the absence of a provision in the articles, the power to adopt, amend, or repeal bylaws is shared by the directors and shareholders. The RMBCA does not use the term "adopt", but the official comment makes explicit that it is to be included within the meaning of "amend." Under RMBCA Section 10.20(a)(1), the articles are competent to extinguish the power of the board. Apparently they cannot extinguish the power of the shareholders who, under RMBCA Section 10.20(b), are guaranteed power over the content of the bylaws. Thus the flexibility available under California, Delaware, and ACC provisions is not attainable under the RMBCA.

The ACC's concern that shareholders ultimately control the corporation is manifested in Section 460 wherein they are given the right to remove any or all of the directors at any time for any reason.

Section .230 BYLAWS: NUMBER OF DIRECTORS AND OTHER CONTENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .230 is predicated upon Section 212 of

the GCL, and substantially enlarges the coverage of AS 10.05135, which had been based on Section 27 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Under ACC Section .230, the bylaws have a mandatory content only if the articles have not fixed the number of directors or established a formula from which that number may be derived. The ACC's provisions on the number of directors establish three as the default minimum unless the corporation has fewer than three shareholders. In that instance, the number of directors need not exceed the number of shareholders. This will provide significant flexibility in the formation and operation of closely held corporations. Any bylaw which would change the number of directors must obtain approval of the outstanding shares. Further, if the effort is to reduce the number of positions on the board to fewer than five, subsection 230(d) protects the interests of minority shareholders by invalidating the attempt if sixteen and two-thirds percent of the outstanding shares vote against it.

Under subsection (e), the optional content of the bylaws is partially enumerated. These provisions need not be adopted but are intended to suggest to those forming corporations some of the important matters governing procedures, e.g. for shareholder and director meetings, the qualifications, duties, authority and compensation of directors and officers, and such other matters relating to the day to day management of the corporation as are usefully stabilized in a formal agreement.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 2.06(b) simply states that the bylaws may contain any provision for managing the business and regulating the affairs of the corporation that is not inconsistent with law or the articles. This is in accord with ACC Section .230(e). The absence of the enumerated list of optional provisions should not be taken to suggest that the RMBCA is less exacting than the ACC. The cross-references to RMBCA Section 2.06 indicate twenty-two matters which should be considered for regulation in the bylaws. Rather than the convenience of ACC Section .230(e), one has to page through the provisions of the RMBCA.

Section .233 BYLAWS TO BE KEPT AT OFFICE; INSPECTION BY SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .233 is taken from Section 213 of the GCL.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The corporation is obligated to keep at its principal business office in Alaska a copy of its bylaws reflecting all current provisions including amendments. The shareholders are to have a right to inspect the bylaws at all reasonable times. A foreign corporation which does not have a principal business office in Alaska is obligated to furnish a copy of its current bylaws to any Alaska shareholder who

makes a written request.

AS 10.05.237 through .249 cover the content of ACC Section .233, but do not clearly obligate a foreign corporation to make a copy of its bylaws available to requesting shareholders who are citizens of Alaska.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains a similar requirement although it is somewhat difficult to locate. Section 16.02 directs that a corporation keep copies of the records required in Section 16.01(c). One of the items set forth in in Section 16.01(c) is a copy of the corporate bylaws.

Notes

ARTICLE 4. CORPORATE FINANCE

Section .305 CREATION, CLASSES, AND ISSUANCE OF SHARES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .305 is premised upon GCL Section 400, with modifications to accommodate MBCA Sections 15 and 16, which were the basis of AS 10.05.060 and .069. Section .305(a) replaces AS 10.05.060 without substantive change, and Section .305(b) replaces AS 10.05.069 without substantive change.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .305 permits great flexibility to the corporation in creating distinctions as among various classes or series of shares with respect to voting rights, as well as preferences or privileges regarding distributions during the life or at the dissolution of the entity.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.01 is functionally identical to ACC Section .305. ACC Section 210(6)'s warning that the rights, privileges, and limitations on classes of stock must be contained in the articles is reflected in RMBCA Section 6.01(b).

Section .308 ISSUANCE OF PREFERRED OR SPECIAL CLASSES OF SHARES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .308 is largely a reenactment of AS 10.05.063, which was predicated upon Section 15 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .305 allows the establishment of classes and series with varying rights and liabilities. ACC Section .308 specifies a number of particulars which may be the subject of variation between different classes. This list should aid the practitioner in discussing with clients the variations possible in such areas as redemption, dividend preferences, liquidation preferences and conversion options.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.02 is functionally identical to ACC Section .308.

Section .310 ISSUANCE OF SHARES IN SERIES

Section .313 VARIATION IN RIGHTS AND PREFERENCES OF SHARES

Section .315 SERIES RIGHTS AND PREFERENCES ESTABLISHED BY BOARD

Section .318 MANNER OF ESTABLISHING SERIES

Section .320 FILING OF STATEMENT BEFORE ISSUANCE OF SERIES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .310 is based upon AS 10.05.066 and MBCA Section 16 without substantive change.

MBCA Section 16 and AS 10.05.069 form the basis for ACC Section 313. Subsection (7), which permits a variation in voting rights in preferred or special classes, is new to Alaska law. The provision was added to MBCA Section 16 in 1966, after enactment of AS 10.05.069. This section thus represents an updating of Alaska law to conform to the Model Act.

ACC Section .315 is predicated upon MBCA Section 16 and reenacts AS 10.05.072 without substantive change.

ACC Section .318 is a reenactment without substantive change of AS 10.05.075 and MBCA Section 16.

ACC Section .320 is essentially a reenactment of AS 10.05.078, which was predicated upon MBCA Section 16. A modification has been made to the language of Section .320(a) to accord with the broader power of delegation to the board to fix by resolution an unissued class.

ACC Section .323 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.084, which was modeled upon Section 16 of the MBCA. A wording change has been made to reflect the broader power of a board to fix by resolution the rights and privileges of an authorized but wholly unissued class.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .310 makes clear that preferred and special classes of shares may be divided into series.

ACC Section .313 enumerates the rights and preferences which may vary between series of the same preferred or special class of shares.

ACC Section .315 specifies that the board may be granted the power by the articles to divide a class into series and fix the relative rights and preferences of the shares of a series. This power is subject to any limitation placed upon it by the articles or by ACC Sections 305-323.

ACC Section .318 specifies the procedure for establishing a series.

ACC Section .320 vindicates the interest of the state in securing information as to the equity interests outstanding for Alaska corporations. This information is supplied by the articles or any amendment thereto in cases not involving board power to fix the relative rights and preferences. However, when the power has been delegated to the board (ACC Section .208(5)(B)(C)), Section 320 requires that this information be filed with the commissioner.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.03 establishes with fewer guidelines to the practicing lawyer, the authority, scope, manner, and steps which must be taken to create series within a class of preferred shares and

to report the same to the secretary of state.

RMBCA Section 6.03 departs from prior provisions of the Model Act and the statutory law of all states, including Alaska, by permitting creation of a repurchase obligation in the corporation with respect to all or a part of a series. This precedent breaking suggestion would create a "put" in the hands of the holders of such shares to force the corporate issuer to reacquire the stock.

Section .325 REDEMPTION OF SHARES; CREATION OF SINKING FUND; REPURCHASE AGREEMENTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .325 is new and has no precedent in Alaska law. It is taken from GCL Section 402(a), (b), and (d).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section 325 covers three crucial questions: (1) it establishes the right of the corporation to create classes or series of shares which are redeemable at the option of the corporate issuer; (2) it forbids (subject to an exception for an open-end investment company) the creation of shares which vest a right to demand redemption in the shareholders; and, (3) it permits the creation a sinking fund or similar provision, or an agreement outside of the articles which covers the subject of redemption.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.01(d) covers the topics addressed in ACC Section .325. Under the RMBCA, the extent of redemption rights, if any, must be authorized in the articles. It would thus appear that the flexibility attainable under ACC Section .325(c) is not possible under the RMBCA.

Section .328 IRREVOCABILITY OF SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR SHARES

ORIGIN: This section is a verbatim reenactment of AS 10.05.087, modeled after MBCA Section 17.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: A subscription for shares of a corporation to be organized is basically a promise to buy shares under specified terms. Many common law cases have held that a subscription is deemed an offer and as such inherently revocable at any time prior to acceptance. These holdings cast doubt upon the ability of promoters to insure an adequate financial start for a fledgling corporate entity. In order to settle the issue of the nature of a subscription, provide a fair result to those who act in reliance on subscriptions, and put an end to any litigation over the question of revocability, ACC Section .328 makes a subscription irrevocable for a period of six months.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.20(a) is identical to ACC Section .328.

Section..330 PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION FOR SHARES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .330 is in substance a reenactment of AS 10.05.090. Minor changes in language have been made to conform Alaska law to MBCA Section 17.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .330 places the power to determine the time of payment for subscriptions with the board. A call for payment by the board must be uniform as to all shares of the same class or series.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.20(b) and (c) is identical to ACC Section .330. Section 6.20 controls share subscriptions issued before incorporation. The initial board is given complete control over their disposition. Section 6.20(f) states that subscriptions entered into after incorporation are treated as a contract between the corporation and the subscriber and governed by Section 6.21. Unless the shareholders reserve powers granted under Section 6.21, the board has the power to control the disposition of post incorporation subscriptions.

Section .333 FORFEITURE OF SHARES FOR DEFAULT IN PAYMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .333 reenacts AS 10.05.093, which was based upon MBCA Section 17. The terms "penalties" and "penalty" have been changed to "remedies" and "remedy" to reflect the approved case law construction.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .333 establishes the general rights of the corporate issuer in the event of default in the payment obligation for shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.20(d) and (e) are identical to ACC Section .333.

Section .335 CONSIDERATION FOR SHARES

Section .338 PAYMENT FOR SHARES

Section .340 JUDGMENT OF BOARD OR SHAREHOLDERS AS TO VALUE OF CONSIDERATION CONCLUSIVE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .335 retains the essence of AS 10.05.096, which was derived from MBCA Section 18. Much of the former section has been deleted in the wake of the new financials (ACC Sections .358 to .370), which eliminate the concepts of par value, treasury shares, stated capital, and surplus accounts.

ACC Section .338 is a verbatim reenactment of AS

10.05.099, which was derived from Section 19 of the MBCA.

ACC Section .340 is a reenactment of AS 10.05. 102, which was modeled upon Section 19 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .335 recognizes two modes for fixing the amount of consideration (expressed in dollars) for the issuance of shares. Unless the power has been reserved to the shareholders in the articles (ACC Section .210(1)(H)), it is vested in the board. The exercise of this power is subject to the fraud standard articulated in ACC Section .340.

ACC Section .338 specifies what may and may not be received as consideration for shares. Common law authorities which have attempted to prevent "watered shares" by requiring that consideration be limited to cash are rejected in favor of a more realistic recognition that the corporation may be advantaged by the receipt of other valuable property (tangible and intangible) as well as services.

ACC Section .340 sets proof of fraud as the standard necessary to overturn a determination of the value of consideration received by the corporate issuer. The most common victim of an improper consideration exchanged for shares is the corporate creditor whose claims against the entity go unsatisfied in the wake of corporate bankruptcy, dissolution, or simple door-closing. The ACC provides considerable protection to creditors in its provision on financials and in ACC Section .488 on secondary liability of officers and directors. These provisions substantially mitigate the harshness to creditors of the fraud standard provided in ACC Section .340.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.21 is functionally identical to ACC Sections .335, .338, and .340.

Section .343 STOCK RIGHTS AND OPTIONS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .343 is new to Alaska law and is predicated upon Section 20 of the MBCA with one modification. This section eliminates the final sentence of the Model Act provision to conform to the financial provisions of the ACC. This section was adopted to clarify and regulate the exercise of the the corporation's right to issue stock rights and options under the general power to contract.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Unless otherwise defined or restricted in the article, ACC Section .343 gives the corporation acting through its board broad powers to create and issue rights or options covering authorized but unissued shares of any class or classes. The only substantive command of ACC Section .343 is that if such rights or options are to be made available to directors, officers, or employees of the corporation, or to any subsidiary but not to the shareholders generally, issuance shall not be licit until the plan is approved by the

outstanding shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.24 is identical to ACC Section .343, except that it does not protect shareholders by requiring their prior approval for a plan which would grant share rights and options to directors, officers, or employees only. The omission of this protection from the RMBCA is unprecedented in existing law and at variance with the Model Act. It may also contravene the rules of the New York Stock Exchange. See, Section A-25 of the Company Manual. The official comment state that shareholder approval of such a plan may be required in order to comply with SEC regulations.

Section .345 EXPENSES OF ORGANIZATION, REORGANIZATION, AND FINANCING

ORIGIN: ACC Section .345 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.111 with a minor language modification in order to parallel MBCA Section 22.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .345 recognizes that there are costs incurred in the issuance and marketing of shares, and protects the purchasers from further liability on the theory that since it received only the "net amount" from the gross price paid, the shares are not "fully paid" and thus "assessable."

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.28 is identical to ACC Section .345 except that it does not contain the express protection for purchasers precluding a claim that their shares are assessable. The framers of the tentative draft recognize that this language is standard in nearly all state codes, but feel that the problem has rarely arisen and the language is thus surplusage.

Section .348 CERTIFICATES REPRESENTING SHARES

Section .350 INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE STATED ON CERTIFICATE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .348 is a verbatim reenactment of AS 10.05.114, and is modeled upon MBCA Section 23.

ACC Section .350 is a verbatim reenactment of AS 10.05.117 with the deletion of paragraph (4) regarding par value, which is no longer a matter of consequence under the ACC. With this modification Section .350 is predicated upon MBCA Section 23.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section 348 is designed to facilitate the trend toward electronic substitutes for the traditional share certificate by permitting the seal of the corporate issuer to be affixed in a facsimile form, and to permit the signatures of the corporate officers to be facsimiles so

long as the "certificate" is countersigned by a transfer agent or a registrar who is not an employee of the corporation.

ACC Section .350 recognizes that information regarding the rights, preferences, and limitations of the shares is of importance to shareholders. If the corporation is authorized to issue only one class of stock, such shares enjoy all attributes of participation, control, and ownership defined by the ACC. However, if the corporate articles authorize the issuance of more than one class, it is both possible and likely that the relative rights, privileges, preferences, and limitations of the classes will differ. In this instance, ACC Section .350(a) requires that the corporation furnish to each shareholder either a statement or summary of the designations, preferences, limitations, and relative rights of shares of the class she has purchased, and similar basic information regarding the shares of any other authorized class. This information may be printed on the certificate, or the certificate may be imprinted with a legend that the corporation will furnish the information without charge.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: In yet another break with the prior act and the statutory content of Alaska and other states, the framers of the tentative draft recommend that the issuance of share certificates be optional with the board. This suggestion allows the corporation the ability to decide that it will issue shares which have no tangible expression at all. If the corporation does opt for share certificates, RMBCA Section 6.25(b) sets forth a minimum content which is identical to that of ACC Section .350(b). RMBCA Section 6.25(c) is functionally identical to ACC Section .350(a).

If the corporation opts to issue shares without certificates, RMBCA Section 6.26(b) requires that it send the "shareholder a complete written statement of the information required on certificates by Section 6.25(b) and (c)." As a result of this last provision, the only accomplishment of the suggested innovation would be to place the owners of "uncertificated shares" in grave danger that they would have no tangible evidence of their interest in the corporation. Should such an individual die, the burden of one charged with marshalling the assets of the estate would be obvious.

Section .353 FULL PAYMENT REQUIRED FOR CERTIFICATE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .353 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.120, which is predicated upon Section 23 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .353 continues the Alaska policy of insisting that a share certificate may not be issued until the agreed consideration has been fully paid.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: This classical restriction from Section 23 of the original Model Act is

repeated in a rather obscure manner in the RMBCA. In Section 6.21(c) and (d) shares are deemed non assessable when fully paid. Further, the corporation is empowered to escrow shares for which the full consideration has yet to be received.

Section .355 ISSUANCE OF FRACTIONAL SHARES OR SCRIPT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .355 is a verbatim reenactment of AS 10.05.123, and as such is a modification of Section 24 of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .355 provides two basic options to the board under which it may deal with claims to fractional share ownership. The board may issue a certificate for a fractional share in which case the holder is entitled to the privileges conferred by shares of that class; or, the board may issue scrip entitling the holder to receive a certificate for a full share upon surrender of scrip aggregating a full share. If the second alternative is selected, the holder of the scrip is not entitled to the privileges of share ownership until the exchange of scrip aggregating a full share. Under subsection (c), the board may establish machinery to eliminate the outstanding scrip so long as it is noticed on the scrip at the time of issuance.

ACC Section .355 continues the Legislature's prior determination that it would not follow the Model Act which gives the board a third option, under which it could eliminate fractional shares by simply paying their fair market value. Given the difficulties experienced with that Model Act provision (see, e.g., Teschner v. Chicago Title & Trust Co., 59 Ill.2d 452, 322 N.E.2d 54 (1974)), that decision seems wise. A further reason for opting to continue prior Alaska policy is to prevent the use of this "cash out" option to facilitate management strategies to eliminate outside shareholders in a move to "go private". The technique is a board ordered reverse stock split that is calculated to reduce outsider shareholdings to fractions which can then be cashed out irrespective the wishes of those shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.04 is functionally similar to ACC Section .355, except that it grants the third, or "cash out", option previously rejected by the Alaska Legislature.

Section .358 DISTRIBUTIONS; CONDITIONS

Section .360 PROHIBITED DISTRIBUTION; INABILITY TO MEET MATURING DEBTS AND LIABILITIES

Section .363 PROHIBITED DISTRIBUTION OF JUNIOR SHARES; LIQUIDATION PREFERENCE

Section .365 PROHIBITED DISTRIBUTION TO JUNIOR SHARES; RATIO OF

RETAINED EARNINGS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .358 supplants the earned surplus test of AS 10.05.204(1) (payments of dividends) and .012 (repurchase of shares). With the additions and deletions noted in the Official Comment, it is premised upon the amended version of Section 500 of the GCL.

ACC Section .360 replaces AS 10.05.201 and is based on GCL Section 501.

ACC Section .363 is taken from GCL Section 502, and replaces AS 10.05.207(4).

ACC Section .365 adopts the language of GCL Section 503, and supplants AS 10.05.207(3).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: In general: ACC Sections .358 through .368 contain the essence of a major reform, in which antiquated and unworkable concepts of "balance sheet" and "earned surplus" (with the myriad of exceptions) are replaced by a simple ratio of assets to liabilities in determining the circumstances in which the board of directors has discretion to declare and pay distributions of corporate assets to shareholders. With minor modifications they are predicated upon the 1977 California General Corporations Law.

Pending passage of CSSB 246/HB 343, Alaska continues to rely upon a mid-1950's version of the Model Act. To its credit, the Alaska Legislature did not authorize certain aspects of Section 45 of the Model Act, which would have further enhanced the circumstances in which the board could dissipate corporate assets to the prejudice of creditors and the holders of preferred and other senior shares. Alaska, for instance, did not adopt a "nimble dividends" provision such as that suggested by alternative Section 45(a) of the Model Act. Further, if the distribution had to be charged to "capital accounts", Alaska insisted upon a two-thirds authorization of the shareholders rather than the simple majority suggested by the Model Act.

Notwithstanding these prudential rejections of Model Act suggestions, Alaska was committed to a system predicated upon an equitable insolvency test supplemented by an exception ridden earned surplus test. Though not as weak as the system in some states, this scheme is still premised upon unsound norms of "legal accounting" and mired in statutory and common law exceptions which make it nearly impossible to draw sensible limits upon the power of the board. Such a status quo is objectionable not only because it fails to deter those bent upon abusing corporate creditors, but for the more important reason that it fails to guide the honest director who is seeking maximum, licit flexibility.

In the mid-1970's, the California Legislature joined the bar association of that state in the creation of a committee to study, with a view toward revision, the California Corporations Code. At that time, California law relied upon the earned surplus test burdened by the possibilities of reduction surplus and nimble dividends. Two irrebuttable

criticisms set the stage for reform: (1) the existing restraints upon dissipation of corporate assets afforded insufficient protection to corporate creditors; and, (2) the language of the law meant little to accountants who were relied upon to prepare and audit the books and records. After a substantial debate, the 1977 California Corporations Code was framed in a manner designed to meet both of these problem areas. The earned surplus test was junked. Also discarded were the concepts of par value, stated capital, and all manner of capital surplus. In their place the statute articulated a simple test of the ratio of assets to corporate liabilities. For the purpose of complying with this test, the corporate books were to be kept in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

In 1980, the Alaska Code Revision Commission concluded that both the substantive scheme and deference to the accounting profession pioneered in California were worthy models for a new Alaska Corporations Code. Accordingly, with the modifications hereinafter noted, Alaska is presented with the opportunity to become the second state to adopt the ratio/assets surplus test.

Two part test: ① Insolvency ②

Protection of Creditors: Protection for the legitimate interests of corporate creditors begins with ACC Section .360's injunction that no distribution (defined by ACC Section .990(17) as a transfer of cash or property by a corporation to its shareholders without consideration) may be undertaken when the result would produce equitable insolvency. The content of this equitable insolvency restraint has been altered in several particulars:

> Neither a corporation nor any of its subsidiaries shall make any distribution to the corporation's shareholders if the corporation or the subsidiary making the distribution is, or as a result thereof would be, likely to be unable to meet its liabilities as they mature.

Reforms: → ①

Two significant changes are incorporated in this formulation of the equitable insolvency standard.

The "likelihood" element of the formula is intended to be more restrictive than the traditional inquiry. AS 10.05.201 asked whether the corporation is now, or, giving effect to the dividend, would be insolvent. ACC Section .360 is more cautious, prohibiting distributions if the corporation is, or giving effect to the distribution, would likely be unable to meet its liabilities as they mature.

② The inclusion of subsidiaries is the second reform. A parent corporation and its subsidiaries are to be considered as a unit; the various corporate shells are disregarded in favor of viewing the financial position of the total operations of an affiliated group. For a definition of "subsidiary" see ACC Section .990(42).

Assuming that insolvency within the meaning of ACC Section .360 is not threatened, ACC Section .358 establishes two circumstances under with the board enjoys discretion to

IF NO INSOLVENCY LIKELY, TWO ADD'L TESTS

declare and pay a distribution to shareholders.

Distributions in cash or other assets may be declared and paid against "retained earnings" (ACC Section .358(a)(1)). Like the earned surplus test, this requirement reflects a legislative judgment that routine distributions should only be made from operating profits. Unlike the Model Act, the ACC contains no provision for permitting net operating losses to be charged off by writing down capital surplus. There is no such concept. If the corporation cannot make the payment out of assets charged against retained earnings, the ACC deems it a distribution in partial liquidation.

2d TWO part test

Distributions in partial liquidation are within the discretion of the board if a two part test is met.

① The first requirement is that the assets of the corporation which would remain after the distribution are at least equal to 1.25 time liabilities. Compliance with this ratio guarantees a minimum cushion to creditors in that the corporation must continue to hold five dollars of assets for every four dollars of liabilities.

The second requisite focuses upon current liquidity of the corporation. The general rule is that the corporation's current assets be at least equal to current liabilities. Both current assets and current liabilities are defined by Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Special concern is manifest for corporations which have a recent history of paying more in interest on their debt than their earnings would reflect if interest and taxes were not deducted in computing net profits. Such corporations must comply with a further requirement that current assets be at least 1.25 times current liabilities.

Protecting the interests of senior shares: The basic thrust of both classical and the ratio/assets restraints upon distributions has been the protection of creditors. This emphasis is natural, for by definition the creditor is an "outsider" precluded from any direct voice in corporate management. The ACC also attempts to accommodate a second source of recurrent tension respecting distribution: the interests of quasi-outsiders who have purchased shares with either a dividend or liquidation preference.

"Senior shares" achieve this status by dent of a contract between the corporate issuer and the holder of the securities. The specific terms used to identify this arrangement is "the indenture." While the content of an indenture may reflect specific understandings between the potential investors and the corporation, most are comprised of either or both of the following elements: (1) a "dividend preference" (the holders of this class of stock are "guaranteed" a dividend preference over subordinated or "junior" classes of stock); and (2) a "liquidation preference" (in the event of dissolution, the holders are guaranteed a preferential claim to assets which exceed the claims of all creditors). Neither of these guarantees is chiseled in stone. Performance is permitted only if the corporation can otherwise meet its legal obligations. Thus if the distribution

would threaten the security of creditors mandated by ACC Section .358, it cannot be made to even senior shares.

Adding to the vulnerability of the holders of these securities is a third classical feature of their status: they normally do not enjoy a right to elect members to the board of directors. The directors are, instead, elected by the owners of the junior, or "common", shares. Unless restrained by easily understood guidelines, there is danger that the directors will advance the interests of their constituents at the expense of the non-voting senior shares.

continues theory of ex. law

AS 10.05.207 and .210 show that the Legislature has long been interested in affording protection to senior shares. ACC Section .365 continues this policy by restricting the board's authority so that there can be no distribution to junior shares unless the amount of retained earnings immediately prior thereto equal or exceeds the amount of the proposed distribution plus the aggregate amounts of cumulative dividends in arrears on all shares having a dividend preference. The net effect of ACC Section .365 is to foreclose the use of payments in partial liquidation to holders of junior shares so long as the indenture obligations to senior shares are unmet.

The liquidation preference of senior shares is guarded by ACC Section .363. By its terms neither a corporation nor any of its subsidiaries may make any distribution to junior shares if, after giving effect to the proposed distribution, the excess of corporate assets over liabilities would be less than the liquidation over the class or series to which the distribution is made.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: If supporters could be found for a continuation of the baroque concepts of "legal accounting" contained in current Alaska law, they will find no comfort in the RMBCA. The official comment to RMBCA Section 6.40 makes it clear that it is intended to "sweep away all the distinctions among the various types of surplus and impose realistic restrictions on distributions build around the equity insolvency test of earlier statutes." (p. 6-60). The RMBCA also follows the California/ACC approach and yields all notions of legal accounting. It stops short, however, of requiring that books and records according to generally accepted accounting principles. While it expects that ". . .their use will be the basic rule in most cases. . . ." the final judgment is left within the business judgment of the board. (6-78).

There are differences between the existing California and proposed Alaska statutes and RMBCA Section 6.40. While the former use the equity insolvency test as the first of a two prong concept, RMBCA Section 6.40 relies upon it almost exclusively. Put most simply, the cushion of $5 in assets to every $4 in liabilities is not mandatory under RMBCA Section 6.40. The standard is explicit under the proposed content of the ACC. It would present a moving target under the RMBCA. A miss would ensure harm to creditors and promote litigation against the directors and shareholders of the defaulting

entity. Neither seems a desirable outcome.

RMBCA Section 6.40(c)(2) does contain protection for the holder of senior securities which is similar in object to ACC Section .360.

Section .368 EXCEPTION FOR PURCHASE OR REDEMPTION OF SHARES OF DECEASED SHAREHOLDER

ORIGIN: ACC Section .368 is new to Alaska law; it is taken verbatim from GCL Section 503.1.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: It is often desirable in smaller corporation to provide for the death of a shareholder with a plan permitting the corporation to purchase or redeem the shares of the deceased. Such a plan prevents the potentially troublesome problems of having the deceased's heirs participating in the business. A common method used in effecting such plans is a corporate purchase of insurance on the shareholder's life. The insurance proceeds are to be used for the purchase or redemption. ACC Section .368 provides that, notwithstanding an inability to comply with Sections 358 through .365, the amount of the proceeds from the policy in excess of the total amount of premiums paid may be used to purchase or redeem the decedent's shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains no explicit provision enabling such limited repurchase plans.

Section .370 INAPPLICABILITY TO REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANY

ORIGIN: ACC Section .370 is new to Alaska law, and is derived from GCL Section 504.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: In order to avoid any conflict with federal law, an exception to the provisions of ACC Section .358 is made for corporations defined as regulated investment companies under the United States Internal Revenue Code.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA appears to have no comparable exception, although the result would doubtless be reached through litigation.

Section .373 SHARE DIVIDENDS: RESTRICTIONS

ORIGIN: This section is a reenactment without change of AS 10.05.204(5), and is predicated upon Section 45(e) of the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Share dividends present no direct threat to creditors who are protected by the ratio/assets surplus test of ACC Section .358. However, if the corpo-

ration has more than one class of shares, the power of the board to distribute shares of the "senior" or "preferred" class to the common shareholders as a dividend is a direct threat to their proportional interest in the corporation. ACC Section .373 continues Alaska law by prohibiting the board from taking such a step unless it is authorized in the articles or is the subject of a majority vote of the holders of the senior shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.23 is functionally identical to ACC Section .373.

Section .375 ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS IN ARTICLES, BYLAWS, INDENTURES OR AGREEMENTS

ORIGIN: This section does not change prior Alaska law; it merely makes the law explicit.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .375 makes it explicit that the provisions of the ACC on the declaration of dividends and purchase or redemption of shares do not "occupy the field" and thereby prevent further regulation by the articles, by-laws, indentures or agreements.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.40 contains a prefatory clause which accomplishes the same result as ACC Section .375.

Section .378 LIABILITY OF SHAREHOLDERS RECEIVING PROHIBITED DISTRIBUTIONS; SUIT AGAINST SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .378 is new to Alaska law, and is derived from GCL Section 506. It supplements ACC Section .480(b), itself a reenactment of AS 10.05.225.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .378 provides a non-exclusive remedy against shareholders who have received any distribution with knowledge that it is illicit. The remedy runs to the corporation and may be asserted to the use of the corporation by any non-consenting creditor for violation of Sections .358 or .360, provided that the creditor's claim had arisen prior to the distribution. Under subsection (b), non-consenting holders of senior shares may commence the action for violation of Section .363 or .365 provided that the senior shares were held at the time of the distribution.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.33(b)(2) achieves the goal of ACC Section .378 by indirection. Shareholders are rendered liable for contribution to a director sued for an illicit distribution to the extent that they knew it to be in violation of the act or provisions of the articles.

Section .380 IDENTIFICATION OF DISTRIBUTION IN NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .380 is taken from GCL Section 507. It replaces AS 10.05.207(5).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: In order to set the stage for recovery of illicit distributions and to inform shareholders when a dividend represents a partial liquidation (as opposed to a distribution of profits), ACC Section .380 requires that management identify the source and accounting treatment of a dividend charged against any source other than the retained earnings account. Such a policy is consistent with current Alaska practice. AS 10.05. 207(5) requires identification of distributions in partial liquidation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.40 does not require that shareholders be given this prudential information. Omitting such a step fails to alert Alaskans of potentially favorable tax treatment of the dividend on their federal returns.

Section .383 INAPPLICABILITY TO WINDING UP AND INVOLUNTARY OR VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .383 is taken from GCL Section 508.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The provisions of Article 9 for the winding up of corporate affairs and the involuntary or voluntary dissolution of the corporation are plenary in their coverage. No additional law is required to protect the interest of creditors and holders of senior shares. Thus, the provisions of Sections .358 through .365 are made inapplicable to such procedures by ACC Section .383.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: There is no comparable provision in the RMBCA.

Section .385. REDEMPTION OF SHARES AT THE OPTION OF CORPORATION; MANNER

ORIGIN: Current Alaska law provides no statutorily approved procedure for the redemption of shares. ACC Section .385 is derived from GCL Section 509, with the deletion of language in subsection (c) which would have, nonsensically, required a corporation to send a notice to itself if it did not have the shareholder's address.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .385 creates a statutory procedure for redemption. The notice provisions of subsection (b) are subject to modification by the articles of incorporation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.31 empowers a corporation to acquire its own shares. However, the RMBCA does not appear to contain any provision defining the manner of taking such a step.

Section .388 ACQUISITION OF CORPORATION'S OWN SHARES; REISSUANCE OR RETIREMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .388 is taken from GCL Section 510. It continues existing Alaska law (AS 10.05.312 to .345) in requiring a filing with the commissioner of an amendment to the articles. It departs from and simplifies existing law by the elimination of the concept of "treasury shares".

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .388 specifies the treatment to be given redeemed or repurchased shares. They return to the status of authorized but unissued shares unless the articles prohibit reissuance. If reissuance is prohibited, the articles stating the number of authorized shares must be amended to reflect the lower number. Such an amendment must be filed with the commissioner. Shareholder approval of the required amendment is unnecessary.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.31 is functionally identical to ACC Section .388

Section .390 CAPITALIZATION OF RETAINED EARNINGS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .390 continues the policy of existing Alaska law, which permits directors to increase either the stated capital (AS 10.05.108) or the capital surplus (AS 10.05.366) accounts by charging the earned surplus account. There is no corresponding provision in the GCL financials.

The accounting provisions of existing law require that an amount equal to the total par value of shares distributed as dividends be transferred to the stated capital account from a surplus account (AS 10.05.204(4)(A)). No such accounting treatment is required under the ACC since the use of par value has been eliminated.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .388 permits the board to pass a resolution which transfers amounts properly allotted to the retained earnings account into the paid-in account. The effect of such a transfer would limit the ability of the board in future to make distributions under ACC Section .358(a).

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains no similar provision.

Notes

ARTICLE 5. MEETINGS OF SHAREHOLDERS

Section .405 MEETINGS OF SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .405 is predicated upon Section 28 of the MBCA and Section 500(d) of the GCL. It replaces AS 10.05.138.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .405 requires that shareholders of any corporation organized under or subject to this Chapter meet at least once annually. For the first time in Alaska law, a shareholder is provided with standing to seek a summary court order to convene an annual meeting if such a meeting has not been held within the prior thirteen month period. ACC Section .405(c) differs from the Model Act in conferring the power to summon special meetings of the shareholders upon the chairman of the board and the president of the corporation. AS 10.05.138 confers such power upon the president, but does not reach the chairman of the board.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The content of ACC Section .405 is paralleled in RMBCA Sections 7.01, 7.02, and 7.03. RMBCA Section 7.01 requires an annual meeting of shareholders. RMBCA Section 7.03(a)(1) is similar to ACC Section .405(b) in authorizing aggrieved shareholders summary access to a court ordered meeting in the event the annual meeting is not held. Special meetings may be called by shareholders under both ACC Section .405(c) and RMBCA Section 7.02. The ACC continues current Alaska law and the original recommended content of the Model Act by requiring that 10% of the voting shares are needed to call a special meeting. In the exposure draft Section 7.02(a)(2) recommended that the minimum be lowered to 5%. In the final draft the figure was restored to the traditional 10%.

Section .408 CLOSING OF TRANSFER BOOKS AND FIXING RECORD DATE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .408 is predicated upon Section 30 of the MBCA with two modifications. In both subsections (a) and (b), the Model Act's ten day minimum period before the action is taken has been extended to twenty days, to further the use of the twenty day notice periods found throughout the ACC. AS 10.05.144 utilizes a ten day period. Also, sixty day limitations have replaced the fifty day formula now found in Alaska law respecting the closing of transfer books or fixing of a record date. Finally, the ACC follows the Model Act in making a shareholder list compiled from the closed transfer

books or by virtue of the record date effective as to any adjournment of the meeting.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .408 provides three alternatives for effecting a determination as to shares entitled to vote in an annual or special meeting, or to participate in a distribution. Under the first alternative, the board may simply close the stock transfer books. A second alternative is for the board to declare a "record date" for such determination. Finally, the default mode for determining the shareholders if the board has not exercised its options under the first or second alternative is to adopt the date on which the notice of the meeting is called, or the date that the resolution of the board declaring the distribution is adopted.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Sections 7.07 and 7.05(d) contain the three alternatives specified in ACC Section .408 with slightly differing minimum and maximum times.

Section .410 NOTICE OF SHAREHOLDERS' MEETING

ORIGIN: ACC Section .410 is predicated upon MBCA Section 29 and AS 10.05.141. The only change is to set a twenty day minimum for delivery of notice, a general policy running throughout the ACC.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .410 establishes the minimum content and the minimum and maximum time restraints on written or printed notice for annual or special meetings. The notice must be "delivered" not less than twenty nor more than fifty days before the date of an annual or special meeting, and in every instance, the notice must state the place, day, and hour of the meeting. For special meetings only, the notice must also declare the purpose(s) for which the meeting is being convened.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.05 is in substantive accord with ACC Section .410. The RMBCA does propose a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 60 days for notice. The ACC uses 20 and 50.

Section .413 VOTING LIST; LIABILITY

ORIGIN: ACC Section .413 is predicated upon AS 10.05.147, which was based upon the pre-1962 version of Section 31 of the MBCA. ACC Section .413(c) is based upon MBCA Section 31 and AS 10.05.150.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .413 mandates that at least twenty days prior to each meeting of shareholders, the officer or agent having charge of the stock transfer books make a list of all shareholders entitled to vote. This list must be

kept open and subject to inspection by a shareholder at any time during usual business hours for a period of twenty days prior to the meeting. This right of inspection prior to the meeting may be exercised by an agent or attorney of the shareholder.

ACC Section .413(c) imposes a civil liability upon an officer or agent having charge of the stock transfer books who fails or refuses to exhibit such a list as above provided. Such a liability runs to any shareholder able to establish damage as a consequence of this failure or refusal, in an amount determined by the court's discretion.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.20 substantially mirrors the provisions of ACC Section .413. RMBCA Section 7.20(d) sanctions a summary court ordered inspection in the case that the access to the shareholder list mandated is denied. A similar provision is found in ACC Section .430(d). RMBCA Section 7.20 does not establish any potential civil liability in the event of a denial of inspection rights. In his address to the Alaska Bar Association Convention Professor Hamilton stated the view that personal liability sanctions are rarely imposed and thus do not serve as a pragmatic deterrent.

Section .415 QUORUM OF SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .415(a) is predicated upon MBCA Section 32 and AS 10.05.153, and reflects no change in existing Alaska law. ACC Section .415(b) is predicated upon GCL Section 602(b), and is unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Absent a provision in the articles or bylaws, the default quorum requirement is the presence, in person or by proxy, of an absolute majority of the shares entitled to vote. The articles or the bylaws may establish a greater than majority quorum requirement. Only the articles are competent to establish a less than majority quorum requirement, which may not be less than one-third of the voting shares. The affirmative vote of the majority of the shares represented at which a quorum is present is the act of the shareholder. Once a quorum has been established, it is not possible for a disgruntled minority to defeat the capacity of the majority to transact business by simply "walking out" of the meeting.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.25 is functionally identical to ACC Section .415.

Section .418 PROXIES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .418 is taken from GCL Section 705, with a modification to eliminate Section 705(e)(3) (rights of creditors). Section .418 replaces AS 10.05.159 and .168,

which had been based on Section 33 of the MBCA. The explicit treatment of the question of "revocation" and the circumstances under which a proxy may be made "irrevocable" by agreement are unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .418 permits a shareholder to create a legal power in a nominee to vote his or her shares, the life of which can not exceed eleven months. A revocable proxy is treated as destructible at the will of the proxy giver. This Section regulates the circumstances or acts which will "revoke" the proxy, thus disabling management from recognizing the power of the nominee to cast the votes represented by the shares. Finally, for the first time, Alaska law contains explicit provisions defining the circumstances under which a proxy may be made irrevocable.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.22 is identical to ACC Section .418.

Section .420 VOTING OF SHARES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .420 is predicated upon MBCA Section 33, with the exception of subsections (d) and (i). Section .420(d) is predicated upon GCL Section 708(a), and replaces AS 10.05.156 to .168. Section .420(i) is new and unprecedented in Alaska law. It is based upon GCL Section 509(d).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .420 establishes a cumulative voting scheme designed to enhance the opportunity for minority share interests to obtain representation on the board. Section .420(d) makes cumulative voting optional and presumptive unless eliminated by a provision of the articles. It goes beyond the Model Act to provide that if elimination of cumulative voting is sought via amendment to the articles, such an amendment shall not be effective if a sufficient number of votes are cast against it as would elect a single director if voted cumulatively in an election for the entire board. Shares held by the corporation or its controlled subsidiary may not be voted or counted towards the outstanding shares entitled to vote.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.21, 7.14, and 7.28 cover the subject matter addressed in ACC Section .420. There is substantial accord except with respect to the presumptive status of cumulative voting. Cumulative voting rights exist under ACC Section .420(d) unless extinguished in the articles. This is a continuation of historic Alaska practice and reflects a Legislative solicitude for representation of minority share interests on the board. Under RMBCA Section 7.28(a) such rights do not exist unless the articles make affirmative provision.

Section .423 ACTIONS TAKEN WITHOUT MEETING: WRITTEN CONSENT;

REVOCATION OF CONSENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .423(a) is predicated upon Section 145 of the MBCA and AS 10.05.807, with language added to make it clear that the written consents are invalid unless of identical content as to all shareholders. Section .423(b) is adapted from GCL Section 603(c), and is unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .423 provides for informal action by shareholders, as long as the action is taken by the unanimo written consent of the shares. The Commission conside and rejected the California and Delaware positions which would tolerate informal action by less than unanimous consent, believing that the unanimous consent requirement was a valid trade-off for the abolition of a formal meeting. This presumption for informal action may be extinguished by the articles or the bylaws.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.04 is in substantial accord with ACC Section .423. The prudential requirement that the consents be identical in content is not contained in Section 7.04. The official comment (7-17, 18) makes it clear that, like the Code Revision Commission, the framers of the RMBCA do not advocate adopting a position wherein informal action may be taken by less than the unanimous consent of the voting shares.

Section .425 VOTING TRUSTS AND AGREEMENTS AMONG SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .425(a) is taken from MBCA Section 34 and AS 10.05.171. Unlike existing Alaska law, Section .425(a) has adopted the Model Act's language designed to require disclosure of the terms and identity of voting trusts. Section .425(b) is taken from GCL Section 706(d), and is unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .425 permits a voting trust, regulates its duration, and mandates disclosure of its terms and members. Shares committed to a voting trust must be surrendered to the trustee in exchange for trust certificates, while all incidents of share ownership other than voting rights remain with the shareholder/participant. The Model Act language on the extension of voting trusts has not been adopted, in the belief that at the end of the ten year maximum life, the parties are capable of forming a new trust. Section 425(b) tolerates other agreements such as pooling agreements and share classification, leaving to common law any limitations upon their use.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Sections 7.30 and 7.31 cover the subject of voting trusts and voting agreements among shareholders. Their content is in substantial accord with ACC Section .425, except for the provision

on extending the period of time for a voting trust.

Section .428 SHAREHOLDERS' PREEMPTIVE RIGHTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .428 is predicated upon MBCA Section 26A and replaces AS 10.05.129. Existing Alaska law contains no provision comparable to Section .428's presumptions as to shares or offerings to which preemptive rights are not extended.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Unless limited or denied by provisions of the articles, ACC Section .428 establishes preemptive rights in certain shareholders to acquire under fair and reasonable terms unissued shares or convertible securities. Preemptive rights do not exist in holders of any class of preferred shares, nor do common shareholders have preemptive rights to the issuance of nonconvertible preferred shares. If a majority of the shares approve, preemptive rights do not exist as to shares issued to directors, officers, or employees. This provision is intended to facilitate the implementation of qualified deferred compensation schemes under the Internal Revenue code. Section .428 expressly recognizes that the articles are competent to enlarge or diminish the scope of preemptive rights.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.30 reverses the statutory presumption on preemptive rights. Under ACC Section .428 such rights exist unless limited or extinguished in the articles. Under RMBCA Section 6.30(a), such rights do not exist unless affirmatively provided in the articles. Assuming the presence of such rights, the balance of RMBCA Section 6.30 is in accord with the provisions of ACC Section .428.

Section .430 BOOKS AND RECORDS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .430 is based upon Section 52 of the MBCA and AS 10.05.237 to .249.

Section .430(a) continues the content of AS 10.05.237 with added provisions for minutes of meetings of board committees and for electronic processing. Section .430(b) continues the policy of AS 10.05.237(b), but has eliminated the durational and numerical qualifications of AS 10.05.240. Section .430(c) continues the policies of AS 10.05.243, with the modification of imposing a minimum liability of $5000. Section .430(d) has modified AS 10.05.246 in view of the standing requirements eliminated under Section .430(b). Section .430(e) adopts without change the content of AS 10.05.249 regarding the right to demand a copy of the most recent financial statement.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .430(a) creates the obligation for any corporation organized under this Chapter to keep

specified books and records of account, minutes of proceedings, and a record containing the names and addresses of all shareholders and the number and class of shares held by each. This subsection facilitates the collection and keeping of such data by electronic processing so long as such data can be reduced to writing.

Subsection .430(b) creates the right of inspection and vests that right in any shareholder and the Department of Commerce and Economic Development. The shareholder must make written demand and state the purpose(s) for which inspection is demanded. The inspection may be made in person or by agent or attorney, and at a reasonable time and for a proper purpose.

Subsection .430(c) creates personal liability in any officer or agent who denies a right of inspection which the shareholder can establish was properly demanded, with certain affirmative defenses available to defeat this liability.

Subsection .430(d) affirms the power of a competent court to enforce a right of inspection properly demanded.

Subsection .430(e) gives the shareholder a right to receive, upon written request, a copy of the corporation's most recent financial statement.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.20 requires that the corporation maintain and make available for inspection a list of the names and addresses of its shareholders. RMBCA Section 16.01 requires the keeping of books, records of account and minutes of the proceedings of all shareholder, board and board committee meetings. RMBCA Section 16.02 creates a right of inspection in shareholders asserting a proper purpose to inspect reasonably related portions of the Section 16.01 materials. RMBCA Section 16.04 details the circumstances under which a court may order observance of the Section 16.03 inspection rights. In total, these provisions accord with those of ACC Section .430, except that they do not expressly allow for civil liability on the part of the officer or agent who wilfully frustrates what are later determined to have been valid assertions by shareholders of inspection rights.

Section .433 ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREHOLDERS: CONTENT; FINANCIAL STATEMENT ON REQUEST

ORIGIN: ACC Section .433 is new and without precedent in Alaska law. It is adapted from Sections 1501 and 2000 of the GCL. GCL Section 1501(g) on attorney fees and costs was omitted from Section .433.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .433 establishes the obligation of the board to send an annual report to shareholders within 180 days after the close of the fiscal year. The report must contain a balance sheet and an income statement prepared according to generally accepted accounting principles. The report need not be prepared by independent ac-

countants, but if so prepared it must be certified by the independent accountant.

If the corporation has fewer than 100 shareholders the articles are competent to waive the obligation to provide an annual report.

If the corporation has more than 100 shareholders the content of the annual report is expanded to include a brief description of all "insider transactions" (transactions, other than compensation, in which the corporation has engaged with one of its officers, directors, or a controlling shareholder) involving an amount in excess of $40,000. Corporations reporting under Section 12 of the Federal Securities and Exchange Act, and those reporting under Sections 7(c), 8(c), and 28 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act are exempted from ACC Section .433(b) on the grounds that their federal reporting obligations cover these important items.

Section .433(c) permits shareholders holding at least 5% of the outstanding shares of any class to make written requests for periodic income statements.

Section .433(f) establishes the penal consequences of any failure, refusal, or neglect to make or disseminate the reports and statements required by this section, and also provides that a competent court may specifically enforce these rights.

Section .433(g) makes this section applicable to foreign corporations with principal executive offices in or meetings held in Alaska.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 16.20 follows the California/ACC example and imposes an annual reporting obligation upon corporations. It does <u>not</u> contain any exemption for small corporations and the comment (16-20) makes it clear that it will have ". . .its principal impact on small, closely held corporations. . . ." Corporations which report under federal law would <u>not</u> be exempt from the RMBCA Section 16.20 obligation. Thus Native Corporations would face the duplicative burden of reporting.

RMBCA Section 16.21 requires that some of the "insider transactions" addressed in ACC Section .433(b) be reported to shareholders. In general, it does not require disclosure of major transactions with directors, officers or controlling shareholders. Yet it would require special reports of every instance of advances or indemnification. ACC Section .433(b)(2) requires this only if the instances aggregate more than $10,000 to an individual officer or director during the fiscal year.

The RMBCA does not guarantee access on the part of shareholders holding at least 5% of the outstanding shares to quarterly financial statements. Nor does it contain any express sanction for defiance of the reporting obligations it does impose. This last point reveals a distinction between the attitudes of the framers of the two statutes. The Alaska Code Revision Commission felt that it is unwise for a statute to create any positive obligation and then fail to spell out the consequences of a refusal on the part of affected persons

to comply with its terms.

Section .435 SHAREHOLDERS' DERIVATIVE ACTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .435 is new and without statutory precedent in Alaska. Shareholders' derivative actions are presently regulated by the Alaska Supreme Court's adoption of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.1.

Subsection .435(a) is taken in modified form from Section 626(a) of the NBCL. Subsection .435(b) is taken from GCL Section 800(b)(1). Subsections .435(c) through (i) represent original work by the Code Revision Commission. Subsection (h), security for expenses, is taken from MBCA Section 49. Subsections (j) and (i) are predicated upon NBCL Section 626(d) and (e).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .435(a) subjects shareholders' derivative actions to statutory regulation for the first time. Section .435(b) establishes a limited departure from what is otherwise a contemporaneous share ownership requirement. If a noncontemporaneous shareholder can establish to the satisfaction of the court that the criteria enumerated in Sections .435(b)(1)-(5) are satisfied, the statute empowers the court to grant standing to such a plaintiff.

Section .435(c) requires that a qualified shareholder make a demand upon the board to secure such action as the plaintiff desires, unless the shareholder can show that such demand would be futile. Under Section .435(d), the burden to establish excuse is upon the plaintiff-shareholder. If a demand on the board is not excused, Section .435(e) provides that a decision by the board, consonant with its duties of care and loyalty, that in its business judgment such litigation would not be in the best interest of the corporation, terminates the right created by Section .435(a). A shareholder is not thereafter precluded from offering evidence that any or all of the directors who have decided that the litigation not go forward are implicated in the wrong complained of.

If an initial demand on the board has been excused, or if the shareholder is able to prove that the recommendation by a board upon which demand has been made should be ignored as tainted, Section .435(f) provides for the subsequent intervention by allegedly disinterested directors asserting that, in their good faith, independent, and informed business judgment, the action should be dismissed as inimical to the best interests of the corporation. Assuming that these disinterested directors are able to meet their burden of establishing good faith, independence, and informed business judgment, the trial court is directed to make an independent assessment in exercising its own judgment as to whether the action should be maintained.

Section .435(g) aligns Alaska with California and New York in omitting the requirement that a shareholder make a

demand upon the outstanding shares.

Section .435(h) enables a corporation or the actual defendants to move the court at any time before final judgment to require the plaintiffs to give security for the reasonable expenses, including attorney fees, that may be incurred by the petitioners. The amount of security shall be determined by the court in its discretion, except that if the plaintiff shareholder(s) hold 5% or more of any class of outstanding shares or voting trust certificates representing shares, there shall be no security for expenses requirement.

Section .435(i) forbids any form of "out of court settlement" of a derivative action without court approval.

Section .435(j) provides that any recovery should be accounted for to the corporation, however, the court may award the prevailing party reasonable expenses, including attorney fees.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.40 accords with the Commission's recommendation that demands upon shareholders be eliminated. However, RMBCA Section 7.40 also would eliminate the security for expenses provided by ACC Section .435(h). Finally, the official comment to RMBCA Section 7.40 (7-85) make it clear that it takes no position on the question of the power of independent directors to seek dismissal of the derivative action on the ground that, in their collective business judgment, it is not in the best interests of the corporation. Such matters are resolved by ACC Section .435.

Section .438 LIABILITY OF SHAREHOLDERS AND SUBSCRIBERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .438 is predicated upon MBCA Section 25 and AS 10.05.125.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .438 establishes the basic proposition of limited liability of shareholders, except for their liability to pay the full consideration for the shares which runs to designated classes of successors in interest.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 6.22 is functionally identical to ACC Section .438 except that it does not clarify the non-liability of executors, administrators, conservators, guardians, trustees, assignees for the benefit of creditors, receivers or pledgees.

Notes

ARTICLE 6. DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

Section .450 BOARD OF DIRECTORS; DUTY OF CARE; RIGHT OF INSPECTION; FAILURE TO DISSENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .450(a) is premised upon the 1977 revision of the MBCA Section 35. The rights, privileges, and duties which are fixed upon the board devolve upon delegates. ACC Section .450 differs from the Model Act language to make it clear that with this delegation flows the liabilities which the Chapter otherwise imposes upon the directors. This modification follows GCL Section 300(d).

Subsection (b) is also premised upon the revised content of MBCA Section 35. Presently, there is no statutorily defined duty of care to be observed by a corporate director. One deviation from the MBCA is the provision in ACC Section .450(b) in which the duty of care includes the duty of reasonable inquiry. This is taken from GCL Section 300(d).

This section replaces AS 10.05.174, .222, and .219.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Under Section .450 there must be a board of directors. ACC Section .450 provides for the exercise and delegation of board functions; the duty of care which must be observed by the directors and their right to rely upon certain information, opinions, reports, or statements from officers, experts, and committees of the board; the grant of an absolute right of inspection to every director as to all corporate books, records, and documents, together with the right to use an agent or attorney and the right to make copies or extracts; and, the consequences of a director's failure to dissent as to any action taken by the board at a meeting at which she is present.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.01 parallels ACC Section .450(a) in requiring a board of directors. The authority to delegate board functions is more limited under RMBCA Section 8.01 in that the corporations with more than 50 shareholders may not delegate board functions.

RMBCA Section 8.30 establishes the standards of care which must be observed for directors. Like ACC Section .450(b) it imposes a standard of honesty in fact augmented by the requirement that the conduct meet the level which an "ordinarily prudent person in a like position would exercise under similar circumstances. . . ." Unlike the California and ACC standard, the one articulated in the RMBCA does not reference a duty of reasonable inquiry. RMBCA Section 8.30(b) and (c) are similar to ACC Section .450(b) in enabling a director to rely upon information, opinions, reports and statements from officers, experts, or committees of the

board. This right of reliance is qualified and inapplicable if the director knows, or as a reasonable person ought to know, that, as to the mater in question, reliance is unwarranted.

Section .453 NUMBER AND ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .453(a) and (b) are premised upon a modification of New York Business Corporation Law Section 702(a) and (b), and were adopted in lieu of comparable provisions of Section 36 of the MBCA. Section .453(c), (d), and (e) are taken from MBCA Section 36. This section replaces AS 10.05.177, .180, and .183.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Section .453(a) continues the policy of AS 10.05.177, which sets the minimum number of directors at three, save for a corporation with less than three shareholders. In a corporation with less than three shareholders, the number of directors need not exceed the number of shareholders. The Model language which would permit a corporation to function with a board of one regardless of the number of shareholders was rejected. Further, Section .453(a) makes it impossible for a board to adopt bylaws changing the number of directors without participation of the shares (as now provided in AS 10.05.177), unless the board acts under a provision of the articles or bylaws adopted by approval of the outstanding shares.

This section also directs that there shall be an election of directors at each annual meeting except in the case of a classified board, and defines the tenure in office of incumbent directors. Subsection (c) sanctions a provision in the articles which would secure the election of one or more directors to the holders of the shares of a class or series voting as a class or series. Subsection (e) makes clear that a director serves until the expiration of the term for which he is elected and until a successor has been elected and qualified.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.03 governs the number and election of directors. It perpetuates the concept previously not adopted by the Legislature which would permit a board of a single director regardless of the number of persons who own shares. RMBCA Section 8.03 tracks ACC Section .453(b) in permitting the articles or bylaws to establish a formula permitting either the shareholders or the board to increase or decrease the number of positions on the board. The RMBCA limits the power of the board under such a provision to an increase or decrease of no more than 30 percent from the number last approved by the shareholders. It, too, establishes the norm of one year terms unless the board is classified with staggered terms.

RMBCA Section 8.04 parallels ACC Section .453(c) in permitting the articles to permit classes to elect certain positions on the board. Unlike the ACC, it would not permit

series of shares to have discrete voting rights.

RMBCA Section 8.05 is functionally identical to ACC Section .453(e) respecting terms of directors and the continuation of a director's liability until a successor shall have been elected and qualified.

Section .455 CLASSIFICATION OF DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .455 is an enactment of MBCA Section 37, and works an important change from AS 10.05.186. Under existing Alaska law, the decision to classify the board could be taken by a bylaw adopted by the board without shareholder participation. Subsection (b), continuing the concern for minority shareholder representation on the board, is new. Section .455 replaces AS 10.05.186.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .455 provides for optional classification of the board if there are nine or more board members, as long as the option is specified in the articles. However, if the corporation has not eliminated cumulative voting, an amendment to the articles attempting to provide for board classification is ineffective if the number of shares voting against classification is sufficient to elect one director under a cumulative voting scheme.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: 8.06 is functionally identical to ACC Section .455(a). Classification cannot be made unless there are nine or more directors and there may not be more than three classes serving staggered one year terms. Unfortunately, the RMBCA does not contain any protective mechanism for those corporations which have elected cumulative voting rights.

Section .458 VACANCIES ON THE BOARD

ORIGIN: ACC Section .458 is adapted from GCL Section 302. It has no direct parallel in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .458 provides that the board may declare vacant the office of a director who has been declared of unsound mind by a court order, or who has had civil rights suspended due to imprisonment as provided in AS 33.30.310.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains no comparable provision.

Section .460 REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR WITHOUT CAUSE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .460 is premised upon Section 303 of the GCL, and has no parallel in Alaska law. This section provides an important shareholder check upon the incumbent di-

rectors innovated in California (as mandatory), and now found in Delaware (optional), New York (optional), and in the MBCA (optional). Section .460 follows the California version, and is mandatory. The special provisions regarding notice are original, having no parallel in statutory precedent, and apply only to those corporations with 500 or more record shareholders.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .460 provides for removal of incumbent directors at any time without any reason by a vote of the outstanding shares, subject to specific notice provisions. If the attempted removal is to be made at a special meeting, or at a regular meeting of a corporation with more than 500 record shareholders, notice of the removal action must be given. Provisions are also made for the protection of representatives of a minority of the shares, or the directors elected by a class or series of shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.08 continues the Model Act tradition of suggesting that this provision be made optional according to provisions of the articles. It contains no notice provisions respecting corporations with a relatively large number of shareholders. Like ACC Section .460, RMBCA Section 8.08 contains provisions to protect directors seated through cumulative voting or as the representatives of a particular class of shares.

Section .463 REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR BY SUPERIOR COURT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .463 is taken from GCL Section 304, and is without parallel in Alaska law. This section modifies the GCL by adding "gross neglect of duties" as a ground for judicial removal, and in granting standing to the board to seek removal.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The primary recourse for shareholders dissatisfied with the performance of a director is to seek removal under ACC Section .460. However, if there are insufficient votes, ACC Section .463 specifies the serious grounds under which the holders of at least ten percent of the shares of any class or a majority of the board of directors have standing to seek removal in the superior court.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: 8.09 is functionally identical to ACC Section .463.

Section .465 VACANCIES AND RESIGNATION; SPECIAL MEETING OF SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .465 is modeled upon GCL Section 305 with certain modifications. Section .465(a) continues the policy of AS 10.05.189 in vesting broad authority to fill vacancies with the remaining member(s) of the board, yet

unlike AS 10.05.189, this presumption may be modified by provisions in the articles or bylaws. The 1976 amendment to AS 10.05.189, requiring expansion vacancies to be filled by shareholders, has been dropped, given shareholders' expanded mandatory role in ACC .453. Section .465(b) has no parallel in Alaska law. Section .465(d) is a substantial modification of GCL Section 305(c), omitting Section 305(c)(2) (eliminating the role of the superior court).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section and Section .458 define when a vacancy exists upon the board. ACC Section .465 provides that in the absence of contrary provisions in the articles or bylaws, and unless the vacancy has occurred by removal by shareholders (Section .460), the vacant position(s) may be filled by the director(s) remaining in office, even though there may be less than a quorum of the entire board. This section also provides for resignation by a director and his status until the election and qualification of a successor.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.10 differs from ACC Section .465 in two particulars. It fails to make clear that, unless otherwise provided in the articles or bylaws, a sole remaining director may act to fill vacancies on the board. This provision may be especially important in the event of a disaster in which nearly all of the directors may have perished. To some extent this omission is remedied by Section 3.03(b)(2) under which one or more officers of the corporation may be deemed directors for a meeting during a defined period of emergency. RMBCA Section 8.10 does not contain a comparable provision to ACC Section .465(c) whereby if the directors elected by the shareholders constitute less than a majority of the board, shareholders holding as few as 10% of the outstanding shares may call a special meeting to elect the entire board.

Section .468 EXECUTIVE AND OTHER BOARD COMMITTEES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .468 is a modified version of the new Section 42 of the MBCA, and clarifies AS 10.05.195.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .468 permits the articles or bylaws to empower the board to set up executive and other committees, and to delegate to such committees the powers otherwise vested in the board, with certain exceptions. The duty of care of directors not members of such committees is provided for in Section .468(b).

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.25 is functionally identical to ACC Section .468 with two exceptions. RMBCA Section 8.25(a) requires that each committee have two or more director-members. This limitation is not found in ACC Section .468. RMBCA Section 8.25 does not explicitly cover the creation of committees and the delega-

tion of board functions to the duty of care owed by non-member directors.

Section .470 MEETINGS: CALL, PLACE, NOTICE, AND WAIVER

ORIGIN: ACC Section .470 is a modified version of GCL Section 307, which replaces AS 10.05.198 (which was predicated upon MBCA Section 43).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .470 defines the officers or directors who have authority to call regular or special meetings of the board or board committee, the notice requirements that must be observed, and the waiver of such notice requirements by unnoticed directors.

ACC Section .470(a) is unprecedented in Alaska law and for the first time defines the corporate officers or directors who have authority to call regular or special or special meetings of the board or board committee.

ACC Section .470(b) follows the Alaska's existing no notice policy for regular meetings. With respect to special meetings there is a standardization of a twenty day written notice requirement with broad authority to use the instrumentalities of electronic telecommunications in which case the time provision is the 72 hour requirement observed for personal communication. Section .470(b) goes beyond either the GCL or the Model Act in requiring that notice of special meetings disclose the purpose or business to be transacted. Section .470(c) defines the circumstances under which an unnoticed director can or will be taken to have waived the notice requirements.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Sections 8.22 and 8.23 contain coverage comparable ACC Section .470(b) and (c). RMBCA Section 8.22 does not specify who may call meetings of the board or board committees, nor does it, in the absence of a requirement in the article cr bylaw, necessitate that notice of special meetings disclose the purpose and business to be transacted. This omission may prove troublesome in the context of a closely held corporation in which the minority's only pragmatic protection may be to refrain from attending a special meeting thus blocking the formation of a quorum.

RMBCA Section 8.23 on waiver of notice is substantively identical to ACC Section .470(c).

Section .473 QUORUM OF DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section 473 continues the policy and language of AS 10.05.192 and MBCA Section 40.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .473 fixes the quorum of the board or any board committee at an absolute majority of the positions of such body. The articles or bylaws are

competent to set a higher quorum requirement, but may not go below the majority requirement. This position reflects a continuation of prior Model Act policy which opposed less than majority quorum requirements. ACC Section .473 also establishes the norm that the act of the majority of the directors at a meeting at which a quorum is present is the act of the board unless the articles require a greater number.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.24(a) and (c) are functionally identical to ACC Section .473. RMBCA Section 8.24(b) deviates from prior Model Act policy and would permit the articles or bylaws to fix the quorum requirement as low as one-third of the number of members of the board or committee.

Section .475 INFORMAL ACTION BY DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .475(a) is a straight enactment of the last paragraph of MBCA Section 43. Section .475(b) is a modified version of AS 10.05.199 and MBCA Section 44.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .475 provides for board meetings to be conducted via telecommunications equipment allowing simultaneous contact of all participants. It also provides for business to be transacted without any form of meeting via the use of written consents identical in content obtained from all directors.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.20(b) is functionally identical to ACC Section .475(a) in permitting board meetings to be conducted via communications equipment. RMBCA Section 8.21 is functionally identical to ACC Section .475(b) in permitting the board to act without a meeting utilizing written consents signed by all of the members. The prudential requirement that those consents be identical in content is omitted from the RMBCA.

Section .478 DIRECTOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

ORIGIN: Existing Alaska law has no statutory law on director conflicts of interest. ACC Section .478 is modeled upon GCL Section 310, with modifications designed to produce a more stringent standard regarding director conflict of interest. One departure from the GCL was the omission of its provision permitting a committee of the board to validate certain interested transactions. Also omitted was California's third alternative for validation, which would be a showing by the proponent of a contract or transaction that such transaction was just and reasonable. Instead of being an independent vehicle for validation, such a requirement is imposed as an <u>additional</u> ground for validation under Section .478(a)(2).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .478 addresses conflict of

interests in two distinct and classical instances: (1) where the contract or other transaction is between the corporation and one or more of its directors; and (2) where the contract or transaction is between two corporations sharing a common director or directors.

ACC Section .478(a) provides that transactions between the corporation and a director or a business entity in which the director has a material financial interest must be approved either by validation via the informed approval of the shareholders, or by the approval of a disinterested and fully informed majority of a quorum of the full board. The director's shares are not to be computed either for purposes of determining a quorum of the shares or a quorum of the board. The proponent of the contract has the additional burden to show that the contract or transaction is just and reasonable.

In the case of a common director(s) on the boards of each of the corporate parties to a transaction, there is no objection as long as the other directors are fully apprised of all facts, including the common directorship. Nothing in ACC Section .478(c) is intended to influence Alaska's antitrust laws, nor does this section intend to operate in derogation of a director's common law duty of loyalty in the context of the corporate opportunity doctrine.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.31 parallels ACC Section .478 is primarily concerned with conflicts of interest in which the director has a direct or indirect adverse financial interest. Its coverage is very similar to ACC Section .478(a). There is no explicit RMBCA coverage of the secondary conflict of interest situation in which a common director or directors serve on the boards of both corporate parties to a contract or transaction.

Section .480 LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .480 is an augmented version of new Model Act Section 48, and replaces AS 10.05.216 and .225. Section .480(a) continues the policy of AS 10.05.216 imposing joint and several liability upon directors. Section .480(a)(3) continues an imposition of liability for illicit loans to officers or employees contained in AS 10.05.216(d), which is not found in MBCA Section 48. The affirmative defense by a director that she observed the duty of care defined in ACC Section 450(b) is new to Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .480 imposes joint and several liability upon directors who vote for or assent to three types of illicit transactions: distributions to shareholders contrary to provisions of Article 4 of this Chapter; distributions to shareholders which are prejudicial to the rights of creditors during the liquidation of the corporation; and loans or extensions of corporate credit to any officer or employee contrary to the restrictions of ACC Section .485 and any provisions of the articles of incorpora-

tion. A defense to liability is proof by the defendant(s) of an observance of the duty of care articulated in Section .450(b).

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 8.33(a) is functionally identical to ACC Section .480(a)(1) in dealing with the consequences of a director's personal liability for voting for or assenting to illicit distributions. The rights of contribution recognized in ACC Section .480(b) are mirrored in RMBCA Section 8.33(b). The ACC's coverage of distributions which are illicit during the course of liquidation are not contained in the RMBCA. Illicit loans to officers or directors, covered by ACC Section .480(a)(3), are the subject of RMBCA Section 8.32. The circumstances under which such loans may be licitly extended are covered by ACC Section .485. They are more stringent than the circumstances recognized under RMBCA Section 8.33(a)(1) and (2).

Section .483 OFFICERS: TENURE, RESIGNATION, AGENCY, DUTY OF CARE

ORIGIN: ACC Subsection .483(a) is adapted from GCL Section 312(a), former GCL Section 821, and NBCL Section 715(e). Unlike AS 10.05.228, Section 483(a) eliminates the necessity of a vice president.

Subsection .483(b) is taken from GCL Section 312(b), and differs from AS 10.05.228 by providing that officers must be selected by the board.

Subsection .483(c) is taken from NBCL Section 715(g), and replaces AS 10.05.231; it reflects no substantive change in defining the source of real authority of officers.

Subsection .483(d) is taken from GCL Section 313, which in turn, is adapted from Pennsylvania BCL Section 305.

Subsection .483(e) is premised upon NBCL 715(h), without inclusion of the specific "right of reliance" provision of the New York act. For the first time, the ACC defines the duty of care for officers, however, unlike NBCL Section 715, ACC Section 483(e) makes it clear that the duty of care includes a duty of reasonable inquiry.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Five major topics are addressed by ACC Section .483: (1) the minimum number of offices which a corporation must have; (2) the manner of selection and the right of resignation of officers; (3) the source of real authority of corporate officers; (4) a strategy by which a third party can preclude a corporate principal's denial of the authority of an officer as agent; and, (5) a definition of the standard of care according to which officers are to discharge their responsibilities to the corporation.

COMPARISON OF THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The five topics covered by ACC Section .483 are treated in five separate sections of the RMBCA.

RMBCA Section 8.40 deals with the required officers.

It differs from ACC Section .483(a) in several particulars. Section 8.40 merely requires that the corporation have "the officers described in its bylaws or appointed by the board of directors. . . ." Thus it would appear that under the RMBCA a corporation could be headed by the "Great PooBah", an individual assisted by the "Supreme Tweeb." Notwithstanding, there must be at least one officer who has the functions of the corporate secretary and who assumes all statutorily imposed duties of that office.

RMBCA Section 8.41 is in accord with ACC Section .483(a) in describing the duties of officers. They are fixed by the terms of the bylaws or, the the extend permitted, by the board. The RMBCA misses the accomplishment of ACC Section .483(c) in making explicit the grant of real agency authority to corporate officers.

RMBCA Section 8.42 joins ACC Section .483(e) in defining a duty of care for corporate officers. Unlike the ACC, the RMBCA does not make an express reference to a duty to make reasonably inquiry as part of the "reasonable person in like circumstances" standard. RMBCA Section 8.42 parallels its treatment of the duty of care for corporate directors by articulating "safe harbor" provisions wherein an officer may rely upon reports and representations of others. The ACC does not spell out this concept.

RMBCA Section 8.43 parallels ACC Section .483(b) in providing that officers serve at the pleasure of the board. It also recognizes circumstance under which an officer may resign her position.

RMBCA Section 8.44 is functionally identical to ACC Section .483(b) in providing that the removal of an officer does not prejudice any contract rights which the officer might have in the event that removal was in breach of a contract of employment. Both the ACC and RMBCA language aim to forestall circumstances in which a corporation could be ordered to specifically perform a contract with an officer in whom the board no longer reposed confidence. Such a corporation may, however, be liable in damages.

Section .485 LOANS TO DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .485 is unique, borrowing from MBCA Section 47 and GCL Section 315, but reflecting policies which are more protective of the corporate fisc than either of those provisions. It replaces AS 10.05.213.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .485 repudiates AS 10.05.213's flat prohibition against loans to corporate directors or officers. However, loans may not be made to directors without the approval of two-thirds of the voting shares. The board is competent to extend loans to officers and employees. A "loan" is defined broadly, to include securities or real or personal property, as well as cash. Directors, officers, and employees of parent, subsidiary, and sibling corporate affiliates are restrained under this section for purposes of

obtaining a corporate loan.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: 8.32 also prohibits a corporation from extending loans or guarantees to corporate directors. It does not cover loans to officers or employees. Further, the power to loan or guarantee the loans of directors is easier to achieve under RMBCA Section 8.32. Either a simple majority of the voting shares may approve or the board may determine that the loan or guarantee benefits the corporation and, having so determined, approves it.

Section .488 SECONDARY LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .488 is new and without direct precedent in corporate law. This section was adapted from NBCL Section 630, which imposes personal joint and several liability upon the ten largest shareholders of a non-publicly traded corporation for all debts, wages, or salaries due and owing to any of the corporation's laborers and employees.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The social problem targeted for redress by ACC Section .488 is the abuse of unsecured creditors, including employees, who are precluded by the relatively small dimension of their demands, contrasted with the high costs of litigation, from asserting the more traditional common law efforts to "pierce the corporate veil".

Section .488 creates a "secondary liability" on the part of incorporators, directors (other than a provisional director appointed under Section 640), and the president, secretary, and treasurer in the event that corporate assets prove insufficient to meet corporate obligations for contract indebtedness, materials, supplies, inventory, or services furnished in the state during their period of service. This secondary liability is joint and several, and may amount to a maximum of $25,000 for each creditor. The terms of a written contract between a corporation and a third party may modify or preclude the liability created by this section. The liability of this section also extends to directors, incorporators, and officers of every foreign corporation doing business within Alaska to the extent that materials, supplies, inventory, or services were furnished within the state.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The exposure draft of the RMBCA contained nothing comparable to the New York precedent or the ACC provision on secondary liability. However, the final draft states in Section 2.02 that the articles can impose personal liability on shareholders for specified amounts in specified conditions.

Section .490 INDEMNIFICATION OF OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, EMPLOYEES, AND AGENTS: INSURANCE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .490 is premised upon Section 5 of the Model Act and works few changes on the provisions of AS 10.05.010.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Corporate director, officers, and employees are vulnerable to attack in their personal capacity for acts done in their corporate roles. There is an understandable demand for financial protection from potentially ruinous costs and liabilities. Standing in opposition to this demand are social policies implicit in the condemnation of activity or behavior as criminal, violative of administrative regulations, or harmful to the interests of the corporation. These competing interests must be confronted in any statutory provision covering indemnification.

ACC Section .490 distinguishes between those circumstances in which a claim for indemnification may be made as of "right" from those in which it is addressed to the discretion of the corporation. As a further limitation upon discretionary indemnification, ACC Section .490(a) and (b) specify standards which must have obtained as to both the conduct and state of mind of the defendant. Finally, the corporation is empowered to purchase and maintain insurance which would recompense a defendant for any costs or liabilities incurred irrespective of the power of the corporation to have effected indemnification for its own resources.

Indemnification as a matter of right under ACC Section .490(c) can be asserted by a defendant who has been exonerated on the merits. Discretionary indemnification is provided in two circumstances. ACC Section .490(a) deals with a defendant in direct civil, administrative or criminal proceedings. While the decision to indemnify is left to the judgment of the corporation under subsection (d), it is conditioned upon a finding that the defendant ". . .acted in good faith an in a manner reasonably believed to be in or not opposed to the best interests of the corporation, and, with respect to a criminal action pro proceeding, had no reasonable cause to believe the conduct unlawful. . ." ACC Section .490(b) deals with the even more troubling situation of discretionary indemnification where the defendant has been assailed in a derivative proceeding. If the defendant has been adjudged guilty of violating either the duty of care or loyalty, the power of the corporation to indemnify against the very harm which it has suffered, or the court incurred costs in resisting liability, can only be exercised pursuant to a specific finding by and order of the court in which the action was tried.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: Chapter 8, sub-chapter E of the RMBCA contain the coverage on indemnification. RMBCA Section 8.51(a), (b) and (c). deals with the authority of a corporation to indemnify. It is functionally equivalent to ACC Section .490(c). RMBCA Section 8.51(d) prohibits indemnification in the instance of a successful derivative suit or other proceeding charging personal benefit to the defendant. However this ironclad prohibition

is later qualified by RMBCA Section 8.54(2) where it is recognized that the court may order indemnification. The combination of these two provisions is a result not unlike ACC Section .490(b). RMBCA Section 8.52 on mandatory indemnification deals with the defendant who was wholly successful. It accords with ACC Section .490(c).

RMBCA Section 8.53 adopts a stricter attitude toward advances against th defendant's anticipated expenses. ACC Section .490(e) leaves the question within the discretion of the corporation conditioned only upon an undertaking by or on behalf of the defendant that the amount will be repaid if it is ultimately determined that there is no indemnification as a matter of right. The RMBCA would require a prior determination of the defendant's good faith, the furnishing of a written personal undertaking to repay the advance, and a determination that the facts then known would not preclude indemnification.

RMBCA Section 8.55 is in substantial accord with ACC Section .490(d)'s position on how and by whom the corporate decision to indemnify is to be made. The primary responsibility is that of disinterested and uninvolved directors so long as they constitute a majority of a quorum. If this quorum cannot be mustered the decision may be reached by independent legal counsel or approved by the outstanding shares.

RMBCA Section 8.56 extends the provisions on the indemnification of directors to employees and officers. This accords with the provisions of ACC Section .490.

RMBCA Section 8.57 accords with ACC Section .490(g) permitting a corporation to purchase and maintain a policy of insurance covering directors, officers and employees which would cover any liability arising out of that status whether or not the corporation would have the power to indemnify with its own funds.

Notes

ARTICLE 7. AMENDMENTS AND CHANGES

Section .502 AUTHORIZATION: PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED AMENDMENTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .502(a) is taken from GCL Section 900. It repeats the substance of AS 10.05.270, which it replaces. Section .502(b) is largely a reenactment of AS 10.05.273, with several deletions reflecting the elimination of the concept of par value. The language under Section .502(b)(2) is new, and reflects a major change in Alaska law, in order to carefully and unequivocally authorize only changes which extend limitations imposed upon a corporation's duration. Subsections .502(b)(5) and (6) follow MBCA Section 58, in order to conform Alaska law to the language of the Model Act.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .502 permits a corporation to amend its articles in "any and as many respects as may be desired." Whether a provision is required or permitted in the articles of incorporation is determined as of the effective date of the amendment.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.01 confers a power to amend the corporate articles in the most general of terms. It does not differ substantively from ACC Section .502 but does not contain the non-exhaustive list of permitted amendments found in the ACC. This reflects a differing drafting style in which the Alaska statute would contain illustrations and examples to guide both lay persons and counsel.

Section .504 PROCEDURE TO AMEND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .504's subsections (a)(1), (b), and (c) are taken from AS 10.05.276 and MBCA Section 59. Section .504(a)(2) is adapted from Section 902(a) of the GCL, and changes Alaska law by explicitly giving shareholders the power to initiate amendments to the articles.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .504 sets forth the mandatory procedures which must be followed to amend the articles. Under Section .504(a)(2), once shares have been issued, the power to initiate amendments resides concurrently in the board and with the voting shares. An amendment initiated by the shares does not become effective until approved by the board; likewise, an amendment initiated by the board requires shareholder approval to become effective. Alaska law presently requires a two-thirds majority of the shareholders to approve amendments; ACC Section .504(a)(2) opts for a majority of the outstanding shares entitled to vote, but makes the articles competent to establish a supermajority voting re-

quirement. This section also provides for notice as well as the power of the board alone to amend the articles if no shares have been issued.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: Several provisions of the RMBCA contain coverage of topics addressed in ACC Section .504. RMBCA Section 10.05 accords with ACC Section .506(a)(1) in providing that if no shares have been issued the power to amend the articles is with the board. Once shares have been issued ACC Section .504 requires the approval of both the directors and an absolute majority of the shares to amend the articles. RMBCA Section 10.02 creates a limited exception to this norm for what the official comment terms "housekeeping amendments" (10-9). These amendments can be affected by board approval only. Among them are two which Alaska law has always prohibited: deleting the names and address of the original registered agent and initial directors.

Once shares are outstanding RMBCA Section 10.03 severely restricts the power of shareholders. They cannot initiate amendments but can only approve those proposed by the board. Both statutes require that shareholders be given notice of the amendment whether it is to be considered at a regular or special meeting of the shares.

Section .506 CLASS VOTING ON AMENDMENTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .506 is largely a reenactment of AS 10.05.282. Section .506(6) amends AS 10.05.282 to conform with Section 60 of the MBCA, and includes an increase in the authorized number of shares of a superior class as an amendment giving a right to class voting. This section also replaces AS 10.05.279.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .506 provides for "class voting", which obtains irrespective of any provisions in the articles, and may not be impaired or denied by any internal rule. Further, as to any amendment on which there is a right to vote by class, there is no "approval by the shareholders" unless the amendment receives the affirmative vote of a majority of the affected class as well as a majority of the other shares entitled to vote.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.04 accords with ACC Section .506(a) in mandating class voting rights under circumstances where an amendment would affect the rights, privileges, or restrictions imposed upon that class of shares. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the RMBCA or its official comments which parallels ACC Section .506(b)'s express statement that if the holders of shares of a class are entitled to vote as a class then the amendment is not approved unless it receives a majority vote of the outstanding shares of that class and also receives an absolute majority of the outstanding shares.

Section .508 GREATER VOTING REQUIREMENTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .508 is taken from GCL Section 902(e), and is new to Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section permits the articles to set up supermajority or even unanimous voting requirements. An amendment affecting such an article must be approved by the same supermajority vote.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 7.27 directly parallels the content of ACC Section .508. The official comment (7-65) makes it clear that the articles may establish unanimous voting requirements.

Section .510 ARTICLES OF AMENDMENT

Section .512 FILING OF ARTICLES OF AMENDMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .510 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.285, with the deletion of the provision regarding stated capital. Section .512 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.288.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: In order for an amendment to the articles to become effective, it is necessary to make a filing with the commissioner (ACC Section .512) and receive a certificate of amendment. Section .510 specifies what the articles of amendment are to include.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.06 is functionally identical to ACC Section .512 except that it would require filing with the secretary of state and it omits the requirement that the articles of amendment be signed by designated corporate officers.

Section .514 EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE OF AMENDMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .514 is essentially a reenactment of AS 10.05.291, with language added from MBCA Section 63 permitting up to a 30-day delay in effectiveness.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: An amendment to the articles is not effective until the commissioner has reviewed the amendment to ascertain its conformity with law, and has issued a certificate of amendment. Section .514(b) specifies that an amendment does not have a retroactive effect so as to compromise any pending litigation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.09 provides that, unless a delayed effective date is specified, the amendment or restatement becomes effective

when the articles of amendment or restatement are filed.

Section .516 RESTATED ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

Section .518 FILING OF RESTATED ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

Section .520 EFFECT OF ISSUANCE OF RESTATED CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .516 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.294. ACC Section .518 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.303; Section .520 is a verbatim reenactment of AS 10.05.306.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section authorizes a corporation to restate its articles as they may have been amended as a matter of form by resolution of the board. The substantive provisions cannot be so amended, and in fact, Section .516 requires that a statement be filed with the restated articles averring that the restated articles correctly set out without change the corresponding provisions of the articles.

ACC Section .518 specifies the procedure to be followed by the corporation and the commissioner in the filing and administrative handling of the restated articles. Section .520 provides that the restated articles become effective and supersede the original articles and all amendments to them upon the issuance of the restated certificate of incorporation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.07(e) and (f) follow the provisions of ACC Section .516 except that the restated articles may contain an amendment not previously reported to the state. Under this section the filing is again with the Secretary of State, not the commissioner as provided in ACC Section .518.

Section .522 AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION IN REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS

Section .524 FILING OF AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES IN REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS

Section .526 EFFECT OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF AMENDMENT IN REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .522 is taken from MBCA Section 65, and is new to Alaska law.

ACC Sections .524 and .526 are derived from MBCA Section 65, and are new to Alaska law, being added in the wake of Section .522. Section .526 varies from the MBCA by omitting the 30-day effectiveness delay provision found in the Model Act.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .522 is designed to coordinate Alaska law with the Federal Bankruptcy Act. It permits

amendment of the articles as part of the reorganization proceedings, which amendment might otherwise not obtain the affirmative vote of the shares. Without this provision, an involuntary dissolution and reincorporation may be necessary to achieve the desired result of the bankruptcy reorganization, with a possible increase in federal income tax liability.

ACC section .524 specifies the filing procedure for any amendments to the articles accomplished by bankruptcy reorganization under ACC Section .522. Section .526 provides for the effectiveness of the amendments upon the issuance of a certificate of amendment by the commissioner.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 10.08 is functionally identical to ACC Section .522 -- .526.

Notes

ARTICLE 8. ORGANIC CHANGE

Section .530 MERGER

Section .532 PROCEDURE FOR MERGER

Section .534 CONSOLIDATION

Section .536 PROCEDURE FOR CONSOLIDATION

Section .538 SHARE EXCHANGE

Section .540 PROCEDURE FOR SHARE EXCHANGE

ORIGIN: ACC Sections .530 and .532 (pertaining to the definition of and procedure for merger) are taken from MBCA Section 71, and reflect without change AS 10.05.375 and .378. ACC Sections .534 and .536 (pertaining to the definition and consolidation) are taken from MBCA Section 72, and reflect without change AS 10.05.381 and .384. ACC Sections .538 and .540 (define and determine the procedure for a share exchange). They are taken from MBCA Section 72A, and are without precedent in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: These sections define and set create uniform procedures for the proposal of the three classic furms of organic change. In the event of either a merger or consolidation, one or both of the participating corporations formally ceases to exist. In the case of a share exchange there is no formal suppression of a constituent corporation but it becomes a wholly owned subsidiary of the acquiring corporate entity. In each instance, the ACC places the responsibility for the framing of the proposal within the discretion of the boards of the participating corporations. The ACC provides for a share exchange for the first time in Alaska law.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Sections 11.01 and 11.02 cover the subjects addressed in ACC Sections .530 -- .540. The RMBCA provisions on merger and share exchange parallel those of the ACC. There is no separate treatment of consolidation in the RMBCA. This departure from the prior provisions of the Model Act and the statutory laws of all jurisdictions currently following it is explained by the drafters of the RMBCA as reflecting sentiment that consolidations are currently out of fashion. If the plan is that both participating corporations are to cease existence and emerge and a new, third corporation, the RMBCA would require the extra steps of prior formation of that third corporation and then merging the two constituent corporations into it. Under ACC Section .534 this result can be effected

in a single, and far simpler step.

Section .542 DISPARATE TREATMENT OF SHARES OF THE SAME CLASS OR SERIES PROHIBITED: EXCEPTIONS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .542 is predicated upon, but not adapted from GCL Section 1101, and is unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .542 establishes a legal presumption against treating the holders of shares of the same class or series in any plan for an organic change in a different manner. A major question much litigated in the last decade is whether organic changes may be used to eliminate certain shareholders by forcing them to accept cash or non voting stock for their shares while other holders of identical stock receive voting shares in the surviving corporation. ACC Section .542 resolves this issue for Alaska in a manner that comports with Delaware and California decisional law. The fiduciary duties of majority or controlling shareholders are recognized in Section .542(a). Section 542(b) recognizes that disparate treatment may be necessary to preserve a Subchapter S election under the Internal Revenue Code. Disparate treatment may also be necessary for other sound business reasons, but the proponents of the plan have the burden to prove it is consistent with fiduciary duties owed to all the shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The official comment to the RMBCA (11-4, 5) makes it clear that the framers of that statute did not resolve this basic question. Any state which chooses to follow this recommendation will condemn to totally unstructured litigation all participants in any organic change which is challenged for its discriminatory treatment of shareholders. Under ACC Section .542 the presumption is against discriminatory treatment unless it can be justified on the predicate of some corporate business reason, as opposed to the personal goals of dominant shareholders.

Section .544 NOTICE TO AND APPROVAL BY SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .544 is a modified version of new Section 73 of the MBCA, and has been extended to treat share exchange in a manner identical to merger or consolidation.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section mandates the steps necessary to seek the approval of shareholders of each corporation participating in a merger, consolidation, or share exchange. Written notice stating that one of the purposes of the meeting is to consider the proposed organic change, a copy of the plan for such change, and the text of the ACC provisions on the rights of dissenting shareholders must be given to each shareholder irrespective of voting rights.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.03 follows ACC Section .544 in requiring notice to shareholders which specifies that an organic change is to be proposed by the board and accompanied by a summary of the plan. This notice is statutorily deficient unless it also includes notice of dissenter's rights. However, unlike ACC Section .544 which express this important obligation in the provision entitled "notice to and approval by shareholders", the RMBCA command that there be notice of dissenter's rights is found in Section 13.20(a).

Section .546 MANNER OF APPROVAL BY SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .546 is premised upon new Section 73 of the MBCA, with a modification to retain the two-thirds voting requirement found in AS 10.05.390. The only change worked by Section .546 pertains to the inclusion of share exchanges.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .546 enfranchises all shares of every class or series of each constituent corporation to an organic change. The plan prepared by the board and noticed to the shareholders is "approved" upon receiving the affirmative vote of an absolute two-thirds majority of all outstanding shares. If the articles of any of the participating corporations provide for class voting on plans for organic change, then in addition to the two-thirds voting requirement for approval by the outstanding shares, there is also a two-thirds affirmative vote requirement for that class. If the articles do not provide for class voting, but the plan for organic change contains provisions which, had they been proposed as amendments to the articles, would have required the affirmative vote of a class, then class voting is required under Section .546.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.03 differs radically from both existing and proposed Alaska law. Unless a greater number is required by the articles, a plan of merger or share exchange is approved by the holders of a simple majority of the shares. RMBCA Section 11.03 does not enfranchise all shares regardless of the presence or absence of voting rights under the articles. It does recognize class voting in a manner not unlike ACC Section .576. In a departure from the 1977 position of the Model Act (Section 73) and the laws of those states which currently accord with that section, the recommended content of RMBCA Section 11.03(g) would create certain circumstances in which mergers and share exchanges can be effected without shareholder approval. As explained in the official comment (11-15), "shareholders' votes should be required only if the transaction fundamentally alters the character of the enterprise or substantially reduces the shareholders' participation in voting or profit distribution." Unfortunately, RMBCA Section 11.03(g) pays no attention at all to the basic economic pursuit of the corporate entity before and after the

organic change. So long as the number of outstanding shares is not changed plus or minus 20%, shareholders who had invested in a corporation historically tied to the fishing industry could find themselves tied to the fate and fortune of a hulla hoop concern. They would never have been consulted, their approval would not have been required, and they would have no dissenter's rights!

Section .548 ABANDONMENT OF PLAN OF MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, OR EXCHANGE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .548 is taken from MBCA Section 73, and reflects without change the content of AS 10.05.393, save for the inclusion of share exchange.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides that, notwithstanding approval by the shareholders, the plan may fail without further action if any condition precedent or concurrent is not satisfied, or if any condition subsequent is triggered.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.03(i) accords with ACC Section .548.

Section .550 ARTICLES OF MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, OR EXCHANGE

Section .552 FILING OF ARTICLES OF MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, OR EXCHANGE

ORIGIN: ACC Sections .550 and .552 are predicated upon new Section 74 of the MBCA. Section .550 changes AS 10.05.396 by the inclusion of share exchanges. Section .552 technically restates AS 10.05.402 to reflect the uniform processing procedures found in ACC Section 910.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: These sections establish the formal requirements necessary to reflect the combination. Section .550 provides that each constituent corporation must execute a set of recombination articles, including the mechanics of the shareholder vote. Section .552 directs that a duplicate copy of the recombinate articles be delivered to the commissioner.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.05 is functionally identical identical to ACC Section .552

Section .554 MERGER OF SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

Section .556 PROCEDURE FOR MERGER OF SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

Section .558 FILING OF ARTICLES OF MERGER OF SUBSIDIARY CORPORATION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .554 is taken from MBCA Section 75, and has no precedent in Alaska law.

ACC Section .556 is taken from MBCA Section 75, with a modification to create a presumption against disparate treatment of the shares.

ACC Section .558 is taken from MBCA Sectio 75.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section authorizes a merger between a parent and a subsidiary whenever at least 90 percent of all outstanding shares of each and every class are owned by the parent corporation.

ACC Section .556 places the power to propose and implement a merger of the subsidiary in the board of the parent. No shareholder approval is required. Disparate treatment of shares must pass muster under ACC Section .542.

ACC Section .558 continues the uniform filing procedures established in ACC Section .910.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.04 is functionally identical to ACC Sections .554, 556 and .558 in the treatment of "short form mergers" between a parent and a 90% owned subsidiary. It does not, however, contain the ACC Section .556(a)(2)'s language creating the presumption of non-discriminatory treatment of all shares of the subsidiary.

Section .560 EFFECT OF MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, OR EXCHANGE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .560 is predicated upon revised MBCA Section 76. The provision for an optional delayed effective date, the inclusion of share exchanges, and the elimination of net surplus reflect the changes made to AS 10.05.405.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .560 governs the date, circumstances when an organic change becomes effective. It is a sufficient authority for the succession by the surviving or resulting corporation to all of the rights and liabilities of the constituent corporations. To the extent that the recombination articles purport to amend the articles of incorporation, such change is given effect. Finally, ACC Section .560(c) determines the fate of all shares of the constituent corporations which are to be converted or exchanged. The ownership claims and interests of shareholders in the constituent corporations are defined subject to any rights which may be asserted by a dissenting shareholder under ACC Section .574.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.06 is functionally identical to ACC Section .560 except for its failure to spell out the consequences of a consolidation in which constituent corporations A and B emerge as resulting corporation C.

Section .562 MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, OR EXCHANGE OF SHARES BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .562 is predicated upon new Section 77 of the MBCA, and replaces AS 10.05.408, .411, and .414. The inclusion of share exchange is unprecedented.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .562 removes potential conflicts of laws when domestic and foreign corporations undergo organic change. This section provides that if the surviving or resulting corporation is foreign, it must as a condition of merging with a domestic corporation agree to service of process in Alaska, and to pay promptly all dissenting shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 11.07 is functionally identical to ACC Section .562 except that the substantive law referenced and made applicable to the surviving foreign corporation differs as noted above.

Section .564 REORGANIZATION: DISCLOSURE OF ALIEN AFFILIATES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .564 reflects the content of AS 10.05.250, as amended in 1980.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section requires the disclosure of alien affiliates and the percentage of their outstanding shares in any corporation organized under this Chapter.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA is indifferent to the status of alien affiliates.

Section .566 SALE OF ASSETS IN REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS; MORTGAGE OR PLEDGE OF ASSETS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .566 is predicated on the 1962 version of Section 78 of the MBCA, and modifies the content of AS 10.05.435.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The proposed Alaska Corporations Code distinguishes between a sale of assets in the normal course of business (such as a sale of all inventory) and a sale of all or substantially all assets not in the regular course of business. Shareholder approval is necessary for the latter on the theory that, like a merger or share exchange, it represents another fundamental change.

ACC Section .566 is concerned with the sale, lease, exchange, or other disposition of all or substantially all of the property and assets of the corporation in the usual and regular course of its business. The power to effectuate such a transaction resides with the board; it does not require shareholder approval. A mortgage or pledge of these assets

may be made under similar authority irrespective of whether or not it is in the regular course of business. This last provision would change existing Alaska law which required shareholder approval of such mortgages or pledges of corporate property.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 12.01 is functionally identical to ACC Section .556 and would also change existing Alaska law by not requiring shareholder approval for any pledge or mortgage of corporate assets.

Section .568 SALE OF ASSETS NOT IN REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS

Section .570 APPROVAL OF TRANSACTION BY SHAREHOLDERS

Section .572 ABANDONMENT OF TRANSACTION BY BOARD

ORIGIN: ACC Section .568 is predicated upon MBCA Section 79. AS 10.05.438 is modified to eliminate a mortgage or pledge of all or substantially all assets (now covered under Section .566). This section differs from the Model Act by requiring shareholder notice also to include a copy of the ACC Sections on the rights of dissenting shareholders.

ACC Section .570(a) is predicated upon MBCA Section 79(c), and preserves the two-thirds voting requirement of AS 10.05.441. Section .570(b) is new.

ACC Section .572 is predicated upon MBCA Section 79(d), and reflects without change AS 10.05.444.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .568 treats the sale, lease, exchange, or other disposition of all or substantially all of the assets of a corporation as the equivalent of an organic change if not made in the usual course of business. When not in the regular course of business, written notice of the proposed disposition of assets and a copy of the ACC provisions on dissenters' rights must be given to all shareholders regardless of voting rights

The proposal for the sale of all or substantially all of the assets is approved by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all outstanding shares, with all shares being enfranchised regardless of restrictions or limitations in the articles. Class voting is recognized. Section .572(b) requires the extraordinary absolute 90 percent approval by outstanding shares (with all shares franchised) when the buyer is in control of or under the control of the seller.

This section permits the board, in its discretion, to abandon a section .568 transaction notwithstanding its approval by the shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 12.02 accords with ACC Sections .568 -- .572 in treating the sale, lease or exchange of all or substantially all corporate property other than in the usual and regular course of business as an organic change. The proposal must originate with

the board and cannot be effectuated without shareholder approval. Unlike existing and proposed Alaska law, the RMBCA requires only majority approval. The official comment makes it clear that class voting can be had in appropriate circumstances even though the section is silent on the question. The official comment also warns of the existence of dissenter's rights, a topic upon which RMBCA Section 12.02 is also silent. By contrast,the ACC gathers all of these important provisions into the three related sections rather than scattering them across a lengthy code.

Section .574 RIGHT OF SHAREHOLDERS TO DISSENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .574 is predicated upon MBCA section 80, with alterations to allow dissenters' rights for shareholders in corporations party to a share exchange. This section consolidates AS 10.05.417 through .432 and AS 10.05.447. through .462.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .574 provides that a shareholder who has dissented from an organic change has a right to have the corporation purchase her shares at "fair valuation." Section .574(b) changes Alaska law by recognizing that a shareholder need not dissent with respect to all of her shares. Section .574(c) changes Alaska law by denying dissenters' rights in the case of a "short form" merger (Section .556). There is an additional change by the presumptive denial of dissenters' rights for holders of shares traded on a national securities exchange on the record date fixed for ascertaining the shares entitled to vote on the organic change.

ACC Sections .576 through .586 establish the criteria for perfecting dissenter's rights, withdrawal of a demand, notice, payment for shares, action to determine value of shares upon failure to agree, presentation of and status of shares reacquired by the corporation. Aside from the right to litigate the regularity of any organic change, or to challenge any disparate treatment of shares (Section .542), the right to claim the status of a dissenter is intended to be the exclusive remedy available to shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 13.02 parallels ACC Section .574 in recognizing the right of shareholders to dissent in the case of an organic change, including the sale of all or substantially all of the corporate property other than in the usual and regular course of business. However, RMBCA Section 13.02(a)(4) goes beyond existing or proposed Alaska law, or the prior content of MBCA Section 80, in creating dissenter's rights in the event the corporation amends its articles to impair the shareholder's preemptive, redemption, or voting rights. The final draft of the RMBCA has added yet another circumstance in which dissenter's rights are recognized. It would allow a shareholder to dissent to an amendment which would reduce her shares to a

fraction of a share if the fractional share could be acquired for cash under Section 6.04.

The Model Act exception, reflected in ACC Section .574(d), which denies preemptive rights if the securities were readily marketable on a national exchange is not carried over into RMBCA Section 13.02.

Section .576 RIGHTS OF DISSENTING SHAREHOLDERS: WITHDRAWAL OF DEMAND

ORIGIN: ACC Section .576 is predicated upon MBCA Section 81. The provisions which explicitly determine the impact upon the status of the dissenting shareholder, the restoration of full shareholder status, and the exclusion of price movement in anticipation of the organic change are new to Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .576 mandates a three-step procedure for the perfection of the status of a "dissenter." First, the shareholder must file a written objection to the plan; second, the shareholder must not vote in favor of the proposal; and third, within ten days after the vote, the shareholder who complies with steps one and two must make a written demand upon the corporation to be paid the "fair valuation" of his shares. Absent a written waiver by the corporation, a shareholder who fails to make a written demand within the time limitations set forth in this section shall be bound by the terms of the organic change.

Once a shareholder has complied with these three steps, he loses the right to vote and other shareholder rights. Section .576 provides for the restoration of these rights if the shareholder withdraws his demand for dissenters' rights (which withdrawal requires the consent of the corporation), or if the corporation rescinds, abandons, or otherwise is disabled from carrying through with the organic change.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 13.20 mirrors the first two steps outlined in ACC Section .576 for the asserting of a dissenter's rights. The third step, a written demand upon the corporation to be paid for the affected shares is found under RMBCA Section 13.23.

Section .578 NOTICE TO DISSENTING SHAREHOLDER

ORIGIN: ACC Section .578 is predicated upon MBCA Section 81.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section requires that the surviving corporation make the first move by making a written offer to each dissenting shareholder which includes a copy of a recent financial statement. These provisions are not found in AS 10.05.420 and .450.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section

13.22 requiring that the corporation notify shareholders of their rights to dissent and the means of exercising that right are covered by provisions of the ACC which require that this information be supplied to shareholders at the time the organic change is submitted for shareholder approval. The duty of the surviving or resulting corporation is set forth in ACC Section .578. RMBCA Section 13.25 requires that the corporation tender what it estimates to be the fair value of the shares accompanied by a current balance sheet. By contrast, ACC Section .578 requires that the corporation make a written offer to purchase the shares at a price considered to be their fair value.

Section .580 PAYMENT TO DISSENTING SHAREHOLDER AFTER AGREEMENT ON VALUE OF SHARES

ORIGIN: ACC Section .580 is predicated upon MBCA Section 81, and reflects without change AS 10.05.423 and .453.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .580 provides for a thirty day period during which the dissenting shareholder and the corporation have to reach an agreement on the fair valuation of the dissenter's shares. If agreement is reached within 30 days, the price is to be paid and the shares surrendered within 90 days. If no agreement is reached, recourse must be had through ACC Section 582.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 13.28 addresses the options of a shareholder dissatisfied with the amount tendered by the corporation under Section 13.25. Within 30 days she must notify the corporation in writing of the amount of money she will accept for the shares and make demand for that sum. If no demand is made within this period the right to contest the fair value as determined by the corporation is deemed waived.

Section .582 ACTION TO DETERMINE VALUE OF SHARES UPON FAILURE TO AGREE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .582 is taken from MBCA Section 81, and replaces AS 10.05.426 and .456.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: If a dissenting shareholder and the corporation do not reach an agreement as to the fair valuation of the dissenter's shares, Section .582 directs that the corporation invoke the jurisdiction of a superior court to judicially determine the fair value. All dissenters are to be joined in this action. Section .582(b) provides for an award of interest. Section .582(c) vests the court with broad discretion respecting litigation costs and expenses, excluding attorneys' fees.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section

13.30 parallels ACC Section .582. However, if the corporation does not file for a judicial determination of fair value within the time proscribed, it is automatically obligated to pay the shareholder the amount demanded. The strategy of the ACC for coping with this eventuality is to grant to any dissenting shareholder the right to commence the judicial proceeding and then bind all shareholders to that single determination by assertion of quasi-in rem jurisdiction of the superior court.

RMBCA Section 13.31 parallels ACC Section .582(c) permitting the court to assess the costs associated with the determination of fair value. There is one important difference, the RMBCA would permit this award to include an assessment of counsel fees. The ACC would not.

Section .584 PRESENTATION OF DISSENTERS' SHARES TO CORPORATION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .584 has no counterpart in Alaska law. It is predicated upon Section 1320 of the GCL.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides that the corporation may demand the physical production of the dissenters' share certificates within twenty days from the perfection of their status (Section .576), so that the corporation may confirm its potential liability. Failure of a dissenter to comply terminates all his dissenters' rights. ACC Section .584 also restricts the transferability of shares for which a demand for payment has been made.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 13.22(b) gives the corporation obliged to honor an assertion of dissenter's rights the authority to stipulate when and where the certificates must be deposited. The obligation on the part of the shareholder to deposit the shares is created by RMBCA Section 13.23(a). RMBCA Section 13.24 recognizes the right of the corporation to restrict the transfer rights of shares from the date of demand for their payment until the proposed corporate action is effectuated.

Section .586 STATUS OF SHARES ACQUIRED FROM DISSENTING SHAREHOLDERS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .586 is predicated upon MBCA Section 81, and consolidates AS 10.05.429 and .462, with the substituted reference to "reacquired" for "treasury" shares.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .586 establishes that shares purchased from dissenters may be used by the surviving corporation as reacquired shares, except that in the case of merger or consolidation, they may be held and disposed of as the plan may otherwise provide.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: It would ap-

pear that the RMBCA has failed to include a provision comparable to former MBCA Section 81.

Notes

ARTICLE 9. DISSOLUTION

Section .605 VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION BY VOTE, WRITTEN CONSENT OF SHARES, OR ELECTION OF THE BOARD

ORIGIN: Dissolution is to a corporate entity what death is to a natural person. As with the provisions respecting the articles and bylaws, amendments and organic change, the protection of the interests of shareholders and creditors and the imposition of duties of care and loyalty upon directors and officers are addressed in the ACC provisions governing dissolution. Article 9 carefully distinguishes between two fact patterns which are united only in the conclusion that the corporation ceases to exist. The distinction is predicated upon whether the decision to dissolve is that of a majority of the shareholders, or whether that result is inflicted upon the corporation by judicial decree because of the valid contention of a minority of shareholders or the commissioner that the continued existence of the corporate entity is intolerable. If majority consent is the key, the dissolution is said to be "voluntary." If the life of the corporation is to be taken as a consequence of gross abuse of the minority or persistent and serious flaunting of the state's regulation, then corporate termination is "involuntary."

The ACC provisions on voluntary dissolution reflect substantial modification of prior Alaska law and follow the format and content of the California General Corporation Law. However, the California model proved unacceptable as a basis for most of the provisions respecting involuntary dissolution where the decision was made to pattern the proposed code after the Model Business Corporation Act and historic Alaska statutes. Notwithstanding, certain innovations from the GCL have been engrafted onto the involuntary provisions and are noted in the official comments to the specific sections.

ACC Section .605 is an adapted version of GCL Section 1900, and a consolidation of AS 10.05.465, .474, and .477. This section differs from Alaska law insofar as it curtails the role of the board in initiating and approving a plan of voluntary dissolution.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .605 places the decision to voluntarily dissolve a functioning corporation with the shareholders. Under the ACC, the board of directors is given no role in either proposing or passing upon the decision to voluntarily dissolve. Thus, the shareholders initiate the proposal, and must cast at least a two-thirds affirmative vote of the shares in order to approve the plan. Alternatively, unanimous written consent of the franchised shares will eliminate the need for a noticed meeting. Three excep-

tions, where the board does possess the power to voluntarily dissolve, are: (1) where the corporation has been adjudged bankrupt, (2) the corporation has no assets and a history of having transacted no business for the preceding five years, or (3) where the corporation is still-born having issued no shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA also distinguishes between voluntary and what is termed "judicial dissolution." A third category, "administrative dissolution" is a specie of involuntary dissolution worked by the state as a consequence of corporate failure to comply with applicable law. The ACC classifies such administrative procedures as a specie of involuntary dissolution. Aside from this basic similarity, there are distinctions between the two codes which will be detailed in the following section by section analysis.

RMBCA Section 14.02 differs significantly from the ACC Section .605/California philosophy on voluntary dissolution. Under the RMBCA the shareholders have the power to initiate and effectuate the decision to voluntarily dissolve only if they can act unanimously under Section 7.04. In all other instances they must depend upon the board of directors to initiate a proposal to voluntarily dissolve the entity. In the absence of a provision in the articles requiring a greater vote, the board's proposal is approved if ratified by a majority of the shares.

RMBCA Section 14.01 makes the initial board or incorporators competent to dissolve a corporation which is still born having neither issued shares nor transacted business.

Section .608 CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: CONTENTS, SIGNING, VERIFICATION AND FILING

ORIGIN: ACC Section .608 derives from GCL Section 1901, and consolidates AS 10.05.468, .474, .480, and .483 (MBCA Sections 82(b), 83(b), 84(b), and 85).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .608 imposes upon the corporation the requirement that it file with the commissioner a certificate of election to dissolve, the content of which is specified. This section works only minor changes in the signing ,verifying, and filing procedures as found in current Alaska law.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.03 is substantially in accord with ACC Section .608 substituting the term "articles of dissolution" for the "certificate of dissolution."

Section .610 CERTIFICATE OF REVOCATION OF ELECTION: CONTENTS, SIGNING, VERIFICATION, AND FILING

Section .613 EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE OF REVOCATION OF ELECTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .610 is an adapted version of GCL 1902, which consolicates MBCA Sections 88,89, and 90, and AS 10.05.492 through .504.

ACC Section .613 is substantially a reenactment of AS 10.05.507, based upon MBCA Section 91.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .610 permits a corporation to revoke an election to wind up and dissolve prior to the distribution of any assets, and upon approval of the same power as made the initial decision to voluntarily dissolve. The provision that no assets be distributed prior to revocation of election to dissolve is the most important change wrought by Section .610, and is crucial in protecting the interests of creditors and senior shares as provided in ACC Sections .358 through .365. The contents and procedure for filing a certificate of revocation of election are specified.

Effectiveness of the certificate of revocation of election is contingent upon inspection, filing, and return of a duplicate original by the commissioner. Until that time, the corporation is deemed to be in the process of dissolution.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.04 also permits a corporation to revoke the decision to dissolve by the same authority who made the initial decision to dissolve. The California and ACC condition that there have been no distribution of corporate assets under the aborted plan to dissolve is, unfortunately, not reflected in Section 14.04. Instead, it merely requires that the election to revoke the dissolution occur within 120 days of the date on which articles had been delivered to the secretary of state. The consequence of an effective revocation of the dissolution election under RMBCA Section 14.04(d) and (e) is identical to ACC Section .613.

Section .615 COMMENCEMENT AND CONDUCT OF VOLUNTARY PROCEEDINGS FOR WINDING UP; CESSATION OF BUSINESS; NOTICE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .615 is adapted from GCL Section 1903, and replaces AS 10.05.486 and .489(1) (MBCA Sections 86 and 87). The express provisions for board powers during winding up and the limited circumstances in which the corporation may continue normal business activities during winding up are new to Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Under ACC Section .615, "dissolution" is the decision to terminate the corporate existence. The actual steps which effectuate that decision are termed "winding up". Those steps begin and become obligatory upon electing to dissolve. In an important break with older statutes, winding up (the marshalling of all corporate assets, payment of all creditors and distribution of any net assets to shareholders) is not vested in court appointed receivers, but is

the responsibility of the board of directors.

A decision to dissolve the entity dramatically affects the real authority of the board. No longer may it continue pursuit of the original corporate business or purpose(s). Instead, it is to wind up the corporate affairs, file the articles of dissolution (ACC Section .620) and in so doing terminate the corporate existence (ACC Section .625). It is the goal of the statute that voluntary dissolution can, and typically will, be accomplished without the expense and inconvenience of judicial intervention by the elected representatives of the shares.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: 14.05 is functionally identical to ACC Section .615.

Section .618 JUDICIAL SUPERVISION OF WINDING UP; PETITION AND NOTICE; ORDER PROTECTING SHAREHOLDERS AND CREDITORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .618 is an adapted version of GCL Section 1904, broadening the coverage of AS 10.05.489(3) (which was based upon MBCA Section 87).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .618 creates standing in the corporation, a five percent shareholder(s), or three or more creditors to petition the superior court to assume jurisdiction over the winding up of the corporation which has elected to voluntarily dissolve. The assumption of jurisdiction is discretionary with the court. The standing in the shareholders and creditors is new to Alaska law.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.30(4) attains only one of the prudential safeguards achieved by ACC Section .618. Under Section 14.30(4) the corporation is given standing to have its voluntary dissolution continued under court supervision. The official comment (14-38) explains that such a step may be "appropriate to permit the orderly liquidation of the corporate assets and to protect the corporation from a multitude of creditors' suits or suits by dissatisfied shareholders. Unfortunately, those creditors and shareholders are given no standing to invoke suck a petition, a standing which is recognized under ACC Section .618.

Section .620 ARTICLES OF DISSOLUTION: CONTENT

Section. 623 FILING OF ARTICLES OF DISSOLUTION

Section .625 EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE OF DISSOLUTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .620 is taken from GCL Section 1905, and replaces AS 10.05.510, which was modeled after MBCA Section 92.

ACC Sections .623 and .625 are reenactments of AS

10.05.513 and .516, based upon MBCA Section .93.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Upon completion of the winding up process, a corporation is to file articles of dissolution, whose content and filing procedure are specified.

ACC Sections .623 and .625 establish a procedure whereby the articles are filed, processed by the commissioner, and a certificate of dissolution is issued. The issuance of the certificate terminates the existence of the corporation except for certain purposes.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains no comparable coverage. The official comment to RMBCA Section 14.03 (14-9) makes it clear that the "articles of dissolution" are comparable to the ACC's certificate of dissolution and merely stipulate the procedure whereby the decision to voluntarily dissolve was achieved. The continuation of the corporate existence after dissolution is thought by the framers of the tentative draft a sufficient protection for corporate creditors and holders of shares with a liquidation preference. Such a notion was rejected in California and it is with the California precedent that the ACC is aligned.

Section .628 *INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION BY VERIFIED COMPLAINT; FILING; INTERVENTION BY SHAREHOLDER OR CREDITOR*

ORIGIN: ACC Section .628 is predicated upon GCL Section 1800, with the deletion of 1800(d). It replaces AS 10.05.540 through .543, which was based upon MBCA Section 97. Section .628(b)(1), (2), (3), and (4) reenact comparable provisions of AS 10.05.540(1), (2), and (3). Section .628(b)(5) is new and designed to provide relief in what are, fundamentally, incorporated partnerships. Section .628(b)(6) is also new and in combination with subsection (a)(3), permits any shareholder to dissolve a corporation whose terms has expired. Section .628(c) replaces AS 10.05.552. Prior law specified that the joinder of shareholders was not necessary; this principle is implicit in subsection (c) which grants to any shareholder a right of intervention.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .628 envisions involuntary dissolution as an adversarial process conducted before a trial court. Section .628(a) provides that a verified complaint may be filed in the superior court by one-half or more of the directors then in office, a shareholder(s) holding shares representing not less than one-third of the common shares, any shareholder if the ground for dissolution is expiration of the period of time for which the corporation was formed, or any person expressly authorized to do so in the articles.

The grounds for involuntary dissolution are specified in Section .628(b). The use of involuntary dissolution to resolve deadlocks at either the director or shareholder level

is evident in Section .628(b)(2) and (3). However, in addition to deadlock, there must be a serious threat to the business or property of the corporate entity. With respect to shareholder deadlock, there must be the further element of a history of futile effort to resolve the impasse.

Section .628(b)(4) sets a specific standard for involuntary dissolution predicated upon the conduct of those in control of the entity. In essence, their pattern of behavior must have risen to such a damaging level as to make their continued exercise of the prerogatives of corporate existence obnoxious to both the minority shareholders and the state. If the corporation is held beneficially by 35 or fewer persons of record, Section .628(b)(5) sets a protection of the rights of the complaining shareholder(s) as a further ground for involuntary dissolution. Finally, under Section .628(d) the definition of shareholder is expanded to include those who hold beneficial interests in shares committed to a voting trust under ACC Section .425.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.30(b) is similar to ACC Section .628(b) in enumerating grounds for involuntary dissolution. However, the standing is limited to a shareholder. By contrast, ACC Section .628(a) would grant standing to one half or more of the directors then in office, a shareholder(s) holding one-third or more of the voting power, and any other person authorized in the articles. The grounds include deadlock at either the shareholder or director level and, like ACC Section .628, require an allegation of a threat to the corporate business and affairs. Oppression, fraud, or illegal conduct by those in control of the corporation is also recognized as a ground for seeking involuntary dissolution. Unfairness toward shareholders is not an enumerated ground and, in another difference from ACC Section .628, there is no ground for utilizing involuntary dissolution proceedings to protect the interests of complaining shareholders in a closely held entity.

RMBCA Section 14.30(3) grants to a creditor standing to seek involuntary dissolution if her claim has been reduced to judgment and the corporation is insolvent. ACC Section .628 does not permit creditors to commence the involuntary dissolution proceeding but would permit a creditor or shareholder to intervene for reasons deemed satisfactory by the trial court.

Section .630 AVOIDING DISSOLUTION BY VERIFIED COMPLAINT; PURCHASE OF PLAINTIFF'S SHARES; DETERMINATION OF FAIR VALUE; STAY; APPRAISAL; AWARD; APPEAL;

ORIGIN: ACC Section .630 is a modified version of GCL Section 2000, and is unprecedented in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The proposed code recognizes that the involuntary dissolution of a corporation is a step attended by serious immediate and general social consequences. In

addition to terminating the corporation as an investment vehicle for its beneficial owners, it is eliminated as an employer, competitor and vehicle for distributing goods or services in the market place. Each of these employee and consumer interests make alternatives to dissolution desirable. To accommodate these interests ACC Section .630 establishes two circumstances in which the continued corporate existence may be preserved while at the same time relieving the plight of the plaintiffs who sought involuntary dissolution. First, the corporation may avoid the dissolution by purchasing for cash at fair value the shares owned by the plaintiffs (subject to any contrary provision in the articles). If the corporation elects not to purchase plaintiffs' shares, holders of 50 percent or more of the voting power may do so. Fair valuation is determined on the basis of the liquidation value.

Section .630(b) provides for situations when agreement as to fair value cannot be reached between the purchasing party and the selling party. Upon application to the court and the posting of security for expenses, the court will stay the dissolution proceedings and ascertain the fair value of the shares. Section .630(c) states the procedures which the court and court appointed appraisers shall follow in ascertaining the fair value of the shares. The court is directed to include in its order an alternative decree for the winding up and dissolution of the corporation should the purchasing party fail to pay the amount determined by the appraisers. If the purchasing party wishes to appeal the appraisal, Section .630(d) requires that the purchasing party first pay the appraised value to the moving (selling) party.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: Unfortunately for the public interest, the RMBCA contains no contingencies for saving the corporate existence once proceedings for judicial dissolution have been commenced.

Section .633 INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION BY THE COMMISSIONER: GROUNDS, PROCEDURE, REINSTATEMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .633 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.519 with substantial amendments. It continues the provisions of AS 10.05.519 which modified MBCA Section 94 to substitute involuntary dissolution by administrative process for judicial proceedings inaugurated by the Attorney General. However, the provisions respecting due process rights of the corporation (administrative hearing and trial de novo) are new to Alaska law. AS 10.05.519(h) has been severed from this section and is treated in ACC Section .635.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .633 creates discretion in the commissioner to effect an involuntary dissolution by administrative action for specified grounds, subject to an appeal to the superior court. This section provides for notice to be sent to the corporation, and affords the corporation an

oppcrtunity to correct the neglect, omission, delinquency, or noncompliance, or, to request an administrative hearing. The ACC attempts to give the targeted corporation liberal due process in these administrative proceedings. Thus before the decision to administratively dissolve can be carried into effect, the corporation must be accorded a prior hearing to ascertain the presence or absence of the noticed grounds. If the commissioner continues to abide by the original decision to involuntarily dissolve, Section .633(c) grants the corporation an opportunity to appeal to a superior court where the matter will be tried de novo. Section .633(e) establishes a two year period in which a corporation dissolved by the commissioner may be reinstated. Finally, Section .633(g) provides for the non-gratuitous assignment of contract rights by the dissolved corporation, and for counterclaim and setoff to diminish liability to the assignee.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.20 establishes the grounds for administrative dissolution. The list is shorter than that advanced under ACC Section .633 and ignores such Alaska interests as the failure of a control person to comply with the requirement of appointing a registered agent; the protracted failure to fill a vacancy on the board; and, the failure to complete dissolution within two years after filing a certificate of election to voluntarily dissolve. Under the RMBCA administrative dissolution is effected by the secretary of state.

RMBCA Section 14.21 details procedures for administrative dissolution which correspond to ACC Section .633(b). The prior hearing and court appeal rights guaranteed in the ACC are absent from the RMBCA provisions on administrative dissolution. There is no right to a prior hearing before the administrative official in RMBCA Section 14.21. The official comment (14-29) asserts the remarkable premise that grounds will rarely be controverted. Instead of a prior hearing, the corporation must either comply with the administrative demand for correction of the alleged ground or suffer administrative dissolution! The immediate consequence is that it is forbidden to conduct business. In this state of business paralysis, it may now invoke RMBCA Section 14.23 and petition the secretary of state for reinstatement. Only if that is denied can an appeal be taken, under RMBCA Section 14.23(b) to a trial court. Whether a trial de novo can be claimed in that court is left unspecified.

Section .635 COMMISSIONER'S AUTHORITY TO BRING ACTION FOR INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION; GROUNDS; RELIEF

ORIGIN: ACC Section .635 paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) are taken from AS 10.05.519, which is based upon Oregon Revised Statutes Section 57.585 and MBCA Section 94. Paragraphs .635(a)(3) and (a)(4) and subsection (b) are taken from GCL Section 1801(a)(1),(3), and (c).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: The classical "quo warranto proceeding" where the corporate charter is revoked for serious legal offense is reflected in ACC Section .635. Following a long-standing legislative decision, the state's interest is guarded by the Commissioner of Commerce and Economic Development rather than the Department of Law. ACC Section .635 establishes the commissioner's authority to bring an action for involuntary dissolution in the superior court upon specified grounds. The court may order dissolution or other relief as it considers just and proper, and may appoint a receiver for the winding up or order the board to wind up the corporation under the court's supervision.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.30(a) defines the quo warranto powers recommended in the tentative draft. They do not include the ground that the corporation has seriously violated a statute regulating corporations (ACC Section .635(a)(3)). The power of a court which has assumed jurisdiction over such a proceeding is confirmed in RMBCA Section 14.31(b) in a manner functionally equivalent to ACC Section .635(b).

Section .638 VENUE AND PROCESS FOR COMMISSIONER'S ACTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .638 is a reenactment of AS 10.05.534, which is modeled after MBCA Section 96.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section establishes the venue and service of process rules governing suits for involuntary dissolution.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.31(a) covers the venue for such a proceeding which is entrusted to prosecution by the attorney general. The statute does not specify the notice requirements mandated by ACC Section .638.

Section .640 APPOINTMENT OF PROVISIONAL DIRECTOR: DEADLOCK

ORIGIN: ACC Section .640 is predicated upon GCL Sections 308 and 1802.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Where the ground for a complaint for involuntary dissolution is a deadlock in the board (ACC Section .628(b)(2)), Section .640 affords yet another opportunity to save the corporate existence. As an alternative to dissolving the corporation, the court may appoint a provisional director who is neither a shareholder nor a creditor of the corporation. The provisional director has all the rights and powers of a director until the deadlock is broken, or until the director is removed by order of the court or by approval of the outstanding shares. The provisional director is exempted from secondary liability of directors under ACC

Section .488(a).

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.31(c) details the ancillary jurisdiction of a court before which a complaint for involuntary dissolution is pending. Such a court has the power to issue injunctions, appoint a receiver or custodian pendente lite, take actions to preserve the corporate assets and carry on the business of the entity until a full hearing can be held. Unfortunately, none of these powers directly or by fair inference, includes the authority to resolve the deadlock at the board level by appointment of a provisional director.

Section .643 APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER: APPLICATION, HEARING AND NOTICE, SECURITY, QUALIFICATIONS, POWERS, COMPENSATION

ORIGIN: ACC section .643(a) is taken from GCL Section 1803, and is new to Alaska law. Subsection (b) is taken from MBCA Section 99 and reflects the content of AS 10.05.576. Subsection (c) is taken from MBCA Section 98 and AS 10.05.567, with the modification of omitting attorneys fees.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC section .643 grants broad powers to a court which has assumed jurisdiction over a complaint seeking involuntary dissolution, to act upon plaintiff's motion for the appointment of a receiver. Unlike AS 10.05.555 through .573, and MBCA Section 98, which uses a "liquidation receiver", the receiver under the ACC serves to preserve the corporation and its business pending a hearing on the complaint for involuntary dissolution. The directors, under court supervision, are used to handle the affairs which the Model Act vests in the liquidating receiver.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.32 is similar to ACC Section .643. Since the RMBCA is rather vague on the major premise that the winding up of a corporation is normally committed to the directors, Section 14.32(a) is less clear than ACC Section .643 that the appointment of a custodian should be upon the motion of some shareholder or creditor able to convince the court that the directors cannot be entrusted to marshall and properly apply the corporate assets. A "receiver" under the RMBCA terminology does not act to manage the business and affairs of the corporation but rather acts to liquidate its assets. Under the ACC the term "receiver" embraces both functions for one acting under the authority of ACC Section .643.

Section .645 DECREE FOR WINDING UP AND DISSOLUTION: FURTHER JUDICIAL RELIEF

ORIGIN: ACC Section .645 is new, and based upon GCL Section 1804. This section replaces AS 10.05.537, .546, and .549,

which were modeled upon MBCA Section 97.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .645 empowers the court hearing a suit for involuntary dissolution under either ACC Section .628 or .633 to decree a winding up and dissolution, or, in a final effort to preserve the social interests advanced by preservation of the corporate existence, issue such less drastic orders, decrees, and injunctions as justice and equity may require.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.33 covers the entry of a decree of dissolution. Unfortunately, it contains no reference to the authority of that court to order alternative relief aimed at the simultaneous resolution of the alleged ground for dissolution while preserving the corporate existence.

Section .648 COMMENCEMENT AND CONDUCT OF INVOLUNTARY PROCEEDINGS FOR WINDING UP; CESSATION OF BUSINESS; NOTICE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .648 is taken from GCL 1805, and replaces AS 10.05.555 and .558, which were based on MBCA Section 98.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides that upon entry of a decree under Section .645, the board is to commence winding up subject to court supervision. Regular business operations are to cease, except where the continuation of business activities is necessary to preserve goodwill or the going-concern value of assets which are to be sold. In the absence of a perfected appeal or stay order, notice is to be given to all shareholders and known creditors and claimants.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.06(b) accords with ACC Section .648 that in the wake of a decree of dissolution the process of winding up and liquidation is to commence. The official comment (14-48) references Sections 14.05, 14.06, and 14.07 which import the provisions on the process of winding up, liquidation and distribution.

Section .650 JURISDICTION OF COURT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .650 is adapted from GCL Section 1806, and replaces AS 10.05.573, .579, .582, and .585, which reflected the content of MBCA Sections 98, 100, 101, and 102.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section sets forth an extensive list of the ancillary powers and jurisdiction that may be exercised by the superior court. Of particular interest is the power conferred by Section .650(6) for the court to fill any vacancy on the board which the directors or shareholders prove unable to fill. Also of interest is Section .650(7), which grants extraordinary powers of removal and prohibition

from further office holding of any director guilty of dishonesty, misconduct, neglect or abuse of trust in conducting the winding up of the corporation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: 1..31(c) contains a less explicit and expansive list of ancillary powers.

Section .653 CLAIMS AGAINST CORPORATION; COURT AND NON-COURT DIRECTED WINDING UP; PRESENTATION; NOTICE; PAYMENT; SECURED CLAIMS; REJECTED CLAIMS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .653 is predicated upon GCL Sections 1807 and 2008, and replaces AS 10.05.579, which was based upon MBCA Section 100.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .653 details procedures for settling all claims against the corporation. All claims must be presented within a specified time after which they are barred. This section makes separate provisions for the fate of contingent, unmatured, or disputed claims, or where there is uncertainty or dispute concerning the identity or capacity of the claimant, depending upon whether the winding up is with or without judicial supervision. When assets are reduced to cash, the Commissioner of Revenue is established as a stakeholder, under a provision which ensures that disputes do not leave the commissioner with custody of the assets for an indefinite period of time.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.06 deals with known claims against the dissolved corporation. Like ACC Section .653, it provides for notice to creditors and the establishing of deadlines which, if not met, bar claims. RMBCA Section 14.07 covers unknown claims against the entity. Like ACC Section .653(d) and (f), there is provision for notice by publication. Assets covering the claims of creditors or claimants who cannot be found or who are not competent to receive them are to be deposited, under RMBCA Section 14.40 with the state treasurer.

The above provisions of the RMBCA on voluntary dissolution are made applicable in the case of judicial dissolution by Section 14.33.

Section .655 ORDER DECLARING CORPORATION WOUND UP AND DISSOLVED; DECLARATIONS; EFFECT; ADDITIONAL ORDERS; DISCHARGE OF DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .655 is derived from GCL Section 1808, and replaces AS 10.05.585, which was based upon MBCA Section 102.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Upon final settlement of accounts and a determination that the corporation's affairs are in a condition for it to be dissolved, ACC Section .655 directs the

court to make an order declaring the corporation duly wound up and dissolved. This order must specify information regarding provisions for taxes and penalties, known debts and liabilities, and distribution of assets to shareholders. The order must also declare that those conducting the winding up have settled their accounts and that their duties and liabilities are discharged. Upon the issuance of this order, corporate existence ceases.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA does not contain an explicit provision covering what, under ACC Section .655, is the last step in the orderly winding up and distribution of corporate assets.

Section .658 FILING OF DECREE OF DISSOLUTION

ORIGIN: ACC Section .658 is a reenactment without change of AS 10.05.588, which was based upon MBCA Section 103.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides the procedure for filing of the decree of dissolution.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: Section 14.22(a) of the RMBCA directs that the "clerk of the court shall deliver a certified copy of the decree [of dissolution] to the secretary of state, who shall file it."

Section .660 POWERS AND DUTIES OF DIRECTORS IN DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .660 is derived from GCL Section 2001, and is new to Alaska law. It replaces AS 10.05.489(2), .564, and .570, which were based respectively on MBCA Sections 87 and 98.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .660 is the heart of the reformed framework for utilizing the incumbent directors and officers to conduct both voluntary and involuntary dissolution, a significant change from existing law, which utilizes a "liquidating receiver" appointed by the court. This section enumerates powers and duties of the board. In the event the superior court does not repose confidence in the abilities or fidelity of the incumbent management, it has power under ACC Section .648 to appoint other persons to conduct the winding up.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: As previously noted, it seems implicit under the terms of RMBCA Section 14.05 that the reform of utilizing incumbent directors in preference to court ordered authorities to conduct the winding up has been accepted by the framers of the tentative draft.

Section .663 PROCEEDING TO DETERMINE IDENTITY OF DIRECTORS OR TO APPOINT DIRECTORS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .663 is taken from GCL Section 1003. There is no comparable provision in Alaska law or the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section creates a procedure for establishing the identity of those who are to wind up and dissolve the corporation, and to replace those who are unwilling or unable to perform their duties.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: This power is not expressly provided in the RMBCA.

Section .665 DISTRIBUTION OF CORPORATE ASSETS AMONG SHAREHOLDERS; WHEN TO BE MADE

ORIGIN: ACC Section .665 is based upon GCL Section 2004. It replaces AS 10.05.489 and .561, which were based upon MBCA Sections 87 and 98.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides for the distribution of remaining assets to shareholders according to their respective rights and preferences once the interests of creditors and other claimants against the corporation have been settled.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.05(a)(4) appears to be the only coverage of this point. It does not settle the issue of the timing of such distributions, an ambiguity which may work to the disservice of creditors.

Section .668 PROVISION FOR PAYMENT OF DEBT OR LIABILITY

ORIGIN: ACC Section .668 is taken from Section 2005 of the GCL. It is without precedent in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .668 provides a definition of the concept "adequate provision" for a debt or liability, a concept used extensively throughout Article 9 as a precondition for distributing assets to shareholders when all claims by creditors have not yet been settled.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.05(a)(3) makes a reference to the power to ". . . mak[e] provision for discharging its liabilities." Section 14.40 utilizes the state treasurer as a repository for funds set aside to pay unknown or ineligible creditors or claimants.

Section .670 DISTRIBUTION IN MONEY OR IN KIND; INSTALLMENTS

ORIGIN: ACC Section .670 is taken from GCL Section 2006, and is without precedent in either Alaska law or the MBCA.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .670 gives express sanction to distribution schemes which gives shareholders property as opposed to cash. Installment plans are also sanctioned.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA contains no coverage other than the general provisions of Section 14.05(a).

Section .673 PLAN OF DISTRIBUTION; ADOPTION; BINDING EFFECT; NOTICE; PAYMENT TO DISSENTING SHAREHOLDERS; ABANDONMENT

ORIGIN: ACC Section .673 is predicated upon GCL Section 2007, and is without precedent in Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: ACC Section .673 permits the liquidation rights of outstanding shares to be altered to accommodate a plan of distribution of assets other than money upon the approval by the outstanding shares. Class voting is expressly provided. Preferred shares dissenting from the plan may require the corporation to make payment according to their unaltered liquidation preferences. If such dissent and demand prejudices the plan, the board is authorized to abandon the plan without further recourse to shareholders.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: The RMBCA does not contain provisions incorporating these powers.

Section .675 RECOVERY OF AMOUNTS IMPROPERLY DISTRIBUTED

ORIGIN: ACC Section .678 is taken from GCL Section 2009, and is new to Alaska law.

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: Any amount improperly distributed to shareholders may be recovered under Section .675. There is no requirement that shareholders have knowledge of the impropriety of such a distribution. Any recovery from shareholders may not function to alter their rights to share pro rata in the residual assets of the corporation.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.07(d)(2) provides for the liability of shareholders who have received distributed corporate assets to the claims of creditors.

Section .678 CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF DISSOLVED CORPORATIONS; PURPOSES; ABATEMENT OF ACTIONS; DISTRIBUTION OF OMITTED ASSETS

ORIGIN: ACC Section 678(a) is taken from AS 10.05.594, and is based upon MBCA Section 105. Subsections (b), (c), and (d) are taken from the 1980 amendment to AS 10.05.594 (SB 112).

SUMMARY OF COVERAGE: This section provides that a corporation that has been dissolved may continue to exist for an indefinite period of time for the purpose of winding up its affairs, prosecuting and defending actions by or against it, collecting and discharging obligations, disposing of and conveying its property, and collecting and dividing its assets.

COMPARISON WITH THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE RMBCA: RMBCA Section 14.05(b) contains similar provisions continuing the corporate existence.

Notes