THE REVIEW OF

SECURITIES COMMODITIES REGULATION

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT LAWS AND REGULATIONS AFFECTING THE SECURITIES AND FUTURES INDUSTRIES

Vol. 54 No. 12 June 16, 2021

THE DUTY OF DISCLOSURE FOR CORPORATE OFFICERS: AVOIDING LIABILITY IN THE FACE OF GROWING LITIGATION TREND

In this article the authors outline the fiduciary duties of officers and directors under Delaware law and the limits of their protections from liability. They then turn to recent Delaware cases involving allegations against officers in M & A transactions for breach of the duty of disclosure. They close with practical guidance for officers in such transactions to mitigate the risk of liability.

By Tyler J. Leavengood, Jaclyn C. Levy, and Justin T. Hymes *

In 2009, the Delaware Supreme Court eliminated any doubt as to whether officers of a Delaware corporation owe fiduciary duties to the corporation and its stockholders, confirming in *Gantler v. Stephens* that directors and officers owe the same duties.¹ Yet, in the wake of the *Gantler* decision, there was not a sudden uptick in the number of decisions holding officers liable for breach of fiduciary duty. In the last two years, however, several decisions by Delaware courts have denied motions to dismiss claims against officers – acting solely in their officer-capacity – for breaches of the duty of care, and more specifically, for breaches of the duty of disclosure in connection with proxy statements relating to proposed transactions. Although

* TYLER J. LEAVENGOOD and JACLYN C. LEVY are partners and JUSTIN T. HYMES is an associate in the corporate litigation group of Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP in Wilmington, Delaware. Their e-mail addresses are

tleavengood@potteranderson.com, jlevy@potteranderson.com, and jhymes@potteranderson.com. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the firm, its clients, or any of its or their respective affiliates. This article is for general information purposes and is not intended to be and should not be taken as legal advice. the number of such decisions remains relatively small, they nevertheless serve as a warning to officers that their merger-related actions may be subjected to judicial review.

Delaware law requires that when a corporation's fiduciaries request stockholder approval of a transaction (such as a merger, asset sale, or charter amendment), an officer, like a director, is required to disclose fairly and fully all information that would be material to the stockholders' consideration of the proposed transaction. Understandably, corporate officers, who will often have less direct involvement with or control over the transaction process than will a board of directors, may be concerned about the potential for litigation alleging that stockholders were denied access to information that may later be deemed "material" information by a court. While recent cases provide useful lessons for officers about "what not to do" in exercising their disclosure duties, they also demonstrate that officers can minimize litigation risk through the adoption of certain procedures

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

• INSIDER TRADING IN COMMODITIES MARKETS: AN EVOLVING ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY, Page 143

¹ *Gantler v. Stephens*, 965 A.2d 695, 708 (Del. 2009) ("In the past, we have implied that officers of Delaware corporations, like directors, owe fiduciary duties of care and loyalty, and that the fiduciary duties of officers are the same as those of directors. We now explicitly so hold.").

The Review of Securities & Commodities Regulation

Now in its 54th year of publication, The Review of Securities & Commodities Regulation is published 22 times a year (twice a month except for July and August, when it appears once a month).

As securities, commodities, and banking law have become increasingly complex, The Reviews have become ever more valuable to lawyers in these fields. News of developments, available from many sources, is one thing, but only in-depth analysis will put those developments in perspective and keep a practitioner from being blind-sided by some aspect of the subject that is not news. A half-hour spent consulting a Review article is likely to be the most efficient and economical way of penetrating a new subject or simply keeping up with an old one.

Your subscription to *The Review of Securities & Commodities Regulation* includes, at no extra charge, the monthly The Review of Banking & Financial Services (regularly \$680 as a standalone subscription), now in its 32nd year of publication. Each Review issue consists of one or two articles on current topics in securities, commodities, or banking law that are written by outstanding practitioners in the field.

The Reviews are unique in being published frequently enough to be current and being written by practitioners for practitioners. The articles are up-to-date, concise, and practical. With their broad range of authors from major firms, The Reviews provide a unique window into professional thinking on a host of subjects and problems that confront practicing securities, commodities, and banking lawyers. For practice in these areas, they are a must-have resource.

To begin a subscription, mail or fax the order form below, call our subscriber services at 1-609-683-4450, or order using our online shopping cart.

Use the order form below to subscribe today ... and get 2 additional months of service free.

Mail to: RSCR Publications LLC, PO Box 585 Kingston NJ 08528 or Fax completed form to 609-683-7291	
\Box YES. Please enter my subscription to <i>The</i>	Please Print
Review of Securities & Commodities Regulation for	
14 months of service, 26 issues in all, for \$1,232.00	
Choose format: Print Digital (PDF via email)	Name
□ Include free subscription to the monthly <i>Review of Banking & Financial Services,</i> for 14	Time
months of service, 14 issues, at no extra charge	Firm
Charge my \Box Amex \Box Mastercard \Box Visa	Postal Address
Card Number Expire	City/State/Zin
1	City/State/Zip
Signature	
□ Check enclosed (payable to RSCR Publications LLC)	Email and Phone