American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies, Vol.2, No.7 (July, 2025),
E-ISSN: 2997-9439
American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies
https://semantjournals.org/index.php/ AJEES

| Research Article

Check for updates

The Mechanisms for Protecting the Rights of Minority Shareholders in the Corporate Governance System

Aminjon Kalandarov
Senior Lecturer at the Department of Business Law, PhD in Law, Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: The protection of minority shareholders is a cornerstone of modern corporate governance, ensuring fairness, accountability, and sustainable economic development. This paper explores the mechanisms available for protecting minority shareholders within the corporate governance systems of the United Kingdom and Germany. It analyzes statutory protections, judicial remedies, and the practical application of corporate governance codes. Comparative legal analysis is used to assess the effectiveness of each system, drawing from scholarly work and legislative texts. The paper concludes with recommendations for enhancing minority shareholder protection, particularly in transitioning and developing economies.

Keywords: Minority shareholders, corporate governance, UK Company Law, German Stock Corporation Act, shareholder rights, fiduciary duties.

1. Introduction

The development of robust corporate governance systems has become essential to safeguard the interests of investors and stakeholders. Minority shareholders often find themselves vulnerable in corporate structures dominated by majority shareholders or controlling interests. Effective protection mechanisms are crucial to uphold the rule of law, maintain investor confidence, and promote economic equity.

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of legal and institutional mechanisms designed to protect minority shareholders in two leading jurisdictions: the United Kingdom and Germany. Both jurisdictions represent different legal traditions (common law and civil law) and offer unique insights into corporate regulation.

2. Definition and Status of Minority Shareholders

Minority shareholders are commonly understood to be those shareholders who hold an equity interest in a company but do not possess a controlling stake—typically defined as holding less than 50% of the voting rights. As a result, they are unable to unilaterally influence corporate policy, appoint or remove directors, or pass both ordinary and special resolutions without the support of other shareholders.[1]

Legally, minority shareholders enjoy rights of ownership, such as entitlement to dividends, access to information, and participation in general meetings. However, their lack of decisive influence makes them susceptible to abuse or exclusion by controlling shareholders or directors, especially in private or closely held companies where governance power is concentrated.[2]

The potential for conflict between majority and minority interests is a well-documented phenomenon in corporate governance theory, particularly as it relates to the agency problem. This occurs when those in control of the corporation (majority shareholders or directors) prioritize personal or factional interests over the collective good of all shareholders.[3]

Various legal systems define minority status using specific shareholding thresholds. For example, under the UK Companies Act 2006, a shareholder with at least 5% of the voting rights may requisition a general meeting (Section 303), whereas a 25% holding is sufficient to block special resolutions. In Germany, minority shareholders holding at least 5% or €500,000 in nominal capital may demand a general meeting (Aktiengesetz, §122) or request a special audit in case of suspected wrongdoing (Aktiengesetz, §142).

Academic literature emphasizes that the protection of minority shareholders is vital for corporate accountability and the legitimacy of the governance process. Kraakman et al. (2017) argue that robust protection mechanisms for minority investors enhance the integrity of markets and corporate institutions.[4] Hopt (2011) further suggests that legal safeguards for minority interests—such as judicial remedies and governance codes — play a critical role in promoting long-term investment and preventing expropriation by insiders.[5]

3. Corporate Governance and Minority Rights

Corporate governance is broadly defined as the set of legal, institutional, and ethical frameworks that determine how corporate entities are managed, how decisions are made, and how accountability is ensured among corporate participants. It involves a network of relationships primarily between the company's management, its board of directors, shareholders (including minorities), and other stakeholders such as creditors, employees, and regulators.[6]

Effective corporate governance systems aim to balance the diverse interests of stakeholders while ensuring transparency, strategic oversight, and compliance with legal and ethical standards. Minority shareholders, although often holding limited influence in voting matters, are crucial stakeholders whose protection is essential for promoting investor confidence and ensuring the integrity of capital markets.[7]

A fundamental challenge in corporate governance arises from the misalignment of incentives between corporate insiders (e.g., majority shareholders or executive directors) and minority

---

[1] Bainbridge, S. M. (2015). Corporate Law. Foundation Press. https://archive.org/details/corporatelaw0000bain_n0w2_3ed/page/n9/mode/2up

[2] Cheffins, B. R. (2009). Corporate Ownership and Control: British Business Transformed. Oxford University Press. SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1304194

[3] La Porta, R., Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate Ownership around the World. The Journal of Finance, 54(2), 471–517. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697717

[4] Kraakman, R. H., et al. (2017). The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

[5] Hopt, K. J. (2011). Comparative Corporate Governance: The State of the Art and International Regulation. American Journal of Comparative Law, 59(1), 1–73.

[6] Tricker, B. (2019). Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. // OECD (2015). G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/g20-oecd-principles-of-corporate-governance-2015_9789264236882-en.html

[7] Mallin, C. A. (2022). Corporate Governance (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

shareholders. This is commonly referred to as the "principal-principal" problem in concentrated ownership structures, where controlling shareholders may exploit corporate assets for personal gain, suppress dividends, or deny minority shareholders access to information or influence.[8]

In jurisdictions with a dispersed ownership model—such as the UK or the US—the classic principal-agent problem dominates, where managers may act in their own interest unless constrained by governance mechanisms. However, in many civil law jurisdictions, such as Germany, the more pressing concern is the abuse of control by dominant shareholders. In either model, minority shareholders are at risk unless adequately protected through enforceable rights and institutional checks.

The evolution of corporate governance frameworks has thus included the gradual incorporation of protective doctrines for minority investors. These include, but are not limited to, statutory rights of access to information, voting rights on fundamental decisions, the ability to challenge unfair or prejudicial conduct, and judicial remedies such as derivative actions or petitions for equitable relief.

Moreover, soft law instruments, such as corporate governance codes and stewardship principles, play a growing role in shaping shareholder rights. The UK Corporate Governance Code, for instance, encourages shareholder engagement and board responsiveness, fostering an environment where the concerns of minority shareholders are not easily disregarded. Although not legally binding, these codes often serve as persuasive standards in litigation and shareholder activism.[9]

Lastly, empirical studies highlight that jurisdictions with stronger protections for minority shareholders tend to have more developed equity markets and broader investor participation.[10] This suggests that protecting minority rights is not merely a legal concern but a critical component of economic development and corporate sustainability.

4. Minority Shareholder Protection in the United Kingdom

In corporate structures, although directors are responsible for managing a company's affairs, ownership and ultimate control reside with the shareholders. Those holding a majority of the voting rights wield significant influence over corporate decisions, including the power to appoint or remove directors and to pass both ordinary and special resolutions. Specifically, shareholders with over 50% of voting rights can pass ordinary resolutions, while those holding at least 75% can approve special resolutions—such as altering the company's articles or ratifying director misconduct. In contrast, shareholders with 25% or less of voting rights typically lack sufficient power to influence or block such decisions, leaving them potentially vulnerable to oppression or exclusion.[11]

A recurring concern arises in closely held companies where majority shareholders also serve as directors. In such cases, conflicts of interest may discourage the initiation of legal action against director misconduct, particularly if the wrongdoing is perpetrated by those in control.

4.1. The Rule in Foss v Harbottle and Its Exceptions

The landmark case Foss v Harbottle (1843) established the foundational principle that legal rights rest with the company as a separate legal entity, and only the company—not individual

[8] Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A Survey of Corporate Governance. Journal of Finance, 52(2), 737–783. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/shleifer/files/surveycorpgov.pdf
[9] Spencer Stuart (2023). UK Board Index. https://www.spencerstuart.com/-/media/2023/october/ukbi2023/ukbi-highlights-2023-5.pdf
[10] Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2008). The Law and Economics of Self-Dealing. Journal of Financial Economics, 88(3), 430–465. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304405X08000160
[11] Jones, L. (2013). *Introduction to Business Law* (2th ed.). Oxford University Press.

shareholders—can initiate proceedings for wrongs done to it. In practice, this means that the decision to litigate lies with the board of directors, who may be disinclined to sue themselves if they are the alleged wrongdoers. Over time, this limitation has been mitigated by statutory reforms that permit shareholders to initiate certain types of actions in specific circumstances.

4.2. Statutory Remedies under the Companies Act 2006

The Companies Act 2006 offers modernized avenues for shareholder protection. Notably, it permits shareholders to bring derivative actions under Sections 260–264.[12] A derivative claim allows a shareholder to sue in the name of the company for breaches of duty, negligence, or trust committed by directors or shadow directors, even if the misconduct occurred before the shareholder acquired their shares. These claims, however, follow a two-stage court approval process to ensure they are not frivolous. If the court grants permission, any damages recovered benefit the company as a whole, although the initiating shareholder can typically recover legal costs.

Additionally, under Section 994 CA 2006, a shareholder can seek relief for conduct that is "unfairly prejudicial" to their interests or those of other shareholders. This remedy allows for more personal compensation than derivative actions and does not require the conduct to be unlawful—only that it be inequitable and damaging to minority interests. Examples include misappropriation of company assets, diversion of business opportunities, or payment of excessive director remuneration that diminishes returns to other shareholders. The court, under Section 996, has broad discretion to craft remedies, with the most frequent outcome being a buy-out of the aggrieved shareholder's shares at fair market value.

In response, the Companies Act 2006 introduced a more comprehensive statutory regime for minority shareholder protection.

4.3. Statutory Protections under the Companies Act 2006

The Companies Act 2006 provides several key mechanisms to safeguard minority interests:

Unfair Prejudice Remedy (Section 994). This provision allows a shareholder to petition the court where a company's affairs are being, or have been, conducted in a way that is unfairly prejudicial to the interests of the shareholder or a class of shareholders. It is not necessary to prove illegality—inequitable or oppressive behavior suffices. Examples include excluding a shareholder from management in a quasi-partnership company, paying directors excessive remuneration that suppresses dividends, or misappropriating company opportunities. If successful, the court may order a range of remedies, most commonly requiring the majority shareholders or the company to purchase the petitioner's shares at a fair market value (s. 996).

Derivative Claims (Sections 260–264). These provisions empower a shareholder to bring a claim on behalf of the company in respect of a wrong done to the company by a director, former director, or shadow director. The claim is termed "derivative" because the right to sue is derived from the company's right, not personal to the shareholder. The process involves two stages of judicial approval to filter out unmeritorious claims. If granted, the case proceeds in the company's name, and any financial recovery accrues to the company rather than the shareholder, although legal costs may be recoverable.

Access to Company Records (Section 358). Transparency is further reinforced by the statutory right of shareholders to inspect certain company records, including financial reports and resolutions. This access is essential for enabling informed participation in decision-making and serves as a preliminary step to more substantive legal action if misconduct is suspected.

[12] The Companies Act 2006. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/contents

These provisions form a three-tiered framework that allows for personal, representative, and informational remedies depending on the nature of the conduct in question.

4.4. Corporate Governance Code

Beyond statutory protections, minority shareholders benefit indirectly from the UK's **Corporate Governance Code (2024)**. Although primarily applicable to premium-listed companies, the Code sets best practice standards in areas such as board independence, shareholder engagement, and internal controls. It promotes transparency, long-term value creation, and accountability—principles that tend to discourage the types of abuses that disadvantage minority shareholders. Notably, while the Code is not legally binding, it operates under the "comply or explain" regime, meaning listed companies must adhere to its principles or justify their non-compliance in their annual reports.

4.5. Case Law

Judicial interpretation plays a vital role in defining and refining the scope of statutory remedies:

In *O'Neill v Phillips* [1999] 1 WLR 1092, Lord Hoffmann clarified the requirements for a successful unfair prejudice claim, emphasizing that conduct must violate the claimant's legitimate expectations based on mutual trust or prior agreements—even if such expectations were not legally binding.

In *Ebrahimi v Westbourne Galleries Ltd* [1973] AC 360, the House of Lords upheld a winding-up order on just and equitable grounds, stressing that companies with personal relationships resembling partnerships must adhere to principles of mutual confidence and fair dealing.

These decisions illustrate that courts are willing to go beyond the black-letter law and apply equitable doctrines to protect vulnerable shareholders.

4.6. Winding-Up as a Last Resort

Under Section 122(1)(g) of the Insolvency Act 1986[13], minority shareholders may petition for the company to be wound up on "just and equitable" grounds. However, courts generally view this remedy as a last resort and may refuse to dissolve a viable and successful company if alternative remedies, such as those under CA 2006, are available.[14]

Together, these statutory frameworks reflect a sophisticated balance: on the one hand, preserving the board's autonomy in managing company affairs, and on the other, empowering minority shareholders with practical tools to challenge abuse or exclusion. Yet, the procedural complexities and legal costs associated with these actions remain a barrier to effective enforcement, underscoring the need for further reforms to enhance accessibility and shareholder education.

5. Minority Shareholder Protection in Germany

5.1. Statutory Provisions under the German Stock Corporation Act (Aktiengesetz – AktG)

The German Stock Corporation Act (Aktiengesetz – AktG) establishes a comprehensive framework for protecting minority shareholders within the governance of stock corporations (Aktiengesellschaften). While the German two-tier board structure inherently provides institutional safeguards, the AktG complements this model with statutory mechanisms that offer minority shareholders the ability to engage actively in corporate oversight and to seek redress when necessary.

[13] Insolvency Act 1986. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/45/contents

[14] Clarke, T. (2017). International Corporate Governance: A Comparative Approach (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749990

Information Rights – Section 131 AktG

Under Section 131 AktG, shareholders have a legal right to request information from the management board at the general meeting on matters relating to the company's operations. This includes details about the company's legal and business relationships, financial standing, and items on the agenda. The management may only refuse to provide information if doing so would cause serious harm to the company, such as by disclosing business secrets.

This provision ensures shareholder transparency and enables informed participation in corporate governance. The importance of this right is underscored by its enforceability: if information is wrongly withheld, shareholders may challenge the resolutions of the general meeting under Section 243 AktG.

Right to Convene a General Meeting – Section 122 AktG

Section 122(1) AktG grants shareholders holding at least 5% of the company's share capital or shares amounting to €500,000 the right to demand that a general meeting be convened. This provision empowers minority shareholders to bring critical issues to the attention of the company and ensures they are not excluded from the agenda-setting process.

If the management board fails to respond to such a request, shareholders may apply to the court for authorization to convene the meeting themselves. This right serves as a vital democratic mechanism within German corporate law.

Special Audit – Section 142 AktG

Section 142 AktG allows shareholders holding at least 1% of the share capital or shares worth €100,000 to request a special audit (Sonderprüfung) if they suspect mismanagement or wrongdoing. If the general meeting rejects the proposal, shareholders may petition the court to order the audit.

This tool provides an important investigative remedy for minority shareholders to uncover breaches of duty, fraudulent transactions, or conflicts of interest. It also plays a preventive function by deterring management from misconduct due to the risk of external scrutiny.

Squeeze-Out and Sell-Out Rights – Sections 327a–327f AktG

Sections 327a–327f of the AktG regulate the so-called **squeeze-out procedure**, which allows a majority shareholder (holding at least 95% of the capital) to compel minority shareholders to transfer their shares in exchange for cash compensation. The purpose is to facilitate corporate restructuring and efficiency. The squeeze-out must be approved at the general meeting and requires a justification report and independent auditor's review to ensure fair compensation.

Conversely, minority shareholders can also initiate a **sell-out** in situations where they are adversely affected by structural changes, although the sell-out procedure is more prominent in EU cross-border mergers under the SE Regulation.

Importantly, if minority shareholders dispute the valuation, they may initiate appraisal proceedings (Spruchverfahren) before a court.

5.2. Supervisory Board Structure

Germany's corporate governance model is distinctively shaped by its **two-tier board structure**, which is a hallmark of corporate law in civil law jurisdictions. Under the **Aktiengesetz (AktG)**, German stock corporations (Aktiengesellschaften) are legally required to have both a **Management Board (Vorstand)** and a **Supervisory Board (Aufsichtsrat)**, each with clearly defined responsibilities and a strict separation of powers.

The **Management Board** is responsible for the day-to-day operation and strategic management of the company. In contrast, the **Supervisory Board** oversees and monitors the activities of the Management Board, appoints and dismisses its members, approves significant business transactions, and represents shareholder interests in governance oversight (AktG §§ 76–116).

This institutional division acts as a structural check on executive power, and from the perspective of **minority shareholder protection**, the Supervisory Board serves as a key mechanism of corporate accountability.

Representation and Influence of Minority Shareholders

The composition of the Supervisory Board is governed by corporate law and, in larger companies, by co-determination laws such as the **Mitbestimmungsgesetz (Co-Determination Act) 1976**, which require the inclusion of employee representatives. Shareholders, including minority shareholders, elect their representatives to the Supervisory Board through the general meeting. Although majority shareholders typically have more voting power, **minority shareholders can influence the nomination and election of board members,** particularly when there is a fragmented ownership structure or institutional investors coordinate their voting.

Additionally, in some cases, companies may allow **cumulative voting** or **proxy solicitation**, which provides minority shareholders with a realistic opportunity to gain board representation, especially when they act collectively.

The presence of independent and shareholder-nominated members on the Supervisory Board contributes to the **monitoring of executive behavior** and protects against managerial entrenchment and majority abuse. German governance practice encourages Supervisory Board members to act in the interest of the company as a whole, not merely the controlling block.[15]

Supervisory Board Duties in Safeguarding Corporate Integrity

The Supervisory Board is tasked with approving major transactions, such as mergers, acquisitions, and significant financial undertakings. In doing so, it has access to detailed reports from the Management Board and may retain external experts when needed. For minority shareholders, this institutionalized oversight **reduces the need to initiate costly litigation** in order to investigate mismanagement or risky business decisions.

Moreover, the Supervisory Board may initiate internal investigations or audits and refer matters to the general meeting or external auditors, especially where allegations of director misconduct or financial irregularity arise.

Limitations and Critiques

Despite these safeguards, minority shareholder influence in board elections is often diluted due to voting concentration in the hands of controlling shareholders or strategic investors. In practice, **effective minority participation** in board governance may require coalition-building, activism, or support from institutional investors.

Another critique concerns **information asymmetry**—while the Supervisory Board receives regular updates from the Management Board, minority shareholders rely on disclosures and general meeting access, which may not provide the same depth of insight. Nonetheless, by mandating a clear channel of oversight between the two boards, German corporate law aims to minimize self-dealing and insider misconduct.

[15] Hopt, K. J. (2011). Comparative Corporate Governance: The State of the Art and International Regulation. American Journal of Comparative Law, 59(1), 1–73. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1713750

5.3. Judicial Review in the Protection of Minority Shareholders

Judicial oversight plays a critical role in the German corporate governance system, particularly in safeguarding the rights of minority shareholders. While much of Germany's corporate law emphasizes **internal governance mechanisms**—notably the two-tier board structure and statutory shareholder rights—courts act as a **final line of defense** against corporate abuse, enabling shareholders to challenge unlawful, procedurally flawed, or inequitable decisions.

The German court system provides minority shareholders with access to various forms of judicial remedies, the most important of which are **annulment (Nichtigkeitsklage) and rescission actions (Anfechtungsklage)** under **Section 243 AktG.**

Annulment and Rescission of General Meeting Resolutions – Section 243 AktG

Under **§243 AktG**, shareholders may bring legal action to challenge resolutions passed at the general meeting on the grounds of procedural violations, breaches of fiduciary duty, or violations of mandatory legal provisions or the company's articles of association. These include:

- ✓ Lack of adequate notice or documentation before the general meeting;
- ✓ Inadequate disclosure of material information;
- ✓ Conflicts of interest not being properly disclosed;
- ✓ Disenfranchisement of shareholders during voting processes;
- ✓ Resolutions violating minority shareholder protections enshrined in statutory law.

An action under §243 must be filed within **one month** of the publication of the contested resolution and may lead to its annulment if the court finds procedural irregularity or substantive unfairness.

This legal instrument gives minority shareholders **post-decision control**, allowing them to undo corporate resolutions that were passed in a manner detrimental to their interests or in violation of legal norms. The existence of this remedy also exerts **ex ante discipline** on management and majority shareholders, encouraging greater transparency and procedural diligence.

Spruchverfahren (Appraisal Proceedings)

In situations involving structural changes such as **squeeze-outs**, **mergers**, or **domination and profit transfer agreements (DPTAs)**, minority shareholders who disagree with the transaction or the valuation of their shares may initiate **Spruchverfahren**, or **judicial appraisal proceedings**, under the **German Reorganization Act (UmwG)** and relevant provisions of the AktG (e.g., §§ 327f, 305–309 AktG).

The court, often supported by independent valuation experts, reviews whether the compensation offered to minority shareholders meets fair market standards. This ensures that minority shareholders are not economically disadvantaged during corporate restructurings. These proceedings are particularly vital when large shareholders or parent companies absorb smaller ones through mergers or squeeze-outs.

Interim Injunctions and Access to Justice

German courts may also grant **interim relief** (einstweilige Verfügung) in urgent cases, allowing minority shareholders to temporarily block the implementation of contested resolutions or actions (e.g., mergers or executive dismissals) pending full trial. This prevents irreversible harm and preserves the status quo during litigation.

Moreover, the German legal system facilitates access to justice for minority shareholders through **predictable procedures**, **specialized commercial courts**, and relatively **moderate court fees**.

However, critics argue that procedural complexity and the need for legal expertise may still deter small private shareholders from pursuing claims.[16]

Judicial Culture and Enforcement Trends

German courts have a strong tradition of **formalism**, emphasizing procedural correctness. While this ensures legal certainty, it has also been criticized for favoring majority interests when no formal breach can be proven, even if the result is substantively unfair. Recent reforms and scholarly debate have aimed to increase the role of **substantive judicial review**, particularly in appraisal and minority exclusion cases.

6. Comparative Analysis: United Kingdom vs Germany

The protection of minority shareholders in the United Kingdom and Germany reflects broader differences in legal tradition, institutional structure, and governance philosophy. Both jurisdictions aim to safeguard shareholder rights, yet they employ distinct mechanisms shaped by their respective legal cultures.

The **United Kingdom**, following the **common law tradition**, relies heavily on judicial discretion, equitable remedies, and case law development. Minority shareholder protection is often exercised **ex post**—that is, after the harm has occurred—through court-based mechanisms such as **derivative claims** and **unfair prejudice petitions** under the **Companies Act 2006**. The UK operates a **unitary board system**, where executive and non-executive directors sit on the same board. This structure places greater emphasis on internal accountability and shareholder litigation to resolve conflicts.

By contrast, **Germany** adheres to the **civil law tradition**, characterized by codified statutes and institutionalized oversight. The principal legal source for corporate governance and shareholder protection is the **Aktiengesetz (Stock Corporation Act)**. German companies are governed through a **two-tier board structure**, consisting of a **Management Board (Vorstand)** responsible for operations and a **Supervisory Board (Aufsichtsrat)** responsible for monitoring and strategic oversight. This structure offers **ex ante** protection by embedding preventive control mechanisms into the corporate architecture.

With respect to **derivative actions**, UK law provides a clear and structured statutory pathway through Sections 260–264 of the Companies Act 2006. German law, however, is more limited in this regard; it focuses on **direct shareholder rights**, such as challenging general meeting resolutions or initiating special audits, rather than enabling shareholders to sue on behalf of the company.

The UK also offers a broad and flexible **unfair prejudice remedy** under Section 994 CA 2006, allowing courts to address a wide range of inequitable conduct even if it is not illegal per se. In contrast, **Germany offers narrower statutory remedies**, with a stronger emphasis on formal procedural compliance rather than equitable discretion.

In terms of **information rights**, German law is notably more generous. Under Section 131 AktG, shareholders can demand detailed information during general meetings, and failure to respond can be grounds for judicial action. UK shareholders, while not without rights, have **more limited statutory access** to company information and often rely on litigation or regulatory disclosure obligations.

Finally, when evaluating **minority influence**, UK shareholders tend to exert power through **court action**, particularly when conflicts arise. German shareholders, on the other hand, may attain

[16] Ringe, W.-G. (2007). Changing Law and Ownership Patterns in Germany: Corporate Governance and the Erosion of Managerialism. American Journal of Comparative Law, 57(4), 743–778. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2457431

influence through **institutional representation**, particularly via election of Supervisory Board members and participation in decision-making bodies. This structural inclusion reduces the reliance on courts and increases opportunities for oversight from within the company.

In summary, **Germany emphasizes structured participation and preventive oversight**, integrating minority protection into the governance framework itself. In contrast, the **UK relies more on judicial remedies and shareholder-initiated enforcement mechanisms**, offering broader discretionary relief after conflicts have occurred. Each system has its strengths: Germany's institutional safeguards provide stability and predictability, while the UK's flexible and equitable remedies offer stronger individual redress in cases of abuse.

7. Challenges and Critiques

Although both the United Kingdom and Germany offer well-developed legal frameworks for the protection of minority shareholders, **the practical enforcement of these rights often proves difficult and uneven**. Formal rights on paper do not always translate into effective remedies in practice. Various structural, procedural, and financial barriers limit the capacity of minority shareholders to assert their interests, particularly in complex or closely held corporate environments.

One of the most pervasive challenges is the **high cost of litigation**, especially in the United Kingdom. Court-based remedies such as **unfair prejudice petitions** or **derivative actions** involve substantial legal fees, lengthy proceedings, and uncertain outcomes. For many minority shareholders—especially retail or individual investors—this creates a significant disincentive to pursue redress, even in cases of clear misconduct. As Keay (2014) points out, the procedural burdens and evidentiary thresholds associated with derivative claims often deter potential litigants and leave minority grievances unresolved unless backed by considerable financial resources or institutional support.

In addition to cost barriers, **information asymmetry** continues to pose a serious problem in both systems. Minority shareholders frequently lack timely or adequate access to critical company information, which is essential for identifying and proving instances of misconduct or abuse. While German law provides comparatively stronger statutory access to information (e.g., through §131 AktG), there remain practical difficulties in enforcing disclosure rights, especially when management invokes confidentiality or commercial sensitivity exceptions. In the UK, information rights are more limited and often depend on either voluntary corporate transparency or judicial intervention.

From an institutional perspective, **Germany's two-tier board structure**, while designed to enhance oversight, has been criticized for potentially **entrenching majority control**. In companies where the Supervisory Board is heavily influenced by large blockholders, independent scrutiny may be weakened, and minority concerns may be marginalized. Furthermore, **cultural and psychological barriers** can also hinder enforcement. In jurisdictions like Germany, where shareholder activism is less embedded in the corporate culture compared to Anglo-American systems, minority shareholders may be reluctant to challenge management or pursue litigation due to reputational concerns or deference to authority. In both jurisdictions, collective action problems—such as coordination failures among dispersed shareholders—can further undermine effective rights enforcement.

Finally, even where remedies are available, **the effectiveness of judicial enforcement** depends heavily on the attitude of courts, the quality of corporate disclosures, and the willingness of shareholders to engage in complex legal processes. Procedural complexity, coupled with a lack of legal expertise or guidance, disproportionately affects small shareholders and reinforces the divide between legal theory and corporate reality.

In summary, while the UK and German systems each provide valuable tools for minority shareholder protection, their **practical utility is limited by procedural costs, structural imbalances, and enforcement challenges**. Bridging the gap between formal rights and functional effectiveness remains a critical objective for future reforms in corporate governance.

8. Reform and Policy Recommendations

Despite the existence of detailed legal frameworks in both the United Kingdom and Germany for the protection of minority shareholders, practical enforcement remains limited by cost, complexity, and structural imbalance. To bridge the gap between **formal legal protections and their real-world effectiveness**, several targeted reforms and policy measures can be proposed. These recommendations aim not only to enhance the procedural accessibility of minority shareholders but also to improve governance culture, institutional transparency, and equitable representation.

8.1. Strengthening Whistleblower Protections to Empower Internal Reporting

One of the most effective ways to uncover corporate misconduct before it escalates is through **internal reporting channels**, including anonymous whistleblowing systems. Empowering employees and shareholders to report abuse, fraud, or conflicts of interest can significantly enhance the detection of wrongdoing and reduce the burden on minority shareholders to initiate litigation from outside. Effective whistleblower protection laws should include guarantees of anonymity, legal immunity, and mechanisms for independent investigation. The UK's **Public Interest Disclosure Act (PIDA)** has laid foundational principles in this regard, while Germany has recently enacted the **Hinweisgeberschutzgesetz (Whistleblower Protection Act)** in line with the EU Whistleblower Directive (2019/1937). However, both systems require further enforcement and awareness to ensure accessibility for minority stakeholders.

8.2. Lowering Thresholds for Initiating Derivative Actions and Special Audits

Statutory thresholds often determine whether minority shareholders can access legal remedies such as **derivative claims** or **special audits**. In many jurisdictions, these thresholds remain prohibitively high. For example, under German law, shareholders typically need to hold **1% or €100,000** of nominal capital to initiate a Sonderprüfung (special audit), while UK derivative actions require court permission and a substantial evidentiary burden. **Reducing the shareholding threshold**, or allowing collective shareholder petitions (aggregation of small holdings), could increase procedural accessibility, especially for retail investors or small institutional stakeholders. A more flexible, investor-friendly approach would enhance corporate accountability and deter managerial misconduct.

8.3. Encouraging Digital Transparency and Real-Time Reporting Platforms

Information asymmetry remains a core barrier to shareholder participation. To address this, corporate governance frameworks should incorporate **digital transparency mechanisms**, such as online disclosure dashboards, **real-time reporting of material events**, interactive AGM platforms, and automated alerts on board resolutions. These innovations would allow minority shareholders to monitor corporate developments more effectively and in a timely manner, thereby reducing dependence on costly litigation to access information. Regulatory bodies, stock exchanges, and corporate registries can play a vital role in mandating or incentivizing such digital tools, especially in public companies.

8.4. Adopting Hybrid Governance Models in Civil Law Jurisdictions

While civil law jurisdictions such as Germany benefit from structured and codified oversight, they may also suffer from rigidity and limited board responsiveness. One possible reform is the **introduction of hybrid governance elements**, drawing from the flexibility of the Anglo-

American unitary board model. For instance, enhancing the **decision-making power of Supervisory Boards**, allowing shareholder-nominated independent directors, or incorporating **board-level committees (e.g., audit or risk committees)** with minority shareholder representation could increase responsiveness and accountability. Such institutional innovation would retain the strengths of the two-tier system while addressing its shortcomings in adapting to complex shareholder dynamics.

8.5. Expanding Investor Education and Awareness Programs

Many minority shareholders, particularly individual or first-time investors, are not fully aware of their legal rights or the procedural tools available to them. Governments, regulators (e.g., the **Financial Conduct Authority** in the UK or **BaFin** in Germany), stock exchanges, and civil society organizations should invest in **comprehensive investor education programs**. These programs could include workshops, digital learning platforms, simplified legal guides, and shareholder helplines. A well-informed shareholder base not only enhances participation in governance but also promotes long-term market stability and trust.

9. Conclusion

This paper has examined the legal and institutional mechanisms for minority shareholder protection in the corporate governance systems of the United Kingdom and Germany. While the UK relies on flexible, court-based remedies rooted in the common law tradition, Germany adopts a preventive, codified approach emphasizing structural safeguards through its two-tier board system.

Both jurisdictions provide substantive tools—such as derivative actions, unfair prejudice claims, information rights, and judicial review—to mitigate power imbalances and promote accountability. However, practical challenges persist, including high litigation costs, information asymmetry, and procedural complexity, which often hinder effective enforcement.

To enhance minority shareholder protection, the paper recommends targeted reforms, including stronger whistleblower mechanisms, lower thresholds for legal actions, digital transparency tools, and expanded investor education. These steps are essential to bridging the gap between formal legal rights and real-world effectiveness, particularly in evolving corporate environments.

References:

1. Bainbridge, S. M. (2015). Corporate Law. Foundation Press. https://archive.org/details/corporatelaw0000bain_n0w2_3ed/page/n9/mode/2up
2. Cheffins, B. R. (2009). Corporate Ownership and Control: British Business Transformed. Oxford University Press. SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1304194
3. Clarke, T. (2017). International Corporate Governance: A Comparative Approach (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749990
4. Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2008). The Law and Economics of Self-Dealing. Journal of Financial Economics, 88(3), 430–465. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0304405X08000160
5. Hopt, K. J. (2011). Comparative Corporate Governance: The State of the Art and International Regulation. American Journal of Comparative Law, 59(1), 1–73. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1713750
6. Insolvency Act 1986. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/45/contents
7. Jones, L. (2013). *Introduction to Business Law* (2th ed.). Oxford University Press.

8. Kraakman, R. H., et al. (2017). The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
9. La Porta, R., Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, & Shleifer, A. (1999). Corporate Ownership around the World. The Journal of Finance, 54(2), 471–517. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2697717
10. Mallin, C. A. (2022). Corporate Governance (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
11. Ringe, W.-G. (2007). Changing Law and Ownership Patterns in Germany: Corporate Governance and the Erosion of Managerialism. American Journal of Comparative Law, 57(4), 743–778. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2457431
12. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A Survey of Corporate Governance. Journal of Finance, 52(2), 737–783. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/shleifer/files/surveycorpgov.pdf
13. Spencer Stuart (2023). UK Board Index. https://www.spencerstuart.com/-/media/2023/october/ukbi2023/ukbi-highlights-2023-5.pdf
14. The Companies Act 2006. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/contents
15. Tricker, B. (2019). Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. // OECD (2015). G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/g20-oecd-principles-of-corporate-governance-2015_9789264236882-en.html