Collaborative Pathways Between Directors' Fiduciary Duties and Investor Protection in Mergers and Acquisitions: A Comparative Analysis of Mainland China and Hong Kong

Guanchi Chen

School of Law, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518000, China

chenguanchi20030428@outlook.com

Abstract. This study conducts a comparative legal analysis of Mainland China and Hong Kong with respect to the interaction between the directors' fiduciary duties and investor protection in the context of mergers and acquisitions (M&A). It is essentially a comparison of the theoretical aspects of the legal frameworks of the two distinctly different jurisdictions and their actual applications along the frontline areas: scope and enforcement of the duties of loyalty and care of directors; regulation on information disclosure and transparency control, etc.; availability and effectiveness of minority investor protection mechanisms, including litigation pathways; and the nature of judicial review and the scope that case law has over and against statutory rules. Major findings indicate material variations that common versus civil law traditions, disparities in the degree of regulatory enforcement, and judicial treatment regarding director liability and shareholder remedies have created. The paper therefore proposed a set of integrated reforms, touching upon the legal, judicial, and corporate governance improvement that would, inter alia, remove the constraints of the Mainland Chinese system and bring greater legal clarity, enforcement consistency, and practical access to justice for minority investors.

Keywords: Mergers and Acquisitions (M&A), Directors' Fiduciary Duties, Minority Shareholder Rights, Investor Protection, Mainland China, Hong Kong.

1. Introduction

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) remain imperatives of the contemporary global economy as potent drivers of corporate growth, strategic repositioning, and the effective allocation of market resources [1]. As the environment in which firms operate grows more complex and competitive, M&A is increasingly seen as instrumental to scalability through consolidation of the industry and transformation to stay ahead [2]. But deals in such transactions are only part of the picture; more importantly, it has to be a process of balancing the interests of the numerous stakeholders. The success and equity of the M&A process depend significantly on the relationship that exists between the fiduciary duties of the directors of a company and the legal rights of the investors who provide the funds for the transactions [3].

M&A deals typically come with substantial challenges for the board and shareholders due to the unique pressures and complexities of the process. The directors have the fiduciary duty to make and manage the decision to ensure that it is in the best interest of the company and its shareholders, and to manage potential deals with loyalty and care. This puts the directors as sources of conflicts with M&As. Information may easily be considered to flow asymmetrically, since the insiders are presumed to have all crucial information that the ordinary shareholders do not have. As such, the vulnerability of the investors, more so the minority shareholders, calls for strong protection mechanisms not only to uphold their rights but also to uphold general market equity and stability. How well they execute their mandate will have a direct correlation with the outcome of the transaction and the equity treatment of the investors.

Because of these dynamics, the practical significance of the fiduciary duty of directors on investor protection can be highlighted in the M&A context. This is the matter that will be addressed in this paper through comparative legal analysis by contrasting the developing system in Mainland China with the well-established system in Hong Kong. Having analyzed the theoretical underpinning of

these concepts, the paper proceeds with a detailed comparison of the legal norms of both jurisdictions, their judicial application, and moves further to examine disclosure regimes and enforcement mechanisms to locate possible deficiencies and distinctive differences. Specifically, the comparative analysis will contrast the legal norms and judicial application of fiduciary duties, information disclosure regimes and regulatory oversight, minority investor protection mechanisms including remedy pathways and costs, and the distinct roles of judicial review and case law. Ultimately, it is here being proposed collaborative pathways and specific recommendations for reform in Mainland China, fostering a legal environment that better aligns director responsibilities with investor interests to support the healthy development of its capital markets. The analysis will proceed by first establishing the theoretical groundwork, followed by the comparative study and concluding with potential solutions.

2. Laying the Groundwork: Understanding Fiduciary Duties and Investor Protection

In discussing M&A in different jurisdictions, it becomes fundamentally important to highlight two leading basic cornerstones of corporate governance, which are the fiduciary duties that are expected from the directors of a company, and mechanisms through which investors are supposed to be protected. These principles are interconnected and together form the foundation of market trust and efficiency. They are supposed to function even more critically in the time of need such as during M&A processes, which by their very nature involve dramatic reallocation, and hence possible conflicts within corporate control and other value allocations.

2.1. The Foundation: Directors' Fiduciary Duties

Governance principles are high standards of conduct for those involved in the management of a company. The deep historical roots of fiduciary duties are traced within the framework of old common laws relating to the management of assets on behalf of those in a relationship of power and dependence. These obligations have also evolved with modern economic principles. As viewed in agency theory, fiduciary duties are tendencies to perform activist roles in aligning divergent interests between a principal and an agent (shareholders and directors, respectively), hence, minimizing 'agency costs'—again quite subtly different from the trust law perspective that emphasizes basic duties owed due to the very confluence of powers for the benefit of a vulnerable class. A fiduciary relationship arises when one party, the fiduciary (e.g., a director) holds a position of power and trust concerning the other party, the beneficiary (e.g., the corporation and its shareholders), and promises to act in the interests of the beneficiary more than his own [4, 5]. This contractual obligation places a very heavy burden on the fiduciary, as the provision of duties must be such as to realize that no provision of actions taken for the benefit of the shareholders could ever be considered or misconstrued as being taken for the benefit of the director himself [6, 7]. Though specific legal formulations may vary by jurisdiction, the components of fiduciary duties are relatively standard throughout: duty of loyalty and duty of care [4]. The directors must be loyal in a manner that they do not defraud, in good faith, the interest of the company over and above their personal interests hence avoiding conflicts of interest and self-dealing, that would be specifically applicable when such directors have personal interests or relationships with the M&A counterparty. This is partnered by the duty of care which requires directors to act with the diligence, skill, and prudence that a reasonably careful person in a like position would exercise. M&As require the parties involved to make decisions after considering all alternatives and being well-informed. The separation of loyalty from care is more practical since it enables courts and regulators to apply different degrees of remedies; loyalty failures are often due to bad faith or self-interest and hence demand more scrutiny and more stringent remedies, while care failures are mostly on account of negligence or lack of due diligence in decision making.

2.2. The Counterpart: Investor Protection Rationale and Challenges

A reasonable articulation of the obligations that fall on directors is the system of investor protection [8]. At the heart of almost all aspects of corporate governance systems, which have usually set their sights on protecting investors, particularly those without much say, are principles of fairness, market integrity, and economic efficiency [9]. Strong investor protection forms the bulwark of vibrant capital market development. It increases the confidence of investors and reduces the cost of capital for companies while also encouraging more extensive equity market participation and ensuring the allocation of capital to the most productive investments through equity markets. Shareholders invest capital in the company and, according to company law, they are to share in the increase in a company's value on fair terms. However, shareholders are inherently exposed to risk, especially in periods of dynamism through acquisitions. There is a big challenge of information asymmetry because directors and insiders have more detailed and current information about a company's future prospects and the prospect details of a deal [10, 11]. Thus, outside investors may make an uninformed and disadvantaged decision. For instance, outside investors may make a wrong decision if the directors of the target company do not reveal the more relevant pending litigations or the worse state of the business during the merger and acquisition that is being undertaken optimistically. Even more germane is the conflict of interest. The agenda between the management, the directors, or the controlling owners when pursuing mergers and acquisitions is somewhat different from that of the minority shareholders. This may result in unfair deal terms or asset stripping or any other kind of extraction. Some of the specific M&A examples is where a board of directors approves the sale of the company at a low price to the entity of the director who has an undisclosed financial interest, or a controlling shareholder orchestrates 'tunneling' by transferring valuable corporate assets to their private holdings at below-market prices just before the merger, which in normal circumstances would have benefited all the shareholders. Consequently, robust investor protection mechanisms are indispensable. These comprise mandated full and accurate disclosure, strong corporate governance to ensure and foster accountability, substantial legal rights (including but far not limited to voting rights and appraisal rights in certain M&As, and rights against unfair prejudice), and accessible and effective enforcement such as through litigation, among others. Credible investor protection creates confidence, ensures capital formation, allows efficient allocation of resources, and leads to sustainability and dynamism in the financial markets.

3. Two Systems Compared: M&A Oversight in Mainland China and Hong Kong

Differentiation in regulatory oversight and enforcement exists between Mainland China and Hong Kong. Thus, the distinct common law and civil law mix approaches of the two jurisdictions towards the common goal of efficient market regulation have significantly differed in regulatory oversight enforcement practices. The following section will contrast the two approaches along the following four dimensions: the enforcement of directors' fiduciary duties and liabilities towards each other and the company in performing their functions, the regulation of information disclosure, minority protection mechanisms, and the nature of judicial review.

3.1. Directors' Fiduciary Duties: Legal Norms and Judicial Application Standards

Both Mainland China and Hong Kong regard the fiduciary duties of company directors as those owed first and foremost to the company, covering primarily the duties of loyalty and care [12, 13]. The former, based on common law, has well-developed case laws that have defined these duties over the years, among which many provide elaborate guidance in required nuances in specific applications, such as in M&A. For instance, the takeover offers or possible conflicts to takeover the level of diligence that would be expected from them; case laws help define the boundaries of directors' discretion. Specific Companies Ordinance and Listing Rules make explicit requirements on directors to act in the best interests of the company and to avoid conflicts. Crucially, such an important

divergence is actively pursued under the Hong Kong regulatory regime in the area of conflicts during M&A. Listing Rules and Takeovers Code require directors to act in specific ways under such situations. This would usually include making known the nature and extent of the conflict to the board, not voting on the matter of conflict, and in important deals, the setting up of an Independent Board Committee (IBC) having as adviser(s) an independent financial adviser to assess the equity of the deal for the interested shareholders [14]. Also, Hong Kong listing rules may even demand explicit "fiduciary out" clauses in investment agreements so that the directors are not seen as being under a contract to go against their fiduciary duties [15], to place the rule obligation over the contract obligation in some conditions [16].

The duties of directors of companies operating in Mainland China are also defined by the Company Law. There is no extensive case law tradition as in Hong Kong. The Mainland system has well-overdue amendments in enhancing director accountability [17]. Much of the above, however, is not very clearly defined in practice, less so than in Hong Kong or a jurisdiction like Delaware. The Mainland system makes the determination of liability, especially distinguishing between poor business judgment and actionable negligence when there should be such negligence, considerably more ambiguous, although many academics have lobbied for the adoption of clearer standards, potentially a mix of subjective and objective tests [18]. Under the Mainland Company Law, disclosure plus board approval of any such conflict may be found necessary, but the procedural requirements may not be that detailed, as summarily required by the Listing Rules or Takeovers Code for such public companies. The practical effectiveness of these procedures in mitigating conflicts in Mainland companies, particularly those with dominant shareholders, continues to be a matter for further observation. While the Takeovers Code in Hong Kong sets out in great detail, though not statutory, the rules regarding the behavior of directors in takeovers, the situation is different in Mainland China, where such matters are mostly guided by much more general principles and rules and with the oversight of the China Securities Regulatory Commission (CSRC) [19]. There are also differences in enforcement. In Hong Kong, breaches of the Takeovers Code, although non-statutory, may attract stern actions by the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) including public censure and orders of “cold shoulder” which denies the defaulters access to the market [20]. An infringement of the fiduciary duties laid down in the Ordinance may give rise to civil liability and orders of disqualification together with regulatory proceedings by the SFC or the Exchange. In the Mainland, whereas the CSRC may apply administrative penalties for M&A-related violations, such as failure in disclosure, practice against breach of fiduciary duty specifically to the context of M&A may depend more on the changing trends of the judiciary and shareholder action rather not a takeover code of Hong Kong [21].

3.2. M&A Information Disclosure and Regulatory Oversight

The requirements of timely and accurate information disclosure during M&A are ostensibly very different between, and even relaxed by, Hong Kong and Mainland China. While Hong Kong has a rather flexible and yet detailed version of securities legislation and is to implement every other detail covering M&A with the SFC and Stock Exchange, in Mainland China, the flexibility would be even less [22]. In certain circumstances, this market would also include immediate-disclosure-of inside information related to M&A transactions, unless specific safe harbors apply. Therefore, information circulars of transactions usually detail very keenly the deal rationale, financial information (even profit forecasts), valuation methodologies by advisors, and risk factors in the transaction, as well as recommendations by the Independent Board Committee (IBC) and IFA (Independent Financial Adviser) where there are conflicts. The term "inside information" that must be disclosed is generally very expansively construed. Personal responsibility for compliance rests on the officers of Hong Kong listed companies and they can be liable in case of failure [23]. Generally, enforcement is considered to be strict; high penalties act as a deterrent.

Apart from Hong Kong, improvement also emerges across the disclosure system of Mainland China; where, indeed, the CSRC assumes an essential regulatory function. These apply to the

disclosure of M&A with listed entities-including detailed transaction information and details of the parties, and analysis of the effects. Some information regarding the valuation methodology or forward-looking risk assessments for some types of transactions may be less available. A major drawback is that the timeliness, accuracy, and completeness of the information disclosed are still a challenge. Even the Mainland rules have safe harbors for delayed disclosure, the rules under which such safe harbors are provided are to include temporary application where there are state secrets, as well as the particular details and uses of such provisions are likely to be different and, therefore, to lead to inconsistencies in applications for listed companies under both regimes (A+H shares). Negotiating these differences can be cumbersome for A+H companies, perhaps having to follow the higher of the two markets' disclosure requirements or adopting different timings, which would add layers of compliance [24, 25]. Even though the CSRC has improved the enforcement of M&As, in practice, the overall severity of penalties has, in certain cases, been considered insufficient to effectively deter violations. While the latest regulations in mainland China are intended to offer more flexibility for listed companies in executing M&A deals, at the same time, more restrictions are put in place regarding such areas as the security of personal information and cross-border flows of personal data [26, 27]. For practical reasons, the "material information" that will trigger disclosure in mainland China may be more critically subject to interpretive uncertainty than those relatively clearer tests often applied in Hong Kong's inside information regime.

3.3. Minority Investor Protection Mechanisms

The protection of minority investors under M&A can be the reflection of corporate governance at a very important point. Divergences do exist in this respect as well. While, in most surveys, Hong Kong is noted for high rankings in corporate governance within Asia, this is attributed to have been achieved significantly by the minority shareholder protection mechanisms through the common law framework, clarity for the investors in most remedies available. Derivative actions can be brought: leave of court (where the court considers matters like good faith and prima facie in the interests of the company), claims for unfair prejudice under the Companies Ordinance enable shareholders to claim remedies where the affairs of the company have been conducted unfairly to them. This is one of the common cause lists in related-party M&A or oppression disputes. Although this is a right established on many different levels, there are still some requirements for a party to match before the allegation. The regulatory framework such as the Takeovers Code, along with the greater part of Company legislation which is subordinate to it, does not afford protection directly in the matter of takeovers. Break fees have not typically been seen in public M&A except those negotiations with the Government, and where they are absolutely undertaken, it is generally capped at 1% of the offer value. This does not serve to widen the rights of shareholders regarding the provisions of unfair or inequitable treatment by related parties. The general law in Hong Kong does not normally provide for the provision of statutory appraisal rights in an M&A; in most jurisdictions, such rights are available in the statute. There is no corporate governance law in Hong Kong applicable to listed companies—these laws are amended into conditions of the stock exchange.

In Mainland China, an area of ongoing reform Minority shareholders have been protected. Historically, there were substantial obstacles for minority shareholders to pursue any legal action. The costs were so high, it was so difficult in practice, and sometimes courts were perceived not to like getting involved strongly in the internal affairs of companies [28]. The required shareholding thresholds (such as 1% or more held individually or collectively for 180 consecutive days) from which to bring the derivative action have in the past acted as very major procedural barriers. First, internal remedies have had to be exhausted (that the board or supervisory committee should institute legal proceedings) which in practice has turned out to be a very major procedural barrier. That shall implement it. Even better news would be the fact that securities class actions have been introduced to Chinese markets, but with adaptations to the local developments, known as innovative special representative action (SSRA), intended to eliminate the passivity and lack of capacity for litigation on the part of investors by allowing specialized investor protection organizations to take the initiative

in the litigation. This SSRA mechanism explicitly addresses the high costs and collective action problems that dispersed small investors face since the institution bears the primary litigation burden after an initial court ruling based on regulatory findings or criminal judgments. This lowers the direct financial cost for an individual claimant opting to be part of the litigation. Successful application in leading cases has promised to make it a formidable weapon, though long-term effectiveness has yet to be seen in myriad M&A scenarios, particularly those that do not come on the back of a regulatory sanction [9, 29]. Substantive rights, related-party transactions need some approval procedures under the Company Law and listing rules. Fairness, however, remains a conceptual requirement. The appraisal rights in M&A are very restricted in the Mainland context as compared to some other jurisdictions. These reforms notwithstanding, regulatory obstacles, and a cultural reluctance by some founders to cede control can still influence M&A structures, sometimes favoring minority investments over full buyouts. The actual costs of litigation in the Mainland, even outside the SSRA, involving court fees, potentially high lawyer fees (contingency fees are regulated but exist), and the cost of gathering evidence still remain a significant deterrent for many individual minority shareholders contemplating legal action.

3.4. Judicial Review and the Role of Case Law/Precedent

Differences in the enforcement of director duties and investor rights are made by the approach to judicial review [30]. The courts of Hong Kong consider common law precedent and conduct a judicial review of the actions of the directors in the manner in which established principles like the business judgment rule are applied (where applicable, providing directors with deference if they acted informedly and in good faith, and without conflicts) and transactions involving conflicts of interest with a much higher degree of intensity [31]. A rather vast body of case law has developed, which application-wise sort of makes the interpretation and application of duties quite predictable in various factual settings. Precedent-based duty interpretation and application mean that the decisions of the judiciary continuously fine-tune and flesh out the law, setting a guide for future action that enhances legal certainty for directors strategizing M&A deals and for prospective litigants contemplating challenges to investment.

Legislation and Practice have relatively little development regarding the director's duty, especially the duty of care, which has been encumbered in the People's Republic of China. Even though the Company Law enumerates the duties, the provisions do not explicitly detail standards within which courts may use to review decisions by directors, and hence there still prevails a certain degree of uncertainty. Unless clear conflicts or bad faith are evident, the courts of that place may base their decision more on whether the statutory procedures have been maintained rather than the merits of the business decision. Such lacunae are filled under the prevailing system through the development of the statutory provisions and regulations by the CSRC and other such bodies. For the securities market decisions precedent, there are Judicial interpretations in China. This, however, does not assure the interpretation's consistency on the lower subsequent decisions or predictability on issues regarding the M&A governance the directors engaged in. A modest body of explicit, obligatory court rulings applying fiduciary duties to elaborate M&A settings leaves room for doubt—doubt for directors trying to meet their duties, and for investors enforcing their rights. This, in turn, may or may not multiply corporate disputes by rendering companies more cautious. On the one hand, companies may be more cautious; on the other hand, disputes may multiply. Also, such regulatory collaboration between the Mainland and Hong Kong is very important but, however, is challenged by the fact that there are different substantive laws and enforcement mechanisms.

4. Charting the Course Forward: Collaborative Pathways and Reform Proposals for Mainland China

The comparative analysis between Mainland China and Hong Kong does more than reveal very different approaches to regulating director conduct and protecting investors in the M&A context. This

work is put in the position to note how far Mainland China has gone in developing its corporate law framework. The comparison also implicitly indicates further reforms that would foster market integrity where they already exist, make it a partner to enhance investor confidence and, most critically, support effective synergies between directorial duties and shareholder protection. This, of course, should be determined in context specificity with the Mainland. Building on best practices, this chapter makes a fine mix of legislative, judicial, and corporate governance domains in its concrete proposal for reform to reach beyond mere mimicry of another system by addressing specific weaknesses identified in the foregoing analysis for creating a framework that fits market realities for Mainland China.

4.1. Legislative Suggestions: Refining Rules and Enhancing Redress

To rectify the ambiguities and gaps identified in section 3, the following measures under targeted legislative action are proposed. Firstly, there is a need to revise and enhance the definitions and scope of the fiduciary duties of directors within the Company Law. Especially, the amendment should focus on eliminating the ambiguities regarding the practical application of the duty of care and standards of judicial review. Such shall tend to eliminate the existing ambiguities that place the burden of understanding such extremely on both directors and investors. This would include an amendment to the threshold for liability, say, to gross versus ordinary negligence, which could be brought in expressly and presently is a matter of academic debate [32, 33]. This has been interpreted to make a good case for predictability whereby clarity can firmly ground judicial enforcement. The net effect will be more diligence on the part of directors and less litigation risk due to unclear standards. Secondly, the regime of information disclosure has to be further strengthened. Learning from the precise requirements and stricter enforcement attitude of Hong Kong (which has greater market transparency), the disclosures of which the Mainland market regulators require could cover the timing, content, and materiality of information disclosed during an M&A (e.g., perhaps more detailed Mainland directives on the valuation methodology or explicit risk factors that were found to be not well laid out in the directives from the Mainland with penalties for non-compliance of such directives to ensure that there are teeth to punish persistent challenges in incomplete or late disclosure [34]. This would directly address the information asymmetry issue highlighted earlier. As shown in Figure 1, strengthening the disclosure regime involves improvements across several dimensions, including timeliness, content standards, and regulatory enforcement. Thirdly, enhancing legal avenues for minority shareholder redress remains crucial. The major procedural and cost barriers to traditional litigation pathways in the Mainland make it very important to further build on SSRA mechanisms. More legislation that clarifies its application scope, shares the criteria (for example, M&A cases not involving prior regulatory sanctions against which it can be used), and an exploration towards procedures complementing it while also making derivative suits more accessible through lower standing thresholds and modifying the exhaustion requirement would ensure that investors have useful and affordable means to hold errant directors accountable. This, in turn, will lead to empowered investors and thus act as a stronger check on director misconduct.

Figure 1. Strategies to Strengthen Information Disclosure

4.2. Judicial Procedure Recommendations: Improving Expertise and Access

Effective laws are meant to be effectively implemented, hence the need for judicial reform. There is likely to be a contrast as the Mainland China courts do not have abundant binding precedents claims in such matters [35], whereas the common law courts would have a say on this dimension [36]. This, in turn, would fill the existing gap in the judiciary by introducing a more refined and informed

decision-making body capable of determining such matters based on their true economic essence. The suggestions might purport more certainty in legal outcomes regarding the proposed amendments regarding the guidance cases in such matters of director and investor protection. This is not to make Chinese law another Hong Kong common law but to ensure there is predictability in applying the legal principles through clearer judiciary guidance or, perhaps, more narrowly focused judicial interpretations by the Supreme People's Court on point. To practical barriers to litigation minority shareholders. As noted, a major deterrent access to justice sector. Elaborating on how these costs could be reduced, such as refining contingency fee arrangements and expanding legal aid eligibility for certain actions by shareholders would bring judicial remedies closer to the locus standi in practice, where the judiciary has the locus standi to act, as opposed to being mere postmen of the legislature sending parcels of justice legislated under the aegis of the SSRA. Among such reforms would be a substantial investment in judicial training and resources with which to surmount institutional in the implementation of the rest. However, the net effect of the above would be that justice would be riper, more accessible, and easier to predict–a shot in the arm for investors.

4.3. Corporate Governance Enhancements: Strengthening Internal Oversight

Apart from the legal rules, this process has better results through a gradual strengthening of the internal corporate governance mechanisms. The comparative review has indicated certain possible weaknesses in the internal control and monitoring systems in Mainland companies as opposed to very well-developed practices in Hong Kong, particularly in terms of the independence of the directors. A strong lesson learned from Hong Kong is that such efforts should persist. Not only should qualified people be appointed to these boardroom roles, but they should also have resources as well as a mandate, clearer safe harbors from liability when acting diligently, and protection to act effectively in exercising real supervision that true oversight entails, free from the undue influence of the respective company's management and shareholders [37]. Also, the supervisory board as a unique practice in Mainland corporate governance should also have its role strengthened–perhaps more mandates with independent resources–to make internal monitoring of the directors and management as effective as required [38]. To promote corporate cultures that indeed prioritize over short-term gains corporate cultures to value ethical conducts and values fiduciary responsibilities involves setting clearer regulatory expectations, including director training programs that emphasize more on fiduciary duties, and in every respect of every activity by an institutional investment [39]. Long-term endeavored internalization change of corporate culture by the regulator and market players, stronger internal governance not only breaches before they occur and less reliance on expensive external enforcement but also desirability of companies by long-term investors is the first line of defense in establishing effective corporate governance over prevention of breaches of duty and protection of interest during M&As [40].

5. Conclusion

The fine balance in the leading roles' fiduciary duties and investor safeguard is to encourage successful and fair mergers and acquisitions. The issues differ significantly and have varied outcomes as shown by this analysis; while both Mainland China and Hong Kong contend with these foundational matters based on their unique legal traditions and differing market development stages. Clarity has been cast by the comparison in some key forms of divergence that direct the application of fiduciary duty standards, information disclosure enforcement, minority shareholder remedies, and the case law/statute in which the court expressed that foundation's degree of development. These are not mere academic differences; they bear rather strong practical implications in deal structuring, risk assessment, and the ultimate allocation of value in M&As involving jurisdictions. The differences underline some specific challenges within the Mainland Chinese context, pointing to a clear need for further reform to boost investor confidence and ensure market integrity during the process of transformative M&A.

A much stronger M&A environment in Mainland China, the gradual development of much healthier mergers and acquisitions, results from an approach that shares many goals and values but also recognizes some distinctions between directorial accountability and shareholder rights. The paths herein examined, targeted legislative refinements for clearer duties and enhanced remedies, procedural improvements for better expertise and access to the judiciary, and corporate governance improvements for better internal oversight, offer a roadmap for the steps that need to be taken to Mainland China to continue implementing a more robust, transparent, and trustworthy capital market framework that effectively balances the complex interests inherent in mergers and acquisitions as a means of sustainable economic growth and development.

References

[1] Deng P, Yang M. Cross-Border Mergers and Acquisitions by Emerging Market Firms: A Comparative Investigation. International Business Review, 2015, 24 (1): 157-172.

[2] Gaughan P A. Mergers, Acquisitions, and Corporate Restructurings. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.

[3] Rezaee Z. Financial Services Firms: Governance, Regulations, Valuations, Mergers, and Acquisitions. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

[4] Tuch A F. Banker Loyalty in Mergers and Acquisitions. Texas Law Review, 2015, 94: 1079.

[5] Tuch A F. M&A Advisor Misconduct: A Wrong Without a Remedy? Delaware Journal of Corporate Law, 2020, 45: 177.

[6] Zanoni A. Hedge Funds' Empty Voting in Mergers and Acquisitions: A Fiduciary Duties Perspective. Global Jurist, 2009, 9 (4).

[7] Hutchison C. To Whom Are Directors' Duties Owed? Evidence from Canadian M&A Transactions. McGill Law Journal, 2023, 68 (2): 123-159.

[8] Bris A, Cabolis C. The Value of Investor Protection: Firm Evidence from Cross-Border Mergers. The Review of Financial Studies, 2008, 21 (2): 605-648.

[9] Tarek A. Mergers and Acquisitions: Analysing Antitrust Implications and Regulatory Compliance. Available at SSRN: 4518461, 2023.

[10] Hirschleifer D. Mergers and Acquisitions: Strategic and Informational Issues. Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science, 1995, 9: 839-885.

[11] García-Nieto M, Bueno-Rodríguez V, Ramón-Jerónimo J M, et al. Trends and Risks in Mergers and Acquisitions: A Review. Risks, 2024, 12 (9): 143.

[12] Weng C X C, Godwin A. The Duty of Loyalty of Company Directors in China: Tracing Its Origins and Plugging the Gaps. University of Western Australia Law Review, 2022, 49 (2): 46-71.

[13] Lee R W C. Fiduciary Duty Without Equity: Fiduciary Duties of Directors Under the Revised Company Law of the PRC. Virginia Law Review, 2006, 47: 897.

[14] Ambaras Khan M. Shareholders' Protection Through the Enhanced Independent Advice Circular. The Law Review, 2011.

[15] Smith D G, Wright M, Hintze M K. Private Ordering with Shareholders: A Study on Corporate Governance. University of Pennsylvania Journal of Business Law, 2011.

[16] Espinasse P. Cornerstone Investors: A Practice Guide for Asian IPOs. Hong Kong University Press, 2018.

[17] Lin T W. Corporate Governance in China: Recent Developments, Key Problems and Solutions. Journal of Accounting and Corporate Governance, 2004, 1.

[18] Luo Y. Corporate Governance and Accountability in Multinational Enterprises: Concepts and Agenda. Journal of International Management, 2005, 11 (1): 1-18.

[19] Xiao Huang F, Yeung H. Regulatory Cooperation Between Securities Commissions: A Reflection from Hong Kong. The Chinese Journal of Comparative Law, 2013, 1 (1): 112-157.

[20] Sit K. Explaining the Complexities of Hong Kong's Financial Securities Legislation to Enhance Trust Among Small Investors Through Individual Case Reports as Stories. Doctoral dissertation, Middlesex University, 2021.

[21] Au A. Hong Kong Code on Takeovers and Mergers: Toothless Watchdog or Handmaiden of Equality? Hong Kong Law Journal, 1987, 17: 24.

[22] Guo J, Dong J. M&A Performance Involving Chinese Markets: Impact of M&A Financing Methods on Performance. Journal of International Business and Economics, 2024.

[23] Chan R S Y, Ho J K S. Could Complying with China's Secrecy Laws Be an Excuse for Auditors Not to Provide Their Working Papers of Auditing Chinese Companies? Recent Cases in the United States and Hong Kong. King's Law Journal, 2015, 26 (1): 99-128.

[24] Ho S S, Wong K S. A Study of Corporate Disclosure Practice and Effectiveness in Hong Kong. Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting, 2001, 12 (1): 75-102.

[25] Yuen C Y, Liu M, Zhang X, et al. A Case Study of Voluntary Disclosure by Chinese Enterprises. Asian Journal of Finance & Accounting, 2009, 1 (2).

[26] Chen M. Developing China's Approaches to Regulate Cross-Border Data Transfer: Relaxation and Integration. Computer Law & Security Review, 2024, 54: 105997.

[27] Rong K, Ling Y, Yang T, et al. Cross-Border Data Transfer: Patterns and Discrepancies. Journal of International Business Policy, 2025.

[28] Schipani C A, Liu J. Corporate Governance in China: Then and Now. In Corporate Governance. Gower, 2017: 491-559.

[29] Akinsola O K, Hamzah F. Legal Mechanisms for Corporate Restructuring: Understanding the Legal Landscape of Mergers, Acquisitions, and Bankruptcy Proceedings. Journal of Business Law, 2025.

[30] Goshen Z, Hamdani A. Corporate Control, Dual Class, and the Limits of Judicial Review. Columbia Law Review, 2020, 120 (4): 941-994.

[31] Gu W. A Conflict of Laws Study in Hong Kong-China Judgment Regionalism: Legal Challenges and Renewed Momentum. Cornell International Law Journal, 2019, 52: 591.

[32] Reddy K S. Regulatory Framework of Mergers and Acquisitions: A Review of Indian Statutory Compliances and Policy Recommendations. International Journal of Law and Management, 2016, 58 (2): 197-215.

[33] Sharma A. Types of Mergers and Acquisitions: Frameworks, Strategies, and Market Implications. Journal of Strategic Management, 2024.

[34] Zhang J, Bilinski P, Raonic I, et al. Enforcing Disclosure Compliance in Mergers and Acquisitions: Evidence from China. European Accounting Review, 2023: 1-34.

[35] Zhang Q. Judicial Reform in China: An Overview. In China's Socialist Rule of Law Reforms Under Xi Jinping. Cambridge University Press, 2016: 17-29.

[36] Jordan A D. Lost in the Translation: Two Legal Cultures, the Common Law Judiciary and the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Cornell International Law Journal, 1997, 30: 335.

[37] Sari R. Enhancing Corporate Governance Through Effective Oversight and Accountability. Advances: Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis, 2023, 1 (6): 344-356.

[38] Masli A, Sherwood M G, Srivastava R P. Attributes and Structure of an Effective Board of Directors: A Theoretical Investigation. Abacus, 2018, 54 (4): 485-523.

[39] Laby A B. Resolving Conflicts of Duty in Fiduciary Relationships. American University Law Review, 2004, 54: 75.

[40] Akinsola O K. The Role of Corporate Lawyers in Protecting the Rights and Interests of Shareholders During Corporate Restructuring and Governance Reforms. Journal of Corporate Law Studies, 2025.