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The intense competition, rapid technological change, major corporate accounting scandals, and rising stock market volatility have increased the burden on managers to deliver superior performance and value for their shareholders. In the modern “winner takes all” economy, companies that fail to meet this challenge will face the certain loss of their independence, if not extinction.

Corporate restructuring has enabled thousands of organizations around the world to respond more quickly and effectively to new opportunities and unexpected pressures, thereby reestablishing their competitive advantage. It has had an equally profound impact on the many more thousands of suppliers, customers, and competitors that do business with restructured firms.

The failure of many successful companies like the one witnessed by Enron Ltd., raised many doubts about maintainability of consistent corporate success. It is also felt, past success is no guarantee for future success.

Corporate Restructuring, apart from Creating Value in Turbulent Times arms corporates with financial strategies to reposition and revitalize their firms amidst unprecedented turmoil in the global financial and product markets.

Corporate restructuring and improved corporate governance are essential parts of economic reform programs under way in many countries.

This course will enable you to understand how can corporations be restructured to promote growth and reduce excessive debt without placing undue burdens on taxpayers? What framework is needed to promote better corporate governance? How the legal frame work of India facilitate the process of Corporate restructuring.
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Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:

- The concept of corporate restructure
- Why should Corporates restructure themselves
- How to structure a restructuring

Corporate restructuring involves restructuring the assets and liabilities of corporations, including their debt-to-equity structures, in line with their cash flow needs in order to:

- Promote efficiency,
- Restore growth,
- And minimize the cost to tax payers.

Corporate governance refers to the framework of rules and regulations that enable the stakeholders to exercise appropriate oversight of a company to maximize its value and to obtain a return on their holdings.

Fundamental cultural and institutional changes are required if a new corporate governance structure is to be established with arm’s-length, transparent relations between corporations, government, and banks. Changing corporate governance, however, is a long-term process.

Global enterprises may be motivated to reorganize their worldwide tax and legal structure for a variety of reasons. For example:

- To fully realize the value anticipated from a strategic merger or acquisition, a global enterprise must quickly reorganize and integrate its combined business operations from a tax and legal perspective.
- On the other hand, a fully integrated global enterprise may be forced to quickly realign its worldwide structure in order to effect a strategic spin-off or disposition of business operations that the management no longer deems desirable or essential.
- Finally, a global enterprise may wish to reorganize its worldwide structure to accommodate a down-sizing or transformation of its existing business operations or simply to generate tax and legal efficiencies that will contribute to its overall earnings per share.

Whatever the objective, to be truly successful, a global reorganization must be structured in a manner that not only:

- Optimizes the ultimate tax position of the enterprise,
- But also addresses a multitude of legal issues that arise as a result of the restructuring.

Case Studies - 10
There are many reasons why a company may aim to achieve growth rather than remain at the same size. Firms which grow benefit from the economies of scale which eventually lead to a greater profit.

Firms aim to maximize their profit as this is the ultimate goal for all firms. Economies of scale give greater technical efficiency, spreading fixed costs, bulk buying, agglomeration and so on. That is, technical efficiency generally increases as the size of the firm increases, MR = MC and profit is maximised. For example, in the mission statement of National Foods Limited (NFL), it aims to achieve “optimal levels of productivity and profitability whilst at the same time ensuring that shareholders’ investments are safeguarded through ethical and prudent business practices.” ie. maximum technical efficiency. Public companies (the larger ones) also have greater access to capital through share floats and subsequent rights issues that they can offer. This is a benefit of being a large public company. For example, NFL states, as one of their aims, to maximise returns to shareholders through capital growth and dividends. This is just one example of how important access to capital is. Finance from the public is also preferred to finance in the form of a loan, from a bank as repayments are not legally essential. This is something that only a large firm can do. Large firms have a degree of security and stability about them. Generally, there is more security in your job and work environment in a grown, established company rather than in small companies. For example, one of NFL’s aims is to achieve “operations which continue to be carried out in a responsible manner within an environment that provides safe working conditions for all employees.” Employees whose jobs are not under threat tend to work more efficiently without delays. NFL also aims to achieve job satisfaction by its employees and rewards them appropriately for effort and initiative. Finally, large companies are well known and with their status can exert a lot of power and influence on people. Power and respect is desired by almost everyone and thus firms aim to achieve this. NFL aims to achieve leadership in the industries in which its businesses operate. An example of this kind of business is the yogurt industry in which one of NFL’s company, National Dairies, has recently gained the right to manufacture yoghurt in Australia under the Yoplait brand name. Previously, National Dairies was operating at a loss because no one wanted to buy yoghurt under a name they hadn’t heard of but now National Dairies is becoming a market leader in all market sectors because Yoplait is providing a strong “umbrella” brand to the business. With this comes access to international research and product development programs from the owner of the Yoplait brand. Thus influence and brand names can lead to other benefits from having power. One 1995/ 1996 objective was to achieve status as a world competitive producer.

1 Pathways for Takeovers and Mergers
A takeover occurs when one company secures over 50% of another company. This can be for several reasons such as the benefits of economies of scale (especially with the sharing of management), greater marketing power and complimentary...
products. An example of a lateral integration is Mercantile Mutual Financial Services Limited (MM) currently taking over Pacific Mutual Australia Limited (PMA). MM is offering the shareholders of PMA a cash offer of $2.30 for each ordinary share that they own. In addition, another fully franked dividend of $0.10 per share will be offered by PMA once the offer is declared unconditional. One condition is that MM must receive 90% or more acceptance for PMA’s shares. This offer values PMA at $98 million. The board of management of PMA have recommended acceptance to the bid in the absence of a higher offer. MM’s aim in acquiring PMA is obviously to expand its company. Whilst it may be considered horizontal growth it can also be argued that this is lateral growth since both companies, whilst offering some similar services, are not entirely the same. MM is a “leading insurance and financial services group” whilst PMA is an investment management and life company. One of the reasons MM desires to takeover PMA is for greater access to capital. PMA is a large, public company with almost $2 billion in funds under their management including the Armstrong Jones property trusts. The acquisition of PMA will extend MM’s operations into listed property trusts. As PMA also has a share of the New Zealand market in its fund management, MM will be expanding its market by acquiring PMA. Additional growth will occur in their life and funds management businesses. Another example of inorganic company growth is a merger between more than one company. An example of this is was the 1995 SBS IAMA Limited integration of eight independent IAMA businesses and one publicly listed SBS Rural Ltd into one national rural distribution and retail organisation. This integration was spread across nine different companies. It could be argued that it was a horizontal integration as eight of them were very similar in levels of production but it is more likely seen to be a lateral integration. Benefits from this include more access to capital, complimentary (rural) products, a much larger brand name (for power marketing purposes) and for some related fixed costs such as management and marketing. The merging of SBS IAMA was considered successful to the point that it was referred to as a “capital raising” activity rather than just a merger.

2 Forms of Business Growth

(increased market share; product development; growth of market from external sources; profit growth) Steady growth in profits, assets and income can be used as one form of measurement of business growth. In the 1994/1995 Financial year, Burswood Property Trust (Burswood)’s operating revenue increased by 11.7% from the previous year to $429.1 million. In 1986 operating revenue was $43 million in the first 6 months of trading. Its net income (after tax) increased 19.6% to $52.6 million. Distribution (dividends) increased 27% to 15.5 cents per share. However Burswood attributes this growth in profits to increasing demand from a market which Burswood itself, is gaining a greater share of. This increase in demand and the fact that Burswood has an exclusive casino licence, means that growth of the company has been and will continue to be attributed to growth in demand and the market. The external sources contributing to growth in the market are the geographical proximity of Perth, strong economic growth in Asia and an increase in demand from growing middle class populations for “the quality gaming experience, resort facilities and service which are unique to Burswood”. Burswood’s share in the Asian market has grown significantly in the past decade and looks set to continue with this growth, despite increase in competition as well. Burswood is not unlike a monopoly here in WA. Whilst other casinos are opening up elsewhere in the country and the region, none are opening in Perth. Burswood also believes it has further developed or rather improved its products and services which have helped prompt an increase in demand. Newly introduced games in the main gaming hall, huge casino “African Safari” promotions and new player incentive programs have all increased demand from patrons. Recent awards for tourism and service excellence give the casino great marketing power and a good reputation which future patrons may base their visits upon. Another example of expansion through profit growth is PMA. In the financial year ending 30 June 1995, PMA recorded increases in profit after tax (+3%), earnings per share (+1%) and dividend to shareholders per share (+23%) from the previous financial year. This followed continuous growth in all three areas since 1992. At the same time, the amount of shareholder’s funds had increased as well from more than $50 million in 1992 to more than $80 million in 1995. Debts had been reduced to naught and gross funds under management had increased from $4.05 billion to $4.3 billion. These excellent results won them a “Golden Target” award for investor relations, adding prestige to their name. This shows that as the company grew in size, worth and power, demand for their services increased as well.

3 Sources of Finance for Business Growth

There are several ways of raising finance for a company. Determining which method is used to get it, depends on how much finance is needed in the first place and the current net assets of the company, how urgently the finance is needed, whether or not and how long before the money will be paid back and other factors. Some companies will choose to float some shares in their company as a source of finance. Whilst this is can be useful in that there are no legal obligations for the company to pay back the shareholders, unlike with a loan from a bank, it is really only useful when large sources of finance are needed as marketing of the company is time consuming and expensive as preparation of prospectuses, share brokers and advertising need to be organised and paid for. However in the case of Hoyts Cinema Ltd, a share float appears to be quite appropriate as they seek to gain around $100 million to fund their expansion. Hoyts is offering 50 million shares at $2.00 each to give the company a market capitalisation of around $440 million. Profit growth for Hoyts in 1996 has slowed down from 1994-95 when huge box office successes like Forrest Gump and The Lion King raised a lot of revenue for Hoyts. They now plan to hopefully increase their revenue and thus their profit by expanding with 100 new cinema screens around the world. To do this, finance is being raised from this share float. This is not the first time for the Hoyts name, the radio group Hoyts Media and Hoyts Entertainment previously floated in 1987 but fell into receivership later on. That was a different float.
However it is possible for a “second float” to take place in the same company after shareholders have bought their shares. It is still possible for the company to offer more to the public, for extra finance. A new issue of shares is a rights issue and an example of company which has done this is Petroz NL. Petroz is offering a renounceable rights issue of one new ordinary share at $0.65 per share for every two ordinary shares that a shareholder currently owns. This is being held to raise approximately $42.60 million. As this is an expensive exercise, after costs of marketing have been taken into account, it will actually raise only $41 million. The price of the rights issue is approximately 20% cheaper than the recent trading price of normal Petroz shares. Petroz is seeking to gain extra finance to fund “the continuing appraisal of the reserves and reservoir performance of the Bayu - Undan gas/condensate field”; extensive engineering studies; potential development of two oil fields and funding of an active oil exploration program. As the level of risk is relatively high, Petroz seeks to fund these activities from existing cash flow, rather than debt. Thus it has chosen to issue a rights issue in place of a loan from a financial institution with the risk that they may not be able to pay it back.

Practice Questions
1. What are the goals of business organization.
2. Why should organizations resort to restructuring
3. How can growth result from restructuring
4. Organizations should be clean, lean and ethical - discuss.
Objective
The objective of the lesson is to give you insight into:
- Why business organizations fail
- Concept of organizational failure & reorganization
- How symptoms of failure manifest
- Is it possible to predict business failure in advance

Business Failures
Before we understand the physiology of restructuring let us understand the causes for corporate failures.

“God, but it’s hard making predictions!....... Especially about the future” – Alphonse Allais.

“The future, sadly, is not any more what it used to be” – Paul Valery.

The result is increased number of corporate failures.

Business Failure and Reorganization
Business failure occurs due to different reasons. While few firms fail within first year or two of life, few others grow, mature and fail much later. The failure can occur in a number of ways and also from different reasons.

Business failure can be considered from,
- Economic and,
- Financial viewpoint.

Why Business Firms Fail
Let us try understand the different reasons why corporate often fail
- An imbalance of skills within the top echelon.
- A chief executive who dominates a firm’s operations without regard for the inputs of peers
- An inactive board of directors. The board of Directors lack of interest in the financial position of the company may lead to insolvency.
- A deficient finance function within the firm’s management.
- The absence of responsibility for the chief executive officer.

Apart from the above mistakes the firm usually is vulnerable to several mistakes,
- Management may be negligent in developing effective accounting system
- The company may be unresponsive to change
- Management may be inclined to undertake an investment project that is disproportionately large relative to firm size. If the project fails the probability of insolvency is greatly increased.
- Finally the management may rely heavily on debt financing that even a minor problem can place the firm in a dangerous position.

Symptoms of Bankruptcy or Failure
Having understood the causes for a firm’s sickness, the next important question is – is it possible to with reasonable accuracy predict a firm’s failure using some modeling technique.

Research shows that as a company enters the final stage prior to failure - a pattern may develop in terms of - changing financial ratios which prove to be useful indicators of an impending disaster.

Altman has developed a statistical model and found the statistical ratios best predicting bankruptcy.

Based upon Altman’s sample of bankrupt firms the study yielded an equation that used five ratios to predict bankruptcy. Accordingly,

Bankruptcy score = \[ 1.2X1 + 1.4X2 + 3.3X3 + 0.6X4 + 0.999X5 \]

Where,
- \( X1 \) = Networking Capital/Total assets
- \( X2 \) = Retained earnings/Total assets
- \( X3 \) = Earnings before interest and taxes/total assets
- \( X4 \) = Total market value of stock/book value of total debt
- \( X5 \) = Sales/total assets

The Analysis: The Z-score was developed from an analysis of 33 - Bankrupt manufacturing companies with average assets of $6.4 million, and, as controls, another 33 companies with assets between $1 million and $25 million.

Altman’s Z-score calculates 5 ratios,

1 return on total assets
2 sales to total assets
3 working capital to total assets
4 retained earnings to total assets

These ratios are then multiplied by a predetermined weight factor, and the results are added together. The final number—the Z-score—yields a number between -4 and +8.

The research showed that Financially-sound companies show Z-scores above 2.99, while those scoring below 1.81 are in fiscal danger, maybe even heading toward bankruptcy. Scores that fall between these ends indicate potential trouble.

In Altman’s initial study of 33 bankrupt companies, Z-scores for 95 % of these companies pointed to trouble or imminent bankruptcy.

Although the numbers that go into calculating the Z-score (and a company’s financial soundness) are sometimes influenced by external factors, it provides a good quick analysis of where the company under study stands compared to the competition, and provides a good tool for analyzing the ups and downs of the company’s financial stability over time.

The Altman Z-Score Analysis - 5 Ratios
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATIO</th>
<th>FORMULA</th>
<th>WEIGHT FACTOR</th>
<th>WEIGHTED RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return on Total Assets</td>
<td>Earnings Before Interest and Taxes</td>
<td>x 3.3</td>
<td>-4 to +8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales to Total Assets</td>
<td>Net Sales</td>
<td>x 0.999</td>
<td>-4 to +8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity to Debt</td>
<td>Market Value of Equity</td>
<td>x 0.6</td>
<td>-4 to +8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital to Total Assets</td>
<td>Working Capital</td>
<td>x 1.2</td>
<td>-4 to +8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings to Total Assets</td>
<td>Retained Earnings</td>
<td>x 1.4</td>
<td>-4 to +8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practice Questions**

1. Why business firms fail
2. Enumerate few symptoms of business failure
3. Explain altmans bankruptcy score
LESSON 3:
THE PHYSIOLOGY OF BUSINESS FAILURE

Objective
The objective of the lesson is to give you insight in to:

- Types of business failures
- How to meet the challenge of business failure
- How to deal with dilemma of liquidation or reorganization
- Understand informal alternatives for failing business

In an economic sense business failure is associated with success in business relates to firms that earn adequate return on their investment. Similarly business failure is associated with forms that cannot earn adequate returns on their investments.

What is important is whether a business failure is permanent or temporary. In fact the appropriate course of action depends on whether the business failure is permanent or temporary. Thus if the failure is temporary the firm may have to be liquidated and if the failure is permanent the firm may have to take steps to speed the company’s return to business.

Types of Business Failure

Insolvency
A firm may fail if its returns are negative or even low. A firm that consistently reports losses at operational level would experience decline in market share and eventual closure.

Technical Insolvency
A firm is said to be facing technical insolvency when it is unable to pay its liabilities as they become due.

Thus when a firm faces technical insolvency its assets are still greater than the liabilities but the firm is confronted with liquidity crisis.

Bankruptcy
When a firm has technical insolvency some of its assets could be converted to cash to escape complete failure. If this is not done at right time, the firm may have to face a more serious type of failure - Bankruptcy. It occurs when firm’s assets are less than the liabilities.

A bankrupt firm has a negative shareholder’s equity. Although bankruptcy is a more obvious form of business failure courts treat technical insolvency and bankruptcy in the same way.

The Challenge
When a firm faces severe problems, either the problems must be resolved or the firm must be liquidated. At such point an important question has to be answered - “is the firm worth more dead or alive”

The decision to continue operating has to be based upon - The feasibility and fairness of reorganizing the firms as opposed to the benefits of liquidating the business.

When technical insolvency occurs management must either modify the operating financial conditions or terminate the firm’s life.

If a decision is made to alter the company in the hopes of revitalizing its operations,

- Either voluntary agreements with the investors, or
- A formal court arranged reorganization must be used.

If on the other hand the difficulties are believed to be insurmountable, then liquidation will take place either by assignments of assets to an independent party for liquidation or by formal bankruptcy proceedings.

Voluntary Remedies to Insolvency
Once a firm begins to encounter these difficulties the firm’s owners and management have to consider the alternatives available to failing business. Such a firm has two remedies,

- Attempt to resolve its difficulties with its creditors on voluntary or informal process.
- Petition the courts for assistance and formally declare bankruptcy.

The company creditors also may petition to courts and get the company involuntarily declared bankrupt.

To Reorganize or Liquidate
Regardless of whether a business chooses informal or formal methods to deal with its difficulties eventually the decision has to be made whether to reorganize or liquidate the business.

Before this decision can be made both the business liquidation value and its going concern value has to determine.

Liquidation value: equals the proceeds that would be received from the sale of the business less its liabilities.

Going concern value: equals the capitalized value of the company's operating earnings less its liabilities.

Normally,
If the going-concern value exceeds the liquidation value the company needs to be reorganized otherwise it should be liquidated.

However in practice the determination of the going concern and liquidation values is not easy due to following reasons,

- Uncertainty as to estimating the price the company’s assets will bring at auction.
- The company’s future operating earnings
- Appropriate discount rate at which to capitalize the earning may be difficult to determine.
- Management understandably is not in a position to be completely objective, about the above values.

Informal Alternatives for Failing Business
Regardless of exact reasons why a business begins to experience difficulties

Regardless of the exact reasons why a business begins to experience difficulties the result is often same - Cash flow problems
Frequently,

- The first step taken by troubled company involves stretching its payable. In some occasions this can keep the company busy for several weeks of needed time before creditors take action. If the difficulties are more than just minor and temporary the company may turn to its bankers with request for additional working capital loans.

- Another possible action is the company bankers and creditors take up to restructure the company’s debt.

Restructuring of debt by bankers can be quite complex. However debt restructuring basically involves either

- Extension,
- Composition, or
- A combination of both above.

In Extension: The failing company tries to reach an agreement with its creditors that will permit it to lengthen the time for meeting its obligations.

In composition: The firm’s creditors accept some percentage amount less than their original claim and the company is permitted to discharge its debt obligations by paying less than the full amounts and are protected from any further actions on part of creditors while it attempts to work out a plan of reorganization.

**What to do with the Failing Firm**

Another important aspect of the bankruptcy procedures involves what to do with the failing firm. Just as in case of informal alternatives a decision has to be made about whether a firm’s value as a going concern is greater than its liquidation value. Generally if this is so a suitable plan of reorganization can be formulated and the firm is reorganized otherwise it is liquidated.

**Reorganization**

If a voluntary remedy such as an extension or composition is not workable a company can declare or be forced by its creditors into bankruptcy.

As a part of this process a firm is either reorganized or dissolved.

Reorganization is similar to an extension or composition, the objective being to revitalize the firm by changing its capital structure like,

- Reduction of fixed charges by substituting equity and limited income securities in place of fixed income securities, etc.

Corporate restructuring can occur in myriad ways. Mergers, takeovers, divestitures, spin-offs, and so on referred to collectively as corporate restructuring have become a major force in the financial and economic environment all over the world.

**Practice Questions**

1. What should firms do with failing business
2. Discuss the physiology of business failure
3. Discuss the voluntary remedies to business failure
Objective

The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- To understand dynamics of corporate restructuring
- Corporate restructuring as an alternative to failing business

In an incisive study on corporate restructuring covering a number of companies over an extended period of time, Gordon Donalson examined the dynamics of corporate restructuring.

He tried to look at issues like why corporate restructuring occurs periodically, what conditions or circumstances induce corporate restructuring, and how should corporate governance be reformed to make it more responsive to the needs of restructuring. The key insights of this study are as below,

- Even though the environmental change which warrants corporate restructuring is a gradual process, corporate restructuring is often an episodic and convulsive exercise. Why? Typically, an organization can tolerate only one vision of future, articulated by its chief executive, and it takes time to communicate that vision and mobilize collective commitment. Once the strategy and structure that reflect that vision are in place, they acquire a life of their own. A constituency develops with a vested interest in that strategy and structure, which resists change unless it becomes inescapable.

- Hence Gordon Donalson says "hence resistance to change often preserves the status quo well beyond its period of relevance so that when change comes, the pent up forces like an earthquake capture in one violent moment a decade of gradual change.

- The conditions or circumstances which seem to enhance the probability of voluntary corporate restructuring but not necessarily guarantee same are:
  - Persuasive evidence that the strategy and structure in place have substantially eroded the benefits accruing to one or more principal corporate constituencies
  - A shift in the balance of power in favor of the disadvantaged constituency
  - Availability of options to improve performance
  - Presence of leadership which is capable of and willing to act.

- Corporate restructuring occurs periodically due to an ongoing tension between the organizational need for stability and continuity on one hand and economic compulsion to adapt to changes on the other. As Gordon Donaldson says, "the ‘wrongs’ that develop during one period of stable strategy and structure are never permanently rightened because each new restructuring becomes the platform on which the next era of stability and continuity is constructed.

Practice Questions

1. Corporate restructuring is a new concept do you agree
2. Briefly discuss the scope and objective of corporate restructuring
3. Illustrate the emergence of corporate restructuring in its global and national perspective
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give insight into:

- Understanding implications of globalization
- Tools of corporate restructuring
- Types of restructuring
- Techniques of restructuring

In earlier years, India was a highly regulated economy. To set-up an industry various licenses and registration under various enactments were required. The scope and mode of corporate restructuring was, therefore, very limited due to restrictive government policies and rigid regulatory framework. Consequent upon the raid of DCM Limited and Escorts Limited launched by Swaraj Paul, the role of the financial institutions became quite important. In fact, Swaraj Paul’s bids were a forerunner and constituted a ‘watershed’ in the corporate history of India. The Swaraj Paul episode also gave rise to a whole new trend. Financially strong entrepreneurs made their presence felt as industrialists – Ram Prasad Goenka, M.R.Chabria, Sudarshan Birla, Srichand Hinduja, Vijay Mallya and Dhirubhai Ambani and were instrumental in corporate restructuring.

The real opening up of the economy started with the Industrial Policy, 1991 whereby ‘continuity with change’ was emphasized and main thrust was on relaxations in industrial licensing, foreign investments, and transfer of foreign technology etc. For instance, amendments were made in MRTP Act, within all restrictive sections discouraging growth of industrial sector. With the economic liberalization, globalization and opening up of economies, the Indian corporate sector started restructuring to meet the opportunities and challenges of competition.

Present Scenario
Today, a restructuring wave is sweeping the corporate sector over the world, taking within its fold both big and small entities, comprising old economy businesses conglomerates and new economy companies and even the infrastructure and service sector. Mergers, amalgamations, acquisitions, consolidation and takeovers have become an integral part of new economic paradigm. Conglomerates are being formed to combine businesses and where synergies are not achieved, Demergers have become the order of the day. With the increasing competition and the economy, heading towards globalization, the corporate restructuring activities are expected to occur at a much larger scale than at any time in the past, and are stated to pay a major role in achieving the competitive edge for India in international market place.

The process of restructuring through mergers and amalgamations has been a regular feature in the developed and free economy nations like Japan, USA and European countries with special reference to UK where hundreds of mergers take place every year. The mergers and takeovers of multinational corporate houses across the borders has become a normal phenomenon.

Corporate restructuring being a matter of business convenience, the role of legislation, executive and judiciary is that of a facilitator for restructuring on healthy lines. The stand of the Government is that monopoly is not necessarily bad provided market dominance is not abused. In this era of hyper competitive capitalism and technological change, industrialists have realized that mergers/acquisitions are perhaps the best route to reach a size comparable to global companies so as to effectively compete with them. The harsh reality of globalization has dawnted that companies which cannot compete globally must sell out as an inevitable alternative.

Global Scenario
The sweeping wave of economic reforms and liberalization, has transformed the business scenario all over the world. The most significant development has been the integration of national economies with ‘Market-oriented Globalized Economy’. The multilateral trade agenda and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have been facilitating easy and free flow of technology, capital and expertise across the globe.

Globalization gives the consumer many choices – technologies are changing, established brands are being challenged by value for money products, the movement of goods across countries is on the rise and entry barriers are being reduced. As markets consolidate into fewer and larger entities, economies become more concentrated. In this international scenario, there is a heavy accent on the quality, range, cost and reliability of product and services. Companies all over the world have been reshaping and repositioning themselves to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities thrown open by globalization. The management strategy in turbulent times is to focus on core competencies selling loss making companies and acquiring those, which can contribute to profit and growth of the group. The underlying objective is to achieve and sustain superior performance. In fact, most companies in the world are merging to achieve an economic size as a means of survival and growth in the competitive economy. There has been a substantial increase in quantum of funds flowing across nations in search of restructuring and takeover candidates. UK has been the most important foreign investor in USA in recent years with British companies. In telecom, the biggest deals include AT&T-TCI, SBC-Ameritech etc. There have been huge oil sector mergers, the biggest being Exxon-Mobile, BP-Amoco and Total-Petrofina. It is estimated that one-in-four US workers have been affected by the wave of mergers and acquisition activity. In the Japanese context, mergers and acquisitions are less relevant as they believe in alliances and joint ventures than mergers and acquisitions. Also, research has shown that
Japanese are least preferred merger partner/ acquirer. The reason being - incompatible on language.

**National Scenario**

The unleashing of Indian economy has opened up lucrative and dependable opportunities to business community as a whole. The absence of strict regulations about the size and volume of business encouraged the enterprises to opt for mergers and amalgamations so as to produce on a massive scale, reduce costs of production, make prices internationally competitive etc. Today Indian economy is passing through recession. In such a situation, corporates which are capable of restructuring can contribute towards economic revival and growth. Despite the sluggish economic scenario in India, merger and amalgamation deals have been on the increase. The obvious reason is – as the size of the market shrinks, it becomes extremely difficult for all the companies to survive, unless they cut costs and maintain prices. In such a situation, merger eliminates duplication of administrative and marketing expenses. The other important reason is that it prevents price war in a shrinking market. Companies, by merging, reduce the number of competitors and increase their market share.

In the words of Justice Dhananjaya Y. Chandrachud, Corporate restructuring is one of the means that can be employed to meet the challenges which confront business.

Let us understand the techniques of restructuring.

Before that it needs to be understood that - Corporate restructuring can take several forms,

- Mergers and acquisitions
- Portfolio restructurings
- Financial restructurings.

Restructuring may also be classified into following forms,

- Financial restructuring
- Technological restructuring
- Organizational restructuring

The most commonly applied tools of corporate restructuring are

- Amalgamation
- Merger
- De-merger
- Slump sale
- Acquisition
- Joint venture
- Divestment
- Strategic alliance
- Franchises

**Organizational Restructuring Exercise**

Many firms have begun organizational exercises for restructuring in recent years to cope with heightened competition. The common elements in most organizational restructuring and performance enhancement programmes are described below,

- Regrouping of business: firms are regrouping the existing businesses into a few compact strategic business units which are often referred to as profit centers. For example L&T has been advised by Mckinsey Consultants to regroup its twelve businesses into five compact divisions
- Decentralization: to promote a quicker organizational response to dynamic environmental developments, companies are resorting to decentralization, de-layering, and delegation aimed at empowering people down the line. For example, Hindustan Lever Ltd., has embarked on an initiative to reduce

**Portfolio Restructurings**

Mergers, asset purchases, and takeovers lead to expansion in some way or the other. They are based on the principle of synergy which says $2 + 2 = 5$ !

Portfolio restructuring, on the other hand, involves some kind of contraction through a Divestiture or a De-merger is based on the principle of "synergy" which says $5 - 3 = 3$ !

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss the different types of restructuring
2. Discuss the global scenario of restructuring
3. Explain the different tools of restructuring briefly.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Strategy
- Levels of strategies
- Strategic planning & its importance
- Features of strategic planning
- Restructuring as a strategic plan

Towards reorganizing themselves, companies need to develop a strategy. The conditions companies must satisfy if they are to conserve their essential characteristics over time may be summed up as -

- Consistency between their strategy, and
- The characteristics of the external environment in which they operate.

Owing to technological change and evolution as well as owing to heightened competitive pressures following,

- Market globalization and,
- Deregulation,

Companies increasingly have to cope with altered conditions of competition. In response, they are forced to change their strategic framework.

Companies also need to change the way they compete and also the basic assumptions underlying the planning criteria that they adopt for their more general strategic design/architecture and those that govern the ways in which they interact with the external environment.

These changes have a bearing on,

- The companies ability to control environment variables
- The degree of company dependence on the external environment
- The very nature of the variability to be controlled.

Uncertainty has become the central element of competitiveness and business environment. In a world defined by turbulence surprise and a lack of continuity predictions are increasingly erroneous and therefore dangerous. This turbulence is being caused by,

- Acceleration of technological process
- The globalization of competition
- The restructuring of capitalism on a global scale.
- The slowing down of growth in some key sectors
- The political changes
- The high growth rates of Asian countries
- The large imbalance in global economy.

In a world, where prediction is becoming less reliable, decision-making and management models are perennially evolving, successful companies are organizing to become progressively “ready for anything”.

They are equipping themselves to be able to seize unexpected opportunities and retreat rapidly from bad risks. This evolution is centered on,

- Improvement of strategic analysis and thinking in terms of scenarios
- The anticipated development of additional capabilities in key resources
- Increased speed of action and reaction through efficient process of learning and change.

Precisely organizations are restructuring themselves to meet changing environment.

For three decades after world war two, most economies around the world witnessed historically unparalleled progress. However, after the early 1970s growth in most of industrialized economies began to slow down, affecting much of the developing world particularly adversely during the 1980’s and 1990’s. There were a variety of causes of this change in the trajectory of growth some of a macro economic nature and others rooted in the structure of corporate organization and in inter-firm linkages.

The response to these pressures has been a significant change in macroeconomic policies amongst countries. Throughout the world there has been a surge toward deregulation and a feeling of barriers to the global flow of many resources. For some countries this has resulted in significant enhancement to economic growth but for others globalization has done little to enhance living standards and security. Thus the gains from globalization is not automatic they depend on response of producers to the changing competitive environment.

One critical area of change is to be found in organization of production. To cope with new competitive pressures firms have to deliver not just low-priced goods and services but also products of greater quality and diversity. This requires in the first instance that they reorient their internal organization, changing production layout, introducing new methods of quality assurance and instituting processes to ensure continuous improvement.

But these changes in themselves are not sufficient. They need to be complemented by alterations in the relationship amongst firms particularly with firms.

What we Mean by Strategies

Introduction
The term ‘strategies’ has been defined by J.L. Thompson as “means to an end. The end concerns the purpose and objectives of the organization. There is a broad strategy for the whole organization and a competitive strategy for each activity.
Functional strategies contribute directly to the competitive strategy. The word ‘strategy’ is used to describe the direction that the organization chooses to follow in order to fulfill its mission. Another famous strategy thinker, Henry Mintzberg has enunciated 5 Ps of strategy viz.

i. A Plan i.e. strategy is a consciously intended course of action which a firm chooses to follow after careful deliberations on the various options available to it. It is not the first alternative that came to the chief executive’s mind like a flash or a dream.

ii. A Ploy i.e. it is a specific manoeuvre which is intended to outwit an opponent or a competition. It is a trick, a device, a scheme or a deception to gain advantageous position before engaging into the combat of marketing warfare.

iii. A Pattern i.e. it is not one decision and one solitary action; it stands for a stream of decisions and actions to guide and tend the future course of the enterprise until it reaches its predetermined corporate objectives.

iv. A Position i.e. it is a means of locating the firm in an environment full of external factors pulls and pushes. On most of those factors, enterprise has little control and whatever influence it can exercise is constrained by its organizational capabilities.

v. A Perspective i.e. it is an ingrained way of perceiving the world around the organization and its business operations. It is greatly influenced by the mindset of people who form the dominant interest group and are involved in taking decisions affecting the future course that the firm takes.

The above may also be visualized as five uses of strategy. However, they are all linked together and each organization must explore its own uses with respect to its business, internal competencies and external environments. With competition for markets and market share becoming more intense, managers responsibilities are increasing. They must devise suitable strategies to gain an edge over its competitors at a cost which it deems reasonable, strategy is a game plan of the company to outwit and outmanoeuvre its competitors.

Levels of Strategies
Strategies can be visualized to operate at three different levels viz. Corporate level, divisional or business level and operational or functional level. Strategies at corporate level focus on the scope of business activities i.e. what product portfolios to build, to expand and to consolidate. The growth and diversification strategy has to be spelt out in terms of functions and structures- should it be in the form of multi divisions of the same corporation or should it be a holding group having a number of legally independent companies and how resources have to be allocated to various alternative and competing options. Such strategies are known as grand, overall or root strategies. If these are to succeed, they have to take into account political, economical technological environments and in accordance with the societal and national priorities without ignoring the organizational paradigm and dominant stakeholders’ expectations. Their time frame is usually the longest usually five years or more.

Strategies at divisional or business level are directly concerned with the future plans of the profit centers which are divisionalized in large enterprises. These are the sub-strategies as they devolve from the grand strategies and have market orientation because these deal with the current and future product lines and current and future markets including overseas businesses.

Strategies at operational or functional level target the departmental or functional aspects of operations and look at the functional strategies of marketing, finance, human resources, manufacturing, information systems etc. and devise ways and means of increasing their contribution to the other levels of strategies. It must be noted that success of strategies at business or corporate level is largely dependent upon the strategic decisions regarding activities at the operation level.

A good strategy results in effective aligning of the organization with its environment. A company needs to tune its vision continually to the requirements of a constantly changing business environment. Every company, influenced by the cause and effect of its environment, draws resources from the environment and provides value-added resources back to the environment. The effectiveness of the manner in which a company draws resources and delivers back to the environment depends on its strengths and weaknesses. Strategy is a major focus in the quest for higher revenues and profits, with companies pursuing novel ways to ‘hatch’ new products, expand existing businesses and create the markets of tomorrow.

The global economic environment has been posing both threats and opportunities to companies. If a company’s response is weak to the environment, the latter posses a threat to the former. On the other hand, if a company’s response is strong to the environment, the latter unfolds numerous opportunities. As such, strategic management is the continuous process of coordinating the goals of a company with the economic environment at a macro level, in an effective manner, to reap the opportunities and overcome the threats, considering its strengths and weaknesses.

Strategic Planning
The environment in which business organizations operate today is becoming uncertain. In the emerging fast-changing competitive global environment, a company can neither save its way to prosperity nor afford to remain at a standstill if it to avoid stagnation; it must grow on its own, or be absorbed into a growing entity. Profitable growth constitutes one of the prime objectives of most of the business organizations. Different organizations may have to use different growth strategies depending on the nature of complexity and quantum of work involved. The top management of the organization ordinarily provides the direction as to which of the strategies would be the most appropriate for a particular company. This will depend upon several factors, including the corporate objectives of the organization. The strategic alternative, which an organization pursues, is crucial to the success of the organization and achievement of established goals. However, many times these are influenced by factors external to the organization over which the management has limited control.

Strategic planning is a management tool, used to help an organization do a better job to assess and adjust the organisation’s direction in response to a changing environment. Strategic planning is a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organiza-
tion is, what it does, and why it does it, with a focus on the future at the same time. A strategic plan is visionary, conceptual and directional in nature.

Though there is no prescribed single ‘silver bullet’ for corporate success, there is a continuous need for strategic planning. However, management must understand the holistic nature of strategy, and have the determination to adhere to it steadily and steadfastly by using strategic planning as a guide in times of uncertainty. In order to derive the maximum benefit of strategic planning, the companies must recognize that the methodology requires sustained commitment, an understanding of its complexity and the ability to harness its strategic opposites.

Importance of Strategic Planning
Strategic planning encourages, managers to take a holistic view of both the business and its environment. The strength of strategic planning is its ability to harness a series of objectives, strategies, policies and actions than can work together. Managing a company strategically means thinking and accordingly taking suitable action on multiple fronts. Due to involvement of multiple operations objectives, strategies, policies or actions may, on the surface, appear contradictory and mutually exclusive, but in reality they can work together. Strategic planning provides the framework for all the major business decisions of an enterprise-decisions on business, products and markets, manufacturing facilities, investments and organizational structure. In a successful corporation, strategic planning works as the path finder to various business opportunities, simultaneously it also serves as a corporate defense mechanism helping the firm avoid costly mistakes in product market choices or investments. Strategic planning has the ultimate burden of providing a corporation with certain core competencies and competitive advantages in its fight for survival and growth. It is not just a matter of projecting the future. It seeks to prepare the corporation to face the future. Its ultimate burden is influencing the corporation’s mega environs in its favor, working into the environs and shaping it instead of getting carried away by its turbulence or uncertainties. The success of the efforts and activities of the enterprise depends heavily on the quality of strategic planning i.e. the vision, insight, experience, quality of judgment and the perfection of methods and measures.

Features of Strategic Planning
The salient features of strategic planning are as under:
1. It is an inclusive, participatory process in which the Board and staff take on a ‘shared ownership’
2. It is a key part of effective management
3. It prepares the firm not only to face the future but even shape the future in its favor.
4. It is based on quality data
5. It draws from both intuition and logic.
6. It accepts accountability to the community
7. It builds a shared vision that is value-based.
8. It helps to avoid haphazard response to environment.
9. It ensures best utilization of firm’s resources among the product-market opportunities.

Strategic planning is not a substitute for the exercise of judgment by leadership. So the data analysis and decision-making tools of strategic planning do not make the organization work they can only support the intuition, reasoning skills, and judgment that the personnel contribute to their organization.

Strategic Planning and Long Range Planning
Although these terms are frequently used interchangeably strategic planning and long-range planning differ in their emphasis on the concept of “assumed” environment. Long-range planning is generally considered to mean the development of a plan for accomplishing a goal or set of goals over a period of several years, with the assumption that current knowledge about future conditions is sufficiently reliable to ensure the plan’s reliability over the duration of its implementation.

On the other hand, strategic planning assumes that an organization must be responsive to a dynamic, changing environment (as against the stable environment assumed for long-range planning). Strategic planning also emphasizes on the importance of making decisions that will ensure the organization’s ability to successfully respond to changes in the environment.

Once an organization’s mission has been affirmed and its critical issues identified, it is necessary to figure out the board approaches to be taken (strategies), and the general and specific results to be sought (the goals and objectives). Strategies, goals and objectives may come from individual inspiration, group discussion, formal decision-making techniques, or otherwise - but the bottom line is that, in the end, the management agrees on how to address the critical issues.

In strategic planning it is crucial to formally consider the manner in which an organization will accomplish its goals. The solution to this encompasses formulation of a strategy. Strategy is a plan or course of action which is of vital, pervasive or continuing importance to the organization as a whole.

Whereas management is defined as the conducting or supervising of something (as a business) especially the executive function of planning, organizing, directing, controlling and supervising industrial or business project or activity with responsibility for results. (Websters Third New International Dictionary). In light of this strategic management can be defined as the formulation and implementation of plans and the carrying out of activities relating to matters which are of vital, pervasive or continuing importance to the total organization. In other words, strategic management is the application of strategic thinking to the job of leading an organization and has four basic doctrines.

i. Matching business requirements with internal capabilities,
ii. Having strategically balanced portfolio,
iii. Achieving and sustaining competitiveness, and
iv. Developing long-term internal and core competencies.

Strategic planning is useful only if it supports strategic thinking and leads to strategic management.

Practice Questions
1. Core competencies are not fixed but flexible. Explain.
2. Explain the current forms of strategies available to a firm.
3. Briefly explain the features of successful strategic planning.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:
- Understanding the various methods of restructuring
- Various motives for restructuring
- General framework for reorganization

Companies should strive to develop unique resources in order to gain a lasting competitive advantage. Competitive advantage, whatever is source, can ultimately be attributed to the ownership of valuable resources that enable the company to perform activities efficiently at comparatively lower costs than its competitors. Superior performance will therefore be based on developing a competitively distinct set of resources and deploying them in a well-conceived strategy. Companies should abandon the areas of operations and dispense with activities where they do not possess a competitive advantage and concentrate their resources where they could attain competitive strength, so as to focus on improving productivity and increased efficiency.

The concept of ‘core competency’ is central to the resource-based perspective on corporate strategy. The resource-based view of strategy is that sustainable competitive advantage arises out of a company’s possessing some special skills, knowledge, resources or competencies that distinguish it from its competitors. Core competency is a bundle of a specific knowledge; skills, technologies, capabilities and organization which enables it to create value in a market those other competitors cannot do in the short term. The resources could be, for example, manufacturing flexibility, responsiveness to market trend and reliable service.

The main concept about core competencies was developed by C.K.Prahalad and G.Hamel in 1990. The idea is that, over time, companies may develop key areas of expertise, which are distinctive to that company and crucial to the company’s long term development. These areas of expertise may be in any area but are not likely to develop in the critical, central areas of the company where most value is added to its products. While in the case of a manufacturer this could be in the routine and processes at the heart of the production process, for a software company the key skills may be in the initial conceptualization process or alternatively in the high quality of code writing they have achieved.

Core competencies are not fixed and codified but flexible and evolving over time and changing in response to changes in the company’s environment. As the company evolves and adapts a new circumstances and opportunities, so its core competencies will also adapt and change. In this way the company will be able to make the most of its given resources and apply them to new opportunities.

Prahalad and Hamel suggest three factors to help identify core competencies in a company.

i. Core competence provides potential access to a wide variety of markets.

ii. Core competence should make a significant contribution to the perceived customer benefits of the end product.

iii. Core competence should be difficult for competitors to imitate.

Companies can use their core competencies to expand into other markets and add to the customer benefits.

Strategy Formulation and Execution
One of the purposes of corporate restructuring is to have an optimum business portfolio, by deciding whether to retain, divest or diversify the business. Business portfolio restructuring can be done in a variety of ways like amalgamations, merger, demerger, slump sale, takeover, disinvestment, joint venture, foreign franchises, strategic alliance, etc.

The ultimate choice of strategy by the organization would depend upon its growth objectives, attitude towards risk, the present nature of business and technology in use, resources at its command, its own internal strengths and weaknesses, Government policy, etc.

Amalgamation
In amalgamation, two or more existing companies merger together or form a new company keeping in view their long term business interest. The transferor companies lose their existence and their shareholders become the shareholders of the new company. Thus, amalgamation is a legal process by which two or more companies are joined together to form a new entity or one or more companies are to be absorbed or blended with another and as a consequence the amalgamating company loses its existence and its shareholders become the shareholders of the new or amalgamated company.

Merger
A merger has been defined as ‘the fusion or absorption of one thing or right into another’. A merger has also been defined as an arrangement whereby the assets of two (or more) companies become vested in, or under the control of one company (which may or may not be one of the original two companies), which has as its shareholders, all or substantially all, the shareholders of the two companies.

In merger, one of the two existing companies merges its identity into another existing company or one of more existing companies may form a new company and merge their identities into the new company by transferring their business and undertakings including all other assets and liabilities to the new company (hereinafter referred to as the merged company). The shareholders of the company whose identity has been merged (i.e. merging company) get substantial shareholding in the merged company. They are allotted shares in the merged company.
company in exchange for the shares held by them in the
merging company according to the shares exchange ratio
incorporated in the scheme of merger as approved by all or
prescribed majority of the shareholders of the merging
companies and the merged companies in their separate general
meetings and sanctioned by the Court as per the agreed
exchange ratio.

**Demerger**

Demerger in relation to companies, the demerged company
sells and transfers one or more of its undertakings to the
resulting company for an agreed consideration. The resulting
company issues its shares at the agreed exchange ratio to the
shareholders of the demerged company. Demerger is a
relatively new phenomenon in the Indian corporate sector.

**Slump Sale**

In a slump sale, a company sells or disposes of the whole or
substantially the whole of its undertaking for a lump sum
predetermined consideration. In a slump sale, an acquiring
company may not be interested in buying the whole company,
but only one of its divisions or a running undertaking on a
going concern basis. The sale is made for a lump sum price,
without values being assigned to the individual assets and
liabilities transferred. The business to be hived-off is trans-
ferred from the transferor company to an existing or a new
company. A "Business Transfer Agreement" (Agreement) is
drafted containing the terms and conditions of transfer. The
agreement provides for transfer by the seller company to the
buyer company, its business as a going concern with all immov-
able and movable properties, at the agreed consideration, called
"slump price".

**Take Over**

Takeover is a strategy of acquiring control over the management
of another company - either directly by acquiring shares or
indirectly by participating in the management. The objective is
to consolidate and acquire large share of the market. The
regulatory framework of take over listed companies is governed
by the Securities and Exchange Board of India SEBI (Substan-
tial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 1997.

**Disinvestment**

The Disinvestment Policy of the Government of India in the
area of privatizing the public sector undertakings, refers to
transfer of assets or service delivery from the government to the
private sector. For this purpose, the Disinvestment Commis-
mission was established on 23rd August 1996 as an independent
non-statutory, advisory body to make its recommendations on
the public sector enterprises referred to it. The concept of
disinvestment takes different forms - from minimum govern-
ment involvement to partnership with private sector where the
government is the majority shareholder.

The salient features of the procedure evolved by the Depart-
ment of Disinvestment include (i) proposals in accordance with
the prescribed policy to be placed before the Cabinet Committee
on Disinvestment (CCD); (ii) selection of adviser after clearance
of proposal; (iii) issue of advertisement in leading newspapers
inviting Expression of Interest (EOI); (iv) short-listing of
bidders on the basis of laid down criteria; (v) drafting of Share
Purchase Agreement and Shareholders' Agreement; (vi)
finalization of Share Purchase Agreement and Shareholders’
Agreement after negotiations; (vii) Inter-Ministerial Group
(IMG) meeting to approve the proposal and agreements and
(viii) evaluation by the Comptroller and Auditor General
(CAG) of India after the transaction is completed.

**Joint Venture**

Joint venture means a foreign equity formed, registered or
incorporated in accordance with the laws and regulations of the
host country in which the Indian party makes direct investment.
It is a strategic business policy whereby a business enterprise for
profit is formed in which two or more parties share responsi-
ibilities in an agreed manner, by providing risk capital,
technology, patent/ trade mark/ brand names and access to
market. Joint ventures with multinational companies contrib-
ute to the expansion of production capacity, transfer of
technology and penetration into the global market. In joint
ventures, assets are managed jointly. Skills and knowledge flow
both ways. If it is a joint venture between foreign and domestic
firm, the respective combinations usually are for example
domestic firm provides labour and foreign firm provides
technology.

**Franchising**

Franchising aims primarily at distributing goods and services
that have a high reputation in the market and involves servicing
the customers and end users. Franchisers support, train and to
an extent control franchisees in selling goods and rendering
services. The most popular form of franchising is the product
distribution franchise it becomes more complicated when the
franchisee has to market the product that has to be prepared,
treated, assembled, processed or serviced in a specified way, the
franchiser being very reputed and associated with that style of
servicing.

Franchising may be defined as a contract, either expressed or
implied, written or oral, between two persons or parties by
which franchisee is granted the right to engage in the business
of offering, selling, distributing goods and services prescribed
in substantial part by franchiser. Operation of franchisee’s
business is substantially associated with franchiser’s trademark,
service mark or logo or advertisement or commercial symbol.
Franchisee pays directly or indirectly the fees to the franchiser.
The franchising may cover the entire system or a specified
territory or a specified retail outlet. Usually franchisers have
standard agreements for all their franchisees because uniformity
and conformity is considered very important.

**Strategic Alliances**

Any arrangement or agreement under which two or more firms
cooperate in order to achieve certain commercial objectives is
called a strategic alliance. Strategic alliances are often motivated
by considerations such as reduction in cost, technology sharing,
product development, market access to capital.

Strategic alliances facilitate a market entry strategy, which
maximizes the potential for high return while mitigating
economic risks and other exposures.

Strategic alliance is gaining importance in infrastructure sectors,
more particularly in areas of power, oil and gas. The basic idea
is to pool resources and facilitate innovative ideas and tech-
niques while implementing large projects, with the common
objective of reduction of cost and time, and sharing the resultant benefits, in proportion to the contribution made by each party in achieving the targets. For detail regarding strategic alliances students may refer Study XI ‘Alliances’.

Strategy formulation is thus a sequential process which consists of strategic situation analysis and strategic choice analyses. Strategic situation analysis is self examination of the corporation’s existing strategic posture, whereas strategic choice analysis is forward looking scenario building approach to the firm’s future strategic posture. The strategic choice to be made by a firm will depend on its assessment of its competitive strengths and weaknesses and to match these against the opportunities and threats posed by the market forces.

Corporate Restructuring Strategies
Corporate managers face an ever-changing environment. Similarly managers have a variety of strategic options when evaluating the choices to be made in responding to such a situation. We try to discuss here the various forms of possible organizational and financial options available to a corporate managers.

The fact that there are a number of options indicates that there are an array of options and as well no one-size-fit all approach exists.

Below is presented a general framework for corporate restructuring and reorganization.

General Framework for Corporate Restructuring and Reorganization.

- Reorganization of assets and ownership
  - asset sale
  - equity carve outs
  - spin-offs

- Reorganizing financial claims
  - debt-equity exchange offer
  - dual-class recapitalization
  - leveraged recapitalizations
  - financial reorganizations
  - liquidation

- Other strategies
  - alliances and joint ventures
  - ESOP and MLPs
  - Going-private and leveraged buyouts
  - Using international markets
  - Share repurchase programs.

Let us try to define each of the above Methods

- Asset sale: an asset sale is defined as the sale of a division subsidiary product line or other assets directly to another firm. In an asset sale the transferred subsidiary or division is absorbed within the organizational structure of the buying firm. The payment in this form of divestiture is usually cash although the payment in some asset sales is in form of stock of the buying firm.

- Equity carve-out: It is defined as the offering of a full or partial interest in a subsidiary to the investment public. In effect an equity carve out is an IPO of a corporate subsidiary or a split-off IPO. This mode of restructuring creates a new publicly traded company with partial or complete autonomy from the parent firm.

- Spin-off: A spin-off is defined as a pro rata distribution of shares in a subsidiary. No cash is generated by the parent in this form of divestiture although the debt allocation between the parent and subsidiary has capital structure implications. This form of restructuring creates a new and publicly traded company that is completely separate from the former parent firm.

In addition to the above three main forms of restructuring there are variations present in an interrelated form with the main restructuring methods.

- Split-up: It is defined as the separation of the company into two or more parts. This term is applied where the firm is not merely divesting a piece of the firm but is instead strategically breaking up the entire corporation body. The break up process is accomplished with one or more equity carve outs or spin-offs.

- Tracking stock: It is a separate class of common stock of the parent corporation. The value of the stock is based on the cash flow of the specific division. Tracking stock was first issued in 1984 as part of the acquisition of EDS by General Motors.

- Exchange offer: It is defined as a distribution of the ownership of the subsidiary in which shareholders have a choice to retain the parent shares or exchange their existing shares for the new shares in the subsidiary. An exchange offer resembles a spin-off in that shares are issued in a separate, publicly traded company. The difference is that the shares in the new firm are received only by those holders who opt to trade in the shares in the parent.

Motives for Restructuring
Practical experiences suggest that a firm may restructure in many ways. Further the variety of divestiture methods suggest that a firm can restructure in many ways. The variety of divestiture methods also suggest that many motives can exit for corporate restructuring.

Corporate focus often is sited as a prime reason for corporate restructuring. However recent examples suggest that even a focused company periodically reviews strategic alternatives in response to changing conditions in product markets. Research shows that in general firms restructure to remain competitive and to respond to the change forces in the economy. To further analyze the causes and effects of corporate restructuring we may need also to review and analyze,

- Why might divestitures create wealth
- Why do divestitures occur.

Practice Questions
1. Briefly explain the motives of restructuring
2. Define briefly the various tools of restructuring
3. Discuss the various motives for restructuring
LESSON 8:
PROVISIONS UNDER VARIOUS
INDIAN LAWS ENABLING RESTRUCTURING

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you a thorough insight into: Legal framework for reconstruction, amalgamations, demergers in the light of
i. Companies act
ii. Income tax act
iii. Accounting standards
iv. Judicial pronouncements

Provisions under Companies Act of 1956
Chapter V containing Sections 390 to 396A of the Companies Act, 1956 is a complete code in itself. It provides for the law and procedure to be complied with by companies for compromises, arrangements and reconstruction. The terms amalgamation and merger are synonymous under the Act.

The scheme of compromise and arrangement scheme under Section 391 of the Act provides for all matters which the Company Court (hereinafter referred to as 'the Court') should consider and also the conditions under which it has to exercise its powers. The scheme can be approved and implemented under Section 391 without recourse to other provisions of the Act.

Section 390 gives the interpretation of certain important terms used in Sections 391 and 393 of the Act.

The expression ‘company’ means ‘any company liable to be wound up under this Act’. As per Section 390(a) of the Act, “company” includes even an unregistered company under Section 582 of the Act. [Malayalam Plantation India Limited & Harrisons & Crossfields India Limited in Re. (1985) 2 Comp. LJ 409 (Ker.).] It includes companies incorporated outside India, having business operations in India under Section 591 of the Act. Simply stated, the word ‘any company liable to be wound up’ means a company to which the provisions relating to winding up apply. [Khandelwal Udyog Ltd. and Acme Manufacturing Limited in Re. (1977) 47 Comp. Cas. 503 (Bom).] Thus, the expression in Section 390 (a) covers all companies registered under the provisions of Companies Act, 1956, as also all unregistered or other companies in respect of which winding up orders can be made by a court under the provisions of the Act. However, it is not necessary that the company should be in actual winding up i.e. the section can apply even to a company which is a going concern. [Bank of India Ltd. v. Ahmedabad Manufacturing & Calico Printing Co. Ltd., (1972) 42 Comp. Cases 211 (Bom.).]

The meaning of the expression ‘arrangement’ as given under Section 390 (b) of the Act includes reorganization of share capital of the company by consolidation of shares of different classes or division into different classes of shares or both. While ‘compromise’ presupposes the existence of a dispute which it seeks to settle, nothing like that is implied in the word ‘arrangement’ which is of wider importance than ‘compromise’. An arrangement involves an exchange of one class for shares of a different class. All modes of reorganizing the share capital, takeover of shares of one company by another including interference with preferential and other special rights attached to shares can form part of arrangement with members. [Re. General Motor Cars Co. (1973) 1 Ch. 377; Hindustan Commercial Bank Limited v. Hindustan General Electric Corporation AIR 1960 (Cal.) 637]. The Supreme Court has stated: “Generally, where only one company is involved in a change and the rights of the shareholders and creditors are varied, it amounts to reconstruction or reorganization or scheme of arrangement.” [Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Limited v. CIT (1991) 70 Comp. Cas. 184 (SC)].

Under Section 391 (1), a company, either as a going concern or in a winding up, may compromise or enter into an arrangement with its creditors or members or any class of them. Shareholders whose paid-up value on their shares differs, cannot be said to constitute a class. Broadly speaking, a group of persons would constitute, one class if it is clear that they have conveyed all interest and their claims as are capable of being ascertained by a common system of valuation. Such a compromise or arrangement may be made with a single creditor or member even if the company is being wound up. The application can be made by the company or its creditor or member to the Court, after or during the winding up. The official liquidator can, however, make the application only during the winding up proceedings.

Section 39 (1) of the Companies Act, 1956 provides that where a compromise or arrangement is proposed between company and its creditors or any class of them or between company and its members or any class of them, the Court may on the application of the company or any creditor or member of the company or liquidator (where company is being wound up), order a meeting of creditors or class of creditors or members as the case may be to be called, held in such manner as it directs. The word ‘may’ clearly implies that the court has the discretion to make or not to make the order. Even before convening a meeting, the court should pay attention to the fairness of the proposed scheme because it would be no use putting before the meeting a scheme, which is not fair. The court may also refuse a meeting to be called where the proposals contained therein are illegal, or in violation of provisions of the Act or incapable of modification. [Travancore National & Quilon Bank, In Re. (1939) 9 Comp. Cas. 14 (Mad)]. Thus, the Court does not have to compulsorily call for a meeting, but in its discretion, dismiss the application at that stage itself [Sakamari Metals & Alloys Limited, In Re. (1981) 51 Com. Cas. 266 (Bom.)].
The Court is duty bound to ascertain the bona fide of the scheme and whether the scheme is prima facie feasible. The court is not to act as a mere rubber stamp with no power or discretion to refuse to call the meetings. Considering the fact that stay against any proceedings can be granted and that appeal is provided against the calling of the meetings, the Court must consider the application on merits. [N.A.P. Alagiri Raja & Company v. N. Guruswamy (1989) 65 Comp. Cas. 758 (Mad.).] The Court should examine the nuts and bolts of the scheme and should not hesitate to reject the scheme or ask for additional material or even point to creditors, members, etc. of pitfalls in the scheme and the court's role under Section 391(1) is equally useful, vital and pragmatic as under Section 391(2) [Sakamari Metals & Alloy Limited v. Re. (1981) 51 Comp. Cas. 266 (Bom.).] Where a large number of creditors opposed the scheme, it was obvious that there was no possibility of its being implemented [Krishnakumar Mills Co. Ltd. v. Re. (1975) 45 Comp. Cas. 248 (Guj.).]

If a compromise or arrangement is not bona fide but intended to cover misdeeds of delinquent directors, the Court shall not sanction the scheme [Pioneer Dyeing House Limited v. Dr. Shanker Vishnu Marathe (1967) 2 Comp. LJ 16]. If the object of the scheme is to prevent investigation or there is failure in the management of affairs of the company or disregard of law or withholding of material information from the meeting or the scheme is against public policy, the Court will not sanction the scheme [J.S.Davar v. Dr. S.V. Marathe, AIR 1967 Bom. 456 (DB)]. If it can be shown that the petition is made mala fide and motivated primarily to defeat the claims of certain creditors who had obtained decrees against the company, there was inordinate delay in making the application for sanctioning the scheme and certain information was withheld from the Company Court, the petition for sanctioning the scheme though approved by the creditors and shareholders was rejected [Richa Jain v. Registrar of Companies (1990) 69 Comp. Cas. 248 (Raj.).]

Any scheme of compromise, arrangement or reconstruction falls within the provisions of Sections 391 to 394 of the Act. The Company has to draft a scheme of compromise or arrangement scheme for the consideration and approval of its shareholders, creditors and the Company Court.

Under Section 391(1) of the Act, the Court may order that a meeting of the creditors or members or any class of them be called, held and conducted as per the given directions. The Court also fixes the time and place of such meeting, and appoint a chairman of the meeting. The Court fixes the quorum and lays down the procedure to be followed at the meeting, including voting by proxy; determines the value of creditors or members and the persons to whom notice is to be given. The Court also gives directions to the chairman to report to the Court the result of the meeting within a given period.

Apart from the directions of the Court, the provisions of Section 393 of the Act, regarding the information with creditors and members, should also be complied with. Accordingly, with every notice calling the meeting, sent to the creditor or member, a statement setting forth, the terms of compromise or arrangement or specifically stating any material interests of director(s) or, manager of the company in whatsoever capacity, in the scheme and the effect of their interest as in contradiction to the interests of other persons, should be included.

Also, where a notice calling the meeting is given by advertisement, there shall be included either the statement as aforesaid or notification of the place where and the manner in which, the creditors or members entitled to attend the meeting may obtain the copies of such statement. In case, the compromise or arrangement affects the rights of debenture holders, the statement shall accordingly give like information in such respect. Every such copy should be made available to the members or creditors entitled to attend the meeting, in the manner specified and free of charge. Where default is made in complying with any of the requirements of Section 393 of the Act, the company and every officer in default including liquidator of the company and debenture trustee shall be punishable with fine.

At the meeting the scheme is to be passed with the support of majority in number and three-fourths in value of those present and voting. The creditors or members who are present at the meeting but remain neutral or abstain from voting, will not be counted in ascertaining the majority in number or value [Hindustan General Electric Corporation, In Re., AIR 1959, (Cal.) 679].

The Chairman appointed by Court to preside the meeting has to file his report within 7 days of the conclusion of the meeting where the scheme was considered and voted upon by the creditors or members. Subsequently, the petitioner makes the application for confirmation of the scheme within 7 days of filing of the report of the chairman.

The Court, while sanctioning the scheme, must be satisfied that there is full and fair disclosure of information by the petitioner about the state of affairs of the company and its latest financial position. The Court should also be satisfied that statutory majority are acting bona fide and the compromise or arrangement is such that an as may be reasonably approved. [Dorman Long & Co. Limited (1933) All ER Rep. 460]. Therefore the court would like to be satisfied basically on three points: Firstly that the provisions of the statute have been complied with. Secondly, that the class was fairly represented by those who attended the meeting and that the statutory majority are acting bona fide and are not coercing the minority in order to promote interests adverse to those of the class, they purport to represent and; thirdly that the arrangement is such, as a man of business, would reasonably approve [Anglo Continental Supply Co., Re. (1922) 2 Ch. 723]. The scheme, if sanctioned by the Court, with or without modifications, if any, to make it operational, is binding on all the creditors including government creditors and liquidator, contributories, all the members or classes thereof, as the case may be, and also on the company. It take effect not form the date of sanction of the court, but from the date it was arrived at.

Sub-Section (3) of Section 391 provides that the order of the Court becomes effective only after a certified copy thereof is filed with the Registrar of Companies.

Sub-section (4) of Section 391 provides that a copy of every such order of the Court has to be attached to every copy of the Memorandum of Association of the Company.
According to Sub-Section (5) of Section 391 if default is made in complying with Sub-section (4), the company, and every officer of the company who is in default, shall be punishable with fine.

As per Sub-Section (6) of Section 391 the Court may, at any time after an application has been made, stay the commencement or continuation of any suit or proceedings against the company on such terms as it may think fit, until the application is finally disposed of.

Sub-section (7) of Section 391 provides that an appeal from the order of the Court can be made to the higher court so empowered.

Section 392 of the Act confers the powers on the High Court sanctioning a compromise or arrangement in respect of a company, to supervise the carrying out of a compromise or arrangement and give any directions or making modifications in the scheme, as it considers necessary, either at the time of sanctioning it or any time thereafter. Under this Section, the court cannot issue directions which do not relate either to the sanctioned scheme itself or its working in relation to the company which the scheme seeks to reconstruct. [Mysore Electro Chemical Works Ltd. v. ITO, (1982) 52 Comp. Cases 32 (Ker.)]. The court has powers to give directions even to third parties to the compromise or arrangement provided such direction is necessary for the proper working of compromise or arrangement.

As regards the modification of a scheme, application thereof can be made by any person interested. ‘Any person interested’ should not be confined to creditor or liquidator of the company whereby any person who has obtained a transfer of shares in the company but has not yet been registered as a member is also to be included therein [K.K. Gupta v. K.P. Jain (1979) 49 Comp. Cases 342: AIR 1979 SC 734]. In Saroj G. Poddar (Smt.), Re. (1996) 22 Corpt LA 200 at 216 (Bom.); T. Mathew v. Saroj Poddar (1996) 22 Corpt LA 200 at 216 (Bom.) the following main points emerged:

a. The scheme can be modified by the court either at the time of or after its sanction.
b. Such modification can include the substitution of sponsor of the scheme.
c. Modification of scheme or substitution of sponsor should be necessary for proper efficient and smooth working of the scheme.
d. Modification can be made at the instance of any person who is interested in the affairs of the company and the court can also introduce modification suo motu.
e. The court should examine the bona fides of the person applying to be substituted as a sponsor, his capability and his interest qua the company.

If the court is satisfied that a compromise or arrangement sanctioned under Section 391 cannot be carried out satisfactorily with or without modifications, it may vide Section 392 (2) of the Act, either on its own motion or on the application of any person interested in the affairs of the company, make an order for winding up which shall be deemed to be the same as under Section 433 of the Act.

Where an application is made to the court under Section 391 for the sanctioning of a compromise or arrangement proposed between a company and any such persons as mentioned therein, and the Court is satisfied that the scheme relates to the reconstruction or amalgamation of any two or more companies, it will make consequential orders as provided in Section 394 of the Act. However no such order shall be made unless the court receives a report from the Company Law Board or Registrar that the affairs of the company have not been conducted in a prejudicial manner. Also, within thirty days after making of the order, the company shall cause a certified copy thereof to be filed with Registrar for registration.

Rules 67 to 87 of the Act Companies (Court) Rules, 1959 (Rules) lay down the court procedure for the approval of schemes of amalgamation, merger and demerger. Two companies can file a joint application for the approval of a Scheme to the same High Court, if the registered office of the companies is in the same state. "A joint petition by transferor and transferee companies for seeking court’s approval to a scheme of compromise or arrangement under Section 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 is competent. Neither the Companies Act, 1956 nor the (Companies) Court Rules, 1959 prohibit filing of a joint petition by the two companies when the subject matter is the same and common question of fact and law would arise for decision…” [W.A. Beardsell & Co. (P) Ltd. and Mettur Industries Ltd., Re. (1968) 38 Com. Cases 197 (Mad.)].

Section 396 of the Act empowers the Central Government to provide for amalgamation of companies in public interest. As such, the public sector undertakings have to seek the approval of the Department of Company Affairs (DCA) for their schemes of compromise, arrangement and reconstruction. Amalgamation or merger involving a 'sick industrial company's governed by the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985. It is outside the purview of the Companies Act.

The Court and Central Government have supervisory powers in approving schemes of compromises, arrangements and reconstructions by companies.

In the case of slump sale, Section 293(1)(a) of the Companies Act, enables a company to sell the whole of its business or any one of its businesses as a going concern. The section provides that a public company or a private company, which is a subsidiary of a public company, in order to sell or dispose of the whole, or substantially the whole, of any of its undertaking has to obtain the approval of the general meeting by ordinary resolution. The transferor company, as per Section 192A of the Companies Act, read with Companies (Passing of the Resolution by Postal Ballot) Rules, 2001, has to obtain the consent of the shareholders for this purpose by postal ballot.

**Amalgamation under the Income-Tax Act, 1961**

The Income Tax Act, 1961, also defines some of these concepts, but being limited in scope cannot be lifted and read in the Companies Act.

Section 2(1B) of the Income Tax Act, defines “amalgamation” in relation to companies as the merger of one or more compa-
A restructuring in which the value of the business undertaking is not encashed does not lead to taxable income. Under Section 47(vi) of the Income Tax Act, transfer of assets to the transferee company pursuant to a scheme of amalgamation is not a transfer and does not attract capital gains tax. Similarly, shares allotted to shareholders of the transferor company are not a transfer for attracting capital gains. It is also provided in the Act that the acquisition of the property of the company by another company pursuant to the purchase of such property by the other company or as a result of distribution of such property to the other company after the winding up of that mentioned company shall not be regarded as amalgamation.

Demerger of Companies under Income-Tax Act, 1961
Companies Act 1956 does not define demerger. However, under Section 2(19AA) of the Income Tax Act, “demerger” in relation to companies means the transfer, pursuant to a scheme of arrangement under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 by a De-merged company of its one of more undertakings to any resulting company. The manner of transfer requires that all properties and liabilities of the undertaking being transferred by the De-merged company become the property of the resulting company by virtue of the demerger. The transfer of properties and liabilities have to be done at the book value appearing in the books of account of the demerged company immediately before the demerger. While considering book value of assets any revaluation is to be ignored. The resulting company, in consideration of the demerger, has to issue its shares to the shareholders of the demerged company on a proportionate basis. The transfer of undertaking is not on a going concern basis and demerger is in accordance with conditions notified by Central Government under Section 72A(5). It also provides that shareholders holding not less than three-fourths in value of the shares in the demerged company should become shareholders of the resulting company by virtue of the demerger, otherwise than as a result of the acquisition of the property or assets of the demerged company or any undertaking thereof by the resulting company. The word “undertaking” includes any part of an undertaking, or a unit or division of an undertaking or a business activity taken as a whole, but does not include individual assets or liabilities or any combination thereof not constituting a business activity.

Section 2(19AAA) of the Income Tax Act states that “demerged company” means the company whose undertaking is transferred, pursuant to a demerger, to a resulting company. “Resulting company” under the Income Tax Act means one or more companies to which the undertaking of the demerged company is transferred in a demerger and the resulting company in consideration of such transfer of undertaking issues shares to the shareholders of the demerged company.

In case of the slump sale, the ‘written down value’ is to be determined as per Section 43(6) (c) (i) (C) of the Income Tax Act.

Section 72A of the Income Tax Act provides for carry forward and set off of accumulated losses and unabsorbed depreciation allowance from the demerging company to the resulting company. The various provisions of Income Tax Act relating to amalgamations and demergers are to ensure that they are tax neutral for companies and also shareholders.

Accounting Standards
In India accounting for amalgamations is governed by Accounting Standard (AS) 14 issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. It classifies amalgamations into two broad categories amalgamation in the nature of merger and amalgamation in the nature of purchase. The first category covers those amalgamations where there is a genuine pooling i.e. not merely of the assets and liabilities of the amalgamating companies but also of the shareholders’ interests and of the businesses of these companies. Such amalgamations are in the nature of ‘merger’.

The second category on the other hand covers those amalgamations which are in effect a mode by which one company acquires another company and as a consequence, the shareholders of the company which is acquired normally do not continue to have a proportionate share in the equity of the combined company; or the business of the company which is acquired is not intended to be continued. Such amalgamations are amalgamations in the nature of ‘purchase’.

Amalgamation in the nature of merger is an amalgamation, which satisfies all the following conditions:

i. All the assets and liabilities of the transfer company become, after amalgamation, the assets and liabilities of the transferee company.

ii. Shareholders holding not less than 90% of the face value of the equity shares of the transferor company (other than the equity shares already held therein, immediately before the amalgamation, by the transferee company or its subsidiaries or their nominees) become equity shareholders of the transferee company by virtue of the amalgamation.

iii. The consideration for the amalgamation receivable by those equity shareholders of the transferor company who agree to become equity shareholders of the transferee company is discharged by the transferee company wholly by the issue of equity shares in the transferee company, except that cash may be paid in respect of any fractional shares.
iv. The business of the transferor company is intended to be carried on, after the amalgamation, by the transferee company.

v. No adjustment is intended to be made to the book values of the assets and liabilities of the transferor company when they are incorporated in the financial statements of the transferee company except to ensure uniformity of accounting policies.

Amalgamation in the nature of purchases is an amalgamation, which does not satisfy any one or more of the conditions specified in sub-paragraph above.

**Major Judicial Pronouncements**

The following important judicial rulings throw light on the main issues of corporate restructuring in India.

The Supreme Court in Miheer H. Mafatlal v. Mafatlal Industries Limited (1996) 4 Comp. LJ 124 (SC) has ruled that the Court in sanctioning any scheme of merger or amalgamation has no jurisdiction to act as a court of appeal and sit in judgement over the informed view of the concerned parties to the compromise as the same would be realm of corporate and commercial wisdom of the concerned parties. The Court has neither the expertise nor the jurisdiction to delve deep into the commercial wisdom exercised by the creditors and members of the company who have ratified the scheme of merger by the requisite majority. Consequently, the company court’s jurisdiction to that extent is peripheral and supervisory and not appellate. Justice S.B. Majmudar remarked: “While deciding the issue of amalgamation or merger, the company court acts like an umpire in a game of cricket who has to see that both the teams play their game according to the rules and do not overstep the limits. But subject to that, how best the game is to be played is left to the players and not to the umpire”.

The Supreme Court ruled that the company court could not, therefore, undertake the exercise of scrutinizing the scheme placed for its sanction with a view to finding out whether a better scheme could have been adopted by the parties. This exercise remains only for the parties and in the realm of commercial democracy permeating the activities of the concerned creditors and members of the company who in their best commercial and economic interest by majority agree to give green signal to such a compromise or arrangement. The Court also held that a scheme under Sections 391 and 394, the Court will see whether it is lawful, just and fair to the whole class of creditors or members who had approved it with the requisite majority vote including the dissenting minority which will be bound by it.

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss the various provisions relating to restructuring under various laws.
LESSON 9:
DIVESTITURES

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- What is divestiture
- Motives for divestiture
- Evaluation of divestiture

A divestiture involves the sale of a division or plant or unit of one firm to another. From the seller’s perspective, it is a form of contraction; from the buyer’s point of view it represents expansion. For example, when Coromandel Fertilisers Limited sold its cement division to India Cements Limited, the size of Coromandel Fertilizers contracted whereas the size of India Cements Limited expanded. Hence a divestiture is the obverse of a purchase. It is important to recognize that companies often achieve external expansion by acquiring an operating unit—plant, division, product line, subsidiary, etc—of another company. In such a case, the seller generally believes that the value of the firm will be enhanced by converting the unit into cash or some other more productive asset. The selling of some of a firm’s assets is called divestiture. Unlike business failure, the motive for divestiture is often positive; to generate cash for expansion of other product lines, to get rid of a poorly performing operation, to streamline the corporation, or restructure the corporation’s business consistent with its strategic goals.

There is a variety of methods by which firms divest themselves of operating units. One involves the sale of a product line to another firm. These outright sales can be accomplished on a cash or stock swap basis using the procedures described later in this chapter. A second method that has become quite popular in recent years involves the sale of the unit to existing management. This sale is often achieved through the use of leveraged buyout (LBO). Sometimes divestiture is achieved through a spin-off, which results in an operating unit becoming an independent company. A spin-off is accomplished by issuing shares in the operating unit being divested on a prorata basis to the parent company’s shareholders. Such an action allows the unit to be separated from the corporation and to trade as a separate entity. Like outright sale, this approach achieves the divestiture objective, although it does not bring additional cash or stock to the parent company. The final and least popular approach to divestiture involves liquidation of the operating unit’s individual assets.

Regardless of the method used to divest a firm of an unwanted operating unit, the goal typically is to create a more lean and focused operation that will enhance the efficiency as well as the profitability of the enterprise and create maximum value for shareholders. Recent divestiture seems to suggest that many operating units are worth much more to other than to the firm itself. Comparisons of post-divestiture and pre-divestiture market value have shown that the “breakup value” of many firms is significantly greater than their combined value. As a result of market valuations, divestiture often creates value in excess of the cash or stock received in the transaction. Unlike LBOs, the use of divestitures in corporate restructuring is expected to remain popular.

Motive for Divestiture: Divestiture decisions are prompted by a variety of motives. The more important ones are discussed below:

- **Raising Capital:** A common motive for divestiture is to raise capital. Cash strapped firms seem to resort to divestiture to shore up their liquidity. CEAT, for example, sold its Nylon Tyre cord plant at Gwalior to SRF for Rs. 3250 million so that it could settle its outstanding and raise funds to concentrate on tyre manufacturing.

- **Curtailment of losses:** A prominent reason for divestiture is to cut losses. More broadly it may imply that the unit that is proposed to be divested is earning a sub-normal rate of return.

- **Strategic realignment:** The seller may divest a unit which no longer fits with its strategic plan. Often such a unit tends to be in an unrelated line and may demand a lot of managerial time and attention. After divestment, the seller can concentrate on its core business. ICI appears to be a good example. It sold its fiber division to Terene Fibres India, fertilizers division to Chand Chap Fertilizers and Chemicals, and seeds division to Hysum India. These divestitures, ICI believes will enable it to focus on paints and industrial chemicals, in line with its parent’s global strategy.

- **Efficiency gain:** A divestiture results in an efficiency gain when the unit divested its worth more as part of some other firm or as a stand-alone business. This happens when there is a reverse synergy, sometimes referred to as ‘synergy’. This means that the value of the parts is greater than the whole. In simple arithmetic, it implies that 5 - 3 = 3! Remember that a merger is motivated by the possibility of synergistic benefit, where the whole is expected to be more valuable than the sum of the parts: 2 + 3 = 6!

Financial Evaluation of a Divestiture
Typically, when a firm sells a division (or plant) to another company, it transfers the assets of the division along with the liabilities of the division, with the concurrence of the creditors. This means that the selling firm (referred to hereafter as the parent firm), in essence, transfers its ownership position in that division. To assess whether it is worth doing so from the financial point of view, the following procedure may be followed:

**Step 1:** Estimate the divisional post-tax cash flow: The parent firm should estimate the post-tax cash flow relating to the operations of the division and the rest of the operations of the parent firm. The relevant issue in this context is: What happens...
to the post-tax cash flow of the parent company with the division and without the division? The difference between the two represents the post-tax cash flow attributable to the division.

Step 2: Establishment the discount rate for the division. The discount rate applicable to the post-tax cash flow of the division should reflect its risk as a stand-alone business. A suggested procedure is to look at the cost of capital of some firm (or a group of firms) engaged solely or substantially in the same line of business and that is about the same size and use it as proxy for the division’s cost of capital.

Step 3: Calculate the division’s present value: Using the discount rate determined in Step 2 calculates the present value of the post-tax of the post-tax cash flow developed in Step 1. This represents the current worth of the cash flow generating capability of the division.

Step 4: Find the market value of the division-specific liabilities: The market value of the division specific liabilities is simply the present value of the obligations arising from the liabilities of the division. Remember that the market value of the division specific liabilities will be different from the book value of the division-specific liabilities if the contracted interest rates on these liabilities are different from the current interest rates.

Step 5: Deduce the value of the parent firm’s ownership position in the division.

The value of the ownership positive (VOP) enjoyed by the parent firm in the division is simply:

\[
\text{VOP} = \frac{\text{Present value of the division's Cash flow}}{-\text{Market value of the division-specific liabilities}}
\]

Step 6: Compare the value of ownership position (VOP) with the divestiture proceeds (DP). When a parent firm transfers the assets of a division along with its liabilities, it receives divestiture proceeds (DP) as compensation for giving up its ownership position in the division. So, the decision rule for divestiture would be as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DP} & > \text{VOP} \quad \text{Sell the division} \\
\text{DP} & = \text{VOP} \quad \text{Be indifferent} \\
\text{DP} & < \text{VOP} \quad \text{Retain the division}
\end{align*}
\]

Managing Divestments

Since divestments are becoming common place, corporates should approach them systematically and rationally. Here are some basic guidelines for managing divestments.

Consider Divestment as one of the Many Responses to a Situation

There are several options available when a business or division is under-performing. It may be continued as it is; it may be shut down till business conditions improve; new product lines may be added; an aggressive cost reduction program may be initiated; manufacturing and/or distribution arrangements may be strengthened. When none of these alternatives seem feasible or desirable, consider divestment seriously.

Since divestment is one of the many responses, it must be considered as an integral part of the regular planning process. The planning group should be assigned responsibility for initiating divestment moves.

Approach Divestments Positively View a divestment as an opportunity, not a catastrophe. As Vignola says: “Difficulties abound and optimum divestment is not overly easy to accomplish. Yet divestment ought to be viewed as a chance to turn a less than favorable situation into a future benefit to the divesting company.”

Announce divestment decisions candidly and create an impression that the company has the ability to deal with a problem realistically and sensibly. As Leonard Vignola, Jr says: “The decision to divest should be presented as a firm aggressive, positive step on the part of the divesting company.”

Practice Questions

1. Discuss motives for organizational divestitures.
2. Discuss financial evaluation of divestitures.
3. Explain various factors involved in Managing divestitures.
**Objective**

The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- What is demerger
- What is reconstruction
- Difference between demerger and reconstruction

A demerger results in the transfer by a company of one or more of its undertakings to another company. The company whose undertaking is transferred is called the demerged company and the company (or the companies) to which the undertaking is transferred is referred to as the resulting company.

**Demerger**

Companies often have to downsize or ‘contract’ their operations in certain circumstances such as when a division of the company is performing poorly or simply because it no longer fits into the company’s plans or give effect to rationalization or specialization in the manufacturing process. This may also be necessary to undo a previous merger or acquisition which proved unsuccessful. This type of restructuring can take various forms such as demergers or spin-offs, split-offs, etc.

Large entities sometimes hinder entrepreneurial initiative, sideline core activities, reduce accountability and promote investment in non-core activities. There is an increasing realization among companies that demerger may allow them to strengthen their core competence and realize the true value of their business.

‘Demerger’ is often used to describe division or separation of different undertakings of a business, functioning hitherto under a common corporate umbrella. “A scheme of demerger, is in effect a corporate partition of a company into two undertakings, thereby retaining one undertaking with it and by transferring the other undertaking to the resulting company. It is a scheme of business reorganization” Justice N.V. Balasubramaniam J in Lucas TVS Ltd. in Re. CP No. 588 and 589 of 2000 (Mad-Unreported).

Such a split or division may take place for various reasons e.g. a conglomerate company carrying out various activities might transfer one or more of its existing activities to a new company for carrying out rationalization or embarking specialization in the manufacturing process. Also, such a transfer might be of a less successful part of the undertaking to a newly formed company. The new company and transferee, need not be the subsidiaries of the parent company which has affected/undergone such split or division.

The term “Demerger” has not been defined in the Companies Act, 1956. However, it has been defined in Sub-section (19AA) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961. According to the said Sub-section, “demerger” in relation to companies, means transfer, pursuant to a scheme of arrangement under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956, by a demerged company of its one or more undertakings to any resulting company in such a manner that:

i. All the property of the undertaking being transferred by the demerged company, immediately before the demerger, becomes the property of the resulting company in such a manner that

ii. All the liabilities relatable to the undertaking, being transferred by the demerged company, immediately before the demerger, become the liabilities of the resulting company of virtue of the demerger.

iii. The property and the liabilities of the undertaking, being transferred by the demerged company are transferred at values appearing in its books of account immediately before the demerger;

iv. The resulting company issues, in consideration of the demerger, its shares to the shareholders of the demerged company on a proportionate basis;

v. The shareholders holding not less than three fourths in value of the share in the demerged company (other than shares already held therein immediately before the demerger or by a nominee for, the resulting company or, its subsidiary) become shareholders of the resulting company or companies by virtue of the demerger;

vi. The transfer of the undertaking is on a going concern basis;

vii. The demerger is in accordance with the conditions, if any, notified under Sub section (5) of Section 72A of the Income Tax Act 1961 by the Central Government in this behalf.

**Explanation 1** - For the purposes of this clause, “undertaking” shall include any part of an undertaking, or a unit or division of an undertaking or a business activity taken as a whole, but does not include individual assets or liabilities or any combination thereof not constituting a business activity.

**Explanation 2** - For the purposes of this clause, the liabilities referred to in subclause (ii), shall include:

a. The liabilities which arise out of the activities or operations of the undertaking;

b. The specific loans or borrowings (including debentures) raised, incurred and utilized solely for the activities or operations of the undertaking; and

c. In cases, other than those referred to in clause (a) or clause (b), so much of the amounts of general or multipurpose borrowings, if any, of the demerged company as stand in the same proportion which the value of the assets transferred in a demerger bears to the total value of the
The expression "reconstruction" has been used in Section 394 of the Companies Act, 1956. Reconstruction involves the idea of substantially the same persons carrying on substantially the same business or enterprise in the same or a different country, but an essential feature of a reconstruction is that the new company's membership is substantially the same as that of the old company.

**Demerged Company**
According to Sub-section (19AAA) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, “demerged company” means the company whose undertaking is transferred, pursuant to a demerger, to a resulting company.

**Resulting Company**
According to Sub-section (41A) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 “resulting company” means one or more companies (including a wholly owned subsidiary thereof) to which the undertaking of the demerged company is transferred in a demerger and, the resulting company in consideration of such transfer of undertaking, issues shares to the shareholders of the demerged company and includes any authority or body or local authority or public sector company or a company established, constituted or formed as a result of demerger.

The definition of ‘resulting company’ has clearly brought out three important requirements while establishing its relationship with demerging company. They are:
1. Consideration for transfer of undertaking would be by issue of shares only by resulting company.
2. Such consideration would be paid only to the shareholders of demerged company.
3. Resulting company can also be a subsidiary company of a demerged company.

**Reconstruction**
The expression "reconstruction" has been used in Section 394 of the Companies Act, 1956. Reconstruction involves the idea of substantially the same persons carrying on substantially the same business or enterprise in the same or a different country, but an essential feature of a reconstruction is that the new company's membership is substantially the same as that of the old company.

Halsbury's Laws of England defines reconstruction thus: “While an undertaking being carried on by a company is in substance transferred, not to an outsider, but to another company consisting substantially of the same shareholders with a view to its being continued by the transferee company, there is a reconstruction. It is also reconstruction, where, after the transfer of a part of the company's undertaking, the stockholders in the new company comprise a majority in number, but less than half in value of the shareholders in the original company.” Thus “reconstruction” involves the winding up of an existing company and the transfer of its assets and liabilities to a new company formed for the purpose of taking over the business and undertaking of the existing company. Shareholders in the existing company become shareholders in the new company. The business, undertaking and shareholders of the new company are substantially the same as those of the old company.

The new company may have a different capital structure from that of the old one, or have different objects, or be incorporated in a different country, but an essential feature of a reconstruction is that the new company’s membership is substantially the same as that of the old company.

A company may, if its memorandum of association permits, carry out reconstruction following the procedure laid down in Section 494 of the Companies Act, 1956 by incorporating a new company specifically for that purposes. This is a well recognized method of reorganization and restructuring of a company. Where the shareholders of a company approve of such a method of reconstruction or reorganization of a company, it cannot be said that the directors of the company were actuated by any sinister motive in doing so. United Bank of India Ltd. v. United India Credit & Development Co. Ltd. (1977) 47 Comp. Cas. 689 (Cal.) The Supreme Court in Textile Machinery Corporation Ltd. v. CIT (1977) 107 ITR 195 (SC) held that “reconstruction” of business involves the idea of substantially the same persons carrying on substantially the same business. There, it was explained, in the context of the expression “reconstruction of business already in existence”, as used in Section 15C of the then Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, corresponding to Section 80J of the income-tax Act, 1961, that a new activity launched by an assessee by establishing a new plant and machinery by investing substantial funds may produce some commodities of the old business or it may produce some other distinct marketable products or even commodities which may feed the old business. The products may be reconsumed by the assessee in his old business or may be sold in the open market. Such an undertaking cannot be said to have been formed by the reconstruction of the old business and denied the benefit of Section 15C merely because it goes to expand the existing business of the assessee in some directions. Simply stating, a company is reconstructed when a new company is formed, and the existing company is dissolved after...
the business, assets and liabilities of the dissolved company are taken over by the new company under a scheme of arrangement, between the existing company and the new company (known as the reconstructed company), duly approved by all or a majority of the shareholders of both the companies and sanctioned by the court.

The reconstructed company will have substantially the same shareholders and pay the purchase price of the assets and properties of the dissolved company to the shareholders of the dissolved company by issue of its own equity shares at the agreed exchange ratio as per the approved scheme of arrangement.

Procedure to be followed for Reconstruction

- The company should ensure that its Memorandum of Association contains a clause authorizing reconstruction.
- For the purpose of reconstruction, the company should form another company for transferring its own undertaking, assets and liabilities.
- The Board of directors of the company should hold a meeting after due notice to:
  a. discuss and decide on reconstruction;
  b. majority of the directors of the company should make a declaration of solvency under Section 488 of the Act, which should be verified by an affidavit. It should be to the effect that they have made a full inquiry into the affairs of the company, and that, having done so, they have formed the opinion that the country has no debts, or that it will be able to pay its debts in full within such period not exceeding three years from the commencement of the winding up as may be specified in the declaration. The declaration should be made within five weeks immediately preceding the date of the passing of the resolution for winding up of the company under Section 484 of the Act and should be delivered to the Registrar of Companies for registration before that date.
  c. Approve notice for calling a general meeting of the company for passing a special resolution under Section 484(2) of the Companies Act:
     i. for voluntary winding up of the company;
     ii. for appointment of a liquidator under Section 490 and fixing his remuneration.
     iii. For conferring on the liquidator either a general authority to receive, by way of compensation or a part compensation for the transfer or sale, shares, policies, or other like interests in the transferee company, for distribution among the members of the transferor company; or enter into any other arrangement whereby the members of the transferor company, may, in lieu of receiving cash, shares, policies or other like interests or in addition thereto, participate in the profits of, or receive any other benefit form the transferee company; and
  d. Authorize the company secretary to issue notice for the meeting.

- Simultaneously send copy of the notice to the stock exchanges where the shares of the company are listed.
- Hold the general meeting of the shareholders of the company and pass resolution as contained in the notice.
- File Form No.23 and a certified true copy of the special resolution passed, with the Registrar of Companies along with the prescribed filing fee.
- Give notice of appointment of the liquidator to the Registrar within ten days of the appointment [Section 493].

The company should, within fourteen days of the passing of the resolution of the transferor company, the liquidator will transfer the assets etc. of the transferor company to the transferee company and the transferee company shall allot its shares to the shareholders of the transferor company according to the scheme of reconstruction.

Difference between Demerger and Reconstruction

As discussed above, “demerger” means transfer, pursuant to a scheme of arrangement under Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956, by the demerged company of its one or more undertakings to a new company formed for the purpose, known as the resulting company, in such a manner that all the property of the undertaking, being transferred by the demerged company becomes the property of the resulting company by virtue of the demerger; all the liabilities relatable to the undertaking, being transferred by the demerged company become the liabilities of the resulting company by virtue of the demerger; the property and the liabilities of the undertaking or undertakings being transferred by the demerged company are transferred at values appearing in its books of account immediately before the demerger.

In the case of reconstruction, a new company (hereinafter referred to as ‘transferee company’) is formed, the existing company (hereinafter referred to as transferor company) is dissolved by passing a special resolution for members voluntary winding up and authorizing the liquidator to transfer the undertaking, business, assets and liabilities of the transferor company to the transferee company. The transferee company pays the consideration by issue and allotment of its shares to the shareholders of the transferor company in accordance with the pre-determined share exchange ratio. In this process, the old company with substantially the same shareholders, same undertaking and business.

The difference between the two terms comes to the fore only when a scheme of arrangement is framed for sanction by the court. Demerger forms part of a scheme of compromise or arrangement within the ambit of Sections 391 to 394A of the Companies Act, 1956. In addition, demergers which envisage the reduction of share capital, will attract other provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 including Sections 100 to 104. The company will have to pass a special resolution for reduction of its share capital, which is subject to confirmation by the Court as per Section 101 of the Companies Act, 1956.

The articles of association of the company should have a provision permitting reduction of share capital and its memorandum of association should provide for demerger, split, etc. Section 390(b) of the Companies Act, 1956 interprets ‘arrangement’ appearing in Sections 391 to 393 including ‘division’ of shares into shares of different classes. The expression ‘reco-
One of the methods achieving a demerger is through a scheme of reconstruction. A demerger represents a milestone and is not the final step on the process of corporate restructuring. After the demerger, companies can pursue their separate strategies to enhance shareholder value and further streamline their respective portfolios.

**Splits/Divisions**

Demerger, division, split or spin off may take place when a new company is formed for the purpose, inter alia, of taking over the residual division of one or more of existing companies, on the same being spun off in pursuance of a joint venture agreement between the existing company and another company and a scheme of arrangement is formulated in furtherance of such joint venture agreement.

In a split-off, some of the shareholders in the parent company are given shares in a division of the parent company, (usually a subsidiary) which is split-off in exchange for their shares in the parent company.

Split-off can also be used as one mode to defend against hostile takeovers. Companies may choose to split off divisions to make it less attractive to takeover bidders.

Defensive split-offs are however, a drastic takeover defence. The most recent example is the plan of the management of Larsen & Toubro (L&T) to split off its cement division to make it difficult for Grasim Industries to take it over.

**Steps to be taken for Demerger**

1. Preparation of scheme of demerger
   i. Prepare a scheme of demerger in consultation with all interested parties and have the same approved in principle by the Board of Directors of the company at a meeting.
   ii. Appoint an expert for valuing the shares to determine the share exchange ratio.
   iii. Engage an advocate for the preparation of scheme and for appearing Subsequently before the High Court.
   iv. In case of listed companies, the stock exchanges where the shares are Listed should be intimated.
2. Application to court for direction to hold meetings of members/creditors.
3. Obtaining court's order for holding meetings of members/creditors.
4. Notice of the meetings of members/creditors
5. Holding meeting(s) of members/creditors
6. Reporting the result of the meeting by the Chairman to the court
7. Petition to the court for sanctioning the scheme of demerger
8. Obtaining order of the court sanctioning the scheme
9. Court's order on petition sanctioning the scheme of demerger.

**Tax Aspects of Demergers**

The business and economic environment of the country has enhanced the need for rationalization of laws relating to business reorganization, restructuring of production system and better utilization of resources. This has become necessary with the view to enable the Indian Industry to rearrange itself to become globally competitive.

In order to incorporate the recent structural amendments new provisions relating to demerger of companies were introduced by the Finance Act, 1999 which became effective from 01-04-2000.

These amendments were introduced so as to enable the Corporate Bodies to ensure mainly that:

a. Demergers should be tax neutral and should not attract any additional liability to tax.

b. In demergers, tax benefits and concessions available to any undertaking should be available to the said undertaking on its transfer to the resulting company.

c. Tax benefits to such business reorganizations should be limited to the transfer of business as a going concern and not to the transfer of specific assets which would amount to the sale of assets and not a business organizations.

d. The accumulated losses in a demerger should be allowed to be carried forward by the resulting company if these are directly relatable to the undertaking proposed to be transferred. However, if it is not possible to relate these to the undertaking, such losses and depreciation should be apportioned between the demerged company and the resulting company in a reasonable manner.

The benefits available for demergers have been extended to authorities or Board set up by the Central or State Governments.

The Income-tax Act, 1961 provides for the following tax reliefs to the demerged company, the shareholders of the demerged company, who are issued and allotted shares in the resulting company in the exchange for the shares held by them in the demerged company and the resulting company which emerges as a result of a demerger.

**Tax Reliefs to the Resulting Company**

The resulting company is eligible for tax reliefs if:

a. The demerger satisfies all the conditions laid down in Section 2(19AA) of the Income-tax Act, 1961; and

b. The resulting company is an Indian company.

**Indian Scenario with Respect to Demerger and Reconstruction**

In India, the law relating to reconstruction through demerger or division or spin off or split is the same as it is with respect to reconstruction through amalgamation, merger, absorption, etc. Almost eighty per cent of the private sector companies in the country are family managed companies, where the heads of the family promote the companies by their ability, expertise, knowledge, experience and dedication. In some of these large groups, family partitions have taken place, the large companies have been split and the management has been handed over to the family members.

Another type of split that has taken place is the hiving off or unrelated subsidiary activities of a company to specialize in a
particular process or product line. Thus, ITC Ltd. divested its hotel divisions by incorporating a separate company. Also, demerger has been through restructuring of existing companies. Thus, the Tata group transferred their investments in TOMCO (Tata Oil Mills Co. Ltd.) under a scheme of arrangement with Hindustan Lever Ltd. The objective was to concentrate on their core competencies and exit from the consumer products such as soap, oil, etc.

Reverse Merger
It must be understood at the outset that amalgamation and merger are corporate restructuring methods. Both the terms are synonymous. The procedure to be adopted for both is the same and the consequences of both are also the same. For achieving amalgamation as well as merger, an existing company (which is referred to as the “amalgamating or merging or transferor company”), under a scheme of amalgamation or merger, loses its own legal identity and is dissolved without being wound up and its assets, properties and liabilities are transferred to another existing company (which is referred to as the “amalgamated or merged or transferee company”).

Generally, a loss making or less profit earning company merges with a company with track record, to obtain the benefits of economies of scale of production, marketing network, etc. This situation arises when the sick company's survival becomes more important for strategic reasons and to conserve the interest of community.

In a reverse merger, a healthy company merges with a financially weak company. The main reason for this type of reverse merger is the tax savings under the Income-tax Act, 1961. Section 72A of the Income-tax Act ensures the tax relief, which becomes attractive for such reverse mergers, since the healthy and profitable company can take advantage of the carry forward losses of the other company. The healthy units loses its name and surviving sick company retains its name. In the context of the Companies Act, there is no difference between a merger and a reverse merger. It is like any amalgamation. A reverse merger is carried out through the High Court route.

A De-merger may take the form of a spin-off or a split-up. In a spin-off an undertaking or division of a company is spun off into an independent company. After the spin-off, the parent company and the spun off company are separate corporate entities. For example, the Information Technology, Division of WIPRO Limited was spun off a separate company in the late 1980s. In a split-up, a company is split up into two or more independent companies. As a sequel, the parent company disappears as a corporate entity and in its place two or more separate companies emerge. For example, the Ahmedabad Advance Mills was split up into two separate companies, viz., New Ahmadabad Advance Mills and the Tata Metal Strips. Though spin-offs and split-ups are different in form, their economic substance is the same.

Rationale: Spin-offs and split-up are regarded as devices for enhancing corporate values by raising efficiency and performance. The principle sources of efficiency gain and performance improvement are as follows:

Sharper Focus
A spin-off may facilitate a sharper business focus by removing a poor business “fit”. For example, when Itek Corporation of US spun off its vision products division, Itek's management said:

“With the separation of vision products, Itek is once again a high technology company. While the separation of vision products was costly, we are now in a position to totally dedicate our efforts and resources where Item has expertise and leadership”.

Improved Incentives and Accountability
A spin-off strengthens managerial incentives and heightens its accountability. For example, the President's letter in 1980 Annual Report of Peabody International describes the effects of Peabody's spin-off of GEO International: “Speaking from personal experience, one of the most exciting benefits has been a rekindling of the entrepreneurial spirit and initiative within both Peabody and GEO. Managers in both companies now feel that their individual efforts can make a significant difference in bottom line results”.

Tax Aspects of De-merger: The Income Tax Act stipulates the following conditions for a transaction to be recognized as a De-merger:

- All the assets and liabilities of the undertaking are transferred from the De-merged company to the resulting company.
- The transfer is effected on a going concern basis and at book value.
- Shareholders holding not less than 75 per cent in value of the shares in the De-merged company become shareholders of the resulting company or companies by virtue of the De-merger.
- In consideration of the De-merger, the resulting company issues its shares to the shareholders of the De-merged company on a proportionate basis. When a transaction satisfies the above conditions, the following tax provisions are applicable.
- Tax benefits and concessions available to any undertaking should be available to the said undertaking on its transfer to the resulting company.
- Accumulated losses and unabsorbed depreciation can be carried forward from the De-merged company to the resulting company.
- Neither the companies nor the shareholders are subject capital gains tax.
- Expenses incurred wholly for the purpose of De-merger are allowed as a deduction in five annual installments of 20 per cent each.

The above benefits, however, will not apply should there be another De-merger of the resulting company within a period of ten years from the date of De-merger.

Practice Questions
1. Distinguish between demerger & reconstruction.
2. Discuss the procedure for reconstruction.
3. Discuss the tax reliefs for the resulting company out of demerger.
4. Discuss the Indian scenario for demergers & reconstruction.
5. What is reverse merger?
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:
- What is a merger
- What is an amalgamation
- Difference between amalgamation and merger

Introduction
A company may decide to accelerate its growth by developing into new business areas, which may or may not be connected with its traditional business areas, or by exploiting some competitive advantage that it may have. Once a company has decided to enter into a new business area, it has to explore various alternatives to achieve its aims.

Basically, there can be three alternatives available to it:
1. The formation of a new company;
2. The acquisition of an existing company;
3. Merger with an existing company.

The decision as to which of these options are to be accepted will depend on the company's assessment of various factors including in particular:
1. The cost that it is prepared to incur;
2. The likelihood of success that is expected;
3. The degree of managerial control that it requires to retain.

For a firm desiring immediate growth and quick returns, mergers can offer an attractive opportunity as they obviate the need to start from 'scratch' and reduce the cost of entry into an existing business. However, this will need to be weighed against the fact that part of the ownership of the existing business remains with the former owners.

Merger with an existing company will, generally, have the same features as an acquisition of an existing company. However, identifying the right candidate for a merger or acquisition is an art, which requires sufficient care and caliber.

Once an organization has identified the various strategic possibilities, it has to make a selection amongst them. There are several managerial factors which moderate the ultimate choice of strategy. This would depend upon its growth objectives, attitude towards risk, the present nature of business and technology in use, resources at its command, its own internal strengths and weaknesses, Government policy, etc. The changing economic environment is creating its own compulsions for a consolidation of capacity. With growing competition and economic liberalization, the last two decades have witnessed a large number of cases of corporate mergers.

Concept of Merger and Amalgamation
A merger has been defined as the fusion or absorption of one thing or right into another. It may also be understood as an arrangement, whereby the assets of two (or more) companies become vested in, or under the control of one company (which may or may not be one of the original two companies) which has as its shareholders all or substantially all, the shareholders of the two companies. In other words, in a merger one of the two existing companies merges its identity into another existing company or one or more existing companies may form a new company and merge their identities into a new company by transferring their businesses and undertakings including all other assets and liabilities to the new company (hereinafter referred to as the merged company). The shareholders of the company or companies, as the case may be) will have substantial shareholding in the merged company. They will be allotted shares in the merged company in exchange for the shares held by them in the merging company or companies, as the case may be, according to the share exchange ratio incorporated in the scheme of merger as approved by all or the prescribed majority of the shareholders of the merging company or companies and the merged company in their separate general meetings and sanctioned by the court.

The term “amalgamation” contemplates two or more companies deciding to pool their resources to function either in the name of one of the existing companies or to form a new company to take over the businesses and undertakings including all other assets and liabilities of both the existing companies. The shareholders of the existing companies (known as the amalgamating companies) hold substantial shares in the new company (referred to as the amalgamated company). They are allotted shares in the new company in lieu of the shares held by them in the amalgamating companies according to share exchange ratio incorporated in the scheme of amalgamation as approved by all or the statutory majority of the shareholders of the companies in their separate general meetings and sanctioned by the court.

In other words, in amalgamation, the undertaking comprising property, assets and liabilities of one or more companies are taken over by another or are absorbed by and transferred to an existing company or a new company. The transferor company merges into or integrates with the transferee company. The transferor company loses its legal identity and is dissolved (without winding up).

Both the existing companies may form a new company and amalgamate themselves with the new company. The shareholders of each amalgamating company become the shareholders in the amalgamated company. To give a simple example of amalgamation, we may say A Ltd. and B Ltd. and merge their legal identities into C Ltd. It may be said in another way that A Ltd. + B Ltd. = C Ltd.

Therefore, the essence of amalgamation is to make an arrangement thereby uniting the undertakings of two or more
companies so that they become vested in, or under the control of one company which may or may not be original of the two or more of such uniting companies.

According to the mandatory Accounting Standard 14 (AS-14) issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of India (ICAI), ‘amalgamation’ means an amalgamation pursuant to the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 or any other statute which may be applicable to companies. Under the said AS-14, two methods of amalgamation have been contemplated, viz., (a) amalgamation in the nature of merger and (b) amalgamation in the nature of purchase.

In an amalgamation by purchase, one company’s assets and liabilities are taken over by another and lump sum is paid by the latter to the former as consideration, which is within the purview of Sections 391 and 394 of the Act – Re SPS Pharma Ltd. (1997) 25 CLA 110 (AP).

Thus, an amalgamation is an organic unification or amalgam of two or more legal entities or undertakings or a fusion of one with the other. There is not bar to more than two companies being amalgamated under one scheme – Re. Patrakar Prakasham Pvt. Ltd. (1997) 33 (MP) 13 SCL.

In simple terms:

- Companies Act, 1956 is the legislation that facilitates amalgamation of two or more companies.
- For purpose of Companies Act, the terms ‘Merger’ and ‘Amalgamation’ are synonymous.
- Amalgamation is not defined in the Companies Act, 1956.
- Chapter V containing Section 390-396A of the Companies Act contains provisions on ‘compromise, arrangements and reconstructions’.
- Amalgamation is an ‘arrangement’ or ‘reconstruction’.
- Companies (Court) Rules, 1959 lay down procedure for carrying out amalgamation.
- The word ‘amalgamation’ has no definite legal meaning. It contemplates a state of things under which two companies are so joined as to form a third entity, or one company is absorbed into and blended with another company. [per Romer J], Walker’s Settlement, In re. Royal Exchange Assurance Corporation v. Walker (1935) 5 Comp Cas 412 (CA)].
- In amalgamation the undertaking comprising property, assets and liabilities, or one (or more) company (amalgamating or transferor company) are absorbed by and transferred to an existing company or a new company (amalgamated or transferee company).
- Transferor company mergers into or integrates with transferee company.
- This definition is relevant inter alia for Sections 35(5), 35A(6), 35E(7), 41(4) Explanation 2 43(1) Explanation 7 43(6) Explanation 2 43C, 47 (vi) & (vii), 49(1) (iii) (e), 49(2), 72A of IT Act.
- Transfer of assets to the transferee company pursuant to a scheme of amalgamation is not a ‘transfer’ and does not attract capital gains tax under Section 47(vi). Likewise, shares allotted to shareholders of the transferor company is not a transfer attracting capital gains tax under Section 47(vii).
- No company involved in amalgamation need be financially unsound or under winding-up though as per Section 390(a). For purposes of Section 391 ‘company’ means “any company liable to be wound up”. But it does not debar amalgamation of financially sound companies. [Re Rossell Inds Ltd. (1995) 5 SCL 79 Cal].
- Section 390(a) is applicable to a company incorporated outside India. If court has jurisdiction to wind up such a company on any of the grounds specified in the Act, court has jurisdiction to sanction scheme of amalgamation if a company incorporated outside India is a transferee company. [Bombay Gas Co. Pvt. Ltd v. Regional Director (1996) 21 CLA 269 (Bom)].
- There is no bar to a company amalgamating with a fifteen-day old company having no assets and business. [Re Apco Industries Ltd. (1996) 86 Comp Cas 457 (Gu)].
- Amalgamation calls for compliance with both Sections 391 and 394.
- Amalgamation involving a ‘sick industrial company’ as transferor or transferee company is outside the purview of Companies Act. It is governed by the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 (SICA).
- Amalgamation of a company licensed under Section 25 of the Companies Act with a commercial, trading or manufacturing company could be sanctioned under Section 391/394. [Re Sir Mathurdas Vissanji Foundation (1992) 8 CLA (Bom); Re Walvis Flour Mills Company P. Ltd. (1996) 23 CLA 104]. There is nothing in law to prevent a company carrying on business in shares from amalgamating with one engaged in transport. [Re EITA India Ltd. (1997) 24 CLA 37 (Cal)].

**Merger/Absorption**

A merger may also mean absorption of one company by another company, wherein one of two existing companies loses its legal identity and its assets, liabilities and other properties are transferred to the other company as per scheme of arrangement approved by all or the statutory majority of the shareholders of both the companies in their separate general meetings and sanctioned by the court. This is also achieved in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Companies Act, 1956.

In the case of a merger or an amalgamation or an absorption, the shareholders of the merging or amalgamating or absorbing company are issued shares in the merged or amalgamated or absorbed company in exchange for the shares in their respective companies according to the exchange ratio determined under an approved and sanctioned scheme of merger or amalgamation or absorption, as the case may be.

**Practice Questions**

1. Explain the concept of merger and amalgamation.
2. Explain merger and absorption.
LESSON 12:
REASONS FOR MERGER AND AMALGAMATION

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you a thorough understanding:

• As to the advantages that accrue to an organization out of mergers and amalgamations

The key determinants for success in the global market are the ability to achieve size, scale, integration and greater financial strength and flexibility, in the interests of maximizing overall shareholder value. Whatever is the fundamental objective, mergers must form part of the business and corporate strategies aimed at creating sustainable competitive advantage for the firm. It is believed that mergers and amalgamations are strategic decisions leading to the maximization of a company’s growth by enhancing its production and marketing operations, enhanced competition, breaking of trade barriers, free flow of capital, globalization of business etc.

Further, it has been stated that mergers and acquisitions are intended:

a. to limit competition,
b. to utilize under-utilized market power,
c. to overcome the problem of slow growth and profitability in one’s own industry,
d. to achieve diversification,
e. to establish a transnational bridgehead without excessive start up costs to gain access to foreign market,
f. to utilize under-utilized resources - human and physical and managerial skills,
g. to displace existing management,
h. to circumvent Government regulations,
i. to reap speculative gains attendant upon new security issue or change in P/E ratio
j. to create an image of aggressiveness and strategic opportunism, empire building and to amass vast economic powers of the company.


Some of the most common reasons and benefits of mergers and amalgamations include:

i. maintaining or increasing a company’s growth especially where internal growth is restricted due to scarcity of resources;

ii. increasing or enhancing profitability, through cost reduction resulting from economies of scale, operating efficiencies and synergy.

iii. diversification of risks.

iv. Accelerating company’s market power and reducing the severity of competition.

v. reducing tax liability.

Some of the above mentioned reasons and benefits are discussed briefly hereunder.

Improving Economies of Scale
One of the most frequent reason given for mergers is to improve the economies of scale. Economies of scale arise when increase in volume of production leads to a reduction in cost of production per unit. They are generally associated with the manufacturing operations, so that the ratio of output to input improves with the volume of operations. Mergers and amalgamations help to expand the volume of production without a corresponding increase in fixed costs. Thus, the fixed costs are distributed over a large volume causing the unit cost of production to decline. Economies of scale may also be obtained from the optimum utilization of management resources and systems of planning, budgeting, reporting and control. A combined firm with a large size can make the optimum use of the management resources and systems resulting in economies of scale. This gives the company a competitive advantage by gaining an ability to reduce the prices to increase market share, or earn higher profits while maintaining a price.

Operating Economics
Apart from economies of scale, a combination of two or more firms may result in reduction of costs due to operating economies. A combined firm may avoid overlapping of function and facilities. Various functions may be consolidated and duplicate channels may be eliminated by implementing an integrated planning and control system. The merger of Sundaram Clayton Ltd. (SCL) with TVS Suzuki Ltd. (TSL) was motivated by operating economies and by virtue of this, TSL became the second largest producer of two wheelers. TSL needed to increase its volume of production but also needed a large manufacturing base to reduce its production costs. Large amount of funds would have been required for creating additional production capacity. SCL was also required to upgrade its technology and increase its production. Both the firms’ plants were closely located offering various advantages, the most versatile being the capability to share common R & D facilities.

Market Leadership
Some of the mergers and amalgamations take place with a view to seek additional strength in the market. The amalgamation can enhance value for shareholders of both companies through the amalgamated entity’s access to greater number of market resources. With the additional combined market share, a company can afford to control the price in a better manner with a consequent increase in profitability. The bargaining power of the firm vis-à-vis labour, suppliers and buyers is also enhanced.
The merged firm can also export technological breakthrough against obsolescence and price wars. In the case of the amalgamation of Reliance Petroleum Limited with Reliance Industries Limited, the main consideration had been that the amalgamation will contribute towards strengthening Reliance’s existing market leadership in all its major products. It was foreseen that the amalgamated entity will be a major player in the energy and petrochemical sector, bringing together Reliance’s leading positions in different product categories.

Financial Benefits
A merger or amalgamation is capable of offering various financial synergies and benefits such as eliminating financial constraints, deployment of surplus cash, enhancing debt capacity and lowering the cost of financing. Mergers and amalgamations enable external growth by exchange of shares releasing thereby, the financial constraint. Also, sometime cash rich companies may not have enough internal opportunities to invest surplus cash. Their wealth may increase through an increase in the market value of their shares if surplus cash is used to acquire another company. A merger can bring stability of cash flows of the combined company, enhance the capacity of the new entity to service a larger amount of debt, allowing a higher interest tax shield thereby adding to the shareholders wealth. Also, in a merger since the probability of insolvency is reduced due to financial stability, the merged firm should be able to borrow at a lower rate of interest. Apart from this, a merged firm is able to realize economies of scale in floatation and transaction costs related to an issue of capital i.e. issue costs are saved when the merged firm makes a larger security issue.

Acquiring a New Product or Brand Name
A company, for strategic reasons, may wish to produce or market a particular product, but may not have the required production, marketing or managerial facilities for completing a product line or for meeting all the needs of a customer segment. Getting the required know-how from others sources installing and commissioning a plant and then launching the new product may take much time and result in loss of advantages for getting into the associated business. Instead, amalgamation would provide ready-made facilities, which would provide a quicker entry for encashing the comparative advantage of the new product before new entrants make the market much more competitive and much less profitable.

Diversifying the Portfolio
Another reason for merger is to diversify the company’s dependence on a number segments of the economy. Diversification implies growth through the combination of firms in unrelated businesses. All businesses go through cycles and if the fortunes of a company were linked to only one or a few products then in the decline stage of their product life cycles, the company would find it difficult to sustain itself. The company therefore looks for either related or unrelated diversifications and may decide to do so not internally by setting up new projects, but externally by merging with companies of the desired product profile. Such diversification helps to widen the growth opportunities for the company and smoothen the ups and downs of their life cycles.

Synergies
Synergy refers to a situation where the combined firm is more valuable than the sum of individual combining firms (2+2=5). The combination of operations can create a unique level of integration for the amalgamated entity spanning the entire value chain in the line of business. This will enable the amalgamated entity to achieve substantial savings in costs, significantly enhancing its earnings potential. Synergies can be expected to flow from more focused operational efforts, rationalization, standardization and simplification of business processes, productivity improvements, improved procurement, and the elimination of duplication.

Taxation or Investment Incentives
A company, which has incurred losses in the past, can carry such losses forward and offset them against future taxable profits and reduce tax liabilities. Such a company when merged with a company with large taxable profits would help to absorb the tax liability of the latter.

A similar advantage exists when a company is modernizing or investing heavily in plant and machinery, which entitles it to substantial investment incentives, but has not much taxable profits to offset them with. Acquiring or merging such a company with a highly profitable company would help make full use of the investment incentives for the latter.

Survey Findings
In the early seventies, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published a Report of their Committee of Experts on Restrictive Business Practices, on ‘Mergers and Competition Policy’. The report listed twelve motives most often cited for mergers, which may be grouped together under the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Reasons</th>
<th>Related Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Economies of Scale</td>
<td>1. Obtain Real Economies of Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Market share Reasons</td>
<td>2. Acquire Capacity at Reduced Prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Financial Synergy Related Reasons</td>
<td>3. Increase market power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Diversification of Risk Related Reasons</td>
<td>4. Expand production without price reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Build an empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Rationalize production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Obtain Tax advantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Obtain monetary economies of scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Use complementary resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Gain promotional profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Spread risks by diversification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practice Questions
1. Discuss the benefits emerging out of mergers and acquisitions.
2. Discuss the tax incentives available for mergers and acquisitions.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you a thorough understanding:

- The different categories of mergers that can happen and also
- Different types of mergers.
- Motives for a merger

The following is the broad classification of mergers:

a. Horizontal Merger
This class of merger is a merger between business competitors who are manufactures or distributors of the same type of products or who render similar or same type of services for profit. It involves joining together of two or more companies which are producing essentially the same products or rendering same or similar services or their products and services directly compete in the market with each other. It is a combination of two or more firms in similar type of production/distribution line of business. Horizontal mergers result in a reduction in the number of competing companies in an industry, increase the scope for economies of scale and elimination of duplicate facilities. However, their main drawback, is that they promote monopolistic trend in the industrial sector as the number of firms in an industry is decreased and this may make it easier for the industry members to collude for monopoly profits.

b. Vertical Merger
Vertical mergers occur between firms in different stages of production operation. In a vertical merger two or more companies which are complementary to each other e.g. one of companies is engaged in the manufacture of a particular product and the other is established and expert in the marketing of that product or is engaged in production of raw material or ancillary items used by the other company in manufacturing or assembling the final and finished product join together. In this merger the two companies merge and control the production and marketing of the same product.

Vertical merger may take the form of forward or backward merger. When a company combines with the supplier of material, it is called a backward merger and where it combines with the customer, it is known as forward merger. A vertical merger may result into a smooth and efficient flow of production and distribution of a particular product and reduction in handling and inventory costs. It may also pose a risk of monopolistic trend in the industry. As a whole the efficiency and affirmative rationale of vertical integration rests primarily on costliness of market exchange and contracting.

c. Conglomerate Merger
This type of merger involves coming together or two or more companies engaged in different industries and/ or services. Their businesses or services, are neither horizontally nor vertically related to each other. They lack any commonality either in their end product, or in the rendering of any specific type of service to the society. This is the type of merger of companies which are neither competitors, nor complimentaries nor suppliers of a particular raw material nor consumers of a particular product or consumable. A conglomerate merger is one which is neither horizontal nor vertical. In this, the merging companies operate in unrelated markets having no functional economic relationship.

Mergers may further be categorized as:

Cash Merger
A merger in which certain shareholders are required to accept cash for their shares while other shareholders receive shares in the continuing enterprise.

Defacto Merger
Defacto merger has been defined as a transaction that has the economic effect of a statutory merger but is cast in the form of an acquisition of assets.

Down Stream Merger
The merger of parent company into its subsidiary is called down stream merger.

Up Stream Merger
The merger of subsidiary company into its parent company is called an up stream merger.

Short-form Merger
A number of statues provide special company rules for the merger of a subsidiary into its parent where the parent owns substantially all of the shares of the subsidiary. This is known as a short form merger. Short form mergers generally may be effected by adoption of a resolution of merger by the parent company, and mailing a copy of plan of merger to all shareholders of subsidiary and filing the executed documents with the prescribed authority under the statute. This type of merger is less expensive and time consuming than the normal type of merger.

Triangular Merger
Triangular merger means the amalgamation of two companies by which the disappearing company is merged into subsidiary of surviving company and shareholders of the disappearing company receive shares of the surviving company.

Mergers and Acquisitions

Merger
A merger occurs when two or more firms are combined and the resulting firm maintains the identity or one of the firms. Usually, the assets and liabilities of the smaller firms are merged into those of the larger firms. Merger, a form of external expansion, should be undertaken only when they are expected to enhance share value. A merger may take the legal form of
either a statutory merger or a purchase of assets (and often assumption) of the target firm.

Statutory merger: In statutory merger, so called because it is executed under the statutes of the state of incorporation, the stock of the target firm is directly exchanged for stock of acquiring firm, and the legal existence of the target firm automatically ceases. Although the legal form implies a stock-for-stock exchange, the acquiring firm may purchases the stock of the target for cash or by exchanging other securities and then, as the sole stockholder of the target, exchange the stock in a statutory merger.

Purchase of assets: The acquiring firm might purchase the assets and usually, assume the liabilities of the target firm. The purchase may be for cash or securities of the acquiring firm. After the purchase, the sole assets of the acquired firm are the cash and/or securities received in the exchange. After any liabilities not assumed by the acquiring firm are paid, the acquired firm is liquidated by distributing its assets (cash and/or securities of the acquiring firm) to its stockholders in liquidating dividend. Then the acquired corporation is formally dissolved.

Regardless of the legal form used, holders of a stipulated majority of the equity of the acquired firm must approve the merger. Depending on its character, approval of holders of a majority of the stock of the acquiring firm may or may not be required.

Types of Mergers
The four types of mergers are the (horizontal merger, (2) vertical merger, (3) congeneric merger and (4) conglomerate merger. A horizontal merger results when two firms in the same line of business are merged. An example would be the merger of two machine-tool manufacturers. This form of merger results in the expansion of a firm’s operations in a given product line and at the same time eliminates a competitor. A vertical merger occurs when a firm requires a supplier or a customer. For example, the merger of a machine-tool manufacturer with its supplier of castings would be a vertical merger. The economic benefit of this type of merger systems from the form’s increased control over the acquisition of raw materials or the distribution of finished goods.

A congeneric merger is achieved by acquiring a firm that is in the same general industry but neither in the same line of business nor a supplier or customer. An example is the merger of a machine-tool manufacturer with the manufacture of industrial conveyor systems. The benefit of this type of merger is the resulting ability to use the same sales and distribution channels to reach customers of both businesses. A conglomerate merger involves the combination of firms in unrelated business. The merger of a machine-tool manufacturer with a chain of fast-food restaurants would be an example of this kind of merger. At first glance it would appear that such a combination could not provide any operating synergism; admittedly, synergism would be relatively small compared to that of most vertical or horizontal combinations. But if the operating profit patterns of the various acquired firms differ as economic changes occur, a portfolio effect might be achieved. This would make the operating risk of the combination smaller than the risk of the firms standing by themselves. If risk is reduced while the combination of cash flows is unchanged, the value of the combination may exceed that of its individual components. There also may be some favorable effects resulting from the flexibility of personnel and transfer of technology, even though the firm appears to be engaged in different lines of business. In this sense operating synergy may result from conglomerate growth.

Acquiring versus Target Companies
The firm in a merger transaction that attempts to acquire another firm is commonly called the acquiring company. The firm that the acquiring company is pursuing is referred to as the target company; generally, the acquiring company identifies, evaluates, and negotiates with the management and/or shareholders of the target company. Occasionally, the management of a target company initiates its acquisition by seeking to be acquired.

Friendly versus Hostile takeovers
Mergers can occur on either a friendly or a hostile basis. Typically, after isolating the target company, the acquirer initiates discussions with its management. If the target management is receptive to the acquirer’s proposal, it may endorse the merger and recommend shareholder approval. If the shareholders approve the merger, the transaction is typically consummated either through a cash purchase of the shares by the acquirer or through an exchange of the acquirer’s shares, bonds or some combination for the target firm’s shares. This type of negotiated transaction is known as a friendly merger. If on the other hand, the takeover target’s management does not support the proposed takeover for any of a number of possible reasons, such as two low an offering price, a desire to maintain the firm’s autonomy, or a “poor fit”. It can fight the acquirer’s actions. In this case the acquirer can attempt to gain control of the firm by buying sufficient shares of the target firm in the marketplace. This is typically accomplished by using tender offers (i.e. a formal offer to purchase a given number of shares at a specified price). This type of unfriendly transaction is commonly referred to as a hostile merger. Clearly, hostile mergers are more difficult to consummate because the target firm’s management acts to deter rather than facilitate the acquisitions. Regardless, hostile takeovers are sometimes successful.

Strategic Versus Financial Mergers
Mergers are undertaken for either strategic or financial reasons. Strategic mergers involve merging firms to achieve various economies of scale by eliminating redundant functions, increasing market share, improving raw material sourcing and finished product distribution, and so on. In these mergers the operations of the acquiring and target firms are somehow combined to achieve economies and thereby cause the performance of the merged firm to execute that of the premerged firms. An interesting variation of the strategic merger involves the purchase of specific product lines (rather than the whole company) for strategic reasons.

Financial mergers, on the other hand, are based on the acquisition of companies that can be restructured to improve their cash flow. These mergers involve the acquisition of the target firm by an acquirer, which may be another company or a group
of investors often the firm’s existing management. The objective of the acquirer is to drastically cut costs and sell of certain unproductive or noncompatible assets to increase; the firm’s cash flows. The increased cash flows are used to service the sizable debt that is typically incurred to finance these transactions. Financial mergers are not based on the firm’s ability to achieve economies of scale, but rather on the acquirer’s belief that through restructuring, the firm’s hidden value can be unlocked. The ready availability of junk bond financing throughout the 1980s fueled the financial merger mania during that period in the global market. With the collapse of the junk bond market in the early 1990s, financial merger have fallen on relatively hard times. The heavy debt burdens involved in many of the glamour financial merger of the 1980s caused many of them to subsequently file for bankruptcy. As a result, the strategic merger, which does not rely as heavily on debt, tends to dominate today.

Motives for Merging
Firms merge to fulfill certain objectives. The overriding goal for merging is the maximization of the owner’s wealth as reflected in the acquirer’s share price. Specific motives, which included growth or diversification, synergy, managerial skill or technology, tax considerations, increased ownership liquidity, and defense against takeover, should be pursued when they are believed to be consistent with owner wealth maximization.

Growth or Diversification
Companies that desire rapid growth in size or market share or diversification in the range of their products may find that a merger can be used to fulfill the objective. Instead of going through the time-consuming process of internal growth or diversification, the firm may achieve the same objective in a short period of time by merging with an existing firm. In addition, such a strategy is often less costly than the alternative of developing the necessary production capability and capacity. If a firm that wants to expand operations in existing or new product area can find a suitable going concern, it may avoid many of risks associated with the design, manufacture, and sale of additional or new products. Moreover, when a firm expands or extends its product line by acquiring another firm, it also removes a potential competitor.

Synergism
The nature of synergism is very simple. Synergism exists whenever the value of a combination is greater than the sum of the values of its parts. In other words, synergism is “2 + 2 = 5”. But identifying synergism and evaluating it may be difficult; in fact, sometimes its implications may be very subtle. As broadly defined to include any incremental value resulting from business combination. Synergism is the basic economic justification of merger. The incremental value may derive from increases in either operational or financial efficiency.

Operating Synergism
Operating synergism may result from economies of scale, some degree of monophony) power, or increased managerial efficiency. The value may be achieved by increasing sales volume in relation to assets employed (operating asset turnover), increasing profit margins, or decreasing operating risk. Although operating synergy usually is the result of either vertical or horizontal integration, some synergistic effects also may result from conglomerate growth or the integration of technology and/or personnel into a more efficient unit. In addition, sometimes a firm may acquire another to obtain patents, copyrights, technical proficiency, marketing skills, specific fixed assets, customer relationships, or managerial personnel. Operating synergism occurs when these assets, which are intangible, may be combined with the existing assets and organization of the acquiring firm to produce an incremental value. Although that value may be difficult to appraise, it may be the primary motive behind the acquisition.

Financial Synergism
As we are broadly interpreting the term, synergism may include financial advantages as well as operating ones. Among these are incremental values resulting from complementary internal funds flows more efficient use of financial leverage, increase external financial capability, and income tax advantages.

Complementary internal funds flows: Seasonal or cyclical fluctuation in funds flows sometimes may be reduced or eliminated by merger, if so, financial synergism results in reduction of working capital requirements of the combination compared to those of the firms standing alone.

More efficient use of financial leverage: Financial synergy may result from more efficient use of financial leverage. The acquiring firm may have little debt and wish to use the high debt of an acquired firm to lever earnings of the combination. Or the acquiring firm may borrow to finance an acquisition for cash of a low-debt firm, thus providing additional leverage to the combination. The financial leverage advantage must be weighed against the increased financial risk.

Increased External Financial capability: Many mergers, particularly those of relatively small firms into large ones, occur when the acquired firm simply cannot finance its operations. Typical of this situation is a small growing firm with expanding financial requirements. The firm has exhausted its bank credit and has virtually no access to long-term debt or equity markets. Sometimes the small firm has encountered operating difficulty, and the bank has served notice that its loans will not be renewed. In this type of situation, a large firm with sufficient cash and credit to finance the requirements of the smaller one probably can obtain a good buy by making a merger proposal to the small firm. The only alternative the small firm may have is to try to interest two or more larger firms in proposing merger to introduce completion into their bidding for the acquisition.

The smaller firm’s situation might not be so bleak. It may not be threatened by nonrenewable of a maturing loan. But its management may recognize that continued growth to capitalize on its markets will require financing beyond its means. Although its bargaining position will be better, the financial synergy of the acquiring firm’s strong financing capability may provide the impetus for the merger.

Sometimes the financing capability is possessed by the acquired firm. The acquisition of a cash-rich firm whose operations have matured may provide additional financing to facilitate growth.
of the acquiring firm. In some cases, the acquiring firm may be able to recover all or part of the cost of acquiring the cash-rich firm when the merger is consummated and the cash then belongs to it.

A merger also may be based upon the simple fact that the combination will make two small firms with limited access to the capital markets large enough to achieve that access on a reasonable basis. The improved financing capability provides the financial synergy.

**Income tax advantages:** In some cases, income tax consideration may provide the financial synergy motivating a merger, for example, assume that firm A has earnings before taxes of about Rs. 10 crore per year and firm B, now breaking even, has loss carry forward of Rs. 20 crore accumulated from unprofitable operations of previous years. The merger of A and B will allow the surviving corporation to utilize the loss carry forward, there by eliminating income taxes in future periods, as shown in table - 1 in effect, such a merger will increase the net after-tax income of firm A by Rs 4 crore (67 per cent) for each of the next two years. The financial synergism reflects the fact that the combined firm can use the tax-loss carry forward whereas firm B might never be able to use it. However, this is permissible under section 72A of Income tax Act relating to merger of only sick industrial companies of India.

**Counter Synergism**

Certain factors may oppose the synergistic effect contemplated from a merger. Often another layer of overhead costs and bureaucracy is added. Do the advantages outweigh this disadvantage? Sometimes the acquiring firm agrees to long-term employment contracts with the managers of the acquired firm. Such contracts are beneficial but they may be opposite. Personality or policy conflicts may develop that either hamstring operations or require buying out such contracts to remove personnel from position of authority.

**TABLE - 1**

**Advantages of Merger Utilizing Tax-Loss Carry forward**

(In `00,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without merger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings before taxes</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income taxes @ 40%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income to shareholders</td>
<td>Rs. 600</td>
<td>Rs. 600</td>
<td>Rs. 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With merger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings before taxes</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss carry forward</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net taxable income</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income taxes @ 40%</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net income to shareholders</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 1,000</td>
<td>Rs. 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particularly in conglomerate mergers, management of the acquiring firm simply may not have sufficient knowledge of the business to control the acquired firm adequately. Attempts to maintain control may induce resentment by personnel of the acquired firm. The resulting reduction of efficiency may eliminate expected operating synergy or even reduce the post merger profitability of the acquired firm. The list of possible counter-synergistic factors could go on endlessly; the point is that mergers do not always produce the executed results. Negative factors and the risks related to them also must be considered in appraising a prospective merger.

**Other Motives for Merger**

Mergers may be motivated by two other factors that perhaps should not be classified under synergism. These are the opportunity for an acquiring firm to obtain assets at a bargain price and the desire of shareholders of the acquired firm to increase the liquidity of their holdings.

**Purchase of Assets at Bargain Price:** Mergers may be explained by the opportunity to acquire assets, particularly land, mineral rights, plant, and equipment, at lower cost than would be incurred if they were purchased or constructed at-current market prices. If market price of many stocks have been considerably below the replacement cost of the assets they represent, expanding firm considering constructing plants, developing mines, or buying equipment often have found that the desired asset could be obtained cheaper by acquiring a firm that already owned and operated the asset. Risk could be reduced because the assets were already in place and an organization of people knew how to operate them and market their products.

Many of the mergers can be financed by cash tender offers to the acquired firm’s shareholders at price substantially above the current market. Even so, the assets can be acquired for less than their current costs of construction. The basic factor underlying this apparently is that inflation in construction costs not fully reflected in stock prices because of high interest rates and limited optimism (or downright pessimism) by stock investors regarding future economic conditions.

**Increased Managerial Skill or Technology:** Occasionally, a firm will have good potential that it finds itself unable to develop fully because of deficiencies in certain areas of management or an absence of needed product or production technology. If the firm can not hire the management or develop the technology it needs, it might combine with a compatible firm that has the needed managerial personnel or technical expertise, of course, any merger, regardless of the specific motive for it, should contribute to the maximization of owner’s wealth.

**Increased Ownership Liquidity:** The merger of two small firms or a small and a larger firm may provide the owners of the small firm(s) with greater liquidity. This is due to the higher marketability associated with the shares of larger firms. Instead of holding shares in a small firm that has a every “thin” market, the owners will receive shares that are traded in a broader market and can thus be liquidated more readily. Not only does the ability to convert shares into cash quickly have appeal, but owning shares for which market price quotations are readily available provides owners with a better sense of the value of their holdings. Especially in the case of small, closely held firms, the improved liquidity of ownership obtainable through merger with an acceptable firm may have considerable appeal.
Defense against Takeover: Occasionally, when a firm becomes the target of an unfriendly takeover, it will as a defense acquired another company. Such a strategy typically works like this; the original target firm takes an additional debt to finance its defensive acquisition; because of the debt load, the target firm becomes too large and too highly levered financially to be of any further interest to its suitor. To be effective, a defensive takeover must create greater value for shareholders than they would have realized had the firm been merged with its suitor.

In addition, the stockholder-managers of the acquired firm may be offered attractive management contracts and/or seek the opportunity to rise to positions of greater responsibility in the acquired firm than would be possible within their small one.

Leveraged Buyouts and Divestitures
Before addressing the merger negotiation process and mechanics of merger analysis, it is important to understand two topics that are closely related to mergers – LBOs and divestitures. An LBO is a method of structuring a financial merger, whereas divestitures involve the sale of a firm’s assets.

Leveraged Buyouts (LBOS)
A popular technique that was widely used during the 1980s to make acquisitions is the leveraged buyout (LBO), which involves the use of a large amount of debt to purchase a firm. LBOs are clear-cut-examples of financial merger undertaken to create a high-debt private corporation with improved cash flow and value. Typically in the LBO 90 percent or more of the purchase price is financed with debt. A large part of the borrowing is secured by the acquired firm’s assets, and the lenders, because of the high risk, take a portion of the firm’s equity. Junk bonds have been routinely used to raise the large amounts of debt needed to finance LBO transactions. Of course, the purchasers in an LBO expect to use the improved cash flow to service the large amount of junk bond and other debt incurred in the buyout. The acquirers in LBOs are other firms or groups of investors that frequently include key members of the firm’s existing management.

An attractive candidate for acquisition through leveraged buyout should possess three basic attributes:

1. It must have a good position in its industry with a solid profit history and reasonable expectations of growth.
2. The firm should have a relatively low level of debt and a high level of “bankable” assets that can be used as loan collateral.
3. It must have stable and predictable cash flow that are adequate to meet interest and principal payments on the debt and provide adequate working capital.

Of course, a willingness on the part of existing ownership and management to sell the company on a leveraged basis is also needed.

Practice Questions
1. Discuss the different categories of mergers.
2. Differentiate between friendly versus hostile takeovers.
3. Distinguish between strategic versus financial mergers.
4. What are leveraged buyouts (LBO) and divestitures?
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
- The process involved in a merger negotiation
- Takeovers
- Issues involved in valuing the target company

Mergers are often handled by investment bankers financial intermediaries hired by acquirers to find suitable target companies and assist in negotiations. A firm seeking a potential acquisition can hire an investment banker to find firm meeting its requirements. Once a target company is selected, the investment banker negotiates with its management or investment banker. Frequently, when management wishes to sell the firm or a division of the firm, it will hire an investment banker to seek out potential.

In the event that attempts to negotiate with the management of Target Company break down, the acquiring firm, often with the aid of its investment banker, can make direct appeal to shareholders by using tender offers. The investment banker is typically compensated with a fixed fee, a commission tied to the transaction price, or with a combination of fees and commission.

A desirable merger candidate usually receives more than a single offer. Normally certain non financial issues relating to the disposition and compensation of the existing management, product-line policies, financing policies and the independence of the targets firm must be resolved. Although the negotiations are generally based on the expectation of a merger, sometimes negotiations will break down.

Tender Offers
When management negotiations for an acquisition break down, tender offers may then be used to negotiate a “hostile merger” directly with the firm’s shareholders. A tender offer is a formal offer to purchase a given number of shares of a firm’s stock at a specified price. The offer is made to all the shareholders at a premium above the market price. Occasionally, the acquire will make a two-tier offer in which the term offered are more attractive to those who tender shares early. For example, the acquirers offer to pay Rs. 25 per share of the first 60 per cent of the outstanding shares tendered and only Rs 23 per share for the remaining shares. The shareholders are advised of a tender offer through announcements in financial newspapers or through direct communications from the following firm. Sometimes a tender offer is made to add pressure to existing merger negotiations. In other cases the tender offer may be made without warning as an attempt at an abrupt corporate takeover.

Fighting Hostile Takeovers
If the management of a target firm does not favour a merger or considers the price offered in a proposed merger too low, it is likely to take defensive actions toward off the hostile tender offer. Such actions are generally developed with the assistance of investment bankers and lawyers who, for generally sizable fees, help the firm to develop and employ effective takeover defenses. Numerous strategies such as informing shareholders of the alleged damaging effects of a takeover, acquiring another company (discussed earlier in the chapter), or attempting to sue the acquiring firm on antitrust or other grounds for fighting hostile takeovers where developed. In addition, many other defenses (some with colourful names) exist – white knight, poison pills, greenmail, leveraged recapitalization, golden parachutes, and shark repellents. We now take a brief look at each of these strategies.

The white knight strategy involves the target firm finding a more suitable acquirer (the “white knight”) and prompting it to compete with the initial hostile acquire to takeover the firm. The basic premise of this strategy is that if being taken over is nearly certain; the target firm ought to attempt to be taken over by the firm that is deemed most acceptable to its management. Poison pills typically involve the certain of securities that give their holders certain rights that become effective when a takeover is attempted. The “pil” allows the shareholders to receive special voting rights or securities that, once issued, cause the firm to be much less desirable to the hostile acquirer.

Green mail is a strategy by which the firm repurchased through private negotiation a large block of stock at a premium from one or more shareholders to end a hostile takeover attempt by those shareholders. Clearly greenmail is a form of corporate black mail by the holders of a large block of shares.

Another hostile takeover defense involves the use of a leveraged recapitalization, which is a strategy involving the payment of a large debt-financed cash dividend. This strategy significantly increases the firm’s financial leverage, thereby deterring the takeover attempt. In addition, as a further deterrent the recapitalization is often structured to increase the equity and control of the existing management. Golden parachutes are provisions in the employment contracts of key executives that provide them with sizable compensation if the firm is taken over. Golden parachutes deter hostile takeovers to the extent that the cash outflows required by these contracts are large enough to make the takeover unattractive to the acquirer. Another defense is use of shark repellents, which are antitakeover amendments to the corporate charter to corporate charter that constrain the firm’s ability to transfer managerial control of the firm as a result of a merger. Although this defense could entrench existing management, many firms have had these amendments ratified by shareholders.
Because takeover defenses tend to insulates management from shareholders, the potential for litigation is great when these strategies are employed. Lawsuits are sometimes field against management by dissident shareholders. In addition, government frequently intervene when a proposed takeover is deemed to be in violation of law.

**Valuing the target Company**

Whether a firm is planning to acquire a target firm for cash or through a stock swap, it must first determine the target firm’s value. The value would then be used, along with a proposed financing scheme, to negotiate the transaction on a friendly or hostile basis. The value of the target would be estimated by using the capital budgeting techniques whether the target firm is being acquired for its assets or as a going concern.

**Acquisition of Assets:** Occasionally, a firm is acquired not for its income-earning potential but as a collection of assets (generally fixed assets) that the acquiring company needs. The price paid for this type of acquisition depends largely on which assets are being acquired; consideration must also be given to the value of any tax losses. To determine whether the purchase of assets is financially justified, the acquiring firm must estimate both the costs and benefits of the target assets. This is capital budgeting problem, since an initial cash outlay is made to acquire assets and, as a result, future cash inflows are expected.

**Acquisitions of Going Concern:** Acquisitions of target companies that are going concerns are best analyzed by using capital budgeting techniques similar to those used for asset acquisitions. The basic difficulty in applying the capital budgeting approach to the acquisition of going concern is the estimation of cash flows and certain risk considerations. The methods of expected cash flows from an acquisition are similar to those used in estimating capital budgeting cash flows. Typically pro forma income statements reflecting the post merger revenues and cost attributable to the target company are prepared. They are then adjusted to reflect the expected cash flows over the relevant time period. Whenever a firm considers acquiring a target company that has different risk behaviors, it should adjust the cost of capital appropriately before applying the appropriate capital budgeting techniques.

**Stock Swap Transactions**

Once the value of the target company is determined, the acquirer must develop a proposed financing package. The simplest, but probably least common, case would be a pure cash purchase. Beyond this extreme case there are virtually an infinite number of financing packages that use various combinations of cash, debt, preference shares, and equity shares. Here we look at the other extreme - stock swap transactions in which the acquisition is paid for using an exchange of equity shares. The acquiring firm exchanges its shares for shares of the target company according to a pre determined ratio. The ratio of exchange of shares determines the number of shares of the acquiring firm to be exchanged for each share of the target firm. The first requirement, of course is that the acquiring company have sufficient shares available to complete the transaction. Often a firm’s repurchase of shares is necessary to obtain sufficient shares for such a transaction. The acquiring firm generally offers more for each share of the target company than the current market price of its publicly traded shares. The actual ratio of market price of the acquiring firm. It is calculated in this manner because the acquiring firm pays the target firm in stock, which has a value equal to its market price.

**Effect on Earnings Per Share:** Ordinarily, the resulting earnings per share differ from the pre merger earnings per share for both the acquiring firm and the target firm. They depend largely on the ratio of exchange and the pre merger earnings per share of each firm. It is best to view the initial and long-run effect of the ratio of exchange on earnings per share (EPS) separately.

When the ratio of exchange is equal to 1 and both the acquiring firm and the target firm have same pre merger earnings per share, the merged firm’s earnings per share will initially remain constant. In this rate instance, both the acquiring and target firms would also have equal price/earnings (P/E) ratios. In actually the earnings per share of the merged firm are generally above the pre merger earnings per share, of one firm and below the pre merge earnings per share of the other after the necessary adjustment has been made for the ratio of exchange.

**Effect on Market Price Per Share:** The market price per share does not necessarily remain constant after the acquisition of one firm by another. Adjustments occur in the marketplace in response to changes in expected earnings, the dilution of ownership, changes in risk, and certain other operating and financial changes. Using the ratio of exchange, ratio of exchanger in market price can be calculated. It indicates the market price per share of the acquiring firm paid for market price per share of the target firm. The ratio the MPR, is defined by:

\[
MPR = \frac{MP\ acquiring}{MP\ target}
\]

Where

- \( MPR \) = Market price ratio of exchange
- \( MP\ acquiring \) = market price per share of the acquiring firm
- \( MP\ target \) = market price per share of the target firm
- \( RE \) = ratio of exchange

The post merger earnings per share of owners of the acquiring and target companies can be explained by comparing the price/earnings (P/E) ratio. By paying more than its current value of earnings to acquire the earnings (P/E paid > P/E of acquiring company), the acquiring firm transfers the claim on a portion of its pre merger earnings to the owners of the target firm. Therefore on a post merger basis the target firm’s EPS increases, and the acquiring firm’s EPS decrease. Note that this outcome is almost always the case, since the acquire typically pays a 50 per cent, on average premium above the target firm’s market price, thereby resulting in the P/E paid being much above its own P/
E. If acquiring company were to pay less than its current value of earnings to acquire the earnings (P/E paid < P/E of acquiring company), the opposite effects would result.

The long run effect of merger on the earnings per share of the merged company depends largely on whether the earnings of the merged firm grow. Often, although a decrease in the per-share earnings of the stock held by the original owners of the acquiring firm is expected initially, the long run effects of the merger on earnings per share are quite favorable. Since business firms generally expect growth in earnings, the key factor enabling the acquiring company, which initially experiences a decrease in EPS, to experience higher future EPS than it would have without the merger is the fact that the earnings attributable to the new company’s assets grow at a faster rate than those resulting from the acquiring company’s pre-merger assets.

The ratio of exchange in market price is normally greater than 1, which indicates that to acquire a firm, the acquire must pay a premium above its market price. Even so, the original owners of the acquiring firm may still gain because the merged firm’s stock may sell a price/earning ratio above the individual pre-merger ratios. This results from the improved risk and return relationship perceived by shareholders and other investors.

The financial manager must recognize that, only the proper management of the merged enterprise can make its market value be improved. If the merged firm can not achieve sufficiently high earnings in view of its risk, there is no guarantee that its market price will reach the forecast value. Nevertheless, policy of acquiring firms with low P/E can produce favorable results for shareholders. Acquisitions are especially attractive when the acquiring firm’s stock price is high. Since fewer shares must be exchanged to acquire a given firm.

**Terms of Mergers**

Naturally, both firms in the proposed merger/acquisition will seek the best terms possible for their respective shareholders. This involves a negotiation to divide the value between the two sets of shareholders. The ratio of exchange can be determined by a comparison of the two companies in five areas: 1. earnings, 2. growth in earning, 3: dividends; 4, market price; and 5: book value.

It is clear that if we distribute securities in the new firm in proportion to any one of these basis, there will be a conflict with a distribution that uses any other of the basis except in any extremely fortuitous case. Such a conflict suggests the question of what weight is to be attributed to each of these bases of comparison.

Before we examine the interplay of the different bases of valuation of a firm at a practical level, we must emphasize that if the merger is synergistic, the value of both companies for their owners will rise. Thus in a merger negotiation there are always choices of: 1. the improvement of total receipts that can be anticipated beyond the sum of he separate earnings; 2. The savings or cost reduction expected from the fusion; and 3. The impact of both of these factors on the market value of the securities that would result from the merger. To illustrate the complexity of the problem, even if there were no increase in earnings by fusion and no cost savings, it is quite possible that the merger would result in a price earnings ratio higher than the separate price earnings ratio of the two companies, for example, due to off setting risks. Hence we see that historical earnings or price earnings ratios are usually inadequate as the principle of merger.

It flows, then that much of the popular analysis of mergers is based on faulty assumptions, namely, that (1) the past record and valuation of each separate entity is indicative of its separate future records and (2) the future record and valuation of the fusion is the sum of the separate(even future) records and valuation of the separate firms.

Let us assume that it is agreed that future valuation of the fused firms is what is to be divided. We might propose that this value should be divided between the two firms in proportion to the present value of each firm (or the market value ratio). But such a proposal assumes that each firm contributes to an improvement in the total value of the new proportion to its separate market value.

Actually one or the other of the merging companies may have more opportunities to merger at high values with other companies. This is sometimes described on bargaining power and it effects not only the division of the increment of the fused value over the sum of the value of the two separate result of the ratio of shares in the fused firms.

**Illustration of the Problem of Merger Terms**

The quantities data most readily available and most frequently used to evaluate merger terms in the practical world are earnings, dividends, market value, book value, and net current assets.

Assuming the data given in Table-2. It is apparent that computations on a per share basis are convenient and this is the customary procedure. A look at the data suggests that company A is a so-called growth company and company B is mature. If an exchange of one for one were to occur and if the market were to place no higher value of the fused operation then on its two separate parts and Company B were the surviving company, the result might be those given in Table-3.

**Table - 2**

**Proposal to Merge Company A into company B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Company A</th>
<th>Company B</th>
<th>Exchange ratio (B for A) indicated if only 1 factor were considered and no increase in earnings or P/E for fused firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Earnings</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 20,000</td>
<td>Rs. 50,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shares of equity</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earnings per share</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 2.00</td>
<td>Rs. 5.00</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price earnings ratio</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 20</td>
<td>Rs. 10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market value per share</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 40</td>
<td>Rs. 50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividends per share</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 0.20</td>
<td>Rs. 4.00</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book value per share</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 8.00</td>
<td>Rs. 20.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets per share</strong></td>
<td>Rs. 0.50</td>
<td>Rs. 3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected annual growth of earning</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One thing immediately apparent is that all of the per share figures are the arithmetic means of the separate company figured but that the new price-earnings ratio is not an average of old price earnings ratio. Price and the earnings ratio is determined by the price and earnings; price is not determined by the price-earning-ratio and earnings.

### Table - 3
Possible Results of One for One merger of Company A into Company B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Earnings</th>
<th>Rs. 70,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shares of equity</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings per-share</td>
<td>Rs. 3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price earnings ratio</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value per share</td>
<td>Rs. 45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends per share</td>
<td>Rs. 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book value per share</td>
<td>Rs. 14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Current assets per share</td>
<td>Rs. 1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice also that none of the single factor exchange rate is one or greater. The exchange rate of one for one cannot be arrived at by some weighting of the several factors set out. However, in many cases after the exchange rate is established the result can be arithmetically equated to a number of different weighting systems applied to the several factors.

We can determine how long this time period will be by solving the following equation for it:

\[ E_1 (1 + g_1)^N = E_2 (1+g_2)^N \]

Where \( E_1 \) and \( g_1 \) are the earnings and growth rate before merged and \( E_2 \) and \( g_2 \) are the earnings and growth rate after merger and is the break-even number of years. The growth rate after merger is the average of the separate growth rates, weighted by the total earnings of each company. In our case \( g_2 \) is \([0.10 \times (20,000) + 0.05 \times (50,000)] / 70,000 \) of 6.43 per cent.

The company B is trading a current earnings of Rs. 5 per share with a growth rate of 5% for current earnings of Rs. 3.50 per share and a growth rate of 6.43 per cent. Conversely, company A is tracing current earnings of Rs 2 per share with a growth rate of 10% for a current earnings of Rs. 3.50 per share and a growth rate of 6.43.

Substituting in this equation, \( N \) turns to be 26.4 years for company B and 17 years for company A. Thus as to company B, the decline in earnings in the merger from Rs. 5 per share to Rs 3.50 per share will be equalized after 26.4 years. Where the earnings have risen to Rs 18.13 per share [computed as \( \log 5 + 26.4 (\log 1.05) \) or \( \log 3.5 + 26.4 (\log 1.0643) \)]. Similarly the increase from Rs 2 per share to Rs. 3.5 per shares or company A in the merger will be equalized after 17 years when earnings will be at Rs 10.10 per share [computed as \( \log 2 + 17 (\log 1.1) \) or \( \log 3.5 + 17 (\log 1.0543) \)].

### Factors Dominating Situations
Situations in which each of the five factors is likely to dominate are listed before:

**Market Value**
Market value will dominate when there are dissenter problems. Great deviation from market value threatens to result in litigation beyond the problem of receiving the cash needed for dissenters. However, when ‘market’ value represent a thin or even a supported market, only the naïve company will be trapped into reorganizing market value.

**Book Value**
Book value is likely to dominate first in the case where liquidity carries a premium. This might occur, for example, at any time when the capital market and/ or the economy as a whole have slowed down and new securities of any kind are difficult to market at any thing approximating a reasonable price. A second situation where book value will be dominant is where the market value of the assets of one company is well above the market value of its shares.

**Dividends**
Dividend rates of the two companies are not likely to influence the terms of the merger but can be expected to affect the form of securities used. Dividend depends on earnings and policy as to payout. But in a merger every effort will be spent to use a type of security which will preserve existing cash dividends for shareholders of the acquired company. The payout policy of fused operation can not be readily determined in advance except where the policies of both companies have been nearly the same, thus creating an expectation that the same pattern will continue.

**Earnings**
Earnings are sometime stated to be the dominant single factor, and ‘earnings’ in such a statement means historical earnings. The relevant earnings, however, are expected further earnings and these are reflected in market value. Variability of earnings is a factor to be considered, but his is reflected in market value and appears in the price-earnings ratios, which reflect risk as well as growth prospects.

**Dissenting Shareholders**
Although a combination generally depends only upon the approval of a required majority of the total number of shares outstanding, minority shareholders can contest the price paid for their share, if a dissenting shareholder and the company fails to agree as to just settlement on a voluntary basis, the shareholder can take his case to court and demand an appraisal of his shares and a settlement in cash. After a fair-market price has been established by the court the dissenting shareholders receives payment in cash for his shares. If the number of dissenting shareholders is large, they can cause considerable trouble. If the transaction is in share, the demands for cash payments on the part of these shareholders may put a severe financial strain on the combination. Thus, most combinations depend not only upon obtaining approval of a required majority of shareholders but also upon minimizing the number of dissenting shareholders by making the offer attractive to all. Dissenting shareholders may be able to block the combination if they suspect that fraud is involved, even through the required majority of shareholders has approved it.

**Benefits and Costs**
The manager’s objective is to maximize the current wealth of A’s shareholders. Consequently he will go-ahead with the merger if he can negotiate a deal that makes them richer.
Certain difficulties have to be disposed off before beginning any substantive discussion. In the first place, it is sometimes hard to tell who is purchasing whom, the law makes a distinction between mergers, which are purchased by A of company B’s share or assets, and consolidation, in which A and B continue to form a new company, which survives. In the later case buyers and sellers are not legally identified.

The benefits of a merger can be defined as the difference between (1) the total present value of the merged firms and (2) the sum of their values if they do not merge. If V represents a present value, then

\[ \text{Benefit} = \Delta V = V_{AB} - V_A - V_B \ ——— (1) \]

The implied question is, “what aspects of the proposed merger make the two firms worth more together than apart?”

If this definition of benefit is accepted, then cost must be defined as the difference between the amount paid for the acquired firm and the amount it is worth as a separate entity. If B’s owners receive cash for their shares, for example, then

\[ \text{Cost} = \text{Cash} - V_B \ ——— (2) \]

Defining benefits in this way focuses attention on the economic value of merger. Estimating this value is indeed just like a capital budgeting problem. Estimating cost, however, requires consideration of how the benefits of merger are shared between A and B’s owners. As we will see later that cost can depend on how the merger is financed.

Firms should go ahead with mergers for which benefit exceeds cost. If the merger is financed by cash, this requires that

\[ \text{Benefit} - \text{Cost} = \Delta V - (\text{Cash} - V_B) > 0 \ ——— (3) \]

It may not be obvious that A’s shareholders gain when equation (3) holds. If not, consider the following. If there is no merger, then the aggregate value of their shares is V A. If the merger goes through, their position is VAB - Cash. Their net gain is exactly as given by equation (3)

\[ \text{Net Gain} = V_B - \text{Cash} V_A \]
\[ = \Delta V + V_A + V_B - \text{Cash} V_A \]
\[ = \Delta V - (\text{Cash} - V_B). \]

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss how valuing the target company is done.
2. What are the factors that dominate company valuations?
3. How the benefits and costs of merger could be evaluated?
LESSON 15:
COST OF MERGER

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Estimating cost of a merger under different financing schemes
- Accounting policies

Estimating the Cost of a Merger

Cost is the difference between the amount paid for the acquired firm and what it is worth as a separate entity. Estimating cost is straightforward as long as the merger is financed by cash. However, it is useful to distinguish between $I_B$, the “intrinsic” value of the acquired firm as a separate entity and $MV_B$, the aggregate market value of the firm as observed around the time of the merger, since $MV_B$ may be affected by information about the merger.

We can rewrite equation (2) as

$$\text{Cost} = (\text{cash} - MV_B) + (MV_B - I_B) \quad (4)$$

= Premium paid over Difference between observed market value of B and what it is worth on its own

For example, suppose that on the day before A and B’s merger is announced, we observe the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm A</th>
<th>Firm B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market price per share</td>
<td>Rs. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of shares</td>
<td>1,00,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market value of firm</td>
<td>Rs. 1,00,00,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firm A intends to pay Rs. 25,00,000 cash for B. If $MV_B$ reflects only B’s separate value, then

Cash = (Cash - MV_B) + (MVB - IB)

= (25,00,000 - 20,00,000) + (20,00,000 - 20,00,000)

= 5,00,000 + 0

= Rs 5,00,000

On the other hand, suppose B’s price had risen Rs 4.00 per share due to rumours about the merger. Then

Cost = (Cash - MV_B) + (MVB - IB)

= Rs. 5,00,000 + Rs 2,00,000 = Rs 7,00,000

It is also conceivable that A’s management has inside information that leads it to believe that B’s real value is 20 per cent higher than $MV_B$. If they are right, B is a bargain and the cost is reduced.

Cost = Rs. 5,00,000 + (20,00,000 - 24,00,000) = Rs. 1,00,000

As was noted, the protagonist firm in a merger almost always pays a premium over the market value of the acquired firm.

Estimating the Cost when the Acquisition is Financed by Equity

Estimating cost is trickier when mergers are financed by an exchange of shares. Suppose that firm A offers 25,000 shares, worth Rs 100 per share before the merger announcement, instead of Rs 25,00,000 cash. MVB is Rs 20,00,000 as before. The apparent cost of the merger is:

$$\text{Apparent cost} = \frac{100(25,000)}{1,00,000} - \frac{20,00,000}{50,000} = Rs \ 5,00,000$$

However, this is not likely to be the true cost, for three reasons. First, firm B’s real value may not be Rs 20,00,000. Second A’s shares may not be valued correctly at Rs 100. Third, and most important, portion of the benefits generated by the merger will accrue to B’s shareholders – they will be partners of the merged firm.

The true cost is therefore

$$\text{Cost} = \frac{1}{5} \times V_{AB} - V_B$$

Where $\theta$ is the proportion of the merged firm that B’s shareholders end up owning.

Continuing with our example, consider again A’s 25,000 share offer, B’s shareholders will end up with one-fifth of the merged firm:

$$\frac{25,000}{1,00,000 + 25,000} = \frac{1}{5}$$

Suppose the market value before the merger announcement accurately reflects the firm’s separate values. Also the merger generates benefit worth Rs. 1,00,000 so $V_{AB} = V_A + V_B + V = Rs. 1,00,000 + Rs 20,00,000 + Rs 20,00,000 + Rs 10,00,000 = 1,30,000$ Then the merger’s true cost to A’s shareholders is $1/5 V_{AB} - V_B$ or

$$\text{Cost} = (Rs 1,30,000) - (Rs. 20,00,000) = Rs. 6,00,000$$

The implication is that A’s shareholders are as well off offering Rs. 26,00,000 cash as they are offering shares worth Rs 25,00,000 before the merger announcement. The larger the benefits generated by the merger, the greater the true cost of the 25,000-share offer.

In making these calculations management is essentially attempting to estimate what B’s share will be worth after the merger agreement is sealed and announced. When this happens, the price of the 50,000 firm B shares will immediately jump to Rs. 52.00 a Rs 12.00 capital gain over their initial Rs 40.00 price (This assumes the market agrees with the Rs 10,00,000 estimate of merger benefits). If A’s management could wait until the merger terms are announced, estimating cost would be easy.

$$\text{Cost} = 52(50,000) - 10,00,000 = Rs. 6,00,000$$
Why not just announce, tentative merger terms, and then sit back to see how the market reacts before completing the merger negotiations? Would that not avoid these somewhat complicated calculations? The flow in this strategy is that observed market prices will be extremely difficult to interpret if the market knows that the announced terms are tentative and that further negotiations are pending.

**Cash versus Equity for Financial Mergers**

The key distinction between cash and stock as means of financing mergers is that, if cash is offered, the ultimate pay off to B’s shareholders is independent of the success or failure of the merger. Cost can be estimated without reference to the merger’s benefits. If share is offered, cost depends on benefits, because they must be shared with B’s owners.

It is hard to generalize about whether other financing instruments should be treated like cash or share. For practical purposes, bonds or preference share issued by A will probably be treated like cash. The value of the bonds given to B’s shareholders will be essentially independent of the success or failure of the merger, providing A is a good credit risk to start with. Convertible bonds (or convertible preference share) introduced the same problems that equity shares do. The option to convert gives B’s shareholders the chance to share in merger benefits. In order to estimate cost, A’s management must estimate the bond issue’s value once the final merger terms and benefits are known to the market.

What are the consequences of financing mergers with equity rather than cash? Other things being equal, the greater the merger benefits, the greater the cost of equity financing. Also, equity financing mitigates the effect of over- or undervaluation of the acquired firm. If, for example, A’s management mistakenly offers more shares for B than that firm is really worth, then the inevitable bad news will fall partly on B’s shareholders’ shoulders. Finally, equity financing is less advantageous than cash if A’s equity is undervalued by the market. It is observed, then, equity financing is cheap. Note, however, there is no necessary connection between high or low price-earnings ratio and over- or undervaluation. A high price-earnings does not mean that equity financing is cheap.

Our analysis of merger costs gives no explanation for the observed association between merger activity and bull markets for share capital. A rapid increase in prices does not imply that the exchange of the equity shares of A and B for those of firm C. The assets and liabilities of B and A are transferred to C, and the old corporations A and B, cease to exit.

Consolidation has not been very widely used in recent years. Its principal disadvantages, as compared to a merger, are that a new corporation must be formed, consent of a stated majority (usually simple or two-thirds) of the shareholders of each combining corporation is required, and there is no possibility of using “pooling of interests” accounting or utilizing tax-loss carry forwards.

**The Holding Company**

The holding company is a firm which controls one or more other companies (called subsidiaries) through ownership of the subsidiary firm’s equity shares. The holding company structure permits the parent firm (the holding company) to control substantial assets with a small investment and also provide earnings that are highly leveraged. Because of this leverage, the company holding can be a relatively risky enterprise with the opportunity for extraordinary gains and substantial losses if the subsidiaries do poorly.

The difference between the holding company technique for combination and merger and consolidation can be summarized as follows. There are no dissenters’ rights for minority holders when a holding company gains control. At the same time, there is relatively easy means for the holding company to dispose of the shares where there is a desire to switch investment. Thus an operating company in a declining industry may first turn itself into an investment company and then become an operating company in another industry over several decades as it recovers depreciation on its plant and phases out its operation.

**Advantages of Holding Companies**

The primary advantage of the holding company arrangement is the leverage effect that permits the firm to control a large amount of assets with a relatively small investment. In other words, the owners of a holding company can control significantly larger amount of assets than they could acquire through mergers. The following example illustrates the leverage effect.

Suppose, for simplicity, that there are five operational companies each with a Balance Sheet given in Table-4,

**TABLE - 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance Sheet of Each Operating Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 per cent bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 per cent bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 per cent preference share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity share capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And net worth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assume that the after-tax income of each operating company is Rs. 2,12,000 of which Rs.12,000 is due to preference shares. Assume that the equity shares can be brought at book value. Control may require buying at most 51 per cent of the equity. If we create a new company whose assets are the controlling shares of the five operating companies and finance the acquisition with bonds and preference as well as equity shares?
The Balance sheet might be given in table - 5 assuming we acquire 50 per cent of the equity shares of each operating company at book value. Now with Rs 1,50,000 of the holding company's share capital we control Rs. 50,00,000 in assets of the operating companies and claimed Rs. 50,00,000 of earnings of the operating companies (assuming they pay out 100 per cent of earnings). Of the Rs. 5,00,000 we apply Rs. 24,500 to holding company bonds and Rs. 8,000 to the preference shares (both of which carry higher rates than these securities of the operating companies because their income depends on the equity shares earnings of the operating companies). Of the holding company owns 80 per cent or more of the operating company's voting shares, no income tax is due because the intercompany dividends are exempt, but here we own only 50 per cent, and hence only 85 per cent of the intercompany dividends are exempt. At a tax rate of 48 per cent the effective tax rate on the holding company receipts is 0.48 x 0.15 or 7.2 per cent. Here 15 per cent of Rs. 5,00,000 is taxable, or Rs. 75,000. But since the bond interest of Rs. 24,500 of the holding company is deductible Rs. 50,500 is taxable. This derives the effective tax rate below 7.2 per cent in this case. Where the equity share capital of the operating companies earns 66 per cent (Rs. 2,00,000 of equity in each company), the equity of the holding company earns 150 per cent (Rs. 4,49,760 on Rs. 3,00,000).

We have considered the use of only one level of holding company. Above this level leverage increases. The high leverage obtained through a holding company arrangement greatly magnifies earnings and losses for the holding company. Quite often, a pyramiding of holding companies occurs when one holding company controls other holding companies, thereby causing an even greater magnification of earnings and losses. The greater the leverage, the greater the risk involved. The risk return tradeoff is a key consideration in the holding company decision.

Another commonly cited advantage of the holding company arrangement is the risk protection resulting from the fact that the failure of one of the companies does not result in the failure of the entire holding company. Since each subsidiary is a separate corporation, the failure of one company should cost the holding company, at maximum, no more than its investment in that subsidiary. Other advantages include the following: (1) certain state tax benefits may be realized by each subsidiary in its state of incorporation; (2) Lawsuits or legal actions against a subsidiary will not threaten the remaining companies; and (3) it is generally easy to gain control of a firm, since shareholder or management approval is not generally necessary.

Besides the advantages of avoiding dissenters' rights, minimizing the investment needed for control, and achieve leverage, the holding company presents two other advantages: (1) selective insulation of risks and (2) facility in financing. Both of these advantages are not clear cut. If there are inter-company transactions in the systems, the courts may easily refuse to recognize the distinction of the corporations. But if the distinction between holding company and the operating companies is maintained, the decline of one operating company may not affect holding company as seriously as it affects the operating company. Facility in financing may follow from the superior standing of the system compared to the lesser status the individual operating companies would have.

A major disadvantage of the holding company arrangement is the increased risk resulting from the leverage effect. When general economic conditions are unfavorable, a loss by one subsidiary may be magnified. Another disadvantage is double taxation before paying dividends a subsidiary must pay taxes on its earnings. Moreover, the holding companies are generally high cost of administration resulting from maintaining each subsidiary company as a separate entity. A merger, on the other hand, would likely result in certain administrative economies of scale. The need for coordination and communication between the holding company and its subsidiaries may further elevate these costs. Finally, the fact that holding companies are difficult to analyze is another disadvantage. Security analysts and investors typically have difficulty in understanding holding companies because of their complexity. As a result these firms tend to sell low multiples, of earnings (P/Es). This means that the shareholder value of holding companies may suffer.

The operating economies that might come from a system would also be available to other forms of combinations.

**Accounting Policies: Purchase versus Pooling of Interests**

There are two general accounting methods for handling mergers and acquisitions. One is called the purchase method, the other the pooling of interest, and they have considerably different effects on post combination EPs.

Goodwill, which occurs when the purchase price of the selling company exceeds its book value, is treated substantially different under the two methods. Under the purchase method the excess of the selling company's purchase price over book value is first assigned, to the extent possible, to tangible assets, the remainder is defined as goodwill. Goodwill is depreciable for investor reporting purposes but not for tax purposes. This means that there will be a depreciation charge against earnings each year for goodwill but no commensurate depreciation tax shield. Under the pooling of interest method the books of the combining companies are simply combined or pooled as there is no goodwill created and, consequently, no depreciation of goodwill that will reduce reported earnings.

Another aspect of pooling of interest that make it appear favorable was the previously sanctioned accounting practice regarding acquired assets. Assets acquired at book value under
pooling could be resold at market value, and the difference would be reflected in higher profits and earnings. These apparent earnings advantages led to widespread preference for the pooling method along with widespread abuses of the method. The accounting profession has attempted to eliminate what are largely artificial advantages of the pooling method by eliminating some of the obvious enticements and by making it more difficult for pooling of interest.

**Example - 1**
The Balance sheet might be given in table - 5 assuming we acquire 50 per cent of the equity shares of each operating company at book value. Now with Rs 1,50,000 of the holding company’s share capital we control Rs. 50,00,000 in assets of the operating companies and claimed Rs. 50,00,000 of earnings of the operating companies (assuming they pay out 100 per cent of earnings). Of the Rs. 5,00,000 we apply Rs. 24,500 to holding company bonds and Rs. 8,000 to the preference shares (both of which carry higher rates than these securities of the operating companies because their income depends on the equity shares earnings of the operating companies.) Of the holding company owns 80 per cent or more of the operating company’s voting shares, no income tax is due because the intercompany dividends are exempt, but here we own only 50 per cent, and hence only 85 per cent of the intercompany dividends are exempt. At a tax rate of 48 per cent the effective tax rate on the holding company receipts is 0.48 x 0.15 or 7.2 per cent. Here 15 per cent of Rs. 5,00,000 is taxable, or Rs. 75,000. But since the bond interest of Rs. 24,500 of the holding company is deductible Rs. 50,500 is taxable. This derives the effective tax rate below 7.2 per cent in this case. Where the equity share capital of the operating companies earns 66 per cent (Rs. 2,00,000) of Rs 3,00,000), the equity of the holding company earns 150 per cent (Rs. 4,49,760 on Rs. 3,00,000).

We have considered the use of only one level of holding company. Above this level leverage increases. The high leverage obtained through a holding company arrangement greatly magnifies earnings and losses for the holding company. Quite often, a pyramiding of holding companies occurs when one holding company controls other holding companies, thereby causing an even greater magnification of earnings and losses. The greater the leverage, the greater the risk involved. The risk return tradeoff is a key consideration in the holding company decision. Another commonly cited advantage of the holding company arrangement is the risk protection resulting from the fact that the failure of one of the companies does not result in the failure of the entire holding company. Since each subsidiary is a separate corporation, the failure of one company should cost the holding company, at maximum, no more than its investment in that subsidiary. Other advantages include the following: (1) certain state tax benefits may be realized by each subsidiary in its state of incorporation; (2) Lawsuits or legal actions against a subsidiary will not threaten the remaining companies; and (3) it is generally easy to gain control of a firm, since shareholder or management approval is not generally necessary.

Besides the advantages of avoiding dissenters’ rights, minimizing the investment needed for control, and achieve leverage, the holding company presents two other advantages: (1) selective insulation of risks and (2) facility in financing. Both of these advantages are not clear cut. If there are inter-company transactions in the systems, the courts may easily refuse to recognize the distinction of the corporations. But if the distinction between holding company and the operating companies is maintained, the decline of one operating company may not affect holding company as seriously as it affects the operating company. Facility in financing may follow from the superior standing of the system compared to the lesser status the individual operating companies would have.

A major disadvantage of the holding company arrangement is the increased risk resulting from the leverage effect. When general economic conditions are unfavorable, a loss by an subsidiary may be magnified. Another disadvantage is double taxation before paying dividends a subsidiary must pay taxes on its earnings. Moreover, the holding companies are generally high cost of administration resulting from maintaining each subsidiary company as a separate entity. A merger, on the other hand, would likely result in certain administrative economies of scale. The need for coordination and communication between the holding company and its subsidiaries may further elevate these costs. Finally, the fact that holding companies are difficult to analyze is another disadvantage. Security analysts and investors typically have difficulty in understanding holding companies because of their complexity. As a result these firms tend to sell low multiples, of earnings (P/E). This means that the shareholder value of holding companies may suffer. The operating economies that might come from a system would also be available to other forms of combinations.

**Accounting Policies: Purchase versus Pooling of Interests**

There are two general accounting methods for handling mergers and acquisitions. One is called the purchase method, the other the pooling of interest, and they have considerably different effects on post combination EPS.

Goodwill, which occurs when the purchase price of the selling company exceeds its book value, is treated substantially different under the two methods. Under the purchase method the excess of the selling company’s purchase price over book value is first assigned, to the extent possible, to tangible assets, the remainder is defined as goodwill. Goodwill is depreciable for investor reporting purposes but not for tax purposes. This means that there will be a depreciation charge against earnings each year for goodwill but no commensurate depreciation tax shield. Under the pooling of interest method the books of the combining companies are simply combined or pooled as there is no goodwill created and, consequently, no depreciation of goodwill that will reduce reported earnings.

Another aspect of pooling of interest that make it appear favorable was the previously sanctioned accounting practice regarding acquired assets. Assets acquired at book value under pooling could be resold at market value, and the difference would be reflected in higher profits and earnings. These apparent earnings advantages led to widespread preference for the pooling method along with widespread abuses of the method. The accounting profession has attempted to eliminate what are largely artificial advantages of the pooling method by
eliminating some of the obvious enticements and by making it more difficult for pooling of interest.

**Example - 1**

Company XYZ offers Rs. 12,00,000 for Rs. 4,00,000 of ABC's stock at book value. ABC has Rs. 1,00,000 debt. How much goodwill arises? If XYZ has Rs. 20,00,000 equity and Rs. 5,00,000 debt itself, what is the combined balance sheet using the purchase method?

Solution: Rs. 8,00,000 goodwill (Rs. 12,00,000 - Rs.4,00,000) Balance sheets are as follows: (per lakh of Rs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase method</th>
<th>Pooling of interests method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: ————————————— = 40,000 shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity market price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To illustrate, company X acquired company Y in 1999 which had base period earnings of Rs. 8,00,000. At the time of the merger, company Y shareholders received 3,00,000 shares if cinoabt X equity. Annual profits, subsequent to the merger have been Rs. 8,75,000, Rs 9,50,000, Rs 10,50,000 and Rs 9,00,000. The market value of company X's equity is Rs 25 per share and the price/ earnings ratio is 10. Based upon the formula above, the additional shares to be paid to company stockholders would be:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: — — — — — — — — = 30,000 shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003: — — — — — — — — = 60,000 Shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004: — — — — — — — — = 1,00,000 shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005: — — — — — — — — = 40,000 shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 2,30,000 shares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, in addition to the down payment of 3,00,000 company X shares company Y shareholders would receive a total of 2,30,000 shares during the ensuing four years.

Even though several advantages exist for earn-outs, potential problems must also be recognized these are:

1. The required corporation must be capable for being operated as an autonomous business entity.
2. The acquiring firm must be willing to allow freedom of operation to the management of newly acquired business.
3. The acquiring firm must be willing to contribute towards the future growth of acquiring company, realizing that only by working together with the two firms attain success.

Numerous types of earn-outs have been devised; the various arrangements are limited only by the imagination of the management of the two firms involved. However, the base-period-earn-out may be used as any illustration. Under this plan the shareholders of the acquired company are to receive additional shares in each future year if the firm improves its earnings above the base period profits – that is, earnings in the last year before the acquisition. The amount of the future payments will be determined by three factors:

1. The amount of earnings in the forthcoming years in excess of the base-period profits.
2. The capitalization rate (discount rate) agreed upon by the parties.

**Earn-outs**

The deferred payment plan, which has come to be called an earn-out, represents a relatively recent approach to merger financing. The acquiring firm agreed to make a specified initial payment of cash or stock and, if it can maintain or increase earnings, to pay additional compensation.

An earn-out has several benefits for the acquiring organization. These are tested below:

1. It provides a logical method of adjusting the difference between the amount of stock the purchaser is willing to issue, and the amount the seller is agreeing to accept for the business.
2. The merging company will immediately be able to report higher earnings per share because fewer shares of equity will become outstanding at the time of the acquisition. In addition the acquiring company is provided with downside protection in the event that the merged business does not fulfill its earnings expectations.
3. The earn-out diminishes the guesswork in establishing an equitable purchase price, because the price is based upon the actual performance of the prospective acquisition after the merger.

Even though several advantages exist for earn-outs, potential problems must also be recognized these are:

1. The required corporation must be capable for being operated as an autonomous business entity.
2. The acquiring firm must be willing to allow freedom of operation to the management of newly acquired business.
3. The acquiring firm must be willing to contribute towards the future growth of acquiring company, realizing that only by working together with the two firms attain success.

Numerous types of earn-outs have been devised; the various arrangements are limited only by the imagination of the management of the two firms involved. However, the base-period-earn-out may be used as any illustration. Under this plan the shareholders of the acquired company are to receive additional shares in each future year if the firm improves its earnings above the base period profits – that is, earnings in the last year before the acquisition. The amount of the future payments will be determined by three factors:

1. The amount of earnings in the forthcoming years in excess of the base-period profits.
2. The capitalization rate (discount rate) agreed upon by the parties.

3. The market value of the acquiring organization at the end of each year. For example, the compensation in shares in future years might be computed by using the following formula:

**Excess earnings x price/earnings multiple**

---

**Equity market price**

To illustrate, company X acquired company Y in 1999 which had base period earnings of Rs. 8,00,000. At the time of the merger, company Y shareholders received 3,00,000 shares if cinoabt X equity. Annual profits, subsequent to the merger have been Rs. 8,75,000, Rs 9,50,000, Rs 10,50,000 and Rs 9,00,000. The market value of company X's equity is Rs 25 per share and the price/earnings ratio is 10. Based upon the formula above, the additional shares to be paid to company stockholders would be:

Rs. 75,000 x 10

2002: — — — — — — — — = 30,000 shares

Rs. 25

Rs. 1,50,000 x 10

2003: — — — — — — — — = 60,000 Shares

Rs. 25

Rs. 2,50,000 x 10

2004: — — — — — — — — = 1,00,000 shares

Rs. 25

Rs. 1,00,000 x 10

2005: — — — — — — — — = 40,000 shares

Rs. 25

Total = 2,30,000 shares

Therefore, in addition to the down payment of 3,00,000 company X shares company Y shareholders would receive a total of 2,30,000 shares during the ensuing four years.

The foregoing example is oversimplified, since other variables must also be recognized in the development of an earn-out plan. Such factors include

1. A specified limitation as to the maximum amount of share that can be transferred in any year.
2. An established range for the share price employed in the computations;
3. The recognition of yearly earnings increments over the prior year;
4. The determination of an equitable down payment; and
5. The succinct definition of earnings for the earn-out computations.

In conclusion, the earn-out technique provides a means by which acquiring business can eliminate part of the guesswork involved in purchasing a firm. In essence, it allows the acquiring management the privilege of hindsight.

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss the various accounting policies for evaluating mergers and acquisitions.
2. Describe earn outs as a merger financing plan.
3. Discuss the importance cash versus equity for financial mergers.
LESSON 16:
METHODS OF MERGER/AMALGAMATION

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- The different methods through which merger/amalgamation is effected.
- The legal procedures involved in a merger/amalgamation.

A merger or amalgamation may be effected by various methods; e.g.,

i. Merger under a scheme of compromise or arrangement;
ii. Merger by purchase of shares;
iii. Merger in public interest under orders of the Central Government;
iv. Merger through holding company;
v. Merger by a scheme of winding up; or
vi. Merger by exchange of shares followed by winding up.

Preliminary Steps in Mergers
The process of screening and selecting the right companies for mergers and amalgamations should proceed in a systematic manner—from general to the more specific. The process starts by identifying the general domains of potential industries to the specific selection of companies to be evaluated and approached for merger or acquisition. The process of screening is generally as follows:

Identifying Industries
First a set of industries is selected which meet the strategic conditions outlined by the company for the merger. This may be in terms of size. For instance, a company I wanting to acquire a medium scale investment will leave out the large investment I industries such as petrochemicals, shipbuilding, etc.

Selecting Sectors
A broad group of acceptable sectors are then identified. For each of these sectors, data with respect to the sales turnover and growth, return on investment (or sales), market shares, competition and asset turnover etc. is collected for the various J companies. On the basis of this comparison, the more desirable sectors are chosen.

Choosing Companies
Potential companies are carefully looked at with respect to the competitive environment in which they operate. Specific attention is paid to the competitive strengths of these companies in their sectoral environment. Comparable sizes are favourable to the chances of success of the merger.

Generally sales turnover and the asset level, which in turn determines the cost level of acquisition, characterize the size of companies. A common rule of thumb I followed is to consider companies, which are 5 to 10 per cent in size of the bidding companies.

Comparative Cost and Returns
The next step is to consider the financial obligations associated with merger and amalgamation on the basis of which the potential companies are reduced further on the basis of their likely return. The companies are listed and compared with respect to their return on investments and the future expected returns are also developed on the basis of different market scenarios. The risks and uncertainties are incorporated to determine the possible variations in returns. Finally, the various companies are ranked on the basis of their position against each of the identified objectives.

The regulator examines the request keeping in view the statutory, regulatory and other prudential requirements and the need for compliance with the various provisions of the statute and approves the same with or without conditions.

For example, in the case of the application for merger of ICICI Ltd. with ICICI Bank Ltd. submitted to the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) for regulatory approvals, the Reserve Bank approved the merger subject to certain conditions.

Approvals of Respective High Court(s):
Approval of the respective High Court(s) of both the companies confirming the scheme of amalgamation are required. The court issues orders for winding up of the amalgamating companies without dissolution on receipt of the reports from the official liquidator and the Regional Director that the affairs of the amalgamating companies have not been conducted in a manner prejudicial to the interests of its members or to public interest.

Integration Stage
The structural and cultural aspects of the two organizations, if carefully integrated in the new organization will lead to the successful merger and ensure that expected benefits of the merger are realized.

The above aspects are discussed in detail in this lesson.

Legal Aspects of Merger/Amalgamation
Merger or Amalgamation under the Companies Act, 1956—Salient

Features
The Companies Act, 1956 has provided for a set of provisions specially dealing with amalgamation of companies, to facilitate the transactions. The statutory provisions relating to Merger and Amalgamations are contained in Sections 390 to 396A of the Companies Act, 1956.

While Section 390 interprets the expressions company, arrangement and explains unsecured creditors, as used under Sections 391 and 393, Section 391 lays down in detail the power to make compromise or arrangements with creditors and members. Under this Section a company can enter into a compromise or arrangement with its creditors or its members, or any class...
thereof without going into liquidation. Section 392 lays down
the power of the High Court to enforce compromise and
arrangements while Section 393 specifies the information as to
compromise or arrangements that is to be sent with every notice
calling the meeting. The provisions for facilitating reconstruction
and amalgamation of companies are contained in Section 394.
Section 395 prescribes the power and duty of the transferee
company to acquire shares of shareholders dissenting from
scheme or contract approved by majority. Powers of Central
Government to provide for amalgamation of companies in
national interest is laid down under Section 396 and Section
396A specifies provisions for preservation of books and papers
of amalgamated company.

The salient features of Sections 391 and 394 are

• There should be a scheme of compromise or arrangement
  for restructuring or amalgamation.
• An application must be made to the court for direction to
  hold meetings of shareholders/creditors.
• Court may order a meeting of shareholder/creditors.
• Holding of meeting(s) of shareholders/creditors as per
court’s order.
• Scheme of compromise or arrangement must be approved
  by 3/4” in value of creditors, class of creditors, members,
class of members.
• Another application must be made to court sanctioning the
  scheme of compromise or arrangement.
• An approved scheme duly sanctioned by court is binding on
  all shareholders/creditors/company(ies).
• Court’s order takes effect only after a certified copy has been
  filed with the Registrar of Companies.
• Copy of court’s order should be annexed to every copy of
  memorandum of association of the company.
• Court may stay commencement or continuation of any suit
  or proceeding against the company after application has been
  moved in the court.
• Court’s order is appealable in a superior court.

Therefore, merger or amalgamation under a scheme of
arrangements as provided under Sections 391-394 of the Act is
the most convenient and most common method of obtaining
a complete merger or amalgamation between the companies.
There is active involvement of the Court and an amalgamation
is complete only after the Court sanctions it under Section
394(2) and takes effect when such order of court is filed with
the Registrar of Companies. In fact, Sections 391 to 394 of the
Act read with Companies (Court) Rules, 1959 serve as a
complete code in themselves in respect of provisions and
procedures relating to sponsoring of the scheme, the approval
thereof by the creditors and members, and the sanction thereof
by the Court.

Accordingly, amalgamation can be effected in any one of the
following ways:

i. Transfer of undertaking by order of the High Court (Section
   394 of the Companies Act).

Under Section 394 of the Companies Act, the High Court may
sanction a scheme of amalgamation proposed by two or more
companies after it has been approved by a meeting of the
members of the company convened under the orders of the
court with majority in number of shareholders holding more
than 75 percent of the shares who vote at the meeting, approve
the scheme of amalgamation, and the companies make a
petition to the High Court for approving the Scheme. The High
Court serves a copy of petition on the Regional Director,
Company Law Board and if he does not object to the amalg-
amation, the Court sanctions it. Once the Court sanctions the
scheme, it is binding on all the members of the respective
companies.

ii. Purchase of Shares of One Company by another Company
   (Section 395 of the Companies Act)

Under Section 395 of the Companies Act, 1956, the undertak-
ing of one company can be takeover by another company by
the purchase of shares. This section obviates the need to obtain
the High Court’s sanction. While purchasing shares, the
company which acquires shares should comply with the
requirements of SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and
Takeovers).

Regulations, 1997 and Section 372A of the Companies Act,
1956. This Section also provides the procedure for acquiring
the shares of dissenting members.

iii. Amalgamation of Companies in National Interest (Section
    396)

Where the Central Government is satisfied that an amalgam-
ation of two or more companies is essential in the public
interest, then the Government may, by an order notified in the
Official Gazette, provide for the amalgamation of those
companies into a single company. The amalgamated company
shall have such constitution, property, powers, rights, interest
and privileges as well as such liabilities, duties and obligations as
may be specified in the Government’s order.

iv. Amalgamation of Companies under Section 494

Amalgamation of two companies is also possible under Section
494 of the Companies Act, where the liquidator of a company
transfers its assets and liabilities to another company.

Section 394 of the Companies Act, 1956 contains provisions for
facilitating reconstruction and amalgamation of companies. The
provisions apply to mergers also.

The Bombay High Court has held in Sadanand S. Varde v. State
of Maharashtra [(2001) 30 SCL 268 (Bom.)] that the fasciculus
of Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act constitutes a
complete code of the subject of amalgamation. The court has
no special jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution to
sit in appeal over an order made under Section 391 of the
Companies Act, 1956 which has become final, binding and
conclusive. The court cannot sit in judgement over the correct-
ness of an order made under Section 391 by the Court which
has become final, conclusive and binding.

Section 394(1) lays down that where an application is made to
the Court under Section 391 for the sanctioning of a compro-
mise or arrangement proposed between a company and any
such persons as are mentioned in that section, and it is shown to the Court.

a. That the compromise or arrangement has been proposed for the purposes of, or in connection with a scheme for the reconstruction of any company or companies, or the amalgamation of any two or more companies; and

b. That under the scheme the whole or any part of the undertaking, property or liabilities of any company concerned in the scheme (in this section referred to as a “transferor company”) is to be transferred to another company (in this section referred to as “the transferee-company”); the Court may, either by the order sanctioning the compromise or arrangement or by a subsequent order, make provision for all or any of the following matters:

i. The transfer to the transferee company of the whole or any part of the undertaking, property or liabilities of any transferor company;

ii. The allotment or appropriation by the transferee company of any shares, debentures, policies, or other like interests in that company which, under the compromise or arrangement, are to be allotted or appropriated by that company to or for any person;

iii. The continuation by or against the transferee company of any legal proceedings pending by or against any transferor company;

iv. The dissolution, without winding up, of any transferor company;

v. The provision to be made for any persons who within such time and in such manner as the Court directs, dissent from the compromise or arrangement; and

vi. Such incidental, consequential and supplemental matters as are necessary to secure that the reconstruction or amalgamation shall be fully and effectively carried out.

Condition with regard to amalgamation report from CLB (Central Government or HOC)
The first proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 394 of the Act lays down that no compromise or arrangement proposed for the purposes of, or in connection with a scheme for the amalgamation of a company, which is being wound up, with any other company or companies, shall be sanctioned by the court unless the court has received a report from the Company Law Board or the Registrar that the affairs of the company have not been conducted in a manner prejudicial to the interests of its members or to public interest;

The second proviso lays down that no order for the dissolution of any transferor company under clause (iv) shall be made by the Court unless the Official Liquidator has, on scrutiny of the books and papers of the company, made a report to the Court that the affairs of the company have not been conducted in a manner prejudicial to the interests of its members or to public interest.

Sub-section (2) of Section 394 lays down that where an order under this section provides for the transfer of any property or liabilities, then, by virtue of the order, that property shall be transferred to and vest in, and those liabilities shall be transferred to and become the liabilities of, the transferee company; and in the case of any property, if the order so directs, freed from any charge which is, by virtue of the compromise or arrangement, to cease to have effect.

Filing of certified copy of Court’s order with ROC
Sub-section (3) of Section 394 provides that within thirty days after the making of an order under this section, every company in relation to which the order is made shall cause a certified copy thereof to be filed with the Registrar of Companies for registration. If default is made in complying with this sub-section, the company, and every officer of the company who is in default, shall be punishable with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees.

Moreover, according to Sub-section (3) of Section 391 the court order shall not have effect unless a certified copy of the order has been filed with the Registrar.

Sub-section (4) of Section 391 also lays down that a copy of every such order shall be annexed to every copy of the memorandum of the company issued after the certified copy of the order has been filed as aforesaid, or in the case of a company not having a memorandum, to every copy so issued of the instrument constituting or defining the constitution of the company.

Application to Court under Section 391 for direction to hold meetings of shareholders/creditors
A compromise or arrangement is effected by and between two or more companies by entering into an arrangement, which comes within the purview of Section 391 of the Companies Act, 1956.

Section 391 (1) provides that where a compromise or arrangement is proposed -

a. Between a company and its creditors or any class of them; or

b. Between a company and its members or any class of them;

the Court may, on the application of the company or of any creditor or member of the company, or in the case of a company which is being wound up, of the liquidator, order a meeting of the creditors or class of creditors, or of the members or class of members, as the case may be, to be called, held and conducted in such manner as the Court directs.

Sanctioned Arrangement Binding on all Concerned Parties
According to Sub-section (2) of Section 391, if a majority in number representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, or class of creditors, or members, or class of members, as the case may be, present and voting, agree to any compromise or arrangement, the compromise or arrangement shall, if sanctioned by the court, be binding on all the creditors, or all the creditors of the class, all the members, or all the members of the class, as the case may be, and also on the company, or, in the case of company which is being wound up, on the liquidator and contributories of the company.

Disclosure of Material facts is a Pre-condition for Court order
The sub-section further provides that the court shall pass an order sanctioning any compromise or arrangement only when it is satisfied that the company or any other person by whom an
Court cannot proceed. This approval is to be obtained at the pendency of any investigation proceedings in relation to the company under Sections 235 to 251, and the like.

Scope of Section 391
Section 391 deals with the rights of a company to enter into a compromise or arrangement (i) between itself and its creditors or any class of them and (ii) between itself and its members or any class of them. The arrangement contemplated by the section includes a reorganisation of the share capital of a company by consolidation of its shares of different classes or by sub-division of its shares into shares of different classes or by both these methods.

Once a compromise or arrangement comes within the ambit of the section, it may be sanctioned by the court, even if it involves certain acts for which a particular procedure is specified in other sections of the Act e.g., reduction of share capital of a company may form part of a compromise or arrangement and when the court sanctions the compromise or arrangement as a whole, reduction of share capital is also sanctioned without the company following the procedure laid down in Section 100 of the Act. The court can refuse to sanction a scheme of merger or amalgamation or reconstruction if it is satisfied that the scheme involves any fraud or illegality. Once the reduction of share capital of a company is a part of a compromise or arrangement, the requirements of the Companies Act as regards reduction of share capital are not applicable because the court is empowered to sanction reduction of share capital as a part of the compromise or arrangement.

The section also applies to compromise or a management entered into by companies under winding up. Therefore, an arrangement under this section can take a company out of winding up.

Once a compromise or arrangement under this section is approved by statutory majority, it binds the dissenting minority, the company and also the liquidator, if the company is in winding up.

Allied Matters
The companies are required to obtain following approvals in respect of the scheme of amalgamation:

i. Approval of Board of Directors
- The first step in carrying out amalgamation is approval of scheme of amalgamation by the Boards of both the companies.
- Board resolution should, besides approving the scheme, authorise a Director/ Company Secretary/ other officer to make application to court, to sign it and other documents and to do everything necessary or expedient in connection therewith, including changes in the scheme.

ii. Approval of Shareholders/ Creditors
Members’ and creditors’ approval to the scheme of amalgamation is sine qua non for Court’s sanction. Without that the Court cannot proceed. This approval is to be obtained at specially convened meetings held as per court’s directions [Section 391(1)]. However, the court may dispense with meetings of members/creditors. Normally, creditors’ meetings are dispensed with subject to certain conditions. For instance, members’ meeting may be dispensed with if all members’ individual consent is obtained.

iii. Approval of Financial Institutions
The approval of the Financial Institutions, trustees to the debenture holders and banks, investment corporations would be required if the Company has borrowed funds either as term loans, working capital requirements and/ or have issued debentures to the public and have appointed any one of them as trustees to the debenture holders.

iv. Approval from the Land Holders
If the land on which the factory is situated is the lease-hold land and the terms of the lease deed so specifies, the approval from the lessor will be needed.

v. Approval of the High Court
Both the companies (amalgamating as well as amalgamated) are required to seek approval from the respective High Courts in accordance with the provisions of Sections 391-394 of the Act.

In this regard, the following points are worth noting:
An application under Sections 391 and 394 to High Court for an order convening a meeting of members and/ or creditors, is the first step to seeking Court’s sanction to amalgamation.
Every amalgamation, except those which involve sick industrial companies, requires sanction of High Court which has jurisdiction over the State/ area where the registered office of a company is situated. [Section 391].
If transferor and transferee companies are under the jurisdiction of different High Courts, separate approvals are necessary.
If both are under jurisdiction of one High Court, joint application may be made. (Mohan Exports Ltd. v. Tarun Overseas P. Ltd. (1994) 14 CLA 279 (Del) dissenting from Re Electro Carbonium P. Ltd. (1979) 49 Comp Cas 825 (Kar) wherein it was held that a joint application cannot be made.)

Determination of Cut off Date
Among others, the foremost requirement is the determination of cut off date from which all properties, movable as well as immovable and rights attached thereto etc. are required to be transferred from amalgamating company to the amalgamated company. The date may be called transfer date or appointed date and generally it is the first day of preceding financial year for which the audited accounts are available with the company. Another requirement is the determination of a date on which all the required approvals under various statutes are obtained on which the transfer and vesting of the undertaking of amalgamating company with the amalgamated company would take effect. It is common to fix an appointed date as effective date in respect of scheme of amalgamation. A scheme of amalgamation normally contains conditions to be satisfied for the scheme to become effective. It becomes, therefore, essential to consider whether or not the transfer or appointed date should be different from the effective date.
The scheme of amalgamation may provide for merger to be effective from the appointed date. But finally the scheme becomes effective only after a certified copy of the order of the High Court is filed with the concerned office of the Registrar of Companies.

The Supreme Court in Marshal Sons & Co. (India) Ltd. v. ITO (1977) 1 Comp. LJP.1 observed that “it is true that while sanctioning the scheme, it is open to the court to modify the said date and prescribe such date of amalgamation/transfer as it thinks appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the case. If the court so specified a date, there is little doubt that such date would be the date of amalgamation/date of transfer. But where the court does not prescribe any specific date but merely sanctions the scheme presented to it - as has happened in this case - it should follow that the date of amalgamation/date of transfer is the date specified in the scheme as ‘the transfer date’. It cannot be otherwise.”

Arrangements with Secured and Unsecured Creditors
It is also important to lay down clearly the arrangements with secured and unsecured creditors including the debenture holders. The Exchange Ratio, at which shareholders of amalgamating company will be offered shares in the amalgamated company, will have to be worked out based on the valuation of shares of the respective companies as per the accepted methods of valuation, guidelines and the audited accounts of the company. The value of each share of amalgamating company is fixed keeping in view the value of each share of amalgamating company to be allotted in exchange for the former shares. The Exchange Ratio must be certified by the auditor. Share exchange ratio based on financial position of both Companies on a date later than appointed date is not objectionable since date of negotiations between two Companies cannot be ignored. (ie. Sumitra Pharmaceuticals Ltd. (1997) 25 CLA 142 (AP)). When the shares of amalgamating company are held by the amalgamated company or its subsidiaries, the scheme must provide the reduction of share capital to that extent and the manner in which the compensation for shares held in the amalgamating company shall be given. The scheme should also provide for things like transfer of whole or part of the undertaking to the amalgamating company, continuation of legal proceedings against the amalgamating and amalgamated companies, absorption of employees of amalgamating company, obtaining the consent of dissenting shareholders etc.

Practice Questions
1. What are the different methods of mergers?
2. Briefly enumerate steps in mergers.
3. What are the different statutory approvals the company has to obtain for mergers to take place?
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Internal procedural aspects for merger/amalgamation

Procedural Aspects, Including Documentation for Merger/Amalgamation
The procedure commencing with an application for seeking directions of the Court for convening, holding and conducting meetings of creditors or class of creditors, members or class of members, as the case may be, to the stage of the court's order sanctioning the scheme of compromise or arrangement is contained in Sections 391 to 395 of the Companies Act, 1956 and rules 67 to 87 of the Companies (Court) Rules, 1959. The Rules also prescribe Forms for various purposes relating to compromise or arrangement:

Authority to Amalgamate, Merge, Absorb, etc.
The memorandum of association of most of the companies contain provisions in their objects clause, authorising amalgamation, merger, absorption, take-over and other similar strategies of corporate restructuring. If the memorandum of a company does not have such a provision in its objects clause, the company should alter the same.

The Procedural Aspects of Mergers and Amalgamations
Observing Memorandum of Association of Transferee Company
It has to be ensured that the objects of the Memorandum of Association of the transferee company cover the objects of the transferor company or companies; if not it will be necessary to follow the procedure for amendment of objects by passing a special resolution at an Extraordinary General Meeting convened for this purpose. It has been held by various decisions of the courts that there is no necessity to have special power in the object clause of the Memorandum of Association of a company for its amalgamation with another company. It has been laid down that to amalgamate with another company is power of the company and not an object of the company.

Since the amalgamation will involve issue of shares by the transferee company to the shareholders of the transferor companies, a general meeting convened for the purpose of the amendment of the Object Clauses of the Memorandum of Association of the transferee company to incorporate the object of the transferor company, should also cover resolutions relating to the increase of authorized capital, consequential changes in the Articles of Association and resolution under Section 81(1-A) of the Companies Act, 1956 authorizing the Directors to issue shares of the shareholders of the transferor companies without offering them to the existing shareholders of the company. It is also a normal practice that along with the special resolution for amendment of the Object Clause, special resolution is also passed under Section 149(2-A) of the Companies Act, 1956 authorizing the transferee company to commence the business of the transferor company or companies as soon as the amalgamation becomes effective.

Convening a Board Meeting
A Board Meeting is to be convened and held to consider and approve in principle, amalgamation and appoint an expert for valuation of shares to determine the share exchange ratio. Consequent upon finalisation of scheme of amalgamation, another Board Meeting is to be held to approve the scheme.

Preparation of Valuation Report
Simultaneously, Chartered Accountants are requested to prepare a Valuation. Report and the swap ratio for consideration by the Boards of both the transferor and transferee companies and if necessary it may be prudent to also obtain confirmation from merchant bankers on the valuation to be made by the Chartered Accountants.

Preparation of Scheme of Amalgamation or Merger
All the companies, which are desirous of effecting amalgamation or merger must interact through their authorised representatives who should report the result of their interaction to their respective Board of directors. The Boards of the involved companies should discuss and determine details of the proposed scheme of amalgamation or merger and prepare a draft of the scheme of amalgamation or merger. If need be they can obtain opinion of experts in the matter. The drafts of the scheme finally prepared by the Boards of both the companies should be exchanged and discussed in their respective Board meetings. After such meetings a final draft scheme will emerge. The scheme must define the “effective date” from which it shall take effect subject to the approval of the High Courts.

Contents of Amalgamation Scheme
Any model scheme of amalgamation should include the following:

Transfer Date: This is usually the first day of the financial year preceding the financial year for which audited accounts are available with the companies. In other words, this is a cut-off date from which all the movable and immovable properties including all rights, powers, privileges of every kind, nature and description of the transferor-company shall be transferred or deemed to be transferred without any further act, deed or thing to the transferee company.

Effective Date: This is the date on which the transfer and vesting of the undertaking of the transferor-company shall take effect i.e., all the requisite approvals would have been obtained.
Arrangement with secured and unsecured creditors including debenture-holders.

Arrangement with shareholders (equity and preference): This refers to the exchange ratio, which will have to be worked out based on the valuation of shares of the respective companies as per the audited accounts and accepted methods and valuation guidelines.

Cancellation of share capital/ reduction of share capital: This will be necessitated when the shares of the transferor-company(ies) are held by the transferee-company and/or its subsidiary(ies) or vice versa.

Pending receipt of the requisite approvals to the amalgamation, the transferor-company(ies) possesses the property to be transferred and to carry on the business for and on behalf and in trust for the transferee-company.

**The Scheme should suitably provide for**

1. Brief details of transferor and transferee companies.
2. Appointed date.
3. Main terms of transfer of assets and liabilities from transferor to transferee, with power to execute on behalf or for transferee, the deed/documents given to transferee.
4. Effective date of the scheme.
5. Details of consequences of the scheme coming into effect on effective date.
6. The terms of carrying on the business activities by transferor between 'appointed date' and 'effective date'.
7. Details of share capital of transferor and Transferee Company.
8. Proposed share exchange ratio, conditions attached thereto, fractional certificates to be issued to transferee company, approvals and consent required etc.
9. Conditions about payment of dividend, ranking of equity shares, prorata dividend declaration and distribution.
10. Status of employees of transferor companies and various schemes or funds created for their benefit, from the effective date.
11. Agreement between transferor and transferee companies towards making applications/petitions under Section 391 and 394 and other provisions to the respective High Courts.
12. Impact of various provisions covering income tax dues, contingencies and other accounting entries deserving attention.
13. Statement to bear costs, expenses etc. in connection with the scheme by transferee company.
14. Qualifications attached to the Scheme, requiring various approvals and sanctions etc.

**Approval of Scheme**

It would be necessary to convene a Board Meeting of both the transferor and transferee companies for approving the Scheme of Amalgamation, Explanatory Statement under Section 393 and the Valuation Report including the swap ratio.

Notice has to be given to the regional Stock Exchanges and other Stock Exchanges where shares of the Company are listed under the listing requirements at least two days before the Board Meeting is proposed to be held for purpose of approving the Amalgamation.

Immediately after the Board Meeting, the Regional Stock Exchange and all other Stock Exchanges are required to be given intimation of the decision of the Board as well the swap ratio before such information is given to the shareholders and the media.

Application to High Court seeking direction to hold meetings

Rule 67 of the Companies (Court) Rules, 1959 lays down that an application under Section 391(1) of the Companies Act, 1956 for an order seeking direction for convening meeting(s) of creditors and/or members or any class of them shall be by a Judge's summons supported by an affidavit. A copy of the proposed scheme should be annexed to the affidavit as an exhibit thereto. The summons should be moved ex parte in Form No. 33. The affidavit in support of the application should be in Form No. 34.

**Jurisdiction of High Court**

As explained earlier if the registered offices of both the companies are situated in the same State, a joint application or separate applications should be moved to the High Court having jurisdiction over the State in which registered offices of the companies are situated. However, if the registered offices of the companies involved are situated in different States, they should make separate applications to their respective High Courts.

Accordingly, an application should be made to the concerned High Court under Section 391(1) of the Companies Act, 1956 in accordance with the provisions of rule 67 of the Companies (Court) Rules, 1959, for an order directing convening of meeting(s) of creditors and/or members or any class of them, by a Judge's summons supported by an affidavit.

Normally, an application under Section 391 of the Act is made by the company, but a creditor or a member may also make the application. Although a creditor or a member or a class of creditors or a class of members may move an application under Section 391(1) of the Act, yet, such an application may not be accepted by the court because the scheme of compromise or arrangement submitted to the court along with the application will not have the approval of the Board of directors of the company or of the company in general meeting. However, the court has the discretion to give such directions as it may deem proper.

**Where the Company is not the Applicant**

Rule 68 lays down that where the company is not the applicant, a copy of the summons and of the affidavit shall be served on the company, or, where the company is being wound up on the liquidator not less than 14 days before the date fixed for the hearing of the summons.

Where an arrangement is proposed for the merger or for the amalgamation of two or more companies, the petition must pray for appropriate orders and directions under Section 394 of the Act for facilitating the reconstruction or amalgamation of the company or companies.
Obtaining order of the Court for holding Class Meeting(s)
On receiving a petition the court may order meeting(s) of the members/creditors to be called, held and conducted in such manner as the court directs. Once the ordered meetings are duly convened, held and conducted and the scheme is approved by the prescribed majority in value of the members/creditors, the court is bound to sanction the scheme.

The court looks into the fairness of the scheme before ordering a meeting because it would be no use putting before the meeting, a scheme containing illegal proposals which are not capable of being implemented. At that stage, the court may refuse to pass order for the convening of the meeting.

According to Rule 69 of the said Rules, upon hearing of the summons, or any adjourned hearing thereof, the judge shall, unless he thinks fit for any reasons to dismiss the summons, give directions as he may think necessary in respect of the following matters:

i. Determining the members/creditors whose meeting or meetings have to be held for considering the proposed scheme of merger or amalgamation;
ii. Fixing time and place for such meetings;
iii. Appointing a chairman or chairmen for the meetings;
iv. Fixing quorum and procedure to be followed at the meetings including voting by proxy;
v. Determining the values of the members/creditors, whose meetings have to be held;
vi. Notice to be given of the meetings and the advertisement of such notice; and
vii. The time within which the chairman of the meeting or chairmen of the meetings are to report to the Court the result of the meeting or meetings as the case may be.

The order made on the summons shall be in Form No. 35 of the said rules, with such variations as may be necessary. Draft Notice, Explanatory statement under Section 393 of the Companies Act, 1956 and form of proxy are required to be field and settled by the concerned High Court before they can be printed and dispatched to the shareholders.

After obtaining the court’s order containing directions to hold meeting(s) of members/creditors, the company should make arrangement for the issue of notice(s) of the meeting(s). The notice should be in Form No. 36 of the said Rules and must be sent by the person authorized by the court in this behalf. The person authorized may be the person appointed by the court as chairman of the meeting, or if the court so directs by the company or its liquidator if the company is in liquidation, or by any other person as the court may direct. The court usually appoints an advocate to be the chairman of such a meeting.

Holding Meeting(s) as per Court’s Direction
The meetings are to be held as per directions of the Court under the chairmanship of the person appointed by the Court for the purpose. Normally the Court appoints a Chairman and alternate Chairman of each meeting.

Convening of General Meeting
At the General Meeting convened by the High Court, resolution will be passed approving the scheme of amalgamation with such modification as may be proposed and agreed to at the meeting. The Extraordinary General Meeting of the company for the purpose of amendment of Object Clause (Section 17), commencement of new business [Section 149(2A)], consequent change in Articles (Section 31) and issue of shares [Section 81(1A)] can be convened on the same day either before or after conclusion of the meeting convened by the High Court for the purpose of approving the amalgamation.

Following points of difference relating to the holding and conducting of the meeting convened by the High Court may be noted:

a. Proxies are counted for the purpose of quorum;
b. Proxies are allowed to speak;
c. The vote must be put on poll [Rule 77 of the Companies (Court) Rules].

In terms of Section 391, the resolution relating to the approval of amalgamation has to be approved by a majority of members representing three-fourths in value of the creditors or class of creditors or members or class of members as the case may be present and voting either in person or by proxy. The resolution will be passed only if both the criteria namely, majority in number and three-fourth in value vote for the resolution.

The minutes of the meeting should be finalized in consultation with the Chairman of the meeting and should be signed by him once it is finalized and approved. Copies of such minutes are required to be furnished to the Stock Exchange in terms of the listing requirements.

Report by the Chairman on Meeting(s)
The Chairman or Chairman, as the case may be, are to submit their report on the meeting(s) to the Court. The report shall state accurately the number of creditors or class of creditors or the number of members or class of members, as the case may be, who were present and who voted at the meeting either in person or by proxy, their individual values and the way they voted. The report shall be in Form No. 39 [Refer Rule 78 of the said Rules]. The report shall be filed within the time fixed by the court or within 7 days of conclusion of the meeting.

Petition to Court for confirmation of Scheme
When the proposed scheme of compromise or arrangement is agreed to, with or without modifications, as provided in Section 391(2) of the Act, a petition must be made to the court for confirmation of the scheme of compromise or arrangement. The petition must be made by the company and if the company is in liquidation, by the liquidator, within seven days of the filing of the report by the chairman. The petition is required to be made in Form No. 40 of the said rules. On hearing the petition the Court shall fix the date of hearing and shall direct that a notice of the hearing shall be published in the same newspapers in which the notice of the meeting was advertised or in such other papers as the court may direct, not less than 10 days before the date fixed for hearing. (Rule 80) The Court also directs that notices of petition be sent to the concerned Regional Director, Registrar of Companies and the official liquidator.
Obtaining order of the Court sanctioning the Scheme
An order of the court on summons for directions should be obtained which will be in Form No. 41 (Refer Rule 69).

Filing of copy of Court's order with ROC
According to the provisions of Section 391(3) and Section 394(3) of the Companies Act, a certified copy of the order passed by the Court under both the sub-sections is required to be filed with the concerned Registrar of Companies. This is required to be filed with Form No. 21 as prescribed in the Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms, 1956.

Conditions precedent and subsequent to Court's order sanctioning scheme of Arrangement
The court shall not sanction a scheme of arrangement for amalgamation, merger etc. of a company which is being wound up with any other company or companies unless it has received a report from the Company Law Board (Central Govt. acting through Regional Director) or the Registrar of Companies to the effect that the affairs of the company have not been conducted in a manner prejudicial to public interest. When an order has been passed by the court for dissolution of the transferor company, the transferor company is required to deliver to the Registrar a certified copy of the order for registration within thirty days and the order takes effect from the date on which it is so delivered.

Copies of the order of High Court are required to be affixed to all copies of Memorandum and Articles of Association of the transferee company issued after certified copy has been filed as aforesaid. The transferor company or companies will continue in existence till such time the court passes an order for dissolution without winding up, prior to which it must receive a report from the official liquidator to the effect that the affairs of the company have not been conducted in a manner prejudicial to the interest of the members or to public interest. The practice in India is that in certain High Courts the Order on amalgamation is passed only after the Report of the Official Liquidator is received, whereas in certain cases the order of dissolution is passed after which amalgamation is approved by the concerned High Court.

The above sets out briefly the procedure relating to merger and amalgamation in India. It will be obvious from the foregoing that considerable amount of paper work and documents are required to be prepared during the course of the process of merger. Since the law requires approval of the shareholders both in majority in number and three-fourth in value, it has to be ensured that adequate number of shareholders, whether in person or by proxy attend the meeting so that the resolution can be passed by the requisite majority as mentioned above. Normally the time frame for such merger will depend on the opposition, if any, to the proposed merger from shareholders or creditors but in normal case it may take anything between six months to one year to complete the merger from the time the Board approves the scheme of amalgamation till the merger becomes effective on filing of the certified copies of the Court’s Order.

Reverse Merger
Reverse merger takes place when a healthy company merges into a financially weak company. However, in the context of the Companies Act, there is no distinction between a merger or a reverse merger because in either case one company merges with another company irrespective of the fact whether the merging or the amalgamating company is weaker or stronger. Reverse merger like any amalgamation or merger is carried out through the High Court route under the provisions of Sections 391 to 394 of the Companies Act, 1956. However, if one of the companies in this exercise is a sick industrial company, its merger or reverse merger

Amalgamation Of Companies By An Order Of The Central Government (Section 396)

Special Power of Central Government to Order Amalgamation
Section 396 of Companies Act, 1956 confers on the Central Government special power to order amalgamation of two or more companies into a single company, if the Government is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest that two or more companies should amalgamate.

This power is unaffected by, and can be exercised, notwithstanding anything contained in Sections 394 and 395 but subject to the provisions of Section 396. But this exclusion is only in respect of Sections 394 and 395 (including Section 392), and not any other provision of the Act.

However, in the case of amalgamation of two or more banking companies, the Central Government must consult the RBI before passing any order under Section 396 [Section 44A(7) of the Banking Regulation Act].

Manner in which Central Government should Exercise Power under Section 396
The power under Section 396 should be exercised by the Central Government only where the Government is satisfied that it is essential in the public interest that two or more companies should amalgamate.

If the Government is so satisfied, it may pass an order providing for the amalgamation of those companies into a single company.

The Central Government may exercise the power under Section 396 of its own motion without any application being received from the companies intending to amalgamate. There is no bar to the exercise of that power by the Government on such application.

The order of the Central Government under this section may provide for such constitution: such property, powers, rights, interests, authorities and privileges; and such liabilities, duties, and obligations as may be specified in the order.

The order passed by the Government must be published in the Official Gazette. The order aforesaid may also provide for the continuation by or against the transferee company or legal proceedings pending by or against any transferor company and may also contain such consequential, incidental and supplemental provisions as may, in the opinion of the Central Government, be necessary to give effect to the amalgamation.
If the Government decides to order amalgamation of companies' under this section, it must ensure that the following requirements are complied with in regard to the proposed order:

a. A copy of the proposed order has been sent in draft to each of the companies concerned;

b. The time for preferring an appeal under Sub-section (3A) has expired, or where any such appeal has been preferred, the appeal has been finally disposed off; and

c. The Central Government has considered, and made such modifications, if any, in the draft order as may seem to it desirable in the light of any suggestions and objections which may be received by it from any such company within such period as the Central Government may fix in that behalf, not being less than two months from the date on which the copy aforesaid is received by that company, or from any class of shareholders therein, or from any creditors or any class of creditors thereof. [Section 396(4)].

Copies of every order made under this section shall, as soon as may be after it has been made, be laid before both Houses of Parliament. [Section 396(5)].

**Interest and Rights of Members and Creditors**

Every member or creditor (including a debenture holder) of each of the companies before the amalgamation shall have, as nearly as may be, the same interest in or rights against the company resulting from the amalgamation as he had in the company of which he was originally a member or creditor. [Section 396(3)].

If the interest or rights of such member or creditor in or against the company resulting from the amalgamation are less than his interest in or rights against the original company, he shall be entitled to compensation which shall be assessed by such authority as may be prescribed. [Section 396(3)].

The prescribed authority for this purpose is Joint Director (Accounts), Department of Company Affairs [Rule 12A, Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms, 1956].

The assessment of compensation shall be published in the Official Gazette. [Section 396(3)].

The compensation so assessed shall be paid to the member or creditor concerned by the company resulting from the amalgamation. [Section 396(3)].

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss the rights of creditors and members in an amalgamation.
2. Discuss amalgamation of companies by central government.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
- Economic aspects of a merger/amalgamation ie benefits
- Accruing to various interest groups.

Economic Aspects of Merger and Amalgamation including Effect on the Interest of small Investors
Till some years ago, takeover of one company by another was viewed in India as a sign of failure of the former, and violent aggression of another. The acquisition was resorted to mostly for the tax benefits. There are now more economic reasons and wider choices of takeovers/mergers.

It is expected that merger/amalgamation should be quite beneficial for the shareholders of the merging and the merged company or the amalgamating and the amalgamated company, to the employees of both the companies, to the suppliers of raw materials to the companies, to the buyers of the end products of the companies, to the Government and to the society at large. Amalgamations and mergers, by virtue of pooled economic, material and manpower resources of both the companies, are expected to yield improved productivity, enhance profitability, more corporate profits, rich and consistent dividends to the shareholders and, of course, more contribution to the national exchequer in the form of various taxes, levies, imposts etc.

Main objects of an amalgamation or a merger are —
- To bring all the legal identities under one unified control and command.
- To pool the resources of all the companies so as to achieve economies of production, administrative financial and marketing management.
- To secure better credit terms from financial institutions, banks, suppliers, job workers etc.
- To cut down cost of production, management, marketing etc. by effecting savings in all spheres with the help of more qualified and competent technical and other personnel.
- To create a better image by improving the quality of its management, its products, its marketing network, its contribution towards providing employment to a larger number of managers, staff and workers;
- To invest in research and development activities and also engage best possible brains in order to ensure product development to remain in the market.
- To contribute towards national income and improvement in the quality of life of its employees, welfare of all concerned, e.g., suppliers, buyers, creditors and the society at large.
- To improve productivity and profitability in order to maintain a regular and steady dividend to the shareholders.
- To improve the image of the unified company in the stock and capital market,
- To eliminate competition by acquiring, merging or amalgamating competitors.
- To ensure regular supply of raw materials and ready market for the unified company's products.

Achievement of the foregoing objects is bound to improve the economy of the corporate sector and in turn economy of the country. The process of amalgamation/merger creates large and economically viable companies in every sector of the industry. With better management of their financial, administrative, and marketing resources, such companies can substantially reduce their costs so that they are in a better position to compete with large multinational companies which have been allowed access to the Indian markets and which are cash rich and which have the latest technology to bring out the best possible goods and services.

Economic Considerations

Synergies through Consolidation
An important economic reason for mergers and amalgamations is to realize synergies; either through cheaper production bases as in the case of Jindal Strip’s purchase of two units from Bethlehem in US, or by cost savings and pooling of resources in R&D marketing and distribution as in the case of Astra’s $36 billion mergers with Zeneca, Hoechst merger with Rhone Poulene etc.

Most M & A take place with the aim to exploit economies of scale by attaining critical mass and achieving cost savings. Research has also shown that return on capital goes up as the concentration index rises. This has been proved especially in the cases of Pharmaceuticals industries, pulping and air compressors.

Banking industry too has found global consolidation moves profitable, e.g. in case of Deutsche Bank, consolidation of its investment banking activities by acquisition of Bankers Trust paid dividends.

The fact that the size is becoming increasingly important, especially when it takes a line of capital involvement, has been one reason for the oil majors to merge and create big firms considering the bleak future facing the industry. Companies such as Shell and Exxon, with international businesses have clearly performed better than those with just domestic focus.

Many a times the merger takes place because of survival instincts and not because of synergies or because one wants to expand. The classical example of this trend is the Malaysia’s Financial industry. After 8-9 years of wonderful growth and plentiful of money, a regional economic slump fuelled by
currency devaluation had bitten deeply into its growth prospects. Mindful of banking and finance companies’ failure in Thailand and Indonesia - both of which received international financial aid - Malaysia has sought to fortify its domestic companies in a move to rejuvenate the once booming industry. Malaysian Central Bank advised its 40 odd finance companies to merge and consolidate into 5 or 6 core finance companies. Analysts said Bank Negara’s activist stance was needed to stir up the finance firms, which with their banking brethren resisted calls to merge while the good times rolled.

**Vertical Integration**
One of the common reasons for merging is to sustain growth. Growth could be achieved by increasing market share, gaining access to additional customers (as in the case of telecom and financial sector mergers). It could also result from better access to distribution and marketing through the partner. The most attractive mode for growth is by getting access to promising foreign markets. Cross-border M&As of Seiko contemplating a takeover of Allwyn watches, NIIT’s search to acquire a US company, Lafarge eyeing ACC, amounted to $342 billion in 1997. That shows that the M&A is a favoured route to establish a foothold in foreign markets; to increase market share and also to exploit other country’s resources. It could be that the acquired company is in the growth sector, and it seems attractive to the acquirer. In addition, it may be cheaper to acquire rather than to build.

AT&T - TCI and Time Warner - Turner mergers are good instances of vertical integration. Shunned by local distributors AT&T acquired cable operator TCI to link its long distance carrier lines to individual homes and business.

**Customer Demands**
The Grand Metropolitan and Guinness merger to create Diageo was to increase the number of product offerings. The more such products, the greater the ability to fight retailers with the power to either make or break a brand. In an industry where there are no ‘most stocks’ including a number of in-demand products, is the key to greater profitability. Companies can use this consumer pull to negotiate better deals with fewer retailers. Diageo now has 18 of the top 100 wine and spirits brands.

**Technology**
The inability to keep pace with technology or to graduate to a higher level of technology was the reason for the merger of Digital and Compaq, and IBM and Lotus Corporation earlier, Compaq’s hold in the lower-end products segment and Digital’s strengths in mini-computers were brought together by the merger. Similarly, with the 123 spread sheets getting outsmarted by program to succeed the IBM-Lotus Corporation merger aided that process.

**Re-fashioning**
Many companies have resorted to the merger and amalgamation route to change their business to high profile business. By acquiring Polygram from Philips, Seagram moved from the low-margin spirits business to the high-margin media segment. After operating as an engineering conglomerate for 111 years, the US-based Westinghouse Electric suddenly transformed itself into a media company. Since 1994, low profitability had forced the company to sell its distribution and control unit, electrical supplies, office furniture business, defense and electronics business, security systems, refrigeration transport and power generation businesses. On the other hand, it acquired among others CBS, Infinity Broadcasting, Nashville Networks, Country Music Television and American Radio Systems to transform itself into just CBS Corporation.

**Increase Market Share**
Profitability can be improved by increasing the market share, by offering enhanced range of products offered. There appears to be a high degree of co-relation between increased market share and increased profitability. This motive is closely aligned to the economies of skill, as increasing market share usually leads to higher level of production, thereby lowering unit costs.

The grand metropolitan Guinness merger to create size Diageo was to increase the number of product offering. Diageo now has 18 of the top 100 wine and spirits brands. In an industry where there are no “most stocks” including a number of in-demand products companies can negotiate better deals with fewer retailers and thereby increase their profitability Tax considerations.

The merging of a sick unit with a healthy unit, brings taxation advantages by allowing losses of the sick company to set off against the profits of healthy company. Also, vertical mergers i.e. with raw material suppliers or downstream units, could also reduce the incidence of sales tax and other levies. However, any merger conceived solely for the purpose of achieving tax advantages is likely to be disallowed.

**Diversification**
Merger could also be a strategy to diversify operations to increase returns or reduce risk. However, there is a school of thought which feels the diversification of companies is of no value to shareholders as they can diversify their own portfolios more cheaply.

**Practice Questions**
1. Discuss the economic considerations of a merger.
2. Discuss the effect of a merger or an amalgamation on interest of small investors.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Issues involved in strategic management of mergers
- Accounting aspects of merger/amalgamation

Strategic Management of Mergers
Any company wishing to embark upon an acquisition or merger programme needs to have clearly defined objectives and an established strategy for pursuing them. Acquisition made on a random or speculative basis are rarely likely to be successful.

Merger in the Vision and Strategy
The first step of the model is to check whether the merger fits in to the vision and strategy of both/all the parties involved.

- A typical merger is one where two (or more) parties come together and form a new entity. Neither is taking over or acquiring the other. The horizontal combination of the erstwhile Area, headquartered in Sweden, and Brown Boveri, headquartered in Switzerland, into Asea Brown Boveri (ABB), in the late 1980s is an example.
- Even where company A takes over part or whole of company B, the result is a merger.
- In either case, i.e. whether coming together, or whether there is a sale and purchase, it is desirable that the top managements of both A and B have evolved their own respective perspective visions and come to the considered conclusion that a merger is the best strategy. For A, takeover may be a useful strategy for entry into a new product, territory or segment; or a means for faster growth, in addition to internal, organic expansion; or access to resources like capacity, talent, technology, brands or funds. For B, selling out may be a good strategy to divest an unrelated business, focus on core businesses, and release resources for such concentration.

Strategic Search
Once the, in-principle, decision is made to seek a merger the next step is to institute a reasonably thorough search for the right candidate(s):

- The strategic planning cells, if any, at the Group level may be the Champion for such search. In the event of an unrelated diversification, for related diversification or expansion planning all of the concerned member company of the group may spearhead the search.
- Where necessary, discrete, confidential, external consultancy assistance may be taken.
- In addition to the proactive search, be also open to unexpected, sudden offers and opportunities; but evaluate them on the same strategic criteria.

The aim is to achieve optimal, rather than just satisfactory results. Evaluation and Choice.

A good search should have scanned and thrown up a reasonable number of alternatives. They need to be evaluated on the basis of some key criteria, so as to arrive at the final choice. The following are some of the important criteria:

- How far will the merger candidate contribute to the corporate objectives of profitability/shareholder value, growth/market share, image and long run vitality?
- To what extent will it add to the core competence and competitive edge?
- To what degree will it add to the resource base, as well as help improve the generation, mobilization and utilization of physical, financial, human, knowledge and other important tangible and intangible resources?

The Right Price
The above evaluation, hopefully, will throw up a shortlist of about three candidates. Which one is eventually chosen will depend on a combination of its merits and the price at which it can be settled.

Value to the Acquirer/Partner
The negotiations will need to start from the value of the proposition to the party taking the initiative for the transaction:

- In case it is an acquisition, the acquirer will need to forecast the possible enhanced revenue streams, profits, and earnings per share.
- The price will also be influenced by significant assets in the balance sheet as well as undervalued physical or intangible assets.
- It is also worth seeing whether the merger will improve the quality of earnings, and, hence, the price-earnings ratio and the market capitalization.

Value to the Acquiree/Partner
The eventual price will naturally, be also influenced by the value to the seller or the responding second party to the merger:

- If he is a seller, he will usually try and get the maximum price for it. He can leave it to the acquirer to worry about the strategic fit.
- If he is to be a partner in the merged entity, he will need to assess the value of staying alone, and the value of merging. The difference is an approximate measure of the value of the merger to him.
- He will also need to take into account the undervalued assets, as well as the contingent liabilities to both.

Harmonising the Exchange
The right price will need to be negotiated around these two sets of values:

- In case of a cooperative, agreed merger, it is better to arrive at a win-win valuation and share exchange, which is fair to both sets of shareholders.
The consideration for the amalgamation receivable by those shareholders holding not less than 90% of the face value of equity shares of the transferor company who agree to become equity shareholders of the transferee company is discharged by the transferee company wholly by the issue of its equity shares.

An amalgamation should be considered to be an amalgamation in the nature of purchase, when any one or more of the conditions specified above is not satisfied.

Methods of Accounting
There are two main methods of accounting for amalgamation:

a. The pooling of interests method; and
b. The purchase method.

The pooling of interest method is used in case of amalgamation in the nature of merger. The purchase method is used in accounting for amalgamations in the nature of purchase.

The Pooling of Interest Method
In preparing the transferee company's financial statements, the assets, liabilities and reserves (whether capital or revenue or arising on revaluation) of the transferee company should be recorded at their existing carrying amounts and in the same form as at the date of the amalgamation. The balance of the Profit and Loss Account of the transferee company should be aggregated with the corresponding balance of the transferee company or transferred to the General Reserve, if any.

If, at the time of the amalgamation, the transferee and the other company have conflicting accounting policies, a uniform set of accounting policies should be adopted. The difference between the amount recorded as share capital issued (plus any additional consideration in the form of cash or other assets) and the amount of share capital of the transferee company should be adjusted in reserves.

The Purchase Method
In preparing the transferee company's financial statements, the assets and liabilities of the transferee company should be incorporated at their existing carrying amounts or, alternatively, the consideration should be allocated to individual identifiable assets, and liabilities on the basis of their fair values at the date of amalgamation. The reserves (whether capital or revenue or arising on revaluation) of the transferor company, other than the statutory reserves, should not be included in the financial statements of the transferee company except as in case of statutory reserve.

Any excess of the amount of the consideration over the value of the net assets of transferor company acquired by the transferee company should be recognized in the transferee company's financial statements as goodwill arising on amalgamation. If the amount of the consideration is lower than the...
value of the net assets acquired, the difference should be treated as Capital Reserve.

The goodwill arising on amalgamation should be amortized to income on a systematic basis over its useful life. The amortization period should not exceed five years unless a somewhat longer period can be justified.

Where the requirements of the relevant statute for recording the statutory reserves in the books of the transferee company are complied with, statutory reserves of the transferor company should be recorded in the financial statements of the transferee company. The corresponding debit should be given to a suitable account head (e.g., ‘Amalgamation Adjustment Account’) which should be disclosed as a part of “miscellaneous expenditure” or other similar category in the balance sheet.

**Consideration for the Amalgamation**

The consideration for amalgamation may be in the form for securities, cash or other assets. In determining the value of the consideration, assessment is made of the fair value of its various elements.

The fair value may be determined by a number of methods for example, when the consideration includes securities, the value fixed by the statutory authorities may be taken to be the fair value. In case of other assets, the fair value may be determined by reference to the market value of the assets given up where the market value of the assets given up cannot be reliably assessed, such assets may be valued at their respective book values.

The consideration for the amalgamation should include any non-cash element at fair value. In case of issue of securities, the value fixed by the statutory authorities may be taken to be the fair value. In case of other assets, the fair value may be determined by reference to the market value of the assets given up, where the market value of the assets given up cannot be reliably assessed, such assets may be valued at their respective book values.

While the scheme of amalgamation provides for an adjustment to the consideration contingent on one or more future events, the amount of the additional payment should be included in the consideration if payment is probable and a reasonable estimate of the amount can be added. In all other cases, the adjustment should be recognized as soon as the amount is determinable (see Accounting Standard (AS-4), Contingencies and Events Occurring after the Balance Sheet Date).

**Goodwill on Amalgamation**

a. It should be appropriate to amortize goodwill over a period not exceeding five years unless a somewhat longer period can be justified.

b. The following factors are to be taken into account in estimating the useful life of goodwill:

i. The forceable life of the business or industry;

ii. The effects of product obsolescence, changes in demand and other economic factors; the service life expectations of key individuals or groups of employees;

iii. Expected actions by competitors or potential competitors; and legal, regulatory or contractual provision affecting the useful life.

**Reserves**

Expected actions by competitors or potential competitors; and legal, regulatory or contractual provision affecting the useful life. Profit and Loss Account. Where the treatment to be given to the reserves of the transferor company after its amalgamation is specified in scheme of amalgamation sanctioned under the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956 or any other statute, the same is to be followed.

**Disclosure Requirements**

a. For amalgamations of every type, the following disclosures should be made in the first financial statements following the amalgamations:

i. Names and general nature of business of the amalgamating companies;

ii. Effective date of amalgamation for accounting purposes;

iii. The method of accounting used to reflect the amalgamation; and

iv. Particulars of the scheme sanctioned under a statute.

b. In case of amalgamations accounted for under the pooling of interest method, the following additional disclosures are required to be made in the first financial statements following the amalgamation:

i. Description and number of shares issued, together with the percentage of each company’s equity shares exchanged to effect the amalgamation;

ii. The amount of any difference between the consideration and the value of net identifiable assets acquired, and the treatment thereof.

c. In case of amalgamations accounted for under the purchase method the following additional disclosures are required to be made in the first financial statements following the amalgamations:

i. Consideration for the amalgamation and a description of the consideration paid or contingently payable, and

ii. The amount of any difference between the consideration and the value of net identifiable assets required, and the treatment thereof including the period of amortization of any goodwill arising on amalgamation.

**Amalgamation after the Balance Sheet Date**

While an amalgamation is effected after the balance sheet date but before the issuance of the financial statements of either party to the amalgamation, disclosure should be made as per the provisions of AS-4, ‘Contingencies and Events Occurring after the Balance Sheet Date’, but the amalgamation should not be incorporated in that financial statement. In certain circumstances, the amalgamation may also provide additional information affecting the financial statements themselves, for instance, by allowing the going concern assumption to be maintained.

**Practice Questions**

1. Write about strategic management of mergers.

2. What are the accounting aspects involved in a merger and amalgamation?

3. State the course of the disclosure when amalgamation takes place after balance sheet date.
LESSON 20:
FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF MERGER/AMALGAMATION

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:
• Valuation aspects in a merger/amalgamation
• Different methods of valuation
• Some judicial rulings concerning valuations

Financial Aspects of Merger/Amalgamation including Valuation of Shares
In any merger or amalgamation, financial aspects of the transaction are of prime importance. It denotes the benefits in terms of financial benefits, i.e., increase in productivity, improved profitability and enhanced dividend paying capacity of the merged or the amalgamated company, which the management of each company involved in this exercise would be able to derive.

Each amalgamation or merger is aimed at the following financial aspects:

a. To pool the resources of all the companies involved in the exercise of amalgamation or merger so as to achieve economies of production, administrative, financial and marketing management.

b. To secure the required credit on terms from financial institutions, banks, suppliers, job workers etc.

c. To cut down cost of production, management, marketing etc. by effecting savings in all spheres with the combined strength of qualified and competent technical and other personnel.

d. To reinforce the united research and development activities for product development to ensure a permanent, dominant and profit making position in the industry.

e. To improve productivity and profitability in order to maintain a regular and steady dividend to the shareholders.

f. To concentrate on the core competence of the merged or the amalgamated company.

g. To consolidate the resource base and improve generation, mobilization and utilization of physical, financial, human, knowledge, information and other important tangible and intangible resources.

Valuation of Shares
Valuation of shares of each company involved in amalgamation, merger or share-for-share takeover is imperative. This is made on the basis of a number of relevant factors which affect the value of shares. Among the important factors on the basis whereof the shares of a company may be valued are —

i. Net worth of the company,  

ii. Quoted price of the shares in the stock market,  

iv. Profits made over a number of years.  

v. Dividend paid on the shares over a number of years.  

vi. Prospects of growth enhanced earning per share, etc.

Need and purpose of Valuation of Shares
In mergers and amalgamations, valuation of shares of all the companies involved in the transaction is required to be done for determining the exchange ratio of shares for the purpose of issuing shares in the merged or the amalgamated company (transferee company) to the shareholders of the merging or the amalgamating company (transferor company) in lieu of their shareholdings in the transferor company.

Factors Influencing Valuation
The valuation of shares of a company is based, inter alia, on the following factors:

i. Current stock market price of the shares,

ii. Profits earned and dividend paid over the years.

iii. Availability of reserves and future prospects of the company.

iv. Realizable value of the net assets of the company.

v. Current and deferred liabilities for the company,

vi. Age and status of plant and machinery of the company,

vii. Net worth of the company.

viii. Record of efficiency, integrity and honesty of the Board of directors and other managerial personnel of the company.

ix. Quality of top and middle management of the company and their professional competence,

x. Record of performance of the company in financial terms.

Methods of Valuation of Shares
Certain methods have come to be recognized for valuation of shares of a company, viz., (i) open market price; (ii) stock exchange quotation; (iii) net assets basis; (iv) earning per share method; (v) yield or return method; (vi) net worth method; (vii) break-up value, etc.

Ideal Valuation Method
The various methods of valuation of shares of a company as mentioned above have their individual merits and demerits. Therefore, it has been universally recognized that while valuing the shares of a company, it is advisable not to depend upon any single method but to resort to a combination of three well-recognized methods, viz, market value method, yield or return method and net assets value method, for arriving at a fair and reasonable shares exchange ration. While doing this, due weightage should be given to each method based on the company's performance and future prospects.
Valuation by Experts

Valuation of shares of a company is a technical job and should preferably be done by financial experts without taking into account the figures given in the latest balance sheets of a company, because more often than not, the corporate balance sheets disclose less and hide more. The valuation of shares of a company should be done keeping in view the above factors and with the best of judicious approach uninfluenced by extraneous factors. The productivity and profitability of the company, easy availability of raw materials and ready market for the end products of the company do affect the valuation of shares of the company. Valuation does not depend entirely on mathematical calculation. Certain intangible assets like goodwill, patent, trademark or a licence under a patent or a trade mark carry more value than some tangible assets, which must go into the valuation of the shares of a company.

Valuation of Shares in different Situations - Judicial Pronouncements

**Supreme Court in CWT v. Mehedeo Jalan**

In CWT v. Mahadeo Jalan (1972) 86 ITR 621 (SC) the Supreme Court observed:

"An examination of the various aspects of valuation of shares in a limited company would lead us to the following conclusion:

1. Where the shares in a public limited company are quoted on the stock exchange and there are dealings in them, the price prevailing on the valuation date is the value of the shares.
2. Where the shares are of a public limited company which are not quoted on a stock exchange or of a private limited company, then value is determined by reference to the dividends, if any reflecting the profit earning capacity on a reasonable commercial basis. But, where they do not, then the amount of yield on the basis will determine the value of the shares. In other words, the profits which the company has been making and should be making will ordinarily determine the value.

The dividend and earning method or yield method are not mutually exclusive: both should help in ascertaining the profit earning capacity as indicated above. If the results of the two methods differ, an intermediate figure may have to be computed by adjustment of unreasonable expenses and adopting a reasonable proportion of profits.

3. In the case of a private limited company also where the expenses are incurred out of all proportion to the commercial venture, they will be added back to the profits of the company in computing the yield. In such companies the restriction on share transfers will also be taken into consideration as earlier indicated in arriving at a valuation.

4. Where the dividend yield and earning method break down by reason of the company’s inability to earn profits and declare dividends, and if the set back is temporary, then it is perhaps possible to take the estimate of the value of the shares before set back and discount it by a percentage corresponding to the proportionate fall in the price of quoted shares of companies which have suffered similar reverses.

5. Where the company is ripe for winding up, then the break-up value method determines what would be realized by that process. In setting out the above principles, we have not tried to lay down any hard and fast rule because ultimately the facts and circumstances of each case, the nature of the business, the prospects of profitability and such other considerations will have to be taken into account as well as applicable to the facts of each case. But, one thing is clear; the market value, unless in exceptional circumstances to which we have referred, cannot be determined on the hypothesis that because in a private limited company one holder can bring into liquidation, it should be valued as on liquidation, by the break-up method.

The yield method is the generally applicable method while the break-up method is the one resorted to in exceptional circumstances or where the company is ripe for liquidation but nonetheless is one of the methods.”

Therefore, generally, in case of amalgamation, a combination of all or some of the well-accepted methods of valuation may be adopted for determining the exchange ratio of the shares of two companies.

The valuation of company shares is a highly technical matter which requires considerable knowledge, experience and expertise in the job. A ratio based on valuation of shares of both the companies done by experts, approved by majority of the shareholders of both the companies and sanctioned by court is an ideal exchange ratio.

**Supreme Court in Miheer H. Mafatlal v. Mafatlal Industries Ltd.**

The law on the subject has been well settled by the Supreme Court in Miheer H. Mafatlal v. Mafatlal Industries Ltd. (1996) 4 Comp LJ 124 (SC) where it was held that once the exchange ratio of the shares of the transferee company to be allotted to the holders of shares in the transferor company has been worked out by a recognized firm of chartered accountants who are experts in the field of valuation, and if no mistake can be pointed out in the said valuation, it is not for the court to substitute its exchange ratio, especially when the same has been accepted without demur by the overwhelming majority of the shareholders of the two companies or to say that the shareholders in their collective wisdom should not have accepted the said exchange ratio on the ground that it will be detrimental to their interest.

**Supreme Court in Hindustan Level Employees Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd.**

In Hindustan Lever Employees Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd., (1994) 4 Comp LJ 267 (SC) the Supreme Court held that it is not the part of the judicial process to examine entrepreneurial activities to ferret out flaws. The court is least equipped for such oversights, nor indeed is it a function of the judges in our constitutional scheme. It cannot be said that the internal management, business activity or institutional operation of public bodies can be subjected to inspection by the court. To do so is incompetent and improper and, therefore, out of bounds. Nevertheless, the broad parameter of fairness in administration, bona fides in action and the fundamental rules of reasonable management of public business, if breached, will become...
justicable. (The court’s obligation is to satisfy that the valuation was in accordance with the law and the same carried out by an independent body).

The Supreme Court had explained that the nature of jurisdiction by the court, while considering the question of sanctioning a scheme of arrangement or compromise, is of sentinel nature and is not of appellate nature of examine the arithmetical accuracy of scheme approved by majority of shareholders. While considering the sanction of a scheme of merger, the court is not required to ascertain with mathematical accuracy the terms and target set out in the proposed scheme. What is required to be evaluated is general fairness of the scheme.

The contention Braised was that the High Court in exercise of the sentinel nature of jurisdiction in company matters is expected to act as a guardian of interest of the companies, the members and the public, complaint was made in the appeal that the High Court had failed to exercise its jurisdiction in that way but was swayed by considerations which were neither legal nor relevant. In making this contention with great vehemence, it was pointed out that exchange ratio was not correctly determined by placing before the court comparative figures of the assets of the two companies their market value, their holdings in the market, etc: Rejecting the plea the Supreme Court said: “But what was lost sight of was that the jurisdiction of the court in sanctioning a scheme of merger is not to ascertain with mathematical accuracy if the determination satisfied the arithmetical test. A company court does not exercise an appellate jurisdiction. It exercises a jurisdiction founded on failures. It is not required to interfere only because the figure arrived at by the valuer was not as better as it would have been if another method would have been adopted. What is imperative is that such determination should not have been contrary to law and that it was unfair for the shareholders of the company which was being merged. The court’s obligation is to be satisfied that valuation was in accordance with law and it was carried out by an independent body.”

On the facts of the case the court found that the proposed scheme was approved by more than 99% of the shareholders and the grievance voiced by the objector was not shared by them. The objection was raised by the objector on the availability of same facts which were with other shareholders. The same explanatory statement at once was sent to the objector and on the basis of which he had taken inspection of all the relevant documents; the court took notice of the fact that the explanatory statement was approved by the Registrar as a relevant factor. The Supreme Court observed: “In the facts of this case, considering the overwhelming manner in which the shareholders, the creditors, the debenture holders, the financial institutions who had 41% shares in TOMCO, have supported the scheme and have not complained about any lack of notice or lack of understanding of what the scheme was about, we are of the view, it will not be right to hold that the explanatory statement was not proper or was lacking in material particulars.”

In the matter of Carron Tea Co. Ltd.

Although the question of valuation of shares and fixation of exchange ratio is a matter of commercial judgment and the court should not sit in judgment over it, yet the court cannot abdicate its duty to scrutinize the scheme with vigilance. It is not expected of the court to act as a rubber stamp simply because the statutory majority has approved the scheme and there is no opposition to it. The court is not bound to treat the scheme as a fait accompli and to accord its sanction merely upon a casual look at it. It must still scrutinize the scheme to find out whether it is a reasonable arrangement which can, by reasonable people conversant with the subject, be regarded as beneficial to those who are likely to be affected by it. Where there is no opposition, the court is not required to go deeper. However, when there is opposition, the court not only will but must go into the question and if it is not satisfied about the fairness of the valuation, it would be justified in refusing to accord sanction to the scheme as was held by the court [Carron Tea Co. Ltd. (1966) 2 Comp LJ: 278 (Cal)].

In the matter of Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Mahindra Ugine Steel Co. Ltd.

The jurisdiction of the court in inquiring into the fairness of the exchange ratio cannot be ousted by vote of majority shareholders on the ground that valuation of shares is a matter of commercial judgement - [Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Mahindra Ugine Steel Co. Ltd. (1976) 46 Comp G 227 (Gu.)]

1. The Group Company submitted the High Court Order for Adjudication under the Bombay Stamp Act, to the Collector of Stamps, Pune with details of lands and buildings owned by the Transferor Company.

2. The Collector thereafter adjudicated the necessary stamp duty as Rs. 17, 04, 612.00 at 7% on determining the true market value of the immovable property at Rs. 2,43,51,600.00. The same was paid and the Order was registered with the Sub-Registrar of Assurances where the lands and buildings are located.

Practice Questions

1. Explain methods of valuation of shares in a merger or amalgamation.

2. What factors need to be considered before valuing a merger or acquisition?

3. Briefly explain expert valuation method of mergers or acquisitions.
LESSON 21:
TAXATION ASPECTS

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
- Tax benefits accruing out of mergers and amalgamations
- Human aspect issues involved in a merger/amalgamation
- Effective human relation management in a merger/takeover

Taxation Aspects of Mergers and Amalgamations

Meaning of Amalgamation
The word 'amalgamation' or 'merger' is not defined anywhere in the Companies Act, 1956. However Section 2(1 B) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 defines 'amalgamation' as follows:

"Amalgamation" in relation to companies, means the merger of one or more companies with another company or the merger of two or more companies to form one company (the company or companies which so merge being referred to as amalgamating company or companies and the company with which they merge or which is formed as result of the merger, as the amalgamated company), in such a manner that

i. All the property of the amalgamating company or companies immediately before the amalgamation becomes the property of the amalgamated company by virtue of the amalgamation;

ii. All the liabilities of the amalgamating company or companies immediately before the amalgamation become the liabilities of the amalgamated company by virtue of the amalgamation;

Shareholders holding not less than three-fourth in value of the shares in the amalgamating company or companies (other than shares already held therein immediately before the amalgamation by or by a nominee for, the amalgamated company or its subsidiary) become shareholders of the amalgamated company by virtue of the amalgamation, otherwise than as a result of the acquisition of the property of one company by another company pursuant to the purchase of such property by the other company or as a result of the distribution of such property to the other company after the winding up of the first mentioned company.

Thus, for a merger to qualify as an 'amalgamation' for the purpose of the Income Tax Act, the above three conditions have to be satisfied.

Carry Forward and Setoff of Accumulated Loss and Unabsorbed Depreciation
Under Section 72A, a special provision is made which relaxes the provisions relating to carrying forward and set-off of accumulated business loss and unabsorbed depreciation allowance in certain cases of amalgamation. Where there has been an amalgamation of a company owning an industrial undertaking or a ship with another company, then, notwithstanding anything contained in any other provision of the Act, the accumulated loss and the unabsorbed depreciation of the amalgamating company shall be deemed to be the loss or, as the case may be, allowance for depreciation of the amalgamated company for the previous year in which the amalgamation was effected, and other provisions of this Act relating to set-off and carry forward of loss and allowance for depreciation shall apply accordingly.

It is to be noted that as unabsorbed losses of the amalgamating company are deemed to be the losses for the previous year in which the amalgamation was effected, the amalgamated company will have right to carry forward the loss for a period of eight assessment years immediately succeeding the assessment year relevant to the previous year in which the amalgamation was effected.

However, the above relaxations shall not be allowed in the assessment of the amalgamated company unless the amalgamated company:

i. Holds continuously for a minimum period of five years from the date of amalgamation at least three-fourths in the book value of fixed assets of amalgamating company acquired in a scheme of amalgamation.

ii. Continues the business of the amalgamating company for a minimum period of five years from the date of amalgamation.

iii. Fulfills such other conditions as may be prescribed to ensure the revival of the business of the amalgamating company or to ensure that the amalgamation is for genuine business purpose.

It further provides that in case where any of the above conditions are not complied with, the set off of loss or allowance of depreciation made in any previous year in the hands of the amalgamated company shall be deemed to be the income of amalgamated company chargeable to tax for the year in which such conditions are not complied with.

For the purposes of these provisions "accumulated loss" means so much of the loss of the amalgamating company under the head "Profits and gains of business or profession" (not being a loss sustained in a speculation business) which amalgamating company would have been entitled to carry forward and set off under these provisions if the amalgamation had not taken place. Similarly, "unabsorbed depreciation" means so much of the allowance for depreciation of the amalgamating company which remains to be allowed and which would have been allowed to the amalgamating company under the provisions of this Act, if the amalgamation had not taken place.
Capital Gains Tax
Capital gains tax is leviable if there arises capital gain due to transfer of capital assets. The word ‘transfer’ under Section 2(47) of the Act includes the sale, exchange or relinquishment of the asset or the extinguishment of any right therein or the compulsory acquisition there of under any law. Under Section 47(vi) and (vii), transfer does not include any transfer in a scheme of amalgamation of a capital asset by the amalgamating company to the amalgamated company if the latter is an Indian company. From the assessment year 1993-94 any transfer of shares in an Indian company held by a foreign company to another foreign company in pursuance of a scheme of amalgamation between the two foreign companies will not be regarded as ‘transfer’ for the purpose of levying tax on capital gains. This provision will apply only if at least twenty five percent of the shareholders of the amalgamating foreign company continue to remain shareholders of the amalgamated foreign company and such transfer does not attract tax on capital gains in the country in which the amalgamating company is incorporated.

Further, the term transfer also does not include any transfer by a shareholder in a scheme of amalgamation of a capital asset being a share or shares held by him in the amalgamating company if the transfer is made in consideration of the allotment to him of any share or shares in the amalgamated company and the amalgamated company is an Indian company. Even in the absence of Section 47(vii) of the Act, a shareholder is not liable to pay any capital gains tax since an amalgamation does not include exchange or relinquishment of the assets. Amalgamation does not involve an exchange or relinquishment of shares by amalgamating company as held in CIT v. Rasik Lai Manek Lai (1975)95 ITR 656). However, no benefit will be available under Section 47(vii) if the shareholders of amalgamating company are allotted something more than share in the amalgamated company viz. Bonds or debentures (CIT v. Gautam Sarabhai Trust (1988) 173 ITR 216 (Guj.)).

Amortisation of Preliminary Expenses
The benefit of amortisation of preliminary expenses under Section 35D are ordinarily available only to the assessee who incurred the expenditure. However, the benefit will not be lost in case of the undertaking of an Indian company which is entitled to amortization is transferred to another Indian company in a scheme of amalgamation within 10 years / 5 years period of amortization. In that event the deduction in respect of previous year in which the amalgamation takes place and the following previous year within the 10 years / 5 years period will be allowed to the amalgamated company and not to the amalgamating company.

Capital Expenditure on Scientific Research
In the case of an amalgamation, if the amalgamating company transfers to the amalgamated company, which is an Indian company, any asset representing capital expenditure on scientific research, provisions of Section 35 would apply to the amalgamated company as they would have applied to amalgamating company if the latter had not transferred the asset.
The noun ‘slump’ means ‘a gross amount, a lump’. Similarly, ‘slump sum’ means a ‘lump sum’ (Chambers Twentieth Century Dictionary, 1983 Edn., p 1220). A slump sale transaction would, therefore, mean a sale or a transaction which has a lump sum price for consideration.

**Sale in the Course of Winding up**

On the other hand a sale in the course of winding up, is nothing but a realisation sale aimed at collecting the maximum price for distributing to the creditors and the balance to the contributories (the shareholders). By the very nature of the transaction, this is a piece meal sale and not a slump sale. In this case, there will be liability to tax as per the provisions of the Income-tax Act. Slump sale as defined under Section 2(42C) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 means the transfer of one or more undertakings as a result of the sale for a lump sum consideration without values being assigned to the individual assets and liabilities in such sales. In other words, it is a sale where the assessee transfers one or more undertaking(s) as a whole including all the assets and liabilities as a going concern. The consideration is fixed for the whole undertaking and received by the transferor. It is not fixed for each of the asset of the undertaking. The assessee may also transfer a division instead of the undertaking as a whole by way of such sale. Thus it may be noted that the undertaking as a whole or the division transferred shall be a capital asset.

**Tax Aspects for a Slump Sale**

Normally, any sale of a capital asset will give rise to a capital receipt and any profit derived may give rise to capital gains in certain cases. This is true in the case of sale of an undertaking also.

In Doughty v. Commissioner of Taxes, the Privy Council laid down the following principles: The sale of a whole concern engaged in production process, e.g. dairy farming or sheep rearing, does not give rise to a revenue profit. The same might be said of a manufacturing business which is sold with the lease holds and plant, even if there are added to the sale piece goods in stock and even if these piece goods form a very substantial part of the aggregate sold. Where, however, business consists entirely in buying and selling, it is difficult to distinguish for income tax purpose between an ordinary and realization sale, the object in either case being to dispose of the goods at a profit. The fact that the stock is sold out in one sale does not render the profit obtained any different in kind from the profit obtained by a series of gradual and smaller sales. In the case of such a realization sale, if there is an item which can be traced as representing the stock-in-trade, though it is in conjunction with the sale of the whole concern and a transfer of all the assets for a single unapportioned consideration, there cannot be said to be any revenue profit realised on the sale of the stock-in-trade which is sold with all the other assets, although the business of the concern may consist entirely in buying and selling.

The Supreme Court, based on the above decision held in the following two cases that the price received on the sale of industrial undertaking is a capital receipt.

**CIT v. West Coast Chemicals and Industries Ltd. - 46 ITR 135**

Where a slump price is paid and no portion is attributable to the stock-in-trade, it may not be possible to say that there is a profit other than what results from the appreciation of capital. The essence of the matter, however, is not that an extra amount has been gained by the selling out or the exchange but whether it can fairly be said that there was trading or a trading, from which alone profit can arise in business.

**CIT v. Mugneeran Banerji and Co. - 57 ITR 299**

In the case of a concern carrying on the business of buying land, developing it and then selling it, it is easy to distinguish a realisation sale from an ordinary sale, and it is very difficult to attribute part of the slump price to the cost of land sold in the realization sale. The mere fact that in the schedule the price of land was stated does not lead to the conclusion that part of the slump price is necessarily attributable to the land sold.

The same view was also reiterated by the Gujarat High Court in the following cases:

1. **Sarabhai M. Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. v. P.M. Mittal, Competent Authority — 126 ITR 1.**

2. **Artex Manufacturing Co. v. CIT- 131 ITR 559.**

At the same time, the Gujarat High Court also recognised that when an undertaking as a whole is sold as a going concern there will be liability under the head Capital Gains, In 126 ITR 1 the Gujarat High Court stated as follows:

It is well settled that business is property and the undertaking of a business is a capital asset of the owner of the undertaking. When an undertaking as a whole is transferred as a going concern together with its goodwill and all other assets, what is sold is not the individual itemised property but what is sold is the capital asset consisting of the business of the undertaking and any tax that can be attracted to such a transaction for a slump price at book value would be merely capital gains tax and nothing else but capital gains tax. Plant or machinery of any fixture or furniture is not being sold as such. What is sold is the business of undertaking for a slump price. It the capital assets, namely, the business of the undertaking, has a greater value than its original cost of acquisition, then, capital gains may be attracted in the ordinary case of a sale of an undertaking.

The Bombay High court also recognised that there will be a capital gains tax when a sale of business as a whole occurs (Refer Killic Nixon and Co. v. CIT 49 ITR 244).

**Transfer of shares by shareholders of amalgamated company**

The term “transfer” has been defined in Section 2 (47) of the Income-tax Act, 1961. The given definition is not exhaustive but inclusive. It hints at sale, exchange, relinquishment of any transfer by a shareholder, in a scheme of amalgamation of a capital asset being a share or shares held by him in the amalgamating company, if—

a. The transfer is made in consideration of the allotment to him of any share or shares in the amalgamated company, and
The amalgamated company is an Indian company. No exchange or relinquishment involved

It has been held in C/7v. Rasiklal Manektal (HUF) (1989) 177 ITR 198 (SC) that in the event of amalgamation of companies, transfer of shares by the shareholders of the amalgamating company and allotment of shares in their names by the amalgamated company does not involve “exchange” or “relinquishment”.

**The Human Aspects of Mergers and Amalgamations**

The merger is a period of great uncertainty for the employees of the merging organisations. The uncertainty relates to job security and status within the company leading to fear and hence low morale among the employees. It is natural for employees to fear the loss of their revenue or change in their status within the company after a merger since many of these employees literally invest their whole lives in their jobs. Hence the possibility of a change in their position is likely to be viewed with fear and resentment. The possibility of change in compensation and benefits also creates a feeling of insecurity and unease. The influx of new employees into the organization can create a sense of invasion at times and ultimately leads to resentment.

Further, the general chaos which follows any merger results in disorientation amongst employees due to ill defined role and responsibilities. This further leads to frustrations resulting into poor performance and low productivity since strategic and financial advantage is generally a motive for any merger. Top executives very often fail to give attention to the human aspects of mergers by neglecting to manage the partnership in human terms. By failing to give attention to the problems faced by their employees, they fail to fully develop their companies’ collaborative advantage.

The successful merger demands that strategic planners are sensitive to the human issues of the organisations. For the purpose, following checks have to be made constantly to ensure that:

- Sensitive areas of the company are pinpointed and personnel in these sections carefully monitored.
- Serious efforts are made to retain key people.
- S replacement policy is ready to cope with inevitable personnel loss.
- Records are kept of everyone who leaves, when, why and to where.
- Employees are informed of what is going on, even bad news is systematically delivered. Uncertainly is more dangerous than the clear, logical presentation of unpleasant facts.
- Training department is fully geared to provide short, medium and long term training strategy for both production and managerial staff.
- Likely union reaction be assessed in advance.
- Estimate cost of redundancy payments, early pensions and the like assets.
- Comprehensive policies and procedures be maintained for employees related issues such as office procedures, new reporting, compensation, recruitment and selection, performance, termination, disciplinary action etc.
- New policies to be clearly communicated to the employees especially employees at the level of managers, supervisors and line manager to be briefed about the new responsibilities of those reporting to them.
- Family gatherings and picnics be organized for the employees and their families of merging companies during the transition period to allow the employees get off their inhibitions and breed familiarity.

The classic examples of effective human resource management is the acquisition of Wellcome group by Glaxo.

Wellcome and Glaxo were profoundly different companies, both structurally as well as culturally. Wellcome was more of an academic culture and Glaxo more of a commercial, business driven culture. Everything was different between the companies, from finance to information technology, the structure of sales representatives to legal side. Less diplomatic Glaxo staff saw Wellcome as an over-centralised organisation with employees who were unrealistic in their expectations for the business’s financial success. Academia-like penny-pitching officials had saddled Wellcome with out-of-date information technology.

Wellcome staff, in contrast, saw Glaxo as overly commercial mercenaries assaulting their worthy enterprise and driven by cash. They argued, in its enthusiasm for the latest high-tech research gadgetry. The Glaxo officials refused to study tropical diseases, where sufferers could not afford western prices.

To try to combat such sentiments, management declared that both old companies were history and decreed that a new company was to be built in its place. But, the most difficult aspect of merger was to lay off staff both on account of closing down of certain manufacturing units as well as to cut down on excess costs. To overcome the difficulties, management offered a very lucrative package. The solution was expensive but unavoidable, given that Glaxo management was trying not to give the impression that it was steamrolling Wellcome.

In France, the company established an organization called Competence Plus, comprising employees who had been made redundant. They were guaranteed up to 15 months on full salary and given training courses on everything from “networking” to new skills. They were also the first to be interviewed for any vacancies that arose within the new group during that period. Employees hired by other companies for trial periods had their salaries paid by Glaxo-Wellcome. For those who remained, there were improvements too. Glaxo staff worked a 39-hour week, whereas Wellcome did 37 hours. Now Glaxo-Wellcome people work 37 hours. “We were concerned not to make mistakes in the social sphere,” said Mangeot, the Chairman of Glaxo-Wellcome, France.

**Practice Questions**

1. Discuss taxation aspects relating to mergers and acquisitions with respect to
   a. Preliminary expenses
   b. Carry forward and set off of Accumulated Loss and Unabsorbed Depreciation

2. Write about human aspects of mergers and amalgamations.
LESSON 22:
FUNDING THE MERGER PROCESS

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- How to fund a merger

Funding of Mergers
Growth is essential for sustaining the viability, dynamism and value enhancing capability of a company. A company can expand and/or diversify its markets internally or externally. If it cannot grow internally due to lack of physical and managerial resources, it can grow externally by mergers and acquisitions in a convenient and inexpensive manner. However, mergers and acquisitions involve cost and can be an expensive mode if the company pays an excessive price for merger. It should be borne in mind that benefits should exceed the cost of acquisition. It is necessary that price may be carefully determined and negotiated so that merger enhances the value of shareholders. The benefits of a merger can be defined as the difference between (i) the total present value of the merged firms and (ii) the sum of their values if they do not merge. If V represents the present value, and A and B as two firms willing to continue to form a new company:

Benefit = \( AV = V_{AB} - V_A - V_B \)

Cost may be defined as the difference between the amount paid for the acquired firm and the amount it is worth as a separate entity. If B’s owners receive cash for their shares then:

Cost = Cash - \( V_B \).

If the merger is financed by cash, attempt should be made so that

\[ \text{Benefit} - \text{Cost} = AV - (\text{Cash} - V_B) > 0. \]

If there is no merger, aggregate value of their shares is \( V_A \) for firm A. If merger goes through, their position is \( V_B - \text{Cash} \). Net gain is given by:

Net gain = \( V_B - \text{Cash} - V_A \).

= \( AV + V_A + V_B - \text{Cash} - V_A - AV - (\text{Cash} - V_B) \)

Cost however will depend on how a merger is funded or financed.
LESSON 23:
PROCESS OF FUNDING

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Different modes and methods available for funding a merger/takeover
- Leveraged and management buyouts

Funding of merger or takeover involves payment of consideration money to the acquirer for acquiring the undertaking, assets and controlling voting power of shareholders as per valuation done and exchange ratio arrived at. Form of payment may be selected out of any of the modes available such as cash payment, issue of equity shares, mix of equity and cash, debt or loan stock, preference shares, convertible securities, junk bonds etc. Care should be taken to ensure that the financial package chosen should suit the financial structures of both the acquirer and acquiree companies, and it should also provide a desirable gearing level and prove economical to acquirer.

Mergers and takeovers may be funded by a company (i) out of its own funds, comprising paid up equity and preference share capital, for which shareholders are issued equity and preference shares or (ii) out of borrowed funds, which may be raised by issuing various financial instruments. A company may borrow funds through the issue of debentures, bonds, deposits from its directors, their relatives, business associates, shareholders and from public in the form of fixed deposits, external commercial borrowings, hybrids, loans from Central or State financial institutions, banks, rehabilitation finance provided to sick industrial companies under the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, etc.

Well-managed companies make sufficient profits and retain them in the form of free reserves, and as and when their Boards propose any form of restructuring, they are financed from reserves, i.e. internal accruals.

Where their own funds are found to be inadequate for funding of mergers, takeovers, etc. they may seek financial assistance from financial institutions and banks depending upon the quantum and urgency of their requirements. They may issue further equity or preference shares, debentures, or may raise public deposits or even resort to external commercial borrowings etc. Some companies raise funds through private placement of their shares, debentures and other loan instruments.

Although adequate foreign investments are flowing into the country yet most companies in India depend on domestic credit for their financial requirements.

Ordinarily, a cash rich company may use its surplus funds in different ways. Companies are now increasingly using their surplus funds also for taking over the control of other companies, often in the same line of business, to widen their product range and to increase market share.

Funding through Equity Share Capital
Equity share capital can be considered the permanent capital of a company. Normally it is always available unless the company goes into liquidation or till any time before that stage, the Board resolves for capital restructuring. Moreover, equity needs no servicing as a company is not required to pay to its equity shareholders any fixed amount of return in the form of interest etc. When the profits of a company permit, the Board at its discretion, may resolve to pay them a suitable amount as dividend, after approval by the shareholders. Therefore, equity capital is the best suited source of funding a merger or a takeover.

Merger provides additional assets in the form of plant, machinery, buildings and other infrastructure for additional and diversified industrial production. In this case, equity instrument plays a dominant role as the assets of the merging companies are taken over by the merged company and in return the merged company issues its equity to the shareholders of the merging companies.

Also, a merger needs no deployment of additional funds, either from internal accruals or from outside agencies, like the financial institutions, banks etc. Therefore, no additional interest burden is involved. The additional equity which is issued to the shareholders of the merging companies needs no servicing.

At times acquirer’s shareholders are also interested in obtaining payments in equity shares rather than cash due to tax liability immediately devolving upon them in the eventuality of receipt of cash consideration, whereas in case of equity, capital gains tax is deferred till the time of realisation of shares in cash. The only disadvantage to the shareholders of the merged company is the resultant temporary dilution in earnings per share (EPS) due to the issuance of additional shares.

In the normal life of a company, equity capital is costlier than the borrowed capital, because interest on borrowed capital is a charge on the profits of the company whereas dividend on equity shares is paid out of the net profits of the company.

Funding through Preference Share Capital
Another source of funding a merger or a takeover may be through the issue of preference shares, but unlike equity capital, preference share capital involves the payment of fixed preference dividend or a fixed rate of dividend. Therefore, before deciding to raise funds for this purpose, by issue of preference shares, the Board of directors of a company has to make sure that the merged company or the target company would be able to yield sufficient profits for discharging the liability in respect of payment of preference dividend.
Preferential Share Capital
According to Section 85 of the Companies Act, 1956, preference shares represent that part of the share capital of a company, which fulfils both the following requirements, namely:
a. That as respects dividends, it carries or will carry a preferential right to be paid, a fixed amount or an amount calculated at a fixed rate, which may be either free of or subject to income-tax; and
b. That as respects capital, it carries or will carry, on a winding-up or repayment of capital, a preferential right to be repaid the amount of the capital paid-up or deemed to have been paid-up, whether or not there is a preferential right to the payment of either or both of the following amounts, namely:
i. Any money remaining unpaid, in respect of the amounts specified in clause (a), up to the date of the winding-up or repayment of capital; and
ii. Any fixed premium or premium on any fixed scale, specified in the memorandum or articles of the company.

Burden of Preference Dividend
A company funding its merger or takeover proposal through the issue of preference shares is required to pay dividend to the preference shareholders. Therefore, a company has to take into consideration the preference dividend burden, which the profits of the company should be able to service.

Buy-back of Shares
Buy-back is generally resorted to by companies, which have more funds than their present and near future requirements and in the prevailing cash market they cannot deploy those surplus funds in other gainful activities. Therefore, they resort to buy-back. After the buy-back of shares by a company, availability of its shares in the market gets reduced and the balance available stock of shares commands more price and respect. It also suits promoters of the company as their stake in the company increases in proportion to the bought back shares.
Buy back of shares is also used as a takeover defence.

Companies Empowered to Buy-back
Section 77A of the Companies Act, 1956, provides that notwithstanding anything contained in that Act, but subject to the provisions of Sub-section (2) of the Section and Section 77B, a company may purchase its own shares or other specified securities out of:
its free reserves; or
the securities premium account; or
the proceeds of any shares or other specified securities. However, no buy-back of any kind of shares of other specified securities can be made out of the proceeds of an earlier issue of the same kind of shares or other specified securities [Refer Sub-section (1)].

Conditions for Buy-back
According to Sub-section (2) of Section 77A no company can purchase its own shares or other specified securities under Sub-section (1) unless:
a. Such a buy-back is authorised by its articles;
b. A special resolution has been passed in general meeting of the company authorising the buy-back;

However, where the buy-back is or less than ten per cent of the total paid up equity capital and free reserves of the company, then such buy-back can be authorised by the Board by means of a resolution passed at its meeting. No offer of buy-back should be made within a period of 365 days from the date of the preceding offer of buy-back.
c. The buy-back is or less than twenty-five per cent of the total paid-up capital and free reserves of the company. Provided that the buy-back of equity shares in any financial year should not exceed twenty-five percent of its total paid equity capital in that financial year.
d. The ratio of the debt owed by the company is not more than twice the capital and free reserves after such buy-back. However, the Central Government can prescribe a higher ratio of the debt than that specified under this clause for a class or classes of companies.
e. All the shares or other specified securities for buy-back are fully paid-up.
f. The buy-back of shares or other specified securities listed on any recognized stock exchange is in accordance with the regulations made by the Securities and Exchange Board of India in this behalf.
g. The buy-back in respect of shares or other specified securities other than those specified in clause (f) is in accordance with the guidelines as may be prescribed.

Hybrids
The term “hybrid” does not find a mention anywhere in the Companies Act or the rules and regulations framed thereunder. It is also not a term used in business, trade and industry. The dictionary meaning of the term “hybrid” is “anything derived from heterogeneous sources or composed of elements of different or incongruous kinds.”

In the context of funding of mergers and takeovers through various types of financial instruments, viz., equity share capital, preference shares capital, debentures, bonds, external commercial borrowings, global depository receipts, employees’ stock option scheme, sweat equity, non-voting shares or shares with differential voting rights, take over finance, derivative contracts, etc., the expression “hybrid” means a combination of financial instruments which may enable a company to raise funds for financing a merger or takeover.

Therefore, depending on the nature of transaction and the convenience of shareholders, a company may fund its programme of merger or takeover by resorting to issuing a variety of financial instruments in order to collect sufficient finance for successfully implementing its proposal.

Funding through Employees Stock Option Scheme
The share capital that may be raised through a scheme of employees’ stock option can only be a fraction of the entire issue. Hence no company can imagine of funding any scheme of merger or takeover entirely through this route. Merits and demerits of funding of merger or takeover through the equity
Employees' stock option scheme is a voluntary scheme on the part of the company to encourage its employees to have a higher participation in the company. Stock option is the right (but not an obligation) granted to an employee in pursuance of a scheme, to apply for the shares of the company at a predetermined price. Suitable percentage of reservation can be made by a company for its employees or for the employees of the promoter company or by the promoter company for employees of its subsidiaries, as the need may arise. Equitable distribution of shares among the employees will contribute to the smooth working of the scheme.

Only Bona fide Employees eligible for Shares under this Scheme

The offer of shares to the employees on preferential basis has been misused by some companies by allotting shares to non-employees or in the joint names of employees and non-employees. The companies have, therefore, been advised to ensure that the shares reserved under the employees' quota be allotted only to the bona fide employees, subject to the SEBI guidelines issued in this regard and the shares remaining unsubscribed by the employees may be offered to the general public through prospectus in terms of the issue, if any [Press release dated 30.1.1996]. The option granted to any employee is not transferable to any person.

SEBI Guidelines

The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has issued the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Employee Stock Option Scheme and Employee Stock Purchase Scheme) Guidelines, 1999, which are applicable to companies whose shares are listed on any recognized stock exchange in India. As per the guidelines, no employee stock option scheme (ESOS) shall be offered unless the company constitutes a compensation committee for administration and supervision of the ESOS. The Compensation Committee has to be a committee of the Board of Directors consisting of a majority of independent directors.

The lock in period and rights of the option holder are as specified in the guidelines. The Board of Directors have to inter alia, disclose either in the Directors’ Report or in the annexure to the Directors’ Report, the details of the ESOS, as specified in the regulations. As a safeguard the regulations provide that no ESOS can be offered to the employees of a company unless shareholders of the company approve the ESOS by passing a special resolution in a general meeting.

Issue of Sweat Equity Shares

A company whose shares are listed on a recognized stock exchange can also issue sweat equity shares in accordance with the provisions of Section 79A of the Companies Act, 1956 and the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Issue of Sweat Equity) Regulations, 2002 which were notified on 24th September 2002.

These regulations are not applicable to an unlisted company. However, an unlisted company coming out with an initial public offering and seeking listing of its securities on the stock exchange, pursuant to issue of sweat equity shares, is required to comply with the SEBI (Disclosure and Investor Protection) Guidelines, 2000. The Sweat Equity Shares are subject to a lock in for a period of three years from the date of allotment.

Funding through External Commercial borrowings

External Commercial Borrowings are regulated by the ECB Guidelines issued by the External Commercial Borrowings Division, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India as modified from time to time. External Commercial Borrowings (ECB) are defined to include commercial bank loans, buyers' credit, suppliers' credit, securitized instruments such as Floating Rate Notes and Fixed Rate Bonds, etc., credit from official export credit agencies and commercial borrowings from the private sector window of Multilateral Financial Institutions such as International Finance Corporation (Washington) ADB, AFIC, CDC, etc.

ECBs are permitted by the Government as a source of finance for Indian corporates for expansion of existing capacity as well as for fresh investment. The policy seeks to keep an annual cap or ceiling on access to ECB, consistent with prudent debt management. The policy also seeks to give greater priority for projects in the infrastructure and core sectors, such as power, oil exploration, tele-communication, railways, roads and : bridges, ports, industrial parks and urban infrastructure etc. and the export sector. Development financial institutions, through their sublending against the ECB approvals are also expected to give priority to the needs of medium and small scale units.

Applicants are free to raise ECB from any internationally recognised source such as banks, export credit agencies, suppliers of equipment, foreign collaborators, foreign equity-holders, international capital markets etc. Offers from unrecognised sources are not entertained. Similarly, trusts/non-profit making organisation are ineligible to raise ECBs.

Average Maturities for ECB

ECBs have the various minimum average maturities for raising different amount of external commercial borrowings. The average maturity of ECBs for the purpose of ECB guidelines is the weighted average of all disbursements taking each disbursement individually and its period of retention by the borrower.

Adr/Gdr

A Depository Receipt is a negotiable certificate that usually represents a company's publicly traded equity or debt. Depositary Receipts are created when a broker purchases the company's shares on the home stock market and delivers those shares to the Depository's local custodian bank, who then instructs the depository bank, to issue Depositary Receipts.

Global Depository Receipt (GDR)

A GDR is a dollar denominated instrument tradeable on a stock exchange in Europe or U.S.A. The concept of GDR, original to the developed countries, now has gained popularity even in developing countries like India.
They were originally designed as instruments to enable investors in USA to trade in securities that were not listed in the Stock Exchanges in USA. The major benefit that accrues to an investor from GDR is the collection of issue proceeds in foreign currency which may be utilized for meeting foreign exchange component of project cost, repayment of foreign currency loans, meeting commitments overseas and similar purposes.

The other benefits accruing to an investor from GDR issue are firstly, that investor does not have to bear any exchange risk as a GDR is denominated in US dollar with equity shares comprised in each GDR denominated in Rupees. Secondly, investor reserves the right to exercise his option to convert the GDR and hold the equity shares instead.

It facilitates raising of funds of market related prices of minimum cost as compared to a domestic issue and permits raising of further equity on a future date for funding of projects like expansion or diversification through mergers and takeovers etc. It also helps to expand investor base with multiple risk preferences, improves marketability of the issue, and enhances prestige of the company and credibility with international investors.

**American Depository Receipts (ADRs)**

An ADR is a negotiate certificate that represents a non-US company’s publicly traded shares or debt. ADR’s trade freely like any other US security as they are priced and quoted in US dollars. They can be traded on either an exchange or over the counter market and settle according to US standards. ADR’s can also trade in markets outside US and can be used to raise capital in US or in markets outside US.

ADRs are a tradeable instrument, equivalent to a fixed number of shares, which is floated on overseas markets. ADR issues can be made at four levels depending on the preference of the company. The norms for each level differ and the based on the specific criteria to be satisfied by the issuer. The features of ADRs are as follows:

1. This instrument permits the foreign investor to access non-US market investment thereby ‘insulating’ him from exchange risk as and ADR denominated in dollars and dividends are also paid in dollars.

2. ADRs are listed on the New York Stock Exchange or Over the Counter Exchange in the USA. ADR’s attract a much wider investor base than the GDRs, since pensions funds and individual investors are permitted to invest in them.

3. The size of the ADR issue can be expanded or contracted according mand as depository banks can, issue or withdraw corresponding shares in the local market. GDR is a one time issue and can be contracted in size only if investors decide to redeem.

4. ADR issue is more expensive than a GDR issue as the spread for the underwriter on an ADR issue is 7-8 per cent as compared to

5. 5-6 percent for a GDR issue.

6. ADR issue requires drawing up the accounting statements in accordance with the stringent requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission and US GAAP.

**Utilisation of proceeds of GDR issue**

Vide Press Note dated 11.5.1994 issued by Ministry of Finance, it was stipulated that GDR issues would be permitted only for the following end-use to be incurred within one year from the date of issue.

1. Financing capital goods imports.

2. Financing domestic purchase/installation of plant, equipment and buildings.

3. Prepayment or scheduled repayment of earlier external borrowing.

4. Making investments abroad where these have been approved by competent authorities.

5. A margin of 15 per cent of the total proceeds of an issue for the other general corporate restructuring uses.

Companies would be required to submit quarterly statements of utilisation of funds duly certified by their auditors. The issuer companies would be required mandatorily to retain the Euro issue proceeds abroad to be repatriated as and when expenditure for the approved end uses (including 15% earmarked for general corporate restructuring purposes) are incurred.

ADRs and GDR’s are identical from a legal, operational, technical and administrative standpoint.

**Funding through Financial Institutions and Banks**

Funding of a merger or takeover with the help of loans from financial institutions, banks etc. has its own merits and demerits. The advantage in this method of funding is that the period of such funds is definite which is fixed at the time of taking such loans. Therefore, the Board of the company is assured about continued availability of such funds for the predetermined period. On the negative side, the interest burden on such loans, which is quite high in India, must be kept in mind by the Board while deciding to use borrowed funds from financial institution. Such funding should be thought of and resorted to only when the Board is sure that the merged company or the target company will, as per plan, give adequate returns to service such loans, i.e., timely payment of periodical interest on such loans and re-payment of the loans at the end of the term for which such loans have been taken.

However, in the developed markets, funding of merger or takeover is not a critical issue. There are various sources of finance available to an acquirer. In the Indian market, it was not easy to obtain takeover finance from financial institutions and banks because they are not forthcoming to finance securities business. Takeover involves greater risk. There is no other organized sector to provide finance for takeover by a company.

In the context of lack of institutional funding for takeovers, the reconvened Justice P.N. Bhagwati Committee on takeovers in its reports of May 2002 has recommended that banks/financial institutions should be encouraged to consider financing takeovers. The committee has suggested that SEBI could take up the matter with the Reserve Bank of India for facilitating such funding.

Merger as a corporate strategy is now finding favour with corporates in India as a form of corporate restructuring. There
have been many instances of this form of corporate restructuring. Merger of the Shipping Credit and Investment Corporation of India (SCICI) with its parent corporation, the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India Ltd. (ICICI) is one such instance.

Encouraged with the success of the experiment, certain financial institutions and banks have decided to fund takeovers and mergers; in the initial stages. Funding may be only of those companies, where the element of risk is negligible. Funding of mergers and takeovers will assure the funding institutions safe deployment of their funds in attractive, profitable and non-risky ventures.

**Funding through Rehabilitation Finance**

Rehabilitation finance is not available for mergers and takeovers by healthy companies. Merger or takeover may be provided for in a scheme of rehabilitation under the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985. Under the Act, rehabilitation finance may also be provided for in a rehabilitation scheme prepared by an operating agency on the direction of the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR) in the case of a sick industrial company, which is regulated by the Sick Industrial Companies (special Provisions) Act, 1985.

The Act provides for the reference’ to the BIFR in respect of a sick industrial company conduct of inquiry by BIFR, nomination of an operating agency for determination of measures necessary for rehabilitation of the sick company, preparation of a rehabilitation scheme, which may provide, inter alia, for

i. Rehabilitation finance for the sick company;

ii. Merger of the sick company with a healthy company or merger of a healthy company with the sick company;

iii. Takeover of the sick company by a healthy company;

iv. Such other preventive, ameliorative and remedial measures as may be appropriate.

The scheme is prepared by the operating agency, and after the same is sanctioned it becomes operative and binding on all the concerned parties including the sick company and the other companies amalgamating or merging or the amalgamated or the merged companies. These mergers normally rank in category of leveraged buyouts i.e. takeover affected with high degree of borrowing as the financial package approved by BIFR for rehabilitation of sick unit acquired by healthy unit involves further borrowings from financial institutions and banks by acquirer company.

**Leveraged and Management buyouts**

There are various options available for the revival of a ‘sick company. One is buyout of such a company by its employees. This option has distinct advantages over Government intervention and other conventional remedies. Buyout by employees provides a strong incentive to the employees in the form of personal stake in the company. The employees become the owners of the company by virtue of the shares that are issued and allotted to them. Moreover, continuity of job is the greatest motivating force which keeps them on their toes to ensure that the buyout succeeds. Such a buyout saves mass unemployment and unrest among the working class. Relations between the worker management and the employees are expected to be cordial without any break, strike or other such disturbing developments. Hence chances of success are more. However, such a buyout can be successful only if necessary financial support is extended by the Government or the financial institutions and banks.

In Navnit R. Kamaniv. R.R. Kamani, two schemes of rehabilitation came before the BIFR for consideration and approval. One of the schemes was presented by a shareholder holding 24% shares in the company and the other scheme was submitted by the workmen’s union of the company. When the two schemes were viewed in juxta-position, there was no doubt that the scheme presented by the applicant shareholder appeared in a rather poor light. The BIFR sanctioned the scheme which was presented by the workers’ union because, in the opinion of the BIFR, that scheme was more suited for the revival of the company.

The matter went to the Supreme Court. Turning to the merits of the scheme presented by the workers and sanctioned by BIFR, it was considered to be feasible and economically viable by experts. It envisaged the management by a Board of directors consisting of fully qualified experts and representatives of banks, Government and of the employees. The scheme had the full backing of the nationalised banks and the encouragement from the Central and State Governments which had made commitments for granting tax concessions. The backing and the concessions were forthcoming essentially because it was a scheme framed by the employees who themselves were making tremendous wage-sacrifice and trying to salvage the company which has been almost wrecked by others.

The above decision of the Supreme Court brought about a significant change in workers’ attitude towards their own role in the revival and rehabilitation of sick industrial companies, a change from collective bargainers to collective performers. However, in the case before the Supreme Court, the facts were quite favourable for the workers of the company. Though the workers can, through collective effort, achieve the objective of reviving sick industrial units, their own stakes being no less, yet they need all the help and encouragement from the Government, financial institutions and banks for sustained efforts for revival and rehabilitation. Change in attitude of workers’ unions in such an endeavour is all the more important.

Leveraged Buyout (LBO) is defined as the acquisition by a small group of investors, financed largely by borrowing. This acquisition may be either of all stock or assets, of a hitherto public company. The buying group forms a shell company to act as the legal entity making the acquisition. This buying group may enter into stock purchase deal or asset purchase deal. Under the stock purchase device the shareholders sell their stock in the target company to the buying group and then the two firms may be merged. Under the asset purchase mode, the target company sells its assets to the buying group. This exercise aims at generating enormous increases in the market value and value gains for shareholders both who own the firm before the restructuring and after the restructuring.
The leveraged buyouts differ from the ordinary acquisitions in two main ways: firstly, a large fraction of purchase price is debt financed through junk bonds and secondly, the shares of LBOs are not traded on open markets. In a typical LBO programme, the acquiring group consists of a small number of persons/organisations/ sponsored by buy out specialists, etc. This group, with the help of certain financial instruments like high yield high risk debt instruments, private placement instruments, bridge financing etc. acquire all or nearly all of the outstanding shares of the target "firm. An attractive candidate for acquisition through leveraged buyout should possess three basic attributes:

1. It must have a good position in industry with sound profit history
2. The firm should have a relatively low level of debt and high level of 'bankable' assets
3. It must have stable and predictable cash flows and adequate working capital.

The buyout group may or may not include current management of the target firm. If the group does so, the buyout may be regarded as 'management buyout' or MBO. In other words, when the managers buy their company from its owners deploying debt, leveraged buyout is called management buyout.

A Management Buyout (MBO) is simply a transaction through which the incumbent management buyouts all or most of the other shareholders. The management may take on partners, it may borrow funds or it can organize the entire restructuring, on its own. An MBO begins with arrangement/raising of finance. Thereafter, an offer to purchase all or nearly all of the shares of a company not presently held by the management has to be made which may necessitate a public offer and even delisting. Consequently, upon this, restructuring may be affected and once targets have been achieved, then the company can go public again.

**Funding through Public Deposits**

A company may fund its proposal for a merger or a takeover through term deposits. Deposits, like loans from financial institutions, banks etc. or like the debentures carry interest burden at the agreed rate. Therefore, the Board of directors of the company proposing to adopt this route must make sure that the merged company or the target company would give adequate returns, as projected, for timely and regular payment of interest on deposits and timely re-payment of the principal amount of the deposits raised for the purpose.

**Funding through Debentures**

**Issue of Debentures**

A company may meet the cost of its proposed scheme of merger or takeover by issuing debentures. This route involves a burden of interest, which the company would be required to pay to the depositors in quarterly, six-monthly or annual instalments according to the terms and conditions of issue. The Board must resort to this route of funding if it is confident that after the proposed merger, the merged company would be able to meet its commitment of timely payment of interest and repayment of the principal amount of the debentures on redemption. If the company takes over another company, the Board of directors must be quite sure that the target company would be able to give adequate returns for the payment of interest and for redemption of the debentures on maturity. If the company is proposed to be merged with the acquirer company, then the merged company should be able to service the debentures as above.

**Practice Questions**

1. Write about funding through
   a. Equity Share Capital
   b. ADR/GDR
   c. Employees Stock Options
   d. External borrowings
2. Write note on leveraged and management buyouts.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight is to:

- Valuation of an enterprise which is subject to merger/takeover
- Factors that influence valuation
- Motives behind valuation

Introduction
Valuation is a device to assess the worth of the enterprise which is subject to merger or takeover so that the consideration amount can be quantified and price of one enterprise for the other can be fixed. Such valuation helps in determining the value of shares of the acquired and acquiring company to safeguard the interest of the shareholders of both the companies.

The share of any member in a company is a movable property and can be transferred in the manner provided in the articles. A share represents a bundle of rights like right to elect directors, to vote on resolutions of the company, share in the surplus, if any, on liquidation etc.

Valuation of shares in an amalgamation or takeover is made on a consideration of a number of relevant factors, such as stock exchange prices of the shares of the two companies, the dividends paid on the shares, relevant growth prospects of the companies, values of the net assets and even factors which are not evident from the face of the balance sheet like quality and integrity of the management, present and prospective competition, yield on comparable securities, market sentiments etc. Valuation has to be tempered by the exercise of judicious discretion and judgment as it is a very crucial and complicated issue.

Need and Purpose
There are a number of situations which trigger the need to know the value of a business strategic partnerships, merger or acquisition of a business, employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs), joint ventures, etc. From the perspective of a valuer, a business owner, or an interested financial party, a valuation provides a useful base to establish a price for a business or to help increase a company’s value and attract capital.

The necessity for valuation of shares arises inter alia, in the following circumstances:

i. Assessments under the Wealth Tax Act;
ii. Purchase of a ‘block of shares’, which may or may not give the holder thereof a controlling interest in the company;
iii. Formulation of schemes of amalgamation, etc.;
(iv) Acquisition of interest of dissenting shareholders under a scheme of reconstruction;
v. Conversion of shares;
vi. Advancing a loan on the security of shares.

For transactions involving a relatively small number of shares, which are quoted on the stock exchange, normally the price prevailing on the stock exchange is accepted. However, valuation by experts is called for when the parties involved in the transaction/deal/scheme, etc. fail to arrive at a mutually acceptable value or the agreements or Articles of Association, etc., provide for valuation by experts.

The valuation by a valuer becomes necessary when:

i. Shares are unquoted;
ii. Shares relate to private limited companies;
iii. Courts so direct;
iv. Articles of Association so provide;
v. Relevant agreements so provide;
vi. Statute so requires.

Valuation can serve many purposes to establish a price, to help increase value, to attract capital and to meet governmental requirements.

The significance of valuation is however, different in different areas. Valuation is necessary for the decision making by shareholders to sell their interest in the company in the form of shares. Self evaluation may be done by the company being merged with another but it must be satisfied with the value of the shares, it's shareholders should get in the form of shares of the merging company for effecting merger. Such satisfaction is necessary to weigh the over-valuation of shares of acquirer and/or under valuation of shares of the acquired or vice-versa.

Therefore, to enable shareholders of both the companies, to take decision in favour of amalgamation; valuation of shares is needed and once they are satisfied and have approved it with requisite majority, the court approves the same while sanctioning their scheme of amalgamation, because it is the interest of shareholders which will suffer in the event of wrong valuation.

The value of a firm can be directly related to the decisions it makes on which project it undertakes, on how it finances them and on its dividend policy. Understanding this relationship is the key to making value-increasing decisions and sensible financial restructuring.

Valuation is the central focus in fundamental analysis. The underlying theme in fundamental analysis is that the true value of the firm can be related to its financial characteristics its growth prospects, risk profile and cash flows. A deviation from this value is a sign that a stock is under or over valued.

**Valuation plays a Significant part in Acquisitions**

Valuation of the target in an acquisition is an important part of the process of determining the consideration to be offered to the target shareholders. The value that the bidder places on the target sets the maximum or ‘walk away’ price that the bidder can...
afford to offer the target shareholders. The value of the target from the bidders point of view is the sum of the pre-bid stand alone value of the target. On the other hand, target companies may be unduly optimistic in estimating value, especially in hostile takeovers, as their attempt is to convince the shareholders that the offer price is too low.

Valuation of shares also depends on who the buyer is. A low-profile company can extract high price if a big company like Microsoft eyes the new profile company as a takeover proposition.

Factors Influencing Valuation
Many factors have to be assessed to determine fair valuation for an industry, a sector, or a company. The key to valuation is finding a common ground between all of the companies for the purpose of a fair evaluation.

Determining the value of a business is a complicated and intricate process. Valuing a business requires the determination of its future earnings potential, the risks inherent in those future earnings. Strictly speaking, a company's fair market value is the price at which the business would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller when neither are under any compulsion to buy or sell, and both parties have knowledge of relevant facts.

The question that then arises is “How do buyers and sellers arrive at this value?”

Arriving at the transaction price requires that a value be placed on the company for sale. The process of arriving at this value should include a detailed, comprehensive analysis which takes into account a range of factors including the past, present, and most importantly, the future earnings and prospects of the company, an analysis of its mix of physical and intangible assets, and the general economic and industry conditions.

The other salient factors include:
1. The stock exchange price of the shares of the two companies before the commencement of negotiations or the announcement of the bid.
2. Dividends paid on the shares.
3. Relative growth prospects of the two companies.
4. In case of equity shares, the relative gearing of the shares of the two companies. (‘gearing’ means ratio of the amount of Issued preference share capital and debenture stock to the amount of issued ordinary share capital.)
5. Net assets of the two companies.
6. Voting strength in the merged (amalgamated) enterprise of the shareholders of the two companies.
7. Past history of the prices of shares of the two companies.

Also the following key principles should be kept in mind:
1. There is no method of valuation which is absolutely correct. Hence a combination of all or some may be adopted.
2. If possible, the seller should evaluate his company before contacting potential buyers. Infact, it would be wiser for companies to evaluate their business on regular basis to keep themselves aware of its standing in the corresponding industry.

3. Go for a third party valuation if desirable to avoid over valuation of the company which is a common tendency on the seller’s part.
4. Merger and amalgamation deals can take a number of months to complete during which time valuations can fluctuate substantially. Hence provisions must be made to protect against such swings.

Valuation/Acquisition Motives
An important aspect in the merger/amalgamation/takeover activity is the valuation aspect. The valuation of business, however, depends to a great extent on the acquisition motives. The acquisition activity is usually guided by strategic behavioural motives. The strategic reasons could be either purely financial (taxation, asset-stripping, financial restructuring involving an attempt to augment the resources base and portfolio-investment) or business related (expansion or diversification). The behavioural reasons have more to do with the personnel ambitions or objectives (desire to grow big) of the top management. The expansion and diversification objectives are achievable either by building capacities on one’s own or by buying the existing capacities. This would effectively mean a “make (build) or buy decision” of capital nature. The decision criteria in such a situation would be the present value of the differential cash flows. These differential cash flows would, therefore, be the limit on the premium which the acquirer would be willing to pay. On the other hand, if the acquisition is motivated by financial considerations (specifically taxation and asset-stripping), the expected financial gains would form the limit on the premium, over and above the price of physical assets in the company. The cashflow from operations may not be the main consideration in such situations. Similarly, a merger with financial restructuring as its objective will have to be valued mainly in terms of financial gains. It would, however, not be easy to determine the level of financial gains because the financial gains would be a function of the use of which these resources are put. Finally, the pricing of behaviorally motivated acquisitions is not really guided by the financial considerations. Since the acquisitions are not really the market driven transactions, a set of non-financial considerations will also affect the price. The price could be affected by the number and the motives of other bidders. The value of a target is effected not only by the motive of the acquiring company, but also by the target company’s own objectives. The motives of the target company could also be viewed as to be strategic, financial or behavioural.

Valuation of Private Companies
While the principles of valuation of private companies are the same as for public companies, an important difference is that for private company targets we do not have the benchmark valuation provided by the stock market. And also that a public company is often widely researched by investment analysts, information about the private target may be sparse. Forecasting the future cash flows is thus a more difficult exercise. Offseting this disadvantage is the fact that private company bids are almost always friendly, with easier access to the target’s management information.
Valuation of Listed Companies
Shares of listed companies, which are traded, are quoted on the stock exchange and are freely available. These shares can be sold or bought at the stock exchanges. The market price of the shares reflects their value.

However, there cannot be complete reliance on the market value of shares because of two short comings viz. firstly, at times, correct information about a company is not available to the investors, and, secondly, due to insider trading, there are distortions, which are reflected in the market price of shares.

Valuation of unlisted Companies
The P/E ratio cannot be calculated in the case of unlisted companies, as the market price of the shares is not available. Hence, a representative P/E ratio of a group of comparable quoted companies can be taken after suitable adjustments.

Generally, for private limited companies or small companies, which are not quoted and are closely held, a discount is applied for valuation to the prevalent P/E ratio of comparable listed company.

The other factors to be taken into consideration while following earning approach to valuation of an unlisted company are:

1. Company analysis: shareholding pattern, voting powers, rights and obligations of shareholders in addition to other data.
2. Industry analysis: whether it is high or low growth industry, natureindustry and influence on it of seasonal, volatile or cyclical business fluctuations, major competitors and their market share, etc.

Methods of Valuation
The cardinal rule of commercial valuation is, that the value of something cannot be stated in an abstract form; all that can be stated is the value of a thing in a particular place, at a particular time, in particular circumstances.

Valuation of the target requires valuation of the totality of the incremental cash flows and earnings.

Valuation of a target is based on expectations of both the magnitude and the timing of realisation of the anticipated benefits. Where, these benefits are difficult to forecast, the valuation of the target is not precise. This exposes the bidder to valuation risk. The degree of this risk depends on the quality of information available to the bidder, which, in turn, depends upon whether the target is a private or a public company, whether the bid is hostile or friendly, the time spent in preparing the bid and the pre-acquisition audit of the target.

There are four main value concepts namely:

- owner value
- market value
- tax value and
- fair value.

Owner value determines the price in negotiated deals and is often led by a proprietor’s view of value if he were deprived of the property.

The basis of market value is the assumption that if comparable property has fetched a certain price, then the subject property will realize a price something near to it.

The fair value concept in essence, is the desire to be equitable to both parties. It recognizes that the transaction is not in the open market and that vendor and purchaser have been brought together in a legally binding manner.

Tax valuation has been the subject of case law since the turn of the century.

There are concepts of value that impinge upon each of these main areas; namely, investment value, liquidation value, and going concern value.

I. Valuation based on Assets
This valuation method is based on the simple assumption that adding the value of all the assets of the company and subtracting the liabilities, leaving a net asset valuation, can best determine the value of a business. However, for the purposes of the amalgamation the amount of the consideration for the acquisition of a business may be arrived at either by valuing its individual assets and goodwill or by valuing the business as a whole by reference to its earning capacity. If this method is employed, the fixed assets of all the amalgamating companies should preferably be valued by the same professional value on a going concern basis. The term ‘going concern’ means that a business is being operated at not less than normal or reasonable profit and value will assume that the business is earning reasonable profits when appraising the assets. If it is found when all the assets of the business, both fixed and current, have been valued that the profits represent more than a fair commercial return upon the capital employed in the business as shown by such valuation the capitalized value of the excess (or super profits) will be the value of the goodwill, which must be added to the values of the other assets in arriving at the consideration to be paid for the business.

However, although a balance sheet usually gives an accurate indication of short-term assets and liabilities, this is not the case of long-term ones as they may be hidden by techniques such as “off balance sheet financing”. Moreover, a balance sheet is a historical record of previous expenditure and existing liabilities. As a valuation is a forward looking exercise, acquisition purchase prices generally do not bear any relation to published balance sheet. Nevertheless a company’s net book value is still taken into account as net book values have a tendency to become minimum prices and the greater the proportion of purchase price is represented by tangible assets, the less risky it’s acquisition is perceived to be.

Valuation of a listed and quoted company has to be done on a different footing as compared to an unlisted company. The real
value of the assets may or may not reflect the market price of the shares; however, in unlisted companies, only the information relating to the profitability of the company as reflected in the accounts is available and there is no indication of the market price. Using existing public companies as a benchmark to value similar private companies is a viable valuation methodology.

The comparable public company method involves selecting a group of publicly traded companies that, on average, are representative of the company that is to be valued. Each comparable company’s financial or operating data (like revenues, EBITDA or book value) is compared to each company’s total market capitalization to obtain a valuation multiple. An average of these multiples is then applied to get company value.

An asset-based valuation can be further separated into four approaches: Book value.

The tangible book value of a company is obtained from the balance sheet by taking the adjusted historical cost of the company’s assets and subtracting the liabilities; intangible assets (like goodwill) are excluded in the calculation. Statutes like the Gift Tax Act, Wealth Tax Act, etc., have in fact adopted book value method for valuation of unquoted equity shares for companies other than an investment company. Book value of assets does help the valuer in determining the useful employment of such assets and their state of efficiency. In turn, this leads the valuer to the determination of rehabilitation requirements with reference to current replacement values.

In all cases of valuation on assets basis, except book value basis, it is important to arrive at current replacement and realization value. It is more so in case of assets like patents, trademarks, know-how, etc. which may possess value, substantially more or less than those shown in the books.

Using book value does not provide a true indication of a company’s value, nor does it take into account the cash flow that can be generated by the company’s assets.

**2. Replacement Cost**

Replacement cost reflects the expenditures required to replicate the operations of the company. Estimating replacement cost is essentially a make or buy decision.

**3. Appraised Value**

The difference between the appraised value of assets, and the appraised value of liabilities is the net appraised value of the firm.

This approach is most commonly used in a liquidation analysis because it reflects the divestiture of the underlying assets rather than the ongoing operations of the firm.

**4. Excess Earnings**

In order to obtain a value of the business using the excess earnings method, a premium is added to the appraised value of net assets. This premium is calculated by comparing the earnings of a business before a sale and the earnings after the sale, with the difference referred to as excess earnings.

In this approach, it is assumed that the business is run more efficiently after a sale; the total amount of excess earnings is capitalized (e.g., the difference in earnings is divided by some expected rate of return) and this result is then added to the appraised value of net assets to derive the value of the business.

**II. Open Market Valuation**

Open market value refers to a price of the assets of the company which could be fetched or realized by negotiating sale provided there is a willing seller, property is freely exposed to market, sale could materialize within a reasonable period, orders will remain static throughout this period and without interruption from any purchaser giving an extraordinarily higher bid. Each asset of the company is normally valued on the basis of liquidation as resale item rather than on a going-concern basis. The assets of the company, which are not subject to regular sale, could be assessed on depreciated or replacement cost. Besides, intangible assets like goodwill are also assessed as per normal practices and recognized conventions.

**III. Valuation based on Earnings**

The normal purpose of the contemplated purchase is to provide for the buyer the annuity for his outlay. He will expect yearly income, return great or small, stable or fluctuating but nevertheless some return which is commensurate with the price paid therefore. Valuation based on earnings based on the rate of return on capital employed is a more modern method being adopted. From the last earnings declared by a company, items such as tax, preference dividend, if any, are deducted and net earnings are taken.

An alternate to this method is the use of the price-earning (P/E) ratio instead of the rate of return. The P/E ratio of a listed company can be calculated by dividing the current price of the share by earnings per share (EPS). Therefore, the reciprocal of P/E ratio is called earnings – price ratio or earning yield.

Thus P/E = \( \frac{P}{\text{EPS}} \)  

Where P is the current price of the shares. The share price can thus be determined as

\[ P = \text{EPS} \times \text{P/E ratio} \]

**Merger Negotiations:**

**Significance P/E ratio and Eps Analysis**

In practice, investors attach a lot of importance to the earnings per share (EPS) and the price-earnings (P/E) ratio. The product of EPS and P/E ratio is the market price per share.

**Exchange Ratio**

The current market values of the acquiring and the acquired firms may be taken as the basis for exchange of shares. The share exchange ratio (SER) is given as follows:

\[ \text{Share Exchange Ratio} = \frac{\text{Share price of the acquired firm}}{\text{Share price of the acquiring firm}} \]

\[ \text{SER} = \frac{P_a}{P_s} \]

The exchange ratio in terms of the market value of shares will keep the position of the shareholders in value terms unchanged after the merger since their proportionate wealth would remain at the pre-merger level. There is no incentive for the sharehold-
ers of the acquired firm, and they would require a premium to be paid by the acquiring company. Could the acquiring company pay a premium and be better off in terms of the additional value of its shareholders? In the absence of net economic gain, the shareholders of the acquiring company would become worse-off unless the price-earnings ratio of the acquiring company remains the same as before the merger. For the shareholders of the acquiring firm to be better off after the merger without any net economic gain either the price-earnings ratio will have to increase sufficiently higher or the share exchange ratio is low, the price-earnings ratio remaining the same. Let us consider the example in Illustration given below:

**Illustration:** Enterprise is considering the acquisition of Enterprise. The following are the financial data of two companies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shyama, Enterprise</th>
<th>Rama Enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profit after tax (Rs.)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rs.) Market value per share (Rs.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-merger number of shares</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total market capitalization (Rs.)</td>
<td>1,20,000</td>
<td>1,20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shyama Enterprise is thinking of acquiring Rama Enterprises through exchange of shares in proportion of the market value per share. If the price-earnings ratio is expected to be (a) pre-merger P/E ratio of Rama i.e. 7.5 (b) pre-merger P/E ratio of Shyama i.e. 15, (c) weighted average of pre-merger P/E ratio of Shyama and Rama i.e. 13.75, what would be the impact on the wealth of shareholders after merger?

**Solution:**
Since the basis of exchange of shares is the market value per share of the acquiring (Shyama Enterprise) and the acquired (Rama Enterprises) firms, then Shyama would offer 0.25 of its shares to the shareholders of Rama:

\[ P_a = \frac{30}{120} = 0.25 \]

In terms of the market value per share of the combined firm after the merger, the position of Rama's shareholders would remain the same; that is, their per share value would be: 120 x .25 = Rs. 30. The total number of shares offered by Shyama (the acquiring firm) to Rama's (the acquired firm) shareholders would be:

No. of shares exchanged = SER x Pre-merger number of shares of the acquired firm.

\[ = (P_a / P_a) N_a = 0.25 \times 8000 = 2000 \]

and the total number of shares after the merger would be: Nb + (SER) Nm = 20,000 + 2,000 = 22,000. The combined earnings (PAT) after the merger would be: Rs. 80,000 + Rs. 16,000 = 96,000 and EPS after the merger would be:

Post-merger combined EPS = \[
\frac{\text{Post - merger combined PAT}}{\text{Post - merger combined shares}} \] = \[
\frac{\text{PAT} + \text{PAT}_a}{\text{N} + (\text{SER}) \text{Nm}} \]

\[ = \frac{80,000 + 16,000}{80,000 + 16,000} \]

The earnings per share of Shyama (the acquiring firm) increased from Rs.4 to Rs.4.36, but for Rama's (the acquired firm) shareholders it declined from Rs. 2 to Rs.4.36x.25 = Rs.1.09. Given the earnings per share after the merger, the post-merger market value per share would depend on the price-earnings ratio of the combined firm. How would P/E ratio affect the wealth of shareholders of the individual companies after the merger? The shareholders of both the acquiring and the acquired firms neither gain nor lose in value terms if post-merger P/E ratio is merely a weighted average of pre-merger P/E ratios of the individual firms. The post-merger weighted P/E ratio is calculated as follows:

**Post-merger Weighted P/E ratio**

\[ P/E_w = (P/E_a \times \text{PAT}_a / \text{PAT}) + (P/E_b \times \text{PAT} / \text{PAT}_b) \] (4)

Using Equation (4) in our example we obtain:

\[ 30 \times (80,000/96,000) + (15) (16,000/96,000) = 25 + 2.5 =27.5 \]

The acquiring company would lose in value if post-merger P/E ratio is less than the weighted P/E ratio. Any P/E ratio above the weighted P/E ratio would benefit both the acquiring as well as the acquired firms in value terms. An acquiring firm would always be able to improve its earnings per share after the merger whenever it acquires a company with a P/E ratio lower than its own P/E ratio. The higher EPS need not necessarily increase the share price. It is the quality of EPS rather than the quantity which would influence the price.

An acquiring firm would lose in value if its post-merger P/E ratio is less than the weighted P/E ratio. Shyama Enterprise would lose Rs.27.30 value per share if P/E ratio after merger was 15. Any P/E ratio above the weighted P/E ratio would benefit both the acquiring as well as the acquired firm in value terms. When the post-merger P/E ratio is 30, Shyama gains Rs.5.40 value per share and Rama Rs.1.35.

Why does Shyama Enterprise's EPS increase after merger? Because it has a current P/E ratio of 30, and it is required to exchange a lower P/E ratio, i.e.

\[ \frac{P/E \text{ exchanged}}{\text{EPS}_a} = \frac{\text{SER} \times P_a}{\text{EPS}_b} \]

\[ = \frac{25 \times 120}{15} = 15 \]

Shyama Enterprise's EPS after merger would be exactly equal to its pre-merger EPS if P/E ratio paid is equal to its pre-merger P/E ratio of 30. In that case, given Rama's EPS of Rs.2, the price paid would be Rs.60 or a share exchange ratio of .5. Thus Shyama Enterprise would issue .5 x 8,000 = 4,000 shares to Rama Enterprise. The acquiring firm's EPS after merger would be: Rs.96,000/24,000 = Rs.4. It may be noticed that at this P/E ratio, Shyama's shareholders would have the same EPS as before
the merger: .5 x Rs.4 = Rs.2. It can be shown that if the acquiring firm takes over another firm by exchanging a P/E ratio higher than its P/E ratio, its EPS will fall and that of the acquired firm would increase after the merger.

The limitation of this methods is that it is based on past performance whereas for a fair valuation, a reliable estimate of future earnings is necessary.

In view of this, discounted cash flow (DCF) is often a preferred tool to value businesses. What sets this approach apart from other approaches is that it is based on projected, future operating results rather than on historical operating results. As a result, companies can be valued based on their future cash flows, which may be somewhat different from historical results.

Practice Questions
1. When does valuation becomes a necessity.
2. What are the factors which influences valuation of a business?
3. Write about valuation of private companies.
**Lesson 25: DCF Method**

**Objective**
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
- DCF method of valuation
- Valuation by a team of experts

**Discounted Cash Flows**
Discounted cash flow analysis consists of projecting future cash flows, deriving a discount rate and applying this discount rate to the future cash flows and terminal value. This detailed analysis depends on accurate financial projections and discount rate assumptions. The resulting company valuation is the sum of discounted future cash flows and the discounted terminal value.

The first step in conducting a discounted cash flow analysis is to project future operating cash flows over projected holding periods. These projections are generally done before debt (but after taxes) to obtain an accurate indication of future free cash flow, without making any assumptions about the company’s leverage. The future free cash flow is the cash left over after operating the business and investing in necessary property, plant and equipment, but before servicing debt or paying out any cash to owners.

The second step in the discounted cash flow analysis is to develop a discount rate. The discount rate is also referred to as the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) and is best thought of as a percentage, which represents the return, expected by an owner of the company commensurate with the risk associated with the investment.

Thus, a company with little in the way of a demonstrated track record, would receive a higher discount rate than a company with a long history of growth and profitability and more obvious future prospects. Discount rates are generally calculated by deriving the company’s cost of equity capital and the company’s after-tax cost of debt. These financing costs are weighted and result in a WACC percentage, or discount rate.

The cost of equity capital is generally determined using the capital asset pricing model (CAPM), which is based on three inputs:
1. the risk free rate (the expected return on long term government bonds).
2. the beta, which is a measure of the relative riskiness of the company and
3. the equity risk premium (the expected rate of return on common stocks in the long run)

The derived discount rate is applied to the projected future cash flows to determine the present value of the future cash flows. The next step involves calculating a terminal, or residual value. A terminal value calculation combines assumptions used to derive future projections and the discount rate to obtain a current value for a company’s long-term future cash flows. The assumption underlying this step is that a company is a going concern and that its value is imbedded in its ability to generate value not just today, but also in the future. A terminal value is calculated by determining the cash flow in the period beyond the last projected period. This predicted future cash flow is then capitalized by a percentage (represented by the company’s discount rate less the predicted long term growth rate) and this capitalized figure is then discounted back to the present using the discount rate.

Together with an analysis of the company’s operating history, business, industry and competitive environment, the results from one or more of these valuation methodologies are combined to form the basis of a comprehensive business valuation.

To be accurate, this comprehensive business valuation should take into account all aspects of the company’s business, including factors which may be difficult to value and that do not show up on financial statements.

**Valuation based on super Profits**
This approach is based on the concept of the company as a going concern. The value of the net tangible assets is taken into consideration and it is assumed that the business, if sold, will in addition to the net asset value, fetch a premium. The super profits are calculated as the difference between maintainable future profits and the return on net assets. In examining the recent profit and loss accounts of the target, the acquirer must carefully consider the accounting policies underlying those accounts. Particular attention must be paid to areas such as deferred tax provision, treatment of extraordinary items, interest capitalisation, depreciation and amortisation, pension fund contribution and foreign currency translation policies.

Where necessary, adjustments for the target’s reported profits must be made, so as to bring those policies into line with the acquirer’s policies. For example, the acquirer may write off all R&D expenditure, whereas the target might have capitalised the development expenditure, thus overstating the reported profits.

The Value can be calculated using the following formula:

\[ V = T + P - rT \]

Where \( T \) = value of net tangible assets \( P \) = maintainable future profits \( r \) = normal return expected on assets \( c \) = rate at which super profits are capitalized

**Discounted Cash Flow Valuation Method**
Discounted cash flow valuation is based upon expected future cash flows and discount rates. This approach is easiest to use for assets and firms whose cash flows are currently positive and can be estimated with some reliability for future periods.

Discounted cash flow valuation, relates the value of an asset to the present value of expected future cash flows on that asset. In
this approach, the cash flows are discounted at a risk-adjusted
discount rate to arrive at an estimate of value. The discount rate
will be a function of the riskiness of the estimated cash flows,
with lower rates for safe projects and higher rate for riskier
assets.

This approach has its foundation in the 'present value' concept,
where the value of any asset is the present value of the expected
future cash flows on it. Essentially, DCF looks at an acquisition
as a pure financial investment. The buyer will estimate future
cash flows and discount these into present values. Why is future
cash flow discounted? the reason is that a rupee in future is at
risk of being worth less than a rupee now. There are some
business based real risks like acquired company loosing a
contract, or new competitor entering the market or an adverse
regulation passed by government, which necessitates discount-
ing of cash flows.

The discounted cash flow (DCF) model is applied in the
following steps:

1. Estimate the future cash flows of the target based on the
   assumption for its post-acquisition management by the
   bidder over the forecast horizon.
2. Estimate the terminal value of the target at forecast horizon.
3. Estimate the cost of capital appropriate for the target.
4. Discount the estimated cash flows to give a value of the
target.
5. Add other cash inflows from sources such as asset disposals
   or business divestments.
6. Subtract debt and other expenses, such as tax on gains from
disposals and divestments, and acquisition costs, to give a
   value for the equity of the target.
7. Compare the estimated equity value of the target with its
   pre-acquisition stand-alone value to determine the added
   value from the acquisition.
8. Decide how much of this added value should be given away
to target shareholders as control premium.

In preparation for the forecast of target cash flows under the
bidder’s management, the historic cash flow statements of the
target must be examined.

Target cash flows are generally forecast for the next five to ten
years. In general, the longer the forecast horizon, the less
accurate the forecast. Whatever the forecast horizon, the terminal
value of the target at the end of that period based on free cash
flows thereafter also needs to be forecast. Often this terminal
value is based on the assumption of perpetual free cash flows
based on the same level of operations as in the last year of the
forecast period. The level perpetual cash flows are then capital-
ised at the cost of capital to yield the terminal value.

The cost of capital is the weighted average cost of capital
(WACC), estimated from the target’s pre-acquisition costs of
equity and debt.

\[
WACC = K^e E/V + (1 - T^c) K^d D/V -\cdash K^p P/V
\]

Where \(K^e\) = cost of equity;
\(K^d\) = cost of debt;
\(K^p\) = cost of preference shares;
\(E\) = market value of equity;
\(D\) = market value of dept;
\(P\) = market value of preference shares;
\(T^c\) = corporation tax rate;
\(V\) = \(E + D + P\), the value of the firm.

**Valuation by Team of Experts**

Valuation is an important aspect in merger and acquisition and
it should be done by a team of experts keeping into consider-
ation the basic objectives of acquisition. Team should comprise
of financial experts, accounting specialists technical and legal
experts who should look into aspects, of valuation from
different angles.

Accounting expert has to foresee the impact of the events of
merger on profit and loss account and balance sheet through
projection for next 5 years and economic forecast. Using the
accounting data he must calculate performance ratios, financial
capacity analysis, budget accounting and management accounting
and read the impact on stock values, etc. besides, installing
accounting and depreciation policy, treatment of tangible and
intangible assets, doubtful debts, interests, maturities, etc.

Technician has its own role in valuation to look into the life and
obsolescence of depreciated assets and replacements and
adjustments in technical process, etc. and form independent
opinion on workability of plant and machinery and other
assets.

Legal experts advice is also needed on matters of compliance of
legal formalities in implementing acquisition, tax aspects, review
of corporate laws as applicable, legal procedure in acquisition
strategy, laws affecting transfer of stocks and assets, regulatory
laws, labour laws preparing drafts of documents to be executed
or entered into between different parties, etc.

Nevertheless, the experts must take following into consider-
ation for determining exchange ratio.

**A. Market Price of Shares**

If the offeree and offeror are both listed companies, the stock
exchange prices of the shares of both the companies should be
taken into consideration which existed before commencement
of negotiations or announcement of the takeover bid to avoid
distortions in the market price which are likely to be created by
interested parties in pushing up the price of the shares of the
offeror to get better deal and vice versa.

**B. Dividend Payout Ratio (DPR)**

The dividend paid in immediate past by the two companies is
important as the shareholders want continuity of dividend
income. In case offeree company was not paying dividend or its
DPR was lower than the offerer’s, then it’s shareholders would
opt for share exchange for the growth company by sacrificing
the current dividend income for prospects of future growth in
income and capital appreciation.

**C. Price Earning Ratio (PER)**

Price earning ratios of both the offeror and offeree companies
be compared to judge relative growth prospects. Company with
lower PER show a record of low growth in earning per share
which depresses market price of shares in comparison to high
growth rate of combined company should also be calculated.

**D. Debt Equity Ratio**

Company with low gearing offers positive factor to investors for security and stability rather than growth potential with a geared company having capacity to expand equity base.

**E. Net Assets Value (NAV)**

Net assets value of the two companies be compared as the company with lower NAV has greater chances of being pushed into liquidation.

Having taken all the above factors into consideration, the final exchange ratio may depend upon factors representing strength and weakness of the firm in the light of merger objectives including the following:

- Liquidity, strategic assets, management capabilities, tax loss carry overs, reproduction costs, investment values, market values (combined companies shares) book values, etc.

**Valuation by Experts : Effect**

It is well settled that the valuation of shares is a technical matter, requiring considerable skill and expertise. If the same has been worked out and arrived at by experts then the same should be accepted, more so, if the same has the approval of the shareholders. That is to say, where the valuation done by the company's auditors is approved by the majority of shareholders and is also confirmed by eminent experts, who are appointed by the court to examine the valuation so made, as fair, and the valuation is not shown to be patently unfair or unjust, it would be extremely difficult to hold that the valuation so made is unfair, and, then, the court shall have to be slow to set at naught the entire scheme of amalgamation. The court does not go into the matter of fixing of exchange ratio in great detail or to sit in appeal over the decision of the chartered accountant. If a chartered accountant of repute has given the exchange ratio as per valuation made by him and the same is accepted by the requisite majority of the shareholders, the court will only see whether there is any manifest unreasonable or manifest fraud involved in the matter.

So, the exchange ratio of shares in the case of scheme of amalgamation, when supported by an opinion of accounting, technicians & legal experts and approved by a very large number of shareholders concerned, is prima facie to be accepted as fair, unless proved otherwise by the objectors. It is also well established, that there are number of bases on which valuation or the offered exchange ratio, which ultimately is a matter of opinion, can be founded and final determination can be made by accepting one of amalgamation of various consideration. It is also well settled by the Supreme Court in Hindustan Lever Employees' Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd., that mathematical precision is not the criterion for adjudging the fair exchange ratio.

Thus, now, the law has been well settled by the Supreme Court in Miheer H. transferee company to be allotted to the holders of the transferor company has been worked out by a recognised firm of chartered accountants who are experts in the field of valuation, and if no mistake can be pointed out in the said valuation, it is not for the court to substitute its exchange ratio, especially when the same has been accepted without demur by the overwhelming majority of the shareholders of the two companies or to say that the shareholders in their collective wisdom should not have accepted the said exchange ratio on the ground that it will be detrimental to their interest. It is not the part of the judicial process, said the Supreme Court in Hindustan Lever Employees' Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd., to examine entrepreneurial activities to ferret out flaws. The court is least equipped for such oversights, nor indeed is it a function of the judges in our constitutional scheme. It cannot be said that the internal management, business activity or institutional operation of public bodies, can be subjected to inspection by the court. To do so is incompetent and improper and, therefore, out of bounds.

Where the determination of the market price has been entrusted to a reputed valuer, there is no reason to doubt his competence unless mala fides are established against him. Allegations of mala fides are easy to make but difficult to substantiate. Unless the person who challenges the valuation satisfies the court that the valuation arrived at is grossly unfair, the court will not disturb the scheme of amalgamation which has been approved by the shareholders of two companies, who are, by and large well informed men of commercial world. It is difficult to set aside the valuation of experts in the absence of fraud or mala fides on the part of the experts.

**Fair Value of Shares**

Valuation can be done on the basis of fair value also. However, resort to valuation by fair value is appropriate when market value of a company is independent of its profitability.

The fair value of shares is arrived at after consideration of different modes of valuation and diverse factors. There is no mathematically accurate formula of valuation. An element of guesswork or arbitrariness is involved in valuation. The following four factors have to be kept in mind in the valuation of shares. These are:

1. Capital cover,
2. Yield,
3. Earning capacity, and

For arriving at the fair value of share, three well-known methods are applied:

1. The manageable profit basis method (the earning per share method).
2. The net worth method or the break-up value method, and
3. The market value method.

The fair value of a share is the average of the value of shares obtained by the net assets method and the one obtained by the yld method. This is, in fact not a valuation, but a compromise formula for bringing the parties to an agreement.

The average of book value and yield-based value incorporates the advantages of both the methods and minimizes the demerits of both the methods. Hence, such average is called the fair value of share or sometimes also called the dual method of share valuation.

The fair value of shares can be calculated by using the formula—
Valuation of equity shares must take note of special features, if any, in the company or in the particular transaction. These are briefly stated below:

a. Importance of the Size of the Block of Shares:
Valuation of the identical shares of a company may vary quite significantly at the same point of time on a consideration of the size of the block of shares under negotiation.

The holder of 75% of the voting power in a company can always alter the provisions of the articles of association; a holder of voting power exceeding 50% and less than 75% can substantially influence the operations of the company even to alter the articles of association or comfortably pass a special resolution.

A controlling interest therefore, carries a separate substantial value.

b. Restricted Transferability:
Along with principal consideration of yield and safety of capital, another important factor is easy exchangeability or liquidity.

Holders of shares of unquoted public companies or of private companies do not enjoy easy marketability; “therefore, such shares, however good, are discounted for lack of liquidity at rates, which may be determined on the basis of circumstances of each case.

The discount may be either in the form of a reduction in the value otherwise determined or an increase in the normal rate of return.

c. Dividends and Valuation:
Generally, companies paying dividends at steady rates enjoy greater popularity and the prices of their shares are high while shares of companies with unstable dividends do not enjoy confidence of the investing public as to returns they expect to get and, consequently, they suffer in valuation.

d. Bonus and rights Issue:
Share values have been noticed to go up when bonus or rights issues are announced, since they indicate an immediate prospect of gain to the holder although in the ultimate analysis, it is doubtful whether really these can alter the valuation.

Statutory Valuation
Valuation of shares may, be necessary under the provisions of various enactments like the Wealth tax Act, Companies Act, Income-tax Act, etc. e.g. valuation is necessary under the Companies Act in the case of an amalgamation and under the Income-tax Act for the purposes of capital gains.

Some of the other enactments have laid down rules for valuation of shares. The rules generally imply acceptance of open market price i.e. stock exchange price for quoted shares and asset based valuation for unquoted equity shares and average of yield and asset methods i.e. fair value, in valuing shares of investment companies.

Dividend Discount Models

Dividends refer to that portion of a firm’s net earnings which are paid out to the shareholders. Since dividends are distributed out of the profits, the alternative to the payment of dividends is the retention of earnings/profits. The retained earnings constitute an easily accessible important source of financing the investment requirements of firms. There is, thus, a type of inverse relationship between retained earnings and cash dividends: larger retentions, lesser dividends; smaller retentions, larger dividends. Thus, the alternative uses of the net earnings-dividends and retained earnings— are competitive and conflicting.

There are, however, conflicting opinions regarding the impact of dividends on the valuation of a firm. According to one school of thought, dividends are irrelevant so that the amount of dividends paid has no effect on the valuation of a firm. On the other hand, certain theories consider the dividend decision as relevant to the value of the firm measured in terms of the market price of the shares.

The purpose here is, therefore, to present a critical analysis of some important theories representing these two schools of thought with a view to illustrating the relationship between dividend policy and the valuation of a firm.

The basic model for valuing equity is the dividend discount model—the value of a stock is the present value of expected dividends on it.

Versions of the Model
Since projections of dividends cannot be made through infinity, several versions of the dividend discount model have been developed based upon different assumptions about future growth.

Practice Questions
1. Discuss how DCF method is applied.
2. Write about DCF model.
LESSON 26:
OTHER MODELS

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
• Different valuation models including valuation of securities in a takeover
• Non financial considerations in a merger process.

Dividend Growth Valuation Model
(Gordon Growth Model)
The dividends of most companies are expected to grow and evaluation of share values based on dividend growth is often used in valuation of shares. The Gordon growth model relates the value of a stock to its expected dividends in the next time period, the required rate of return on the stock, and the expected growth rate in dividends.
Value of the stock =

where \( \text{DPS} \) = expected dividends one year from now \( r \) = required rate of return for equity investors \( g \) = growth rate in dividends forever

The Gordon growth model can be used to value a firm that is in ‘steady state’ with dividends growing at a rate that is expected to stay stable in the long term.
Thus, though the model’s requirement is for the expected growth rate in dividends, analysts are able to substitute the expected growth rate in earnings and get precisely the same result, if the firm is truly in steady state.

Assumptions
Gordon growth model using dividend capitalization is based on the following assumptions:

i. retained earnings represent the only source of financing,
ii. rate of return is constant,
iii. cost of capital remains constant and is greater than growth rate,
iv. the company has perpetual life.
The implications of the model is that when the rate of return is greater than the discount rate, the price per share increases as the dividend ratio decreases and if the return is less than discount rate it is vice versa. The price per share remains unchanged where the rate of return and discount rate are equal.

Walter’s Valuation Model
Prof. Walter’s theory was that in the long run the share prices reflect only the present value of expected dividends. Retentions influence stock price only through their effect on future dividends. Prof. Walter has formulated this and used the dividend to optimize the wealth of an equity shareholder. His formula in determination of expected market price of a share is given below:

\[ P = \frac{D}{r_a - g} \]

\[ D = \text{Dividend per share} \]
\[ E = \text{Earnings per share} \]
\[ (E-D) = \text{Retained earning per share} \]
\[ R_a = \text{Internal rate if return on the investment} \]
\[ R_c = \text{Cost of capital} \]
if \( R_a \) is greater than 1, lower dividend will maximize the value per share and vice versa.

Assumptions
Walters model is based on the following assumptions:

i. all earnings are either distributed as dividends or invested internally immediately,
ii. all financing is done through retained earnings and external sources of funds like debt or new equity capital are not used,
iii. with additional investment undertaken, the firm’s business risk does not change, implying that the firm’s internal rate of return and its cost of capital are constant,
iv. the firms are a going concern with an infinite life.
In the long run, the relationship between the rate of return on retained earnings or return on investment and the rate of market expectation is important to the investors. Thus,

i. in a company where the rate expected by investors is higher than market capitalization rate, shareholders would accept low dividends and
ii. in a company where return on investment is lower than market capitalization rate, shareholders would prefer higher dividend so that they can utilize the funds so obtained elsewhere in more profitable opportunities.
Thus, according to this model, the investment policy of a firm cannot be separated from its dividend policy and both are inter-related. The choice of an appropriate dividend policy affects the value of an enterprise. Retentions influence the share price only through their effect on further dividend.

Modigliani and Miller - Irrelevance Theory
Modigliani and Miller were of the opinion that its basic earnings power and its risk class determine the value of the firm. Hence, the firm value depends on its asset investment policy rather than on how earnings are split between dividends and retained earnings. According to them, a firm’s dividend policy has no effect on the value of its assets. If the rate of dividend declared by a company is less, its retained earnings will increase and so also the net worth and vice versa.

Assumptions

i. there are no stock floatation or transaction costs,
ii. dividend policy has no effect on the firm’s cost of equity,
iii. the firm’s capital investment policy is independent of its dividend policy,

iv. investors and managers have the same set of information (symmetric information) regarding future opportunities.

Modigliani and Miller demonstrated, under a particular set of assumptions, that if a firm pays higher dividends, then it must sell more stocks to new investors, and that the share of the value of the company given up to new investors is exactly equal to the dividends paid out. The value of the firm was not determined by the amount of dividends paid, but rather by the earning power of the projects in which the firm invested its money.

According to Modigliani and Miller Model the market price of a share after dividend declared is calculated by applying the following formula.

\[
P_0 \cdot \frac{D_1}{K_e} = \frac{P_1 - D_1}{D_1}
\]

where

- \( P_0 \) = the prevailing market price of a share,
- \( K_e \) = the cost of Equity Capital,
- \( D_1 \) = dividend to be received at the end of period one,
- \( P_1 \) = market price of a share at the end of period one, Dividend Yield method

The shareholders in a company are entitled to receive dividends as and when declared. Since investors in company get their return in the form of a dividend the amount of dividend paid out gives some indication of how valuable the shares will be to the potential buyer. If dividend is one of the key factors determining how valuable shares are it is possible to look at the relationship between level of dividend and price in other companies and base a price on what dividend is normally paid.

This concept can be represented as a formula for any individual company compared to an accepted average for similar businesses.

\[
\text{Dividend per share} = \frac{\text{Total dividend declared}}{\text{Number of shares}}
\]

\[
\text{Value per share} = \frac{\text{Dividend per share}}{\text{Average dividend per share}}
\]

\[
\text{Value of business} = \text{Value per share} \times \text{Total number of shares}
\]

The same result can be obtained using figures for the business as whole rather than per share if information is available in that form.

\[
\text{Total value of business} = \frac{\text{Total dividend}}{\text{Average dividend per share}}
\]

**Combination of all or some of the Methods of Valuation may be Adopted**

It is thus well settled law that the combination of three well known methods of valuation of shares, namely, yield method, net asset value method and market value method to arrive at the share exchange ratio giving due weightage to each method based on the company’s performance, operating losses and future maintainable profits is a fair method to arrive at the average value of the share and that the fact that at the relevant time the book value of the share of one company was higher than that of another is not material.

The following principles have emerged from the judicial decisions [see Shah/ bag Enterprises (P) Ltd. Re. (1976) 46 Comp.Cas 642 (GU)] in the matter of approach to different methods of valuation, namely.

1. The assessment value must be based mainly upon the income yield, but with some regard to the assets backing in special cases.

2. Assets backing is of more importance in the case of a majority shareholding than in a minority shareholding, and is more useful in investment companies than in trading companies as a check on value determined from earning capacity.

3. Earning capacity or maintainable profits are not synonymous with the yield or return, which is the balance remaining therefrom after providing a reasonable reserve.

**Valuation of Securities in a takeover**

A takeover, like any other contract of purchase and sale, involves the striking of a bargain between the buyer and the shareholders of the seller in regard to the price. With a range between the maximum price which the buyer is prepared to pay and the minimum price which a sufficient number of the shareholders of the seller are prepared to accept, the price actually paid will depend on such factors as (a) the eagerness of the buyer to buy and whether there are competing bidders; (b) the eagerness of the shareholders of the seller to sell and, in case of share for share offer the willingness of the shareholders of the seller to become the shareholders of the buyer; (c) the skill, judgement and timing of the buyer’s campaign, including the persuasiveness with which the buyer’s case is expressed in the offer documents and other circulars to shareholders, (d) the willingness of the buyer to structure the offer in the light of the particular financial and tax considerations of the shareholders of the seller; (e) if the directors of the seller resist the bid, the skill, judgement and timing of the defensive campaign and degree of support, they receive from their merchant bankers, associates and other financial institutions; (f) whether the directors of the seller hold a large block of effectively controlled shares or the shares are widely dispersed; (g) fortuitous factors, such as the behaviors during the offer period of the stock exchange in general, economic developments, and sometimes even political events which affect investment sentiment. The decision as to what price the transferee company should be prepared to pay to acquire the transferor company should be determined by precisely the same financial analysis as the decision whether the transferee company should erect a new factory or purchase a large item of plant.

Thus the motivation for buying and selling companies varies considerably, but it is important that both parties understand what they want from one another. First, what is the buyer looking for? It could be:

- An opportunity to grow faster, with a ready-made market share. To eliminate a competitor by buying it out.
- Better integration - horizontal or vertical.
- Diversification with minimum cost and immediate profit. To improve dividend yield, earnings or book value.
To forestall the company's own takeover by a third party To enjoy the prospect of turning around a sick company.

On the other hand, why are companies available for sale? Some of the reasons are:

- Declining sales or earnings.
- An uncertain future.
- Owner wants to slow down or retire with no successor.
- Desire to maximise growth under the umbrella of a larger company. To raise cash for a more promising line of business.
- Lack of adequate financial and management skills. To concentrate time and effort on what it can do best.

The stages that have to be gone through in order to conclude a deal, either directly or through an intermediary, include:

- Search and exchange of information about each other.
- Preliminary investigation followed by serious negotiation.
- Contract development and closing the deal.

In the case of a share-for-share takeover (including cases where the consideration consists of loan stock convertible into or with subscription rights for equity capital of transferee company) the value of transferee company's existing operations should be ideally valued on the same basis, so as to determine the maximum number of shares that the transferee company should be prepared to offer.

Non-Financial Considerations in Valuation

Howsoever sophisticated the financial techniques applied to evaluate the worth of a business, and however accurate the assumption, it is more than likely that intangible (and perhaps irrational) factors will ultimately determine the amount the purchaser is prepared to pay. While it is arguable that any acquisition should be justifiable in a financial context, the motives for an acquisition may often be purely defensive, for example, to make the combined company less attractive to acquisition by a third party, to prevent an outsider getting a toe-hold in the industry, to prevent a competitor from acquiring the same business, or to diversify out of a manifestly declining industry. In such circumstances the financial benefits of the acquisition are much more difficult to quantify. Worse still, the motives may simply involve empire-building or personal aggrandisement on the part of the directors or owners of the acquiring company.

The foreign currency acquisition makes the valuation a still more complex and difficult exercise. It is suggested that the acquisition in another country may be evaluated in that country's currency. In addition, the cost of capital estimate for discounting should also be from the target company's country only. The reason for using the acquirer's cost of capital in the target's country is that the product pricing decisions in the acquired company will have to be based on the local market conditions.

Valuation of Shares in different Situations - Judicial Pronouncements

Supreme Court in CWTv. Mahadeo Jalan (1972) 86 ITR 621 (SC) observed:

"An examination of the various aspects of valuation of shares in a limited company would lead us to the following conclusion:

1. Where the shares in a public limited company are quoted on the stock exchange and there are dealings in them, the price prevailing on the valuation date is the value of the shares.

2. Where the shares are of a public limited company which are not quoted on a stock exchange or of a private limited company, then value is determined by reference to the dividends, if any, reflecting the profit earning capacity on a reasonable commercial basis. But, where they do not, then the amount of yield on that basis will determine the value of the shares. In other words, the profits which the company has been making and should be marking will ordinarly determine the value.

The dividend and earnings method or yield method are not mutually exclusive; both should help in ascertaining the profit earning capacity as indicated above. If the results of the two methods differ, an intermediate figure may have to be computed by adjustment of unreasonable expenses and adopting a reasonable proportion of profits.

3. In the case of a private limited company also where the expenses are incurred out of all proportion to the commercial venture, they will be added back to the profits of the company in computing the yield. In such companies the restriction on share transfers will also be taken into consideration as earlier indicated in arriving at a valuation.

4. Where the dividend yield and earnings method break down by reason of the company's inability to earn profits and declare dividends, if the set back is temporary, then it is perhaps possible to take the estimate of the value of the shares before set back and discount it by a percentage corresponding to the proportionate fall in the price of quoted shares of companies which have suffered similar reverses.

5. Where the company is ripe for winding up, then the break-up value method determines what would be realised by that process.

In setting out the above principles, we have not tried to lay down any hard and fast rule because ultimately the facts and circumstances of each case, the nature of the business, the prospects of profitability and such other considerations will have to be taken into account as will be applicable to the facts of each case. But, one thing is clear, the market value, unless in exceptional circumstances to which we have referred, cannot be determined on the hypothesis that because in a private limited company one holder can bring into liquidation, it should be valued as on liquidation, by the break-up method.

The yield method is the generally applicable method while the break-up method is the one resorted to in exceptional circumstances or where the company is ripe for liquidation but nonetheless is one of the methods."

Therefore, generally, in case of amalgamation, a combination of all or some of the well-accepted methods of valuation may be adopted for determining the exchange ratio of the shares of two companies.
The valuation of company shares is a highly technical matter which requires considerable knowledge, experience and expertise in the job. A ratio based on valuation of shares of both the companies done by experts, approved by majority of the shareholders of both the companies and sanctioned by court is an ideal exchange ratio.

**Supreme Court in Miheer H.Mafatlal v. Mafatlal Industries Ltd.**
The law on the subject has been well settled by the Supreme Court in Miheer H. Mafatlal v, Mafatlal Industries Ltd. (1996) 4 Comp LJ 124 (SC) where it was held that once the exchange ratio of the shares of the transferee company to be allotted to the holders of shares in the transferor company has been worked out by a recognised firm of chartered accountants who are experts in the field of valuation, and if no mistake can be pointed out in the said valuation, it is not for the court to substitute its exchange ratio, especially when the same has been accepted without demur by the overwhelming majority of the shareholders of the two companies or to say that the shareholders in their collective wisdom should not have accepted the said exchange ratio of the ground that it will be detrimental to their interest.

**Supreme Court in Hindustan Lever Employees Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd.**
In Hindustan Lever Employees Union v. Hindustan Lever Ltd., (1994) 4 Comp LJ 267(SC) the Supreme Court held that the court’s obligation is to satisfy that the valuation was in accordance with law and the same was carried out by an independent body.

The Supreme Court had explained that the nature of jurisdiction by the court, while considering the question of sanctioning a scheme of arrangement or compromise, is of sentinel nature and is not of appellate nature to examine the arithmetical accuracy of scheme approved by majority of shareholders. While considering the sanction of a scheme of merger, the court is not required to ascertain with mathematical accuracy the terms and targets set out in the proposed scheme. What is required to be evaluated is general fairness of the scheme.

In the matter of Canon Tea Co. Ltd.: Although the question of valuation of shares and fixation of exchange ratio is a matter of commercial judgment and the court should not sit in judgment over it, yet the court cannot abdicate its duty to scrutinise the scheme with vigilance. It is not expected of the court to act as a rubber stamp simply because the statutory majority has approved the scheme and there is no opposition to it. The court is not bound to treat the scheme as a fait accompli and to accord its sanction merely upon a casual look at it. It must still scrutinise the scheme to find out whether it is a reasonable arrangement which can, by reasonable people conversant with the subject, be regarded as beneficial to those who are likely to be affected by it. Where there is no opposition, the court is not required to go deeper. However, when there is opposition, the court not only will, but must go into the question and if it is not satisfied about the fairness of the valuation, it would be justified in refusing to accord sanction to the scheme as was held by the court in Canon Tea Co. Ltd. (1966) 2 Comp LJ: 278 (Cal).

**Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Mahindra Ugine Steel Co. Ltd.**
In the matter of Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Mahindra Ugine Steel Co. Ltd.: The jurisdiction of the court in inquiring into the fairness of the exchange ratio cannot be ousted by vote of majority shareholders on the ground that valuation of shares is a matter of commercial judgment. Bank of Baroda Ltd. v. Mahindra Ugine Steel Co. Ltd. (1976) 46 Comp Cas 227 (Guj).

**Valuation practices in India - Government guidelines**
Central Government had come out with guidelines for valuation of shares in 1991. These guidelines are reproduced below. These guidelines were in use by the Controller of Capital Issues even before 1978. All India Financial Institutions and banks have been following these guidelines uniformly. As such, the procedure laid down in these guidelines is followed by the corporate sector and is in vogue.

These guidelines lay down techniques for calculations of ‘fair value’ ‘Net Assets Value’ and Profit Earning Capacity Value (PECV) and Market Value in the case of quoted shares.

**Practice Questions**
1. Mention valuation practices in India.
2. Mention non-financial valuations in mergers and acquisitions.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:

- Issues involved in a post merger resulting organisation

Introduction
Mergers, amalgamations, acquisitions, takeovers or any other kind of business combinations are undertaken for the purpose of expansion or growth of a business. The fundamental economic rationale for a merger is that the value of the merged entity is expected to be greater than the sum of the independent values of the merging entities.

However, there is more to such transactions than joining two legal entities or creating a new one. A merger can join two cultures, two sets of procedures and protocols, two sets of policies and change the employment environment and prospects of several hundreds of employees, who have been the bed rock of past successes and the key to future value.

Timely integration of systems, applications and data provide the corporate information needed to achieve the post-merger objectives.

The relevance of Post-merger organisation and integration cannot be overstated. Continuous appraisal and improvement are the basic elements in the success of a merger or an acquisition. Due to the complexity of numerous activities and occurrence of many unanticipated events, it is quite possible that the process gets off the track and results are not realized. In fact the main reason, why so many mergers either fail or fall short of expectations is a lack of adequate efforts to integrate the purchased company into the buyer’s existing operations. It should be realised that once the deal is put through, the ‘real’ work has only begun. Too often, the buying company underestimates, how long it will take to get the two companies to act as one. Therefore, where importance is placed on whether it is a good idea to purchase a company and figure out the right price, it is equally essential to understand the target company with an eye to post-merger efforts.

‘Post-merger reorganisation’ is a wide term which encompasses the reorganisation of each and every aspect of the company’s functional areas to achieve the objectives planned and aimed at in takeover, merger, amalgamation or demerger. The parameters of post merger reorganisation are to be established by the management team of every amalgamating company differently depending upon its requirements, objectives of merger and management corporate policy.
LESSON 28:
FACTORS IN POST MERGER RE-ORGANIZATION

Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:

- Post-merger evaluation process

1. Gain or Loss to Stakeholders
In mergers and acquisitions it largely depends upon the terms and conditions of the merger and the track record of the transferor or acquirer company. Based on the cardinal principle, every buyer, in other words transferee or acquirer has to pay more than the book value of the transferor or target company. However, the terms and conditions of the transaction depend upon their present operations and past historical records. Some instances of the acquisitions to small shareholders worth mentioning are as under:

1. On the announcement of merger of ICICI Ltd. with ICICI Bank share price jumped from Rs. 47.70 and Rs. 77.00 on 25.9.2001 to Rs. 56.10 and Rs. 98.00 on 24.10.2001 respectively.

2. AV Birla group acquired 14.5% shares of Larsen & Toubro Ltd. (L&T) from Reliance Industries Ltd. at Rs. 309 per share. For increasing the stake up to 34.5% the Birla group’s open offer at Rs. 190 per share is under protest by the Investors Grievances Forum and the Financial Institutions (FIs). The L&T script surged to close at Rs. 189 from Rs. 172 on 16.10.2002. FIs collectively hold over 36% shares in L&T. They demanded Rs. 340 per share. The open offer has been stayed and was under review by the SEBI on 18.10.2002. National Association of Small Investors (NASI) said that a section of Grasim shareholders would approach the Supreme Court asking the company to increase the offer price for acquisition of L&T to Rs. 3507- per share. As such, the small shareholders of L&T will be provided with an exit opportunity at a price higher than the ruling market price.

3. AV Birla group open offer for 25.5% shares in Indian Aluminium Ltd. (Indal) at Rs. 1207- per share opened on 14.10.2002 did not receive favourable response in view of Sterlite’s offer at Rs. 2217- per share made in 1998 against which the shareholders tendered their shares. There is a good chance for upward revision in the offer price or a strategic deal between Sterlite and AV Birla group. It may also be beneficial to the small shareholders.

4. The takeover by Mr. Arun Bajoria for Bombay Dyeing provided a golden opportunity to the small shareholders to exit at Rs. 1107- per share against the market price ruling between Rs. 60-75 per share.

5. The takeover bid by Mr. Abhishek Dalmia for the Gesco Corporation resulted in upward revision in offer price to Rs. 457- after acquiring 45% shares at Rs. 277- per share. The Dalmias sold their entire 10.5% stake at Rs. 54 per share to Sheth Mahihaa combine.

6. The takeover bids for Ahmedabad Electricity Company (AEC) by Gujarat Torrent group and the Bombay Dyeing resulted in increasing the offer price from Rs. 657- per share to Rs. 1327- per share and at this price Gujarat Torrent Group acquired AEC; undoubtedly, the small shareholders were benefited prior to acquisition of AEC.

7. Similarly, the takeover bid of Mr. Arun Bajoria for Ballarpur Industries resulted in a surge of the scrip price from around Rs. 507- to Rs. 687- when it was made public.

From the above it is evidently clear that such acquisition attempts cause an increase in share price, which benefits the share holders of the target company. For the post acquisition or merger achievements, reorganisational efforts of the acquirer or merged company are very important. Improving the acquisition integration process is one of the most compelling challenge facing businesses today. The results are dependent on the actions suggested by the consultants and merchant bankers and the actions taken by the finance executives, operational heads, HRD head and legal advisors.

2. Implementation of Objectives
We have so far discussed various objectives, motives, reasons and purposes which are to be achieved and accomplished by implementing them after completion of merger, amalgamation or acquisition. Much of the senior management’s attention must be focused on developing a ‘post-transaction’ strategy and integration plan that will generate the revenue enhancements and cost savings that initially prompted the merger or acquisition. After merger or acquisition, the resources of two or more companies should be put together for producing better results through savings in operating costs because of combined management of production, marketing, purchasing, resources etc. These economies are known as synergistic operative economies. Synergy is also possible in the areas of Research and Development function of the combined company for optimum utilization of technological development, which could not be taken up by the separate companies for want of resources.

A key challenge in mergers and acquisitions is their effective implementation as there are chances that mergers and acquisitions may fail because of slow integration. The key is to formulate in advance integration plans that can effectively accomplish the goals of the M&A processes. Since time is money and competitors do not stand still, integration must not only be done well but also done expeditiously.

The takeover or merger of one company with another affects the senior managerial personnel. A cohesive team is required both at the board level as well as at senior executives level. The reorganisation would involve induction of the directors I of
the transferor company on the Board of the amalgamating company, or induction of reputed and influential persons from outside who have expertise in directing and policy planning to broaden the Board for public image as well as smooth functioning of the company. Selection of directors, finalising their term of holding the office as directors, managerial compensation and other payments or reimbursements of expenses etc. are issues to be sorted out.

At the senior executive level also, changes are required particularly in respect of compensation depending upon the terms and conditions of merger, amalgamation or takeover and to adjust in suitable positions the top executives of the amalgamated company to create a congenial environment and cohesive group leadership within the 1 organisation. Understanding different cultures and where and how to integrate them properly is vital to the success of an acquisition or a merger. Important factors to be taken note of would include the mechanism of corporate control particularly encompassing delegation of power and power of control, responsibility towards account communication channels, interdivisional and intra-divisional harmony and achieving optimum results through changes and motivation.

i Management of Financial Resources

ii Financial Restructuring

Financial restructuring becomes essential in post merger reorganisation. Financial restructuring is characterised by liquidity crisis, ‘abnormal’ balance sheets and negative equity. The ‘clean-up’ must happen fast. Replacement of costlier fundings by cheaper borrowings on a long and short term basis as per requirement is one of the several ways and means of financial restructuring for a company. This being an important aspect concerns most of the top management, creditors, bankers, shareholders, regulatory bodies like stock exchange, SEBI as well as the government where provisions of corporate laws are attracted and their permissions or approvals for changes are required. Generally, financial restructuring is done as per the scheme of arrangement, merger or amalgamation approved by the shareholders and creditors but in those cases where takeover or acquisition of an undertaking is made by one company of the other through acquiring financial stake by way of acquisition of shares, e.g. IPCL by RIL, reorganisation of financial structure would be a post-merger event which might compel the company to change its capital base, revalue its assets and reallocate reserves. Decisions have to be made regarding raising owners funds or resorting to borrowed funds as per debt bearing capacity of the company or going in for leasing options. These steps are taken in consultation with the financial consultant and auditors of the company.

iii Rationalisation of Labour Cost.

Post merger reorganisation needs rationalisation of labour cost as it forms the primary factor of prime cost of any product and service. The combined labour force available to the transferee company is to be reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the combined operational functions. With technological upgradation, reduction in labour costs through providing on the job training, motivation, and labour cut by way of voluntary retirement schemes or otherwise forms part of post merger function. This will help in better productivity and higher return on capital employed. The judgement of the Supreme Court of India announced on 30th August, 2002 on the petition of Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL) has cleared a major hurdle to several Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) which were not employing contract labour due to the fear of having to absorb them in regular jobs. The five judges Bench has relaxed contract labour laws for PSUs by quashing a 1976 notification and held that there will not be automatic absorption of contract labour.

iv Production and Marketing Management

With regard to the size of the company and its operational scale, its product mix should be adjusted during post-merger period. Management has to choose from various alternatives like adding or dropping out products. Decisions are taken on the basis of feasibility studies done by experts covering techno-economic aspect, cost-benefit analysis of production process, identification of market, customers and their preferences, fixing price of product with targeted mark-up, required rate of return and competitive strength. Decisions are generally taken on the recommendations covering economic analysis based on incremental reasoning, fine-perspective, opportunity cost, etc. Another aspect closely related to production is to improve productivity and cost-reduction without affecting product quality. This demands attention to the following aspects:

1. Efficiency of management
2. Degree of technological adaptation

1 Technological Improvements.

To tone up production, it is also necessary that available resources are properly allocated for sagacious and planned programme for utilisation of scarce and limited resources available to an enterprise so as to direct the production process to result into optimal production and operational efficiency. Resource allocation can be accomplished by a company using the following techniques:

a. Production function analysis with one or two or more variables;

b. Input output analysis;

c. Linear programming when there are more than two variables.

d. Examining the available options, substitutes and alternative processes.

Revamping of marketing strategy becomes essential, which is accomplished on the basis of market surveys, and recommendation of marketing experts. Marketing surveys may cover both established as well as new products. Pricing policy also deserves attention for gaining competitive strength in the different market segments. Reorganisation of marketing network and rationalisation of marketing strategy is equally important.

v Corporate Planning and Control

Corporate planning to a large extent is governed by the corporate policy. The management’s attitude and promoter’s inclinations are amply reflected in the expressions directed towards achievement of corporate goals. Corporate policy
prescribes guidelines that govern the decision making process and regulates the implementation of the decisions. Corporate planning is to be done in consonance with the corporate policy which might prescribe the broader frame within which activity is to be restricted, minimum returns to be obtained, optimal utilisation of financial, human and material resources is to be made, delegation and de-centralisation of authority is effected, corporate plan made and implemented, and plans and policies formulated prior to the merger or acquisition reviewed.

Other factors to be considered may, inter alia, include the existing and prospective market segments, the product and production activity and the nature of demand. All these factors indicate the future of the concern and the commitments to be fulfilled.

The company planning is associated with the management control so that deviations in the planned targets and achievements are recorded and their causes are traced out for remedial measures. In other words, control, as an activity of management, involves comparison of performance with predetermined standards, ascertaining causes for deviations and prescribing corrective action to reinforce the planned programme. In each area of corporate activities whether it is personnel management, material management, real estate management or financial management, planning is associated with control.

Control techniques which are used by the corporate units would require changes from traditional to modern control techniques.

The traditional control techniques include (1) Budgeting control; (2) Standard costing; (3) Financial ratios; (4) Internal audit, whereas the modern control techniques are: (1) Performance budgeting; (2) Zero Base Budgeting; (3) Programme Planning & Budgeting System (PPBS); (4) Programme Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) and (5) Critical Path Method (CPM). All these techniques are now computer based for which softwares are easily available.

Review of the control techniques could be better done if responsibility centres are defined. In an organisation there may be four responsibility centres viz. Revenue centres, expense centres, profit centres and investment centres. In revenue centres, the output is measured in monetary terms. These centres relate to marketing activities and sales budget focuses main attention on control systems. In expenses centres, inputs are measured in monetary and quality terms. Profit centres which measure both input and output in terms of expenses and revenue respectively, are created when manufacturing and marketing is done by the same organisation.

These decisions about management structure, key roles, reporting relationships, restructuring, etc. should be made, announced and implemented as soon as possible after the deal is signed. Creeping changes, uncertainty and anxiety that last for months are debilitating and start to drain value from an acquisition.

It would be relevant to mention some of the leading common mistakes, made by he corporates, leading to pitfalls in mergers and acquisition:

1. Ego problems on both sides - buyer and seller - rear up very frequently and resulting clashes make bad situations worse. Trying to have two chiefs is a formula for disaster.
2. Attempt to hasten the integration between both the parties raises the likelihood of making serious errors. Sudden and radical changes such as relocating the company’s entire production operations should be carefully considered before implementation.
3. Many buyers assert their ownership by moving quickly to convert the acquired company. This does not always work in the right direction.
4. A cautious approach should be applied to competitor end runs. While the company is focused on integration, it furnishes an ideal time for competitors to make a run on the market.
5. Unless the acquired business is in the exact same field, different dynamics might apply.
6. One of the most common and damaging mistakes is to lay off crucial employees from the acquired company. This is a very complicated, delicate matter and even the seller might not have an accurate idea as job titles can be misleading.

Post Merger Success and Valuation
Every merger is not successful. The factors which are required to measure the success of any merger as can be seen from various studies are briefly discussed below.

1. The earning performance of the merged company can be measured by return on total assets and return on net worth. It has been found that the probability of success or failure in economic benefits was very high among concentric mergers. Simple vertical and horizontal mergers were found successful whereas the performance of concentric mergers was in between these two extremes i.e. failure and success.
2. Whether the merged company yields larger net profit than before, or a higher return on total funds employed or the merged company is able to sustain the increase in earnings.
3. The capitalisation of the merged company determines its success or failure. Similarly, dividend rate and payouts also determines its success or failure.
4. Whether merged company is creating a larger business organisation which survives and provides a basis for growth.
5. Comparison of the performance of the merged company with the performance of similar sized company in the same business in respect of (i)Sales, (ii) assets, (iii) net profit, (iv) earning per share and (v) market price of share.

In valuing the whole enterprise, one must seek financial data of comparable companies in order to determine definitive ratios that can be used to give an indication of the company being analysed. The data is analyzed to estimate reasonable future earnings for the subject company.

The following information must be made available and analyzed for post-merger valuation:

i. All year-end balance sheets and income statements, preferably audited, for a period of five years and the stub period to the valuation date,
ii. All accounting control information relating to the inventory, sales, cost, and profit contribution by product line or other segment; property cost and depreciation records; executives and managerial compensation; and corporate structure.
iii. All records of patents, trademarks, contracts, or other agreements.
iv. A history of the company, including all subsidiaries.

Analysis of these items provides data upon which forecasts of earnings, cash flow, etc. can be made.

In general, growth in profit, dividend payouts, company's history, increase in size providing base for future growth and the amount of relative benefits accruing to the interested or associated companies are the factors which help in determining the success or failure of a merged company. Gains to shareholders have so far been measured in terms of increase or decrease in share prices of the merged company. However, share prices are influenced by many factors other than the performance results of a company. Hence, this cannot be taken in isolation, as a single factor to measure the success or failure of a merged company.

6. In some mergers there is not only increase in the size of the merged or amalgamated company in regard to capital base and market segments but also increase in its sources and resources which enable it to utilize them to optimize its end earnings.

7. Fair market value is one of the valuation criteria for measuring the success of post merger company. Fair market value is understood as the value in the hands between a willing buyer and willing seller, each having reasonable knowledge of all pertinent facts and neither being under pressure or compulsion to buy or sell. Such valuation is generally made in pre merger cases.

8. In addition to the above factors, a more specific consideration is required to be given to factors like improved debtors realisation, reduction in non-performing assets, improvement due to economies of large scale production and application of superior management in sources and resources available relating to finance, labour and materials.

**Conclusion**

To sum up, every acquirer or amalgamating company has to pay consideration for the assets and liabilities proposed to be taken up at the real or actual value. In other words, it pays more than the market capitalisation. Such acquisition price always goes in favour of small investors with the intervention of small investors organisations and the market regulatory authority SEBI, as seen in several cases discussed above. Post merger results mostly depend upon the method and manner in which the acquired or amalgamated company is managed. This is clearly depicted in PSUs as every acquirer of a PSU has to face protest and opposition from employees and parties interested therein as happened in Balco’s acquisition but efficient and skillful management of the acquired Balco by Sterlite group, made things smoother. Similar protests were made by the employees and others in due diligence process of Nalco under taken by Grasim before bidding therefor. As such, success and failure of the acquired or amalgamated company depends largely upon post merger reorganisation technique.

A successful integration ‘melds’ not only the various technical aspects of the businesses but also the different cultures. The best way to do so is to get people working together quickly to solve business problems and accomplish results that could not have been achieved before.

There cannot be a set of rules for post-merger reorganisation to make it successful. The management should not only concentrate on profit but also focus on new ideas and techniques. In the words of Mr. Tom Peters, the enterprise should look beyond mergers and acquisitions as a way to grow. By merging and forming a huge enterprise, they scare off the rising entrepreneurial spirit. Raising market share and creating markets are two different things altogether.

The management guru has appreciated that in India there exists a great entrepreneurial spirit partly fostered by disorganisation. Indian’s innate spirit probably helps entrepreneurs once may move to other countries. Silicon Valley is a perfect example in his words. General Electric had acquired 1700 companies in 20 years, of which | 99.9% were niche middle-sized companies and they were the best in their fields.

Thus, the aspect of post-merger reorganisation is not exhaustive and the parameters of the same would have to be established by the management of the companies, depending upon the organisational requirements, corporate policies and plans and the objectives of the merger etc. sought to be met.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight into:
- Efficiency resulting to an organization post merger
- Trends in mergers and acquisition in India

Measuring Post-merger Efficiency
The criterion to judge a successful merger differs in different conditions. Different factors may be considered for making value judgements such as growth in profit, dividend, company’s history, increase in size, base for growth etc. Several studies suggest different parameters to assess the success of mergers:

i. Successful merger creates a larger industrial organization than before, survives and provides a basis for growth [Edith Perriose].
ii. In Arthur Dewing’s study, three criteria were considered viz. (a) merger should yield a larger net profit than before (b) merger should provide a higher return on total funds (c) there should be a sustained increase in earnings.
iii. Earnings on capitalization and dividend records determine the success of merger [Shaw L].
iv. One criteria could be comparison of performance of (20) merging companies for five years prior to merger with their performance in five years after the merger [Killy EM].

During the studies in late 1960s, two types of efficiency improvements were expected to result from mergers: (1) improvements due to economies of large scale production (2) application of superior management skills to a larger organisation. Some other researches in the seventies and eighties, measured efficiency based off stock market measures, labour productivity or total factor productivity etc. These improvements pointed towards market dominance, but for gauging productivity or total factor productivity etc these improve-
ments may also arise even in the case of conglomerate mergers. Operating economies in th
ese economies may arise due to better utilisation of production capacities, distribution network, engineering services, research and development facilities and so on. The operating economies (economies of scale) would be the maximum in the case of horizontal mergers where intensive utilisation of production capacities will result in benefits for the merged firm.

On the other hand, in the case of vertical mergers, the benefits would accrue from better co-ordination of facilities, both backward and forward, reduction in inventory levels and higher market power of the combined firms. Operating economies in the form of reduction or elimination of certain overhead expenses may also arise even in the case of conglomerate mergers. The net result of realising economies of scale would be a decrease in the cost of production. But if the scale of operations or size of the merged firm becomes too large and unwieldy, then ‘dis-economies’ of scale would also arise and the unit cost of production would show a rising trend.

1 Operating Economies
Whenever two or more firms combine, certain economies are likely to be realised as a result of larger volume of operations resulting in economies of scale. These economies may arise due to better utilisation of production capacities, distribution network, engineering services, research and development facilities and so on. The operating economies (economies of scale) would be the maximum in the case of horizontal mergers where intensive utilisation of production capacities will result in benefits for the merged firm.

2 Financial Economies
Merger of two or more firms brings about the following financial advantages for the merged firm:

a. Relief under the Income Tax Act
Under Section 72A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 carry forward and setting off of accumulated losses and unabsorbed
depreciation of the amalgamating company is allowed against the future profits of the amalgamated company in order to encourage revival of sick units.

b Higher Debt Capacity
The merged firm would enjoy higher debt capacity because benefits of combination of two or more firms provide greater stability to the earnings level. This is an important consideration for the lenders since the possibility of default in repayment of loan and interest is reduced to a great extent. A higher debt capacity if utilised, would mean greater tax advantage for the merged firm leading to higher value of the firm.

c Reduction in Floatation Costs
Whenever the merged firm raises funds from the market through public issue of shares or debentures, it can reduce the floatation costs as compared to the similar amount being raised independently by the merging firms. Such reduction in the floatation costs represents a real benefit to the merged firm.

Apart from the above, earnings and cash flows are primary financial outcomes that need to be tracked since valuation are built on them. Particular attention should be given to the components of these measures, namely, revenue, costs, investments and net working capital. The extent to which these components show progress will determine whether value is being created or not.

3 Growth and Diversification
As stated earlier, merger/amalgamation of two or more firms has been used as a dominant business strategy to seek rapid growth and diversification. The merger improves the competitive position of the merged firm as it can command an increased market share. It also offers a special advantage because it enables the merged firm to leap several stages in the process of expansion. In a saturated market, simultaneous expansion and replacement through merger/takeover is more desirable than creating additional capacities through expansion. A merger proposal has a very high growth appeal, and its desirability should always be judged in the ultimate analysis in terms of its contribution to the market price of the shares of the merged firm.

The merged firm can also seek reduction in the risk levels through diversification of the business operations. The extent to which risk is reduced, however, depends on the correlation between the earning of the merging (combining) firms. A negative correlation between the combining firms always brings greater reduction in the risk whereas a positive correlation leads to less reduction in risk.

The business firm may pursue the objective of diversification with maximum advantage under the following circumstances:

1. If a firm is saddled with problems which can lead to bankruptcy or jeopardise its very existence, then its merger with another firm can save it from such possible undesirable consequences. Indian industrial sector is faced with the problems of the creation of splintered capacities. As a result, many firms with minimum economic size, such as manufacturers of light commercial vehicles, mini steel plants, mini paper plants, mini dry cell battery plants, mini sponge iron plants, mini cement plants, etc. were created. Many of these units have either closed down or are incurring substantial losses. A few of them, though earning profits today, may fall sick in future due to the increasing competition.

In such a situation mergers and takeovers can bring about consolidation of capacities, lead to the revival of sick units and also prevent the occurrence of sickness.

2. If the shares of one of the combining firms are not traded at the stock exchange then creative diversification would be the only feasible route to reduce the level of risk for the investment in these firms.

4 Managerial Effectiveness
It has been pointed out by various studies that incompetency of management has been the most important reason for firms becoming sick. If a sick firm is merged with another well managed company, it will lead to better co-ordination of human resources of both the companies. Managerial effectiveness can also bring substantial gains to the merging firms if two well managed firms combine together to take advantage of valuable human resources.

According to a survey of US manufacturing firms the following motives were identified:

- A desire to utilise competition or to achieve monopoly profits;
- A desire to harness unutilized market power;
- A response to shrinking opportunities for growth and/or profit in one’s own industry due to shrinking demand or excessive competition;
- A desire to diversify to reduce risk of business;
- A desire to achieve a large enough size to realise economies of scale of production and/or distribution;
- Desire to overcome critical drawbacks in one’s own company by acquiring the necessary complementary resources, patents or factors of production;
- A desire to achieve sufficient size to have efficient access to capital markets or inexpensive advertising;
- A desire to utilise more fully particular resources or personnel controlled by the firm, with particular applicability to managerial skill;
- A desire to displace an existing management;
- A desire to utilise tax advantages otherwise not available;
- A desire to reap the promotional or speculative gains contingent upon new security issues, or changed price earning ratios;
- A desire of managers to create an image of themselves as aggressive managers;
- A desire of managers to manage an ever-growing set of subordinates.

Apart from the above, in the present complex business environment, two more factors have assumed importance viz. Customer reactions and employee reactions.

Customer Reactions
It is necessary to ensure that customers are not adversely affected during a merger or acquisition as losing either profitable
customers or a percentage of their business may have a negative impact on earnings and cash flows, especially if the customer represents a large percentage of company’s revenues and profits. Several indicators may be deployed such as customer satisfaction, retention, acquisition, market share etc. Keeping track of market value and sales volume, segment by segment is also useful. Often during mergers and acquisitions competitors attempt to disrupt the relationship between an acquirer and its customers. This implies that a company needs to do more than just maintain customer relationships. It has to make an extra effort to ensure that its business does not erode.

**Employee Reactions**

Employees are capable of having an impact on productivity and customer satisfaction, especially in service business. Employee assessments made at multiple times and with relevant measures may allow better changes to take place. It should be analysed whether employees understand the expected contribution to be made to new organization; the view of employees towards various aspects of organisation and leadership; commitment to the newly formed organization; performance and productivity expected etc.

**Merger and Acquisition trends**

Identification of economic or financial motives is not very difficult. When they exist they are usually stated in the annual reports and merger schemes/documents of the companies during the period of merger. They are widely quoted in newspapers. However, there is no objective guideline to measure psychological or motivational factors of the mergers.

In India, what motivates the interested parties to consummate merger between two or more companies has been stated in annual reports, merger schemes and/or media. Motives for mergers in India have been different during ‘license Raj’ i.e. up to 1991-92 and thereafter as per the Industrial Policy, laws! and regulations during the last over five decades. It is widely accepted that mergers, demergers, takeovers or combinations or disinvestments or acquisitions take place I as a vehicle for faster corporate growth. Motives of some companies as stated in the I merger documents or the media are stated hereunder for specific reference.

1. The move of J.K. Industries Ltd. (JK Tyre) for merging its subsidiary Vikrant I Tyres Ltd. with itself seems to be a fall out of Apollo Tyres Ltd. (ATL) decision to acquire the tyre making facilities of Modi Rubber Ltd. (MRL) which would I add around Rs. 600-800 crores to the top line of ATL from Rs. 1700 crore making it country’s target tyre company ahead of MRF Ltd. Simultaneously, I the JK Tyre also hived off its Sugar and Pharmaceuticals divisions to I concentrate better on its core business of manufacturing and marketing tyres.

2. After the failure in taking over of Indian Aluminium Ltd. in 1998 Sterlite group I has acquired Bharat Aluminium Company Ltd. (Balco), the Chhattisgarh I based aluminium Company from the Government over howls of protests and today, it seems as if it has managed to turn an explosive situation into a win-win thing for the MP State government, shareholders and perhaps, employees, as well. The group has also acquired Hindustan Zinc Ltd. and its ownership has been privatised smoothly. Now, the Sterlite group is interested in National Aluminium Company Ltd. (NALCO), Shipping Corporation of India and Hindustan Copper Ltd.

3. The merger of Reliance Petroleum Ltd. (RPL) with Reliance Industries Ltd. (RIL) from 19.9.2002 has created India’s first private sector Fortune 500 company. The merger is effective from 1st April, 2001. The Board of Directors of the merged RIL at its meeting held on 30.9.2002, while approving annual audited accounts for the year ended 31st March 2002, recommended dividend of 47.5% on the increased capital of Rs. 1396 crores i.e. Rs. 4.75 per share which amounts to a lower dividend in comparison with the dividend paid for the year 2000-2001 to the RPL’s shareholders marginally by Rs. 0.75 per share, as the swap ratio of 1 share of RIL for 11 shares of RPL. The objective of this merger as disclosed by the company is of attaining allround leadership in industry peer group in terms of assets, revenue, production volume, market share and maximisation of total shareholder returns. This merger has created RIL, the largest private sector company by turnover of Rs. 57,127 crores and net profit of Rs. 3,243 crore for the year 2001-02.

4. For the last over five decades Hindustan Lever Ltd. (HLL) operating in India has become a role model not just for FMCG companies but the entire Indian Corporate Sector. Through disinvestment it has acquired Modern Food Industries (India) Ltd. for Rs. 149.4 crores. In mid 80’s, Lipton and Brooke Bond were merged with HLL. TOMCO and Lakme were acquired from Tata group. The merger of International Best Food Ltd. and Aviance Ltd. in 2001 with HLL was with the object of achieving greater synergy, elimination inter se business overlapping, preventing industrial sickness, and economies in costs—benefits of combined financial, managerial, technical, distribution and marketing expertise. However, it is unfortunate to note from the point of view of the minority shareholders, that the share prices of Brooke Bond, Lipton, Ponds, Tomco and HLL valued separately as five different companies would probably be higher than the current share price of HLL.

5. Having identified the pharmaceutical sector Mr. Ajay G. Piramal has dispensed with the textile business and acquired Nicholas Laboratories Ltd. in 1988. Consequently, Nicholas Piramal India Ltd. (NPIL) was incorporated on 30th November, 1988. In 1995 it acquired Bulk Drug division of Sumitra Pharmaceuticals & Chemicals Ltd. The objective was optimum utilisation of the manufacturing facilities, enhancing profitability and becoming a leading health care company in India. In 1997, Boehringer Mannheim India Ltd. and Piramal Healthcare Ltd. were merged with it for achieving synergistic linkage, profitability and growth in business. In 2001, Rhone-Poulene (India) Ltd., NPIL Fininvest Ltd., Super Pharma Ltd. were merged with it with the same objective of optimum utilisation of
the manufacturing, technological and marketing expertise, distribution networks, manpower and other resources.

In 1988, NPIL was then ranked 48 in the industry. Within 14 years it has been ranked as 4th in the Industry. The acquisition led strategy coupled with joint ventures and alliances has registered manifold growth of the company. Its share price has also improved from around Rs. 100/- in 1995 to Rs. 250/- in 2002, even though the year was passing through a bearish phase.

6. In 1989, Usha Alloys & Steels Ltd. (UASL) was merged with Usha Martin Industries Ltd. (UMIL) with the objective of stable profitability, preventing sickness, achieving economies of scale, reduction of overhead reforms and efficient utilisation of the resources etc. Post merger results were however, not encouraging.

7. In 1989, Tata Fertilisers Ltd. (TFL) was merged with Tata Chemicals Ltd. (TCL) with the objective of unhindered flow of financial, technological and managerial resources for completion of the TFL’s project utilisation, of the proven expertise and greatly enhanced financial, technical and managerial potential of TCL. Post merger results proved satisfactory. In 1990-91 and 1995-96 bonus issues were made in the ratio of 1 for 2 and 3 for 5 respectively. The company has been paying dividend continuously on the increased capital at higher rate.

8. With U.K. Corp Limited (formerly Straw Products Ltd.) many companies - M.P. Industries Ltd. (Drycell Battery Project), Dena Bank Ltd. (excluding banking business), Orissa Synthetics Ltd. were merged and it has now hived off its principal Paper undertaking to Central Pulp Mills Ltd. a group company for restructuring of its debts due to Institutions and banks. Its Drycell Plant was closed and Synthetics plant was disposed off to Reliance Industries Ltd. Post merger results however have not been encouraging.

9. In mid 70’s Ankur Chemicals Ltd. was merged with J.K. Business Machines Ltd. (now Hifazat Chemicals Ltd.). The merged company has been notified as a sick undertaking and its plant was taken over by Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation which has also been appointed as the Operating Agency (OA) by the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR). Post merger results are unfavourable to the merged company and its stake holders.

10. In 2001, Ciba CKD Biochem Ltd. (CCBL) merged with its promoter company Novartis India Ltd. (NIL) with the objective of business broad base, economies of scale, strategic importance of anti-TB business and preventing sickness.

Thus, core competence seems to be the operative word. Many players who have undertaken M&A blitz are facing serious liquidity and resource crunch, and all grand plans have been shelved, in the desperate struggle for survival. Corporate mergers are like bush fires. Their flames travel at lightning speed and they can be very destructive according to the view of Professor Hans Schenk, once described by the Economist as the “internationally most reputable Dutch economist”.

In the beginning of the 21st Century, the disinvestment process of the Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) has been through a roller coaster ride. However, the disinvestment of two major Companies - Hindustan Petroleum (HPC) and Bharat Petroleum (BPC) had been put off for a short period for the time being. The table gives the details of disinvestments deals which have been completed so far.

Merger of Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. (MTNL) with Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. (BSNL) was under reconsideration and hence delayed. The Government owns 100% in BSNL and 56.25% in MTNL.

The delay in disinvestment process of two major oil PSUs - HPC and BPC and reconsideration on merger of MTNL with BSNL had adversely affected the share prices of these companies and ultimately stock market index.

The disinvestment has clearly slowed down the Merger & Acquisition (M&A) activities in the first half of 2002-2003. The disinvestment alone amounts to Rs. 3,190.5 crore of the total Rs. 16,078 crore worth of M&As logged during the period. According to the data sourced from the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) a total 640 M&As aggregating Rs. 16,078 crores were announced during April-September 2002 compared to 629 M&As worth Rs. 13,817 crores during the same period in 2001-2002. Most of these deals took place in the chemicals, finance, communication and IT sector including the business process outsourcing (BPO) sector. The M&As volume is higher by 16% due to disinvestment exercise. The privatisation initiated by the Central Government along with the associated open offer for the privatised companies, accounted for higher volume by Rs. 2,261 crores.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to give you insight in to:
• Need for financial restructuring.
• Financial restructuring of an organization in the form of
• Buyback of shares and other methods.

Introduction
Companies have access to a range of sources from which they finance business. These funds are called ‘capital’. The sources of capital can be divided into two categories; internally generated funds and funds provided by third parties. Whichever form of capital is used, it will fall into one of the two categories - debt or equity.

Determination of the Proportion of own Funds and borrowed Funds
Internally generated funds are an important component of a company’s capital structure but it would be unusual for a company to grow at a fast pace only through internal generation of funds. The deficit between the funds which a company requires to fund its growth and the funds which are generated internally, is funded by provision of capital from third parties.

Cost of various types of Capital
Equity capital is the permanent capital of the company, which does not require any servicing in the form of interest. The ideal capital structure would be to raise money through the issue of equity capital.

Debt is essentially an obligation, the terms of which are, inter alia, the repayment of the principal sum within a specific time together with periodic interest payments. Perhaps the easiest form of capital for a company to raise is, a loan from a bank. This form of loan capital may be comparatively expensive than equity.

However, as regards servicing of capital there are advantages of issuing debt instruments. Dividend is not a deductible expense when calculating a company’s taxable profit; it is on the contrary an appropriation of profits. On the other hand, interest paid by a company on debt finance is an allowable expense when calculating a company’s tax, thereby reducing its taxable profit.

Capital Gearing
Capital gearing is the relationship of total debt i.e., bank borrowings, debentures, etc. to total equity capital. Equity capital is not debt for the purpose of calculating a company’s gearing and does not increase gearing. This has a positive advantage to those who review corporate performance treating gearing as a key indicator.

The effort to create securities, which achieve the issuer’s objective of raising long term capital and reducing gearing i.e. to reduce corporate debt, whilst addressing investor concerns about risk, results in resort to different instruments such as convertible preference shares and bonds.

Broadly speaking, the financial structure of a company comprises of its:

i. paid up equity and preference share capital;
ii. various reserves;
iii. all its borrowings in the form of:
   a. long-term loans from financial institutions;
   b. working capital from banks including loans through commercial papers/debentures;
   c. bonds;
   e. credits from suppliers;
   f. trade deposits;
   g. public deposits;
   h. deposits/loans from directors, their relatives and business associates;
   i. deposits from shareholders;
   j. G.D.Rs and A.D.Rs;
   k. funds raised through any other loan instrument.

A company may require any one or more of the above keeping in view its financial requirements at a particular point of time. A dynamic Board should constantly review the financial structure of the company and effect financial restructuring and reorganisation whenever the need arises.

Need for Financial Restructuring
A company should always try to seek a balance between its debt and equity in its capital structure and the funding of the resulting deficit. The targets a company sets in striking this balance are influenced by business conditions, which seldom remain constant.

When, during the life time of a company, any of the following situations arise, the Board of Directors of a company is compelled to think and decide on the company’s restructuring:

i. necessity for injecting more working capital to meet the market demand for the company’s products or services;
ii. when the company is unable to meet its current commitments;
iii. when the company is unable to obtain further credit from suppliers of raw materials, consumable stores, bought-out components etc. and from other parties like those doing job work for the company.
iv. when the company is unable to utilise its full production capacity for lack of liquid funds.

Financial restructuring of a company involves a rearrangement of its financial structure to make the company’s finances more balanced.
Restructuring of under-capitalized Company
An under-capitalized company may consider restructuring its capital by taking one or more of the following corrective steps:

i. injecting more capital whenever required either by resorting to rights issue or additional public issue.
ii. resorting to additional borrowings from financial institutions, banks, other companies etc.
iii. issuing debentures, bonds, etc. or iv. inviting and accepting fixed deposits from directors, their relatives, business associates and public.

Restructuring of over-capitalized company
If a company is over-capitalized, its capital also requires restructuring by taking following corrective measures:

i. Buy-back of own shares.
ii. Paying back surplus share capital to shareholders,
iii. Repaying loans to financial institutions, banks, etc.
iv. Repaying fixed deposits to public etc.
v. Redeeming its debentures, bonds, etc.

Buy-back of Shares
Not only statute, but also common law, has upheld the 'sanctity' of a company's capital. In 1887, in Trevor V. Whitworth (1887) 12 App Cas 409, it was held that a company limited by shares may not purchase its own shares as this would amount to an unauthorized reduction of capital. The rationale for this decision is plain, namely that the creditors of the company make decisions on its credit-worthiness on several grounds, but an important ground is the amount of its share capital. If the courts had not established at an early stage that capital was 'sacrosanct' and could not be returned to shareholders at their whim, then share capital would not have been protected. Without this protection, creditors could find shareholders depleting share capital, with creditors left to carry all the business risks.

In India, the rule in Trevor v. Whitworth was enshrined in Section 77 of the Companies Act, 1956 which prohibited a company from buying or cancelling its own shares, unless it complied with the provisions and followed the procedure for reduction of share capital under sections 100 to 104 of the Companies Act, 1956 which involved confirmation by the Court.

However, Section 77A of the Companies Act, 1956 which was inserted in the Companies Act by the Companies (Amendment) Act, 1999 with retrospective effect from 31.10.1998 is an exception to the prohibition under Section 77 and Section 100. Section 77A allows companies to buy-back their own shares as well as other specified securities.

Concept of Buy-back
Buy-back of equity shares is one of the prominent modes of capital restructuring. It is a financial strategy that allows a company to buy back its equity shares and other specified securities, including the securities issued to employees of the company pursuant to a scheme of stock option or sweat equity. In the fast changing national and international economic scenario, the corporate sector needs freedom in restructuring its debt-equity mix, particularly in times of favourable business environment. Prior to the insertion of Section 77A in the Companies Act, 1956, this type of capital restructuring was achieved through capital reduction process under Section 100 of the Companies Act, 1956, involving the cumbersome procedure of passing a special resolution, subject to confirmation by the Court.

Section 77A has opened up a new method of capital restructuring by companies as and when required. Buy-back being a financial strategy, should not be used for improving controlling interest of the promoters group.

However, improvement controlling interest may occur as a natural consequence of the buy-back strategy. Good corporate management should always aim at creation and enhancement of share holders' value. Buy-back offers a straight forward route for reducing equity. When equity is costlier than debt, buy-back helps in reducing the overall capital cost.

When a company has an unsuitable debt-equity ratio and it needs to alter its 'skewed' equity, it has to build free reserves or inject more borrowed funds. In a growth situation, procuring borrowed funds may be possible but otherwise changing the financial structure is quite difficult. Buy-back option may help in rectifying the skewed equity share capital in the existing capital structure of a low 'leveraged' company with stable return.

Necessity for Buy-back
Good corporate governance requires proper utilisation of shareholders' money. When a company has surplus funds, which it can not, in the given circumstances and in the given state of money market, deploy in a growth process from which it would be able to maintain an average return on capital employed and earning per share, the company's finances need to be restructured by balancing the same.

The Board of Directors of the company has to make a thorough study into the financial structure of the company, the precise reasons for its restructuring and the mode of restructuring which would be suitable to the requirements of the company in the given circumstances.

One of the methods of financial restructuring open to a company is buy-back of its own securities. Buy-back results in the return of the shareholders' money and a reduction of the floating stock of the company's securities in the market while at the same time creating value for the remaining equity.

In a reconstruction, the reasons for embarking upon a buy-back are varied and could include:

- Facilitating reduction of share capital without recourse to the lengthy and time consuming process of passing a special resolution subject to confirmation by the Court as required under Section 100 of the Companies Act, 1956;
- Creation of liquidity in a company's share capital and providing an exit route, where shares are unlisted, or to encourage investment in an unlisted company by agreeing to purchase shares subscribed for at a later date;
- Reducing floating stock of the company's securities in the market and improving the net asset value per share attributable to the remaining equity;
- Proper and judicious deployment of the company’s finances by investing the same in the purchase of its own securities;
- Maintaining shareholders’ value in a situation of poor state of secondary market by a return of surplus cash to the shareholders; and
- Countering hostile take-over.

**Procedure and Practice for Buy-back of Securities**

Under Section 77A of the Companies Act, 1956 any company limited by shares or a company limited by guarantee and having a share capital can buy-back its own securities, whether it is a private, public, listed or unlisted company.

**Buy-back Procedure for listed Securities**

The procedure to be followed for buy-back of securities by listed companies is contained in Sections 77A, 77AA and 77B of the Companies Act, 1956 and (referred to as ‘the Regulations’ hereinafter) the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Buy-back of Securities) Regulations, 1998, which, is detailed below:

[Funding Buy-back: According to Section 77A(1) of the Companies Act, 1956 a company may purchase its own shares or other specified securities (hereinafter referred to as “buy-back”) out of:

i. Its free reserves; or
ii. The securities premium account; or
iii. The proceeds of any shares or other specified securities.

However, no buy-back of any kind of shares or other specified securities can be made out of the proceeds of an earlier issue of the same kind of shares or same kind of other specified securities.

Thus, the company must have at the time of buy-back, sufficient balance in any one or more of these accounts to accommodate the, total value of the buy-back.

**Conditions for Buy-back**

As per Section 77A(2), a buy-back must be authorised by the articles of association of the company. It is, therefore, necessary for a company proposing to resort to a buy-back to make sure that such an authority exists in its articles. If the articles do not contain such a provision, the company must follow the procedure laid down in Section 31 of the Companies Act for altering its articles to incorporate such a provision by passing a special resolution and filing a certified true copy of the same along with Form No. 23, with the concerned Registrar of Companies, for registration as required by Section 192 of the Act.

(In terms of Sub-section (2)(b) of Section 77A, a buy-back must be approved by a special resolution passed in general meeting of the company. However, a special resolution at a general meeting is not necessary where buy-back is or less than ten per cent of the total paid-up equity capital and free reserves of the company and such buy-back has been authorised by the Board of Directors of the company by means of a resolution passed at its meeting.

In such a case, no offer of buy-back can be made within a period of 365 days, reckoned from the date of the preceding offer of buy-back, if any. [For specimen of special resolution for approving buy-back of company's own securities, please see Annexure 3].

Sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Regulations, lays down that for the purposes of passing a special resolution under Sub-section (2) of Section 77A of the Companies Act, the explanatory statement to be annexed to the notice for the general meeting pursuant to Section 173 of the Companies Act shall contain disclosures as specified in Schedule I to the Regulations.

Sub-regulation (2) provides that a copy of the resolution passed at the general meeting under Sub-section (2) of Section 77A of the Companies Act, shall be filed with SEBI and the stock exchanges where the shares of the company are listed, within seven days from the date of passing of the resolution. Regulation 5A of the Regulations, provides the following conditions subject to which a company may buy back its securities when authorised by a Board resolution pursuant to proviso to Section 77A(2) of Companies Act:

a. Before making a public announcement under Regulation 8(1), a public notice shall be given in atleast one English national daily, one Hindi national daily and a regional language daily all with wide circulation at the place where the registered office of the company is situated.

b. The public notice shall be given within 2 days of the passing of the resolution by the Board of Directors.

c. The public notice shall contain the disclosures as specified in Schedule I.

Also, a copy of the resolution, passed by the Board of Directors at its meeting, authorising buy back of its securities, shall be filed with the Board and the stock exchanges where the securities of the company are listed, within two days of the date of passing a special resolution.

**Limits upto which Securities can be bought back**

A buy-back must be equal to or less than twenty-five per cent of the total paid-up capital and free reserves of the company. However, the buy-back of equity shares in any financial year should not exceed twenty-five per cent of its total paid-up equity capital in that financial year [Section 77A(2)(c)].

**Maintenance of post Buy-back Debt-equity ratio**

The ratio of the debt owed by the company must not be more than twice the capital and free reserves after such buy-back. However, the Central Government may prescribe a higher ratio of the debt than that specified under this clause for a class or classes of companies. “Debt” includes all amounts of unsecured and secured debts [Section 77A(2)(d)].

All the shares or other specified securities for buy-back must be fully paid-up [Section 77A(2)(e)].
The buy-back of shares or other specified securities listed on any recognised stock exchange must be in accordance with the SEBI regulations in this behalf [Section 77A(2)(f)].

The buy-back in respect of shares or other specified securities which are not listed on any recognised stock exchange must be in accordance with the guidelines as may be prescribed [Section 77A(2)(g)].

**Methods of Buy-back**

According to Sub-section (5) of Section 77A, a buy-back may be made:

a. From the existing security-holders on a proportionate basis;

or

b. From the open market;

or

c. From odd lots, that is to say, where the lot of securities of a public company, whose shares are listed on a recognised stock exchange, is smaller than such market lot, as may be specified by the stock exchange;

or

d. By purchasing the securities issued to employees of the company pursuant to a scheme of stock option or sweat equity.

According to Regulation 4 of the Regulations, a company may buy back its own securities by any one of the following methods:

a. From the existing security-holders on a proportionate basis through the tender offer;

b. From the open market through:

   i. book-building process,

   ii. stock exchange

or

c. From odd-lot holders.

**Buy-back from existing Security-holders**

According to Regulation 6 of the Regulations, a company may buy back its securities from its existing security-holders on a proportionate basis in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations.
Objective
The objective of this lesson is to introduce
• the importance of, staying agile clean and healthy and ethical for organisations.

The Agile Organization
For some time, management thinkers (and thinking managers) have been stressing the urgent need for radical new approaches to the corporation. In this paradigm, the bottom line cedes its pre-eminence to the top: the corporation concentrates on developing new revenue streams from new products and services, while optimising income from existing lines through innovative marketing and rapid exploitation of changing customer needs and tastes. The new kind of corporation is, above all, ‘agile’.

The dictionary defines ‘agile’ as ‘nimble or active: quick-moving and supple’. For decades, the big business has been compared to a supertanker, which can only be turned at lugubrious speed. Top managers fret about the lack of creativity and innovation beneath them, below the supertanker’s decks, but their own decision-making processes and command structures stultify efforts - even ones which they themselves have promoted - to develop the new and rejuvenate old.

The new changeability is demanded in every major area of corporate strategy and tactics. Like it or not, every corporation belongs in a web (or webs), an eco-system of alliances, partnerships, sub-systems, processes, lines of business, collaborators, etc., none of which is guaranteed any permanence. Hierarchy, dominant market share, vertical integration and economies of scale were the traditional means of mastering the complexities of large organizations - for ever. Today, all four pillars have been undermined.

Hierarchy has very little place in an organization which depends on free-thinking, self-managing innovators at all levels. Formerly impregnable market shares have been undermined by aggressive newcomers in many markets. Vertical integration makes no sense when specialist, horizontal component suppliers can achieve economies of technology and scale far greater than those of vertical generalists.

Telescope to Kaleidoscope
The management metaphor has moved from telescope to kaleidoscope. Where once top managers could focus on their own concerns, with little need for peripheral vision, they now view a constantly changing pattern of shapes, sizes and colours, from which they must try to make sense. It sounds like an awesome task. It would have been impossible save for the advances in IT, which animates and accelerates the agile corporation, setting it free to move from control to coordination of collaborative effort, from the status quo to the future.

All truly agile corporations share this positive attitude to change and the future. What makes such agility possible? The first and paradoxical answer is that agility rests on stability: just as Olympic divers need a solid diving platform to launch their acrobatics, so a corporation must be solidly based in order to perform strategic twists and turns at speed. A key foundation is a large and well-nurtured base of customers who respect the supplier. That respect can only be earned by consistent attributes: top quality, excellent service, and great innovation.

The second answer is decentralization; diffuse authority to where it is most needed and can be most effectively applied. Let people take the initiatives that are best for their customers - in the famous microprocessor case, a Japanese calculator firm which wanted a set of Intel chips for its latest machine. An engineer named Ted Hoff earned immortality by wondering why all the circuits couldn’t be placed on a single piece of silicon.

They could: other engineers took over and their prototype gave birth to great fortunes. The discipline was that of the technology, not of top management.

Central Management
Central management’s role in the agile corporation is partly to lay down exacting standards and to see that they are met. Management is also responsible for ensuring that decentralization is genuine. It uses its powers where they are helpful to ensure that its powers are not used where they hinder. This is another paradox, but the agile corporation thrives on paradox. It knows that there is no one right answer, only the best answer at the time, which will be replaced as soon as a better one arrives: and there’s always a better answer.

That is a basic principle of kaizen, the continuous improvement mentioned above, and the essence of Total Quality Management. For a long time, to many conventional managers, TQM seemed foreign in both senses - an unwelcome and uncomfortable import from Japanese control freaks. In fact, TQM sprang from the work of an American, the remarkable W. Edwards Deming, who believed passionately in setting workpeople free from authoritarian controls so that they could do their jobs better - much better. Whether or not companies use TQM or its close relative, Six Sigma, the agile principle is the same: give individuals control over their own work and its improvement, individually and in the group.

So, are you agile? Can you:
• deliberately fuse old and new?
• blend group working with real individual fulfilment?
• combine short-term, medium-term and long-term, without sacrificing any of the three?
• achieve both discipline and freedom?
• pursue commercialism with humanity?
combine globalism with local, national and regional marketing?
• give the customers what they want while leading them to want it?
• strengthen the old while nourishing the new?
• throw caution to the wind, yet also avoid undue risk?
• grow fast while not overstretching the company by exceeding ‘the limits to growth’?

Sometimes these limits are immediately obvious, like shortages of production capacity, or component supply, or unsaturated markets to exploit. More often, the limits are less specific, compounded of several elements, including competitive actions and reactions, market trends, organisational responsiveness, environmental factors, etc. Taking the long view, the limits seem almost arithmetical: a corporation aiming to grow its earnings per share by 15% compound will have to double in five years, quadruple in ten and octuple in fifteen. The bigger the base, the more highly improbable the growth.

Decentralised Fleet

One remedy was well expressed by one CEO, who wanted to replace his supertanker by a fleet of decentralized motor-boats, speedy and powerful autonomous units that (unlike the unwieldy supertanker) could turn on a dime as they pursued their opportunities and repelled their threats. Few chief executives, however, have found it easy or quick to dictate and achieve this dynamic change in their fleets from stability to agility. Top-down initiatives have run into resistance from senior and middle management - resistance which is insidious and difficult to conquer.

The agile answer is to remove the top-down element from the initiatives - a reform which is at last easier done than said, thanks to informal, internal changes that have increased the agility quotient in all businesses. None of these changes is more important than the spread of multi-disciplinary, cross-functional teams which are formed to tackle projects and which last only as long as the project. Nobody ordained this fundamental reform, but today managers can easily spend half their time in ad hoc teams, the building blocks of the agile corporation.

Team remits may well extend beyond the boundaries of the corporation, into the territory of customers, suppliers or even competitors. The team thus bypasses formal structures and can create its own modus operandi. Time and again, project management by teams has proven its ability to make impossible deadlines possible. ‘Skunk works’, project teams and other ‘hot groups’ have created new heroes as well as new products and services.

Leadership of teams can pass from hand to hand, depending on whose authority of expertise is most relevant. The kaleidoscopic corporation thus breaks away from the old ideas of rank, status and chains of command and communication. The agile corporation relies on people doing what comes naturally, intuitively and voluntarily. Many observers have puzzled about the fact that employees in the mass in general resist change more than they do as individuals - even when the proposal is manifestly beneficial to their individual interests.

Guarding the Status QUO

This obstructive mass mentality reinforces the corporation’s role as guardian of the status quo. That automatically makes it the enemy of the new. There are obstinate, talented people like Ted Hoff inside every organization: the supreme test of agility is whether the organization frustrates that individual talent or thrives on its expression. The new agile approach optimizes the return on human capital employed by facilitating and grouping the use of human talents wherever, whenever or however they are needed.

This inevitably hinges on using new technologies to the full - above all those of information and communication. Organizations have always been machines for controlling and distributing information. Corporate arthritis followed when the messaging machinery became more important than the message. The aim was laudable: to attain disciplined, orderly, regular efficiency. The result was lamentable: wholes worth much less than their parts. Agile firms treat their parts as more important than the whole - and end up with a total entity that much outweighs those parts.

Practice Questions
1. State the advantages of staying lean, clean and ethical
Objective
The objective of this study lesson is:
• To introduce you meaning and concept of Take Over
• Objects of take over and Kinds of T/O
Take Overs
Meaning and Concept of Takeover
Takeover is an acquisition of shares carrying voting rights in a company with a view to gaining control over the management of the company. It takes place when an individual or a group of individuals or a company acquires control over the assets of a company either by acquiring majority of its shares or by obtaining control of the management of the business and affairs of the company. Where the shares of the company are closely held by a small number of persons, a takeover may be effected by agreement with the holders of those shares. However, where the shares of a company are widely held by the general public, it involves the process as set out in the SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 1997.

Takeovers are taking place all over the world. Those companies whose shares are underquoted on the stock market are under a constant threat of takeover. In fact every company is vulnerable to a takeover threat. The takeover strategy has been conceived to improve corporate value, achieve better productivity and profitability by making optimum use of the available resources in the form of men, materials and machines. Takeover is a corporate device whereby one company acquires control over another company, usually by purchasing all or a majority of its shares. Ordinarily, a larger company takes over a smaller company. In a reverse takeover, a smaller company acquires control over a larger company. It must be noted takeover of management is quite distinct from takeover of possession for the purpose of sale of establishment. In the former case the underlying view is to rehabilitate the establishment by providing better management which is not so in the latter case.

Emergence of Concept of Takeover
Earlier in India well performing companies were not allowed to utilise their surplus funds and managerial competence to takeover suitable and promising companies and “build on them” with their own funds and technical, administrative, financial and marketing expertise. They had to wait for companies to go sick, be referred to BIFR, and be taken over under a rehabilitation scheme prepared by a nominated operating agency and sanctioned by BIFR.

In India, the process of economic liberalisation and globalisation ushered in the early 1990's created a highly competitive business environment, which motivated many companies to restructure their corporate strategies. The restructuring process led to an unprecedented rise in strategies like amalgamations, mergers including reverse mergers, demergers, takeovers, reverse takeovers and other strategic alliances.

The concept of takeover picked up and in the meantime the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) also notified the Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeover Regulations, which laid down a procedure to be followed by an acquirer for acquiring majority shares or controlling interest in another company. The takeover code is not meant to ensure proper management of the business of companies or to provide remedies in the event of mismanagement. Its main objective is to ensure equality of treatment and opportunity to all shareholders and offer protection to them, in the event of substantial acquisition of shares and takeovers.

Objects of Takeover
The objects of a takeover may inter alia be
i. To effect savings in overheads and other working expenses on the strength of combined resources;
ii. To achieve product development through acquiring firms with compatible products and technological/manufacturing competence, which can be sold to the acquirer’s existing marketing areas, dealers and end users;
iii. To diversify through acquiring companies with new products and services of markets and stages;
iv. To improve productivity and profitability by joint efforts of technical and other personnel on the strength of improved efficiency in administration, management, production, finance and marketing of goods and services as a consequence of unified control;
v. To create shareholder value and wealth by optimum utilization of the resources of both companies;
vi. To eliminate competition;
vii. To keep hostile takeover at bay;
viii. To achieve economy of numbers by mass production at economical costs;
ix. To secure advantage of vertical combination by having under one command and under one roof, all the stages or processes in the manufacture of the end product, which had earlier been available in two companies at different locations, thereby saving loading, unloading, transportation costs and other expenses and also by affecting saving of time and energy unnecessarily spent on excise formalities at different places and stages;
x. To secure substantial facilities as available to a large company compared to smaller companies for raising additional capital, increasing market potential, expanding consumer
base, buying raw materials at economical rates and for having own combined and improved research and development activities for continuous development of the products so as to ensure a permanent market share in the industry;

xi. To increase market share;

xii. To achieve market development by acquiring one or more companies in new geographical territories or segments, such as new user groups or price categories, in which the activities of acquirer are absent or do not have a strong presence.

**Kinds of Takeover**

Takeovers may be broadly classified into three kinds:

i. Friendly Takeover: Friendly takeover is with the consent of taken over company. In friendly takeover, there is an agreement between the management of two companies through negotiations and the takeover bid may be with the consent of majority or all shareholders of the target company. This kind of takeover is done through negotiations between two groups. Therefore, it is also called negotiated takeover.

ii. Hostile Takeover: When an acquirer company does not offer the target company the proposal to acquire its undertaking but silently and unilaterally pursues efforts to gain control against the wishes of existing management, such acts of acquirer are known as 'hostile takeover'. Such takeovers are hostile on the management and are thus called hostile takeover.

iii. Bail Out Takeover: Takeover of a financially sick company by a profit earning company to bail out the former is known as bail out takeover. Such takeover normally takes place in pursuance to the scheme of rehabilitation approved by the financial institution or the scheduled bank, who have lent money to the sick company. The lead financial institutions, evaluates the bids received in respect of the purchase price track record of the acquirer and his financial position. This kind of takeover is done with the approval of the Financial Institutions and banks.

**Takeover Bids**

"Takeover bid" is an offer to the shareholders of a company, whose shares are not closely held, to buy their shares in the company at the offered price within the stipulated period of time. It is addressed to the shareholders with a view to acquiring sufficient number of shares to give the offeror company, voting control of the target company. It is usually expressed to be conditional upon a specified percentage of shares being the subject-matter of acceptance by or before a stipulated date. A takeover bid is a technique, which is adopted by a company for taking over control of the management and affairs of another company by acquiring its controlling shares.

**Type of Takeover Bids**

A takeover bid may be made by consent of the majority or all the shareholders of the target company, which is referred to as a "friendly takeover bid". It may be against the wishes of the management of the target company, which is referred to as a "hostile Takeover bid". Bids may be mandatory, partial or competitive bids. Mandatory Bid SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations 1997 as amended by Second Amendment Regulations, contain provisions for making public announcement i.e. mandatory bid vide Regulations 10, 11 and 12 in the following cases:

a. for acquisition of 15% or more of the shares or voting rights;

b. for acquiring additional shares or voting rights to the extent of 5% of the voting rights in any financial year ending on 31st March if such person already hold not less than 15% but not more than 75% of the shares or voting rights in a company;

c. for acquiring shares or voting rights along with persons acting in concert to exercise more than 75% of voting rights in a company.

d. for acquiring control over a company.

**Partial Bid**

Partial bid covers a bid made for acquiring part of the shares of a class of capital where the offerer intends to obtain effective control of the offeree through voting power. Such a bid is made for equity shares carrying voting rights. In other words the offerer bids for the whole of issued shares of one class of capital in a company other than equity share capital carrying voting rights, partial bids come to the fore. Regulation 12 of SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares) Regulations, 1997 qualifies partial bid in the form of acquiring control over the target company irrespective of whether or not there has been any acquisition of shares or voting rights in a company. For such acquisition, it is necessary to make public announcement in accordance with the Regulations.

**Competitive Bid**

Competitive bid can be made by any person within 21 days of public announcement of the offer made by the acquirer. Such bid shall be made through public announcement in pursuance of Regulation 25 of the SEBI Takeover Regulations 1997. Any competitive offer by an acquirer shall be for such number of shares which when taken together with shares held by him along with persons acting in concert with him shall be at least equal to the holding of the first bidder including the number of shares for which the present offer by the first bidder has been made. No person shall make a competitive bid for acquisition of shares of a financially weak company where once lead financial institution has evaluated the bid and accepted the bid of the acquirer who has made the public announcement in pursuance of Regulation 35 of SEBI Takeover Regulations, 1997.

**Consideration for Takeover**

Selection of the method for takeover should be made on the basis of information received about the target company and the means available with the acquirer.

1. Consideration in the form of cash: Takeover by an offerer company of an offeree company may be affected by a cash consideration, either for all or in part of the equity capital.
through a bid directly from the equity holders or through the stock market. The offerer company can have the new shares in sufficient number allotted to it or its directors to gain controlling voting power in the offeree company and also purchase for cash, block of shares from the persons in control of the offeree company, carrying effective voting rights and thereby enabling its nominees on the Board to control the affairs of the company.

2. Consideration in the form of Shares: When consideration is offered in the form of shares by the offerer in own company to shareholders of the target company various courses of action are available:

a. Share-for-share takeover bid in which the offerer company in exchange for shares of offeree provides fully paid up shares on a stated basis. Apart from this, share-plus-cash or share-plus-loan stock, convertible or non-convertible, shares or loan stock with a cash option could be a mode of consideration.

b. Reverse bid wherein the offeree company makes share-for-share bid for the whole of the equity capital of the offerer company where the offerer company has a large capital base. This alternative is more suitable when the offeree company is listed, a growing concern and capable of acting as a better holding company by pursuing its policies etc. Also, this mode offers sufficient tax advantages.

c. Combinations of various modes may be resorted to, for discharging the consideration. For instance, acquisition by private deal of a block of shares from the existing Board of Directors or larger controlling interest shareholders of the offeree company or acquisition of all or part of the assets of the offeree company for shares of offerer company or reverse acquisition with offeree company etc.

Thus, the decision about the proper mix of alternatives should be taken through expert advice, having considered the relative quoted market prices of shares of offerer and offeree, their dividend yield, gearing level, security cover, voting strength, net assets value, etc.

3. Acquisition through a new company: A new company may be formed by acquiring shares in two target companies and the shares of the new company may be issued to the shareholders of both the target companies, in consideration for acquisition of share capital or undertakings in whole or in part.

4. Acquisition of Minority held shares of a subsidiary: The offerer, if already holds more than 50% of issued capital in the offeree company and plans to acquire the balance equity of the offeree will have to resort to takeover tactics subject to the restrictions placed by the Law and also SEBI guidelines.

Practice Questions
1. Start the objects of a Corporate Take Over
2. What the different kinds of Take Over
Objective
The objective of this lesson is:

- to introduce you to the concept of Bail out Take Over

Bail out Take overs
Regulation 30 of the SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 1997 states that the provisions of Chapter IV of the Regulations is applicable to a substantial acquisition of shares in a financially weak company not being a sick industrial company, in pursuance to a scheme of rehabilitation approved by a public financial institution or a scheduled bank (hereinafter referred to as lead institution). The lead institution is responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of Chapter IV.

“Financially weak company” in this context means a company which has at the end of the previous financial year accumulated losses resulting in erosion of over 50% but below 100% of its net worth (total of the paid-up capital and free reserves) as at the beginning of the previous financial year.

In a bail out takeover, the lead institution, which is a public financial institution or a bank, appraises the financially weak company, which is not a sick industrial company, taking into account its financial viability, its requirement of funds for revival and draws up a rehabilitation package on the principle of protection of interests of minority shareholders, good management, effective revival and transparency.

The scheme should also specifically provide the details of any change in management. The scheme may provide for acquisition of shares in the financially weak company as:

a. an outright purchase of shares, or
b. exchange of shares, or
c. a combination of both.

However, the scheme may ensure that after the proposed acquisition the erstwhile promoters do not own any shares in case such acquisition is made by the new promoters pursuant to such scheme. In other words, if the acquisition of shares is by new promoters then the old promoters have to give up their shareholding in the financially weak company in its entirety.

Manner of Acquisition of Shares of Financially Weak Company
Before giving effect to any scheme of rehabilitation the lead institution is required to invite offers for acquisition of shares from at least three parties. After receipt of the offers, the lead institution shall select one party having regard to the managerial competence, adequacy of financial resources and technical capability of the person acquiring shares to rehabilitate the financially weak company.

The lead institution shall provide necessary information to any person, intending to make an offer to acquire shares, about the financially weak company, particularly regarding its present management, technology, range of products manufactured, shareholding pattern, financial holding and performance and assets and liabilities of the company for five years from the date of offer and also the minimum financial and other commitments expected of the person acquiring shares. (Regulation 31)

Manner of Evaluation of Bids
The lead institution shall evaluate the bids received in terms of purchase price or exchange of shares, track record, financial resources, reputation of the management of the person acquiring shares and ensure fairness and transparency in the process.

After evaluating the offers, the lead institution has to list them in order of preference, and in consultation with the persons concerned with the affairs of the management of the company, accept one of the bids. (Regulation 32)

Persons Acquiring Shares to Make an Offer
The person identified by the lead institution shall, on receipt of a communication in this behalf from the lead institution, make a formal offer to acquire shares from promoters etc. of the company, financial institutions and also other shareholders at a company, financial institutions and also other shareholders at a mutually determined price. The lead institution may also offer the shares held by it in the target company, as part of the package for its rehabilitation. (Regulation 33)

Person Acquiring Shares to Make Public Announcement
The person acquiring shares is required to make a public announcement of his intention to acquire shares from the other shareholders of the company. The public announcement shall contain relevant details about the offer including the information about the identity and background of the person acquiring shares, number and percentage of shares proposed to be acquired, offer price, the specified date, the date of opening of the offer and the period for which the offer shall be kept open and such other particulars as may be required by SEBI.

The offer letter should be forwarded to each shareholder, other than the promoters or persons in charge of the management of the company and the financial institutions.

If the offer results in the public shareholding being reduced to 10% or less of the voting capital of the company, the acquirer should either:

a. within three months from the date of closure of the public offer, make an offer to buy out the outstanding shares remaining with the shareholders at the same offer price, which may have the effect of delisting the target company;
b. undertake to disinvest through an offer for sale or by a fresh issue of capital to the public which shall open within six months from the date of closure of public offer, such number of shares so as to satisfy the listing requirements.
The letter of offer shall clearly specify the option available to the acquirer. In order to compute the percentage as specified above, the voting rights as at the expiration of thirty days after the closure of public offer shall be reckoned. The acquirer shall while accepting the offer from the shareholders other than promoters or persons in charge, offer to acquire from the individual shareholder, his entire shareholdings if such holding is upto hundred shares of face value of rupees ten or ten shares of the face value of rupees hundred each.

**No Competitive Bid to be Made**

No person shall make a competitive bid for acquisition of shares of the financially weak company once the lead institution has evaluated the bids and accepted the bid of the acquirer who has made the public announcement of offer for acquisition of shares of the company.

**Acquisition of Shares by State Level Public Financial Institution**

Where proposal for acquisition of shares of a financially weak company is made by a state level public financial institution, the provisions of the regulations relating to rehabilitation scheme prepared by a public financial institution, shall apply. However, in such a case the Industrial Development Bank of India shall be the agency for ensuring compliance of the regulations in this respect.

**Practice Questions**

1. State the features of a bail out Take Over
LESSON 34:
ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF TAKEOVER

Objective
This study lesson enables understanding:

- Economic aspects of a takeover
- Financial aspects of a takeover

Economic Aspects of Takeover
As discussed earlier in this chapter, in a takeover the management of the acquirer may maintain the legal identity of both the companies and operate them under the direction of separate Boards of Directors (having common directors) or the management may decide that both the companies should merge or amalgamate in a new company or one may amalgamate or merge with the other so that there is only one company, either the new company or the merged or the amalgamated company functioning under a unified command of one Board of Directors.

In either case, the object of a successful takeover should be the overall economic betterment of the shareholders, the management, staff and all other employees, suppliers of raw materials and other consumables, personnel engaged in the marketing network, the ultimate consumer, the public at large and the Government.

By virtue of better management of the business and affairs of the company, with the active and dedicated association of qualified and experienced technical, managerial, financial and marketing personnel, the value of the shares should increase, employees feel assured of timely payment of their salaries and other dues, suppliers get timely payments for their supplies, end products of the company are freely available, Government dues are paid on time and the company contributes to the society in which it operates and the areas whereof it serves. Socially conscious management of such a unified company is supposed to look after the surroundings and the environment of the place where it works. Besides being beneficial to the concerned companies, takeovers are also beneficial to the economy in the following manner:

i. Disciplining the capital market: Takeovers help in disciplining the market as inefficient and errant companies get taken over due to their low book value and share prices. This process also helps in discovering the potential of the acquired companies, if any.

ii. Consolidation of Efforts and Capacities: In the yesteryears Government authorities had issued licences to units with capacities much below the minimum economic size. Due to increased competition in markets, many of these are either incurring losses or earning marginal profits. Also, in the light of stringent control standards and emergence of multinationals, small units have realized the importance of conservation of resources and reduction of costs. However due to lack of proper infrastructure and sufficient capacity they are unable to implement their schemes efficiently.

iii. Concentrating on core competencies: Due to the restrictive licensing policies followed by the Government, in the past, large companies were not allowed to grow and diversify easily. Rigorous provisions of MRTP posed serious obstacles. The companies were required to diversify into totally unrelated areas. However, due to recent developments like liberalisation and increasing pressure of competition, they are realising the need to focus on core competition, for which mergers and takeovers offer green pastures. This is because these strategies enable the companies to rationalise their portfolios, enhance entity value and increase leveraging capability.

The unified command of the company in a takeover transaction should ensure creation of more wealth through optimum competence, improved productivity and higher profitability. All initiatives to enhance productivity, performance and market capitalisation should be supported. Thus, the takeover strategy has been conceived to improve general economic well-being of all those who are, directly or indirectly, connected with the corporate sector. It is adopted to increase the corporate value, achieve better productivity and profitability by making optimum use of the available resources in the form of men, materials and machines.

Financial and Accounting Aspects of Takeover
Accounting considerations are vital in planning a takeover. While many such transactions are based upon industrial or other operation considerations, others depend upon the financial impact of transactions on the financial position of the parties. In a takeover, if the acquirer is an individual, he has to write in his personal books of account the amounts invested in the shares of the company, whose majority shares or control has been taken over by him. This investment in the shares of the target company shall be reflected in his personal Return of Income at the end of the financial year.

Holding Company’s Books of Account
The books of account of the holding company will be accordingly written as under:

If consideration for the acquired shares has been paid in cash only, the Cash Account will be credited and the Investments Account will be debited.

If only fully paid shares have been allotted by the acquiring company to the shareholders of the target company, whose shares have been acquired, in exchange for their shares, then the
Share Capital Account will be credited and the Investments Account will be debited.

If the consideration has been paid partly in cash and partly in the form of fully paid shares, then for the cash portion, Cash Account will be credited and the Investments Account will be debited and for the fully paid shares portion, Share Capital Account will be credited and the Investments Account will be debited.

Besides, the books of account, the acquiring or the holding company shall also maintain a Register of Investments in accordance with the provisions of Section 372A (5) of the Companies Act, 1956. Subsidiary companies books of account shall be transferred to the investor protection fund of the regional stock exchange of the target company.

There will be no accounting entry in the books of account of the target company or the subsidiary company.

However, in the register of members of the subsidiary company, the transfer of shares of the shareholders, whose shares have been acquired by the holding company, shall be registered as soon as the relevant instruments of transfer along with the relevant share certificates have been received and the registration of their transfer. The share certificates shall be sent to the holding company after making due endorsement of the transfer under the authentication of the authorised signatory of the subsidiary company.

**Taxation Aspects of Takeover**

Taxation aspect is not involved in a takeover at the time of acquisition of shares by the holding company in the company which becomes its subsidiary company by virtue of acquisition of majority of shares.

However, if and when the holding company sells the shares, the sale would involve the payment of Capital Gains Tax (short-term or long-term) under the Income-tax Act, 1961 depending on the period for which the shares are held by the holding company.

**Stamp Duty on Takeover Documents**

In a takeover the dutiable document is the Instruments of Transfer executed by and between the transferors of the shares and the transferee of the shares in the form prescribed in the Companies (Central Government's) General Rules and Forms, 1956. The duty on the Instruments of Transfer is paid in the form of Share Transfer Stamps. These are affixed and cancelled on each Instrument of Transfer at the rate of 0.50 P. per one hundred rupees or a fraction thereof of the sale value of the shares. No stamp duty is payable in case of transfer of shares through Depository.

**Payment of Consideration**

In a takeover, the acquirer acquires majority of the shares of the target company. If the acquisition is an individual, the consideration for the acquired shares is paid to the registered holders of the shares as per agreed terms, in cash. However, if the acquirer is a company, the consideration for the acquired shares may be paid either in cash or in the form of fully paid shares allotted and registered in the name(s) of holders of the shares in the target company.

Regulation 29 of the SEBI Regulations lays down the following procedure for payment of consideration for the acquired shares:

For the amount of consideration payable in cash, the acquirer shall, within a period of 21 days from the date of closure of the offer, open a special account with a banker to an issue registered with the Board and deposit therein, such sum as would, together with 90% of the amount lying in the Escrow Account, if any, make up the entire sum due and payable to the shareholders as consideration for acceptances received and accepted in terms of these Regulations and for this purpose, transfer the funds from the Escrow Account.

The unclaimed balance lying to the credit of the account referred to above at the end of 3 years form the date of deposit thereof shall be transferred to the investor protection fund of the regional stock exchange of the target company.

In respect of consideration payable by way of exchange of securities, the acquirer should ensure that the securities are actually issued and despatched to the shareholders.

**Case Study 1: HLL-Tomco Merger**

(30th June 1993 - Rationale for Arrangement)


The soap and detergents industry in India today has matured into an amalgam of market niches with fast changing consumer loyalties. It has always been a high volume low margin business requiring massive advertising expenditure. The per capita consumption of soaps and detergents in India at that time (1989-1992) was 0.3 kgs per annum for soaps and 1.6 kgs for detergents. Compared to the other developing countries, the consumption figures were extremely low, as the comparative figures were 0.6 to 1 kgs for soaps and 4.5 kgs for detergents. However, with increase in population, spread of education and rising levels of income and consumption, the soaps and detergents industry was poised for a major breakthrough. The overall growth rate of the industry in the country was expected to be about 15 percent per annum. The Working Group on the 7th Plan had estimated that the demand for fabric wash products will grow from about 2.2 million tonnes in 1990 to 4.3 million tonnes in 2000. The consumption of toilet soap was increasing at 6.7% per annum and more particularly the consumption in the rural areas was likely to grow at more than 12%. However, the growth of this industry had been hampered by factors like scarcity of raw materials and lopsided tax structure. The major raw material for detergents, linear alkyl benzene, had to be imported on a large scale due to inadequate availability within the country.

In the early 80s the small scale sector entered the detergents segment of the industry, although it remained to be dominated by the large scale soap manufacturing giants. The leaders in the detergents segment of the market were Nirma and HLL. The total turnover of the detergent bars in 1992 was Rs. 1,016 crores of which Nirma had 24.2%, HLL had 44.6% and others had 31.2%. In the detergents powder market the total turnover was Rs.1,117 crores of which Nirma had 39.5%, HLL had 37.3%, P&G had 3.2% and others 20%. The detergent segment of the industry was bustling with brands at the lower end of the market, but the top end was dominated by Ariel and Surf Ultra. Currently this premium segment which was created by P&G was worth Rs.120 crores, and it was estimated that the growth
in this segment will surpass the average annual growth of 10 percent projected for the entire industry. This segment of the market was considered to be very lucrative and other multinationals were planning to enter this segment - Colgate with its international brands, Spic with a German collaboration and Tata Chemicals with an ethnic brand were likely to compete with the Ariel and Surf. A new segment had emerged within the detergents market, viz. washing machine powders which market sources predicted would constitute 25% of the total detergent market in the next decade. The then estimated demand for fabric wash products, comprising of the synthetic detergents and washing soaps is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total FWP</th>
<th>Synthetic Detergents (Lakh Tonnes)</th>
<th>Washing Soaps (Lakh Tonnes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The toilet soap segment of the industry was valued at Rs. 1,800 crores in 1992, and HLL was leading with a 70.2% share, Godrej had 10.1%, Nirma had 4.6% and others, 15.1%. The toilet soap market was divided into a popular segment which comprised 87 percent and a premium segment of 13 percent, based on price and quality. The demand for toilet soaps was expected to touch 9.14 lakh tonnes in 2000 AD.

**Hindustan Lever Limited-The Company**

Hindustan Lever, (HLL) the largest player in the highly competitive and fast growing soap and detergents market, was poised to transform itself into an almost invincible colossus, with the acquisition of one-time arch rival, TO MCO. The TO MCO acquisition, was a strategic move for Lever, as it came close on the heels of the much publicised strategic alliance between Lever’s global adversary, Proctor & Gamble with Godrej. The merger and strategic alliance, was scheduled to have a significant impact on the structure and performance of the soap and detergents industry in India.

Hindustan Lever’s operations were focused on the personal wash and fabric wash segments of the soap and detergents market, although it was also engaged in the manufacture of speciality and bulk chemicals.

Although the company had acquired market leadership with a 59 percent market share in 1992, the decade of the 80s had been one of enormous transition and change. During this decade, HLL transformed from a beleagured giant to a slimmer organisation with brimming bottom lines. In the mid-80s, when inflation and rising raw material costs were eroding the profitability of practically all the players in the industry, the company responded with a quality improvement drive. Quality, in HLL was seen as equivalent to savings in cost and enhancement of productivity. Low cost production options were explored and the excess production capacities of sick units were acquired on lease. The management of the entire supply chain was toned up by working closely with the suppliers in an attempt to bring down inventories. On the production front, HLL expanded its production base from three major factories and a chemical complex in 1980, to about 20 manufacturing locations in 1992 (including an export processing zone).

Accordingly, the company was no longer dependent on a single location as compared to 1985 when 60% of its production came from the Bombay factory. The non-availability of raw materials coupled with rising prices made it imperative for the company to have control over key inputs and accordingly it commenced the manufacture of sodium tri-polyphosphate in 1983.

On the marketing front, during the 80s, the company launched several new products, extended brands and upgraded existing products. HLL launched and made a success of eight to ten brands in the detergents segments-Wheel, Surfmatic, Rin and Surf Ultra, and in the toilet soaps segment, Liril cologne and LeSancy were launched. The company’s major brands like Lifebuoy, Lux and Rexona were relaunched in modified versions. In 1992, HLL consolidated its value leadership in the fabric wash market with the relaunching of improved quality concentrated detergent powder, Surf Ultra and Triple Power Rin, which are now strengthening their - market position. The net result of the above measures adopted by the company in the early 80s, gave it a competitive edge in terms of lower costs for its products, enabling it to grow ahead of the market and maintain market leadership by offering competitive prices.

HLL’s success, in terms of volume growth, could be attributed to aggressive entry into low-priced products, a proper branding and cost strategy coupled with maintaining a presence in the entire range of the price continuum both in the toilet soaps and detergents markets. Further, in terms of financial performance, the year 1992-93 had been rather impressive* with the sales value edging towards Rs.600 crores, due to improved price realisations and larger volume in soaps and detergents group. Its innovative cost control measures, aggressive marketing, and increased production volumes in diversified locations had been largely responsible for its remarkable improvement in financial performance.

**Organization Culture**

HLL had been known for its result oriented, systems driven work environment, where a strong emphasis is placed on performance. Accordingly, it always has/ had and strives for a team of high performing and high profile executives, carefully selected from the best management institutes. Discussing product profitability and target achievement is the only language that its managers understand. The work culture is very demanding and only the best survive. In fact, about 100 managers at that time from Unilever group companies had quit their jobs, as they were unable to cope with the demanding work culture.

HLL’s size had earlier proved to be its weakness, and accordingly, changes in the organisation structure were necessary to enable it to respond to a rapidly changing market place. One of the recommendations of the management committees had been the reduction in the levels of HLL’s managerial hierarchy from 9 to 5. In two years time the levels were reduced to 7 and a new infotech system was introduced which would facilitate exchange of information and help to increase the speed of response. In order to stem the tide of the managerial exodus, HLL hiked the entry level remuneration for management trainees by nearly 40%, still the remuneration was lower than that of the competitors.
On the industrial relations front, 1988 was an eye opener as the HLL management declared a lock-out at Sewri, its largest production unit, and the factory was opened a year later, only when the workers signed on the dotted line giving an assurance for an increase in productivity in return for salary increases.

Inspite of closure for one year, the challenges of market-place were met with a new focus and productivity improved.

Table 1 gives detailed financial information and equity share data for four years from 1989-1992 for HLL.

Table 1 Hindustan Lever Limited Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs. in crore</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Shareholders' Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Reserves and Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Before Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Net Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Liabilities and Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Inventories (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Bank Balances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Other Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and Advances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Current Liabilities (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth Plans

The growth plans for the company began in the mid 80s with the initiation of the liberalization process. After a series of brainstorming sessions and analysis of macro economic trends like inflation, balance of payments position, and growth rates, Mr. S.M. Dutta, the Managing Director, and his team of 11 executives decided to zero in on the fastest growing business, soaps and detergents, which was also an area of existing strengths and competences. The growth plans were designed to achieve production of one million tonnes by 1994, more than double the turnover for the soaps and detergents group from Rs. 400 crores to Rs. 850 crores in 1996, and double profit from Rs. 28 crores to Rs. 55 crores.

In keeping with the trends in the international personal wash market, where there had been a dramatic shift away from soaps and bars to liquids, the company decided to launch products ranging from liquid soaps to shower gels aimed at the upper middle class. In 1991, the dismantling of MRTP and FERA*, prompted the company to review its growth plans and evaluate the feasibility of achieving the growth target through acquisitions rather than expansion. Accordingly in 1992, it identified TOMCO as a prime acquisition candidate in the soaps and detergents industry which was going through a difficult period with escalating raw material costs and rising advertisement expenditures eroding profits. The declining financial performance of TOMCO prompted HLL to consider the merger route as an easier and less expensive method for growth. According to Mr. S.M. Dutta, ‘acquisition can provide quicker access to manufacturing capacities, are less expensive than organic growth and also provide fairly strong brands’. This strategy of growth through acquisitions was not new to HLL as evidenced by the acquisition of Union Home Products, Sunrise Chemicals and Shivalik Cellulose. It was also not restricted to the soaps and detergents business as HLL was negotiating for the takeover of two superphosphate fertiliser plants which had fallen sick.

TOMCO - The Company

TOMCO, a one time major jewel in the Tata crown, was on the brink of becoming a BIFR case. The 74 year old manufacturer of oil based soaps and synthetic detergents had a token presence in edible oils, vanaspati and animal feeds. Over the years it had never emerged as a market leader and always trailed behind HLL, despite certain intrinsic strengths and a strong infrastructure. The company had 7 lakh urban and rural outlets and 2,500 stock lists spread all over the country. It had a market presence in almost every segment of the soaps and detergents market. In the premium segment of toilet soaps, it had Moti, which was competing with Liril of HLL and Cinthol of Godrej. In the popular segment, it had Hamam and Jai, which were

Hindustan Lever Limited Profit and Loss Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rs. in crore</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the year ended 31st December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings Before Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits After Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Rate %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings per Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High 113.50 Low 69.00

Average 91.25
pitted against Lux and Rexona of HLL. In the economy segment, its OK bar soap had proved to be no competition for the formidable Lifebuoy of HLL. In laundry soaps TOMCO was the largest producer with its 501 bar, which was in direct competition with Sunlight of HLL and Ghavi of Godrej. In the detergents bar market TOMCO’s Dubble trailed behind HLL’s Rin and in the lower end of this segment, TOMCO had positioned Super 501, in competition with Wheel of HLL and Nirma. In the detergents powder segment, TOMCO’s Tej had proved to be no competition for HLL’s Surf. In the low priced segment of the detergent powders market TOMCO’s OK detergent powder was far behind Nirma and Wheel of HLL. It was only in the detergent powders for washing machines, that TOMCO had a leading presence with its Revel and Revel plus.

TOMCO had indigenously developed a detergent concentrate, to compete with Procter and Gamble’s Ariel and HLL’s Surf Ultra. TOMCO had also launched a shampoo Raindrop, and a tooth paste - Effermint.

TOMCO’s financial performance over the period March 1986 to March 1990 had been impressive, with an increase in turnover from Rs. 237 crores to Rs. 335 crores, an increase of 41%. The spectacular performance in 1990 could be attributed to a growth in rural markets as well as a Rs. 28 crores export order for detergents to USSR. A tighter control on input costs had also contributed towards better financial performance. However, after 1990, the profit margins were eroded due to increase in prices of soap making oils and fats. In fact in 1991 alone, the prices of oil rose by Rs. 3500 per tonne, accounting for 63 per cent of the raw material cost. With the break up of USSR the prices of oil rose by Rs. 3500 per tonne, accounting for 63 per cent of the raw material cost. With the break up of USSR the company’s exports suffered a serious setback, and forex.

Earnings dropped from Rs. 29 crores in 1989-90 to Rs. 8 crores in 1990-91. Although the company achieved a turnover of Rs. 387.22 crores for 1990-91, a rise of 14% over the previous year, its pretax profit dipped by 11% to Rs. 6.55 crores. The high cost of raw materials and an increasing wage bill, coupled with stiff competition further eroded profit margins, in 1992. Currently the company was losing heavily and facing a severe cash crunch resulting in further deterioration of profits. Table 2 gives financial information and shareholding pattern for TOMCO.

### Tata Oil Mills Company Limited Profit and Loss Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Profit Before Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>282.15</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>285.73</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>335.26</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>338.86</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>382.80</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>387.21</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Plans

In July 1987, TOMCO’s Chairman, Dr. H.N. Sethna brought in Mr. N.S. Sundarajan as his Managing Director to reverse the company’s fortunes. After a careful analysis the management team decided to consolidate in the area of soaps and detergents while diversifying into related and unrelated areas. The increasing prices of soap making oils prompted the management to reduce its dependence on soaps. Also, it decided to enhance the production capacity of detergents, as it did not require the high cost soap - making oils and fats.

In order to achieve its growth plans and consolidate existing brands, the company embarked on an ambitious modernisation-cum-diversification plan. It put up additional facilities of toilet soaps and detergents in Sewree, Ghaziabad, Madras and established new facilities at Ghaziabad in the North and Ernakulam in the South. It also implemented a Rs. 62 crore project, Tata Vashisti Detergents Ltd., at Chiplun in Maharashtra, to manufacture soaps and detergents. In order to extend its market coverage, it entered into a joint venture agreement with the West Bengal Industrial Development Corporation and took over Gloria Chemicals. As a part of its backward integration plans it set up fatty acid plants at its major factories which were planned to result in cost savings of Rs. 3000 per tonne of fatty acid. Other projects on the anvil included manufacture of titanium-dioxide, sports shoes and pesticides, and setting up of an export oriented unit (Tata Ceramics) for the manufacture of bone china-ware. Other projects in the pipeline were, a Rs. 10 crore joint venture with Clorox of US at Ratnagiri to manufacture institutional hygiene products, disinfectants and cleansers. With all these plans in place, the company hoped to reduce its dependence on soaps and detergents from 85% of turnover to 50%, with sales turnover expected to touch the Rs. 1000 crore mark in 1995-96. To finance its growth plans, in January 1991, the company issued Rs. 46 crores of convertible debentures, which were due for conversion in 1992. However, the Herculean efforts of revitalising the company by the current management team failed and due to lack of thrust in the soaps and detergents business,
TOMCO became the least equipped player with no unique selling proposition.

**Tapping the Synergies**

TOMCO was a good buy for HLL on two very important considerations—complementary brands and manufacturing locations. Although HLL had a presence in practically every segment of the soap market, it did not have an ethnic brand. TOMCO had 7 manufacturing facilities, and it was comparatively stronger in the South with two facilities at Tatapuram, Kerala. It was proposed that the spread of manufacturing facilities would enable the combined entity to substantially reduce the transportation cost and more importantly would facilitate the rapid introduction of new products. The distribution network of over 3000 stockists would be practically doubled with the merger. Also, it was felt that HLL’s technological edge could help reduce TOMCO’s costs by about 30%.

HLL, with the acquisition of TOMCO, planned to have 75% share of the toilet soaps market in volume terms. This could make entry of any competing unit into the industry very costly - even a company like Procter & Gamble had already made a loss of Rs. 7 crores in entering the premium segment of the detergents markets with its Ariel. Thus, although HLL stood to benefit tremendously from the ethnic brands and access to supplementary manufacturing capacities, the real advantage was seen to be in the future stream of profits that were beneath the gross mismanagement of TOMCO. At the time in question, TOMCO was an extremely viable company with an operating profit of Rs. 22 crores in 1991-92. The high interest cost had eroded the profits, as large amounts of funds were blocked in outstanding debtors, inventories, and loans and advances. The 5500 strong workforce managed to produce only 1 lakh tonnes of soaps and detergents, while HLL produced 7 lakh tonnes with 7000 employees. It was envisaged that HLL would use its cash profits of about Rs. 120 crores for the year 1992, to pay off TOMCO’s huge loans. As on 31.3.-1992 the TOMCO had a total loan of Rs. 180 crores and contingent liabilities of Rs. 30 crores, which had resulted in tremendous interest costs. TOMCO’s interest cost were about 4.5% of sales, while HLL stood at 1.5%. It was also expected that the HLL-like efficiency would be put into practice and TOMCO’s working capital of Rs.151 crores would be trimmed. On an average, TOMCO’s receivables were approximately 3 months, compared to HLL’s 5-10 days.

**Incompatibilities and Problems**

It was felt that the more difficult part would be the management of the two very different work cultures and ethos, after the merger. In TOMCO the employee productivity was only 60% of HLL. It was opined that HLL would have to rationalise TOMCO’s work force. HLL itself had launched a voluntary retirement package, in order to get rid of about 500 workers, however only a few resigned. Mr. S.M. Datta had however assured TOMCO employees that their employment conditions were to be protected and service conditions would be honoured. All the employees of TOMCO were to be absorbed as HLL employees. The difference in the productivity levels of TOMCO and HLL employees had been conceded as a point of imbalance. However, even within HLL, there were differences in productivity, with the Bombay factory productivity levels being lower than that in other locations. Further, Mr. S.M. Dutta felt that the productivity level in TOMCO could be raised to that of HLL only in 3 years. HLL had also agreed to maintain the market shares of TOMCO brands and pay off its creditors.

HLL had entered into an agreement with the Consumer Education and Research Centre to clear the consumer activists’ apprehension regarding exploitation of the market by large players through pricing, production restriction, promotion of particular brands or misuse of distribution channels.

**Scheme of Amalgamation**

Considering the advantages and incompatibilities as stated above, on 30th June 1993, 99.97% of the share holders in value terms, of TOMCO and HLL approved the scheme of amalgamation, at an EGM, wherein two shares of HLL were to be allotted for every 15 shares of TOMCO. The approval of the Bombay High Court was proposed to be sought. In addition, it was decided that Unilever will get a preferential allotment of 347, 84, 29 shares at a premium of Rs. 95 to increase its share holding to 51%.

**Practice Questions**

1. State how Take Overs can benefit the Economy as a whole
LESSON 35:
ALLIANCES

Objective
This study lesson enables you:
• Understanding an Alliance
• Advantages
• Characteristics of strategic alliance

Alliances
Introduction
In an interdependent world every company is required to work in cooperation with others if it wants to compete in the global market. The global market has spawned new strategic approaches in many industries. The forging of what have become known as strategic alliances has been noted by senior managements in all regions. Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, tenth edition defines alliances as “associations to further the common interests of the members” or intercorporate agreements covering a wide gamut of functions ranging from component sourcing, through research and development to production and marketing. Alliances are used to enter new markets, access new technologies and achieve economies of scale faster and cheaper than any other acquisition method. The recent trend of collaborations in industrialised countries consist of alliances varying from joint ventures, licensing deals, research consortia and technological exchanges to supply agreements and marketing alliances.

Alliances between companies have become a crucial weapon in the battle for competitive advantage. A “strategic alliance” is an excellent vehicle for two companies to work together profitably. Managed wisely, a strategic alliance can help companies develop and exploit their unique strengths. For example, a large company can break down the marketing barriers that face a small company, which in turn brings entrepreneurial creativity to the partnership. An alliance can also be a powerful tool for accessing new technology and developing domestic or international business opportunities.

Unfortunately, many organizations do not have a clear vision of their long-term direction. They are propelled by short-term tactical or operational needs. Such companies are prone to enter into alliances simply because a potential partner approaches them with a proposal. Most of the “strategic alliances” do not result in additional business, capabilities, or profitability for either of the companies involved, because they have not been well planned in the first place, and/or because implementation has been left to someone else.

Establishing and managing winning alliances, starts with the crucial process of picking the right partner and creating realistic expectations on both sides. At the inception of the alliance, the intent of both parties must be clearly established. Analyzing the corporate and individual personality types involved in an alliance can help managers forecast and avoid problems due to lack of communication or mismatched value systems.

Characteristics of Strategic Alliance
Strategic alliance has three distinguishing characteristics:

i. The two or more firms that unite to pursue a set of agreed upon goals remain independent subsequent to the formation of an alliance,

ii. The partner firms share the benefits of the alliance and control over the performance of assigned tasks,

iii. The partner firms contribute on a continuing basis in one or more key strategic areas e.g. technology, products and so forth.

Joint Ventures
Joint ventures are often confused with strategic alliances or partnerships. In fact a joint venture is more like a partnership with one major distinction: the joint venture is generally formed for the purpose of completing a single goal or a related series goals in a business project. Depending on the agreement, the joint ventures may have the power to obligate each other and each may be liable, within defined limits, for the actions of the other on the project in question.

Trading and Functional Alliances
All alliances involve some measure of inter-corporate integration-less integration than an outright merger, but more than a simple buy-sell relationship. Trading alliances are only a bit more complicated than traditional buy-sell relationship. Normally the objectives of such trading alliances include the need to secure supplies of product, buy or exchange skills/technology and exploit market networks. The main features of such alliance are management at arm’s length, implementation at a fast pace, exclusivity, limited time frames with options to renew based on certain well-defined milestones.

On the other hand, partnerships involving an integration of business resources can take the form of functional alliances. Functional alliances are usually joint ventures or equity-based partnerships. They are characterised by management integration, open-ended collaboration, separate joint-venture entity and long-term commitment. Mainly the functional alliances aim at rationalising costs, revitalising core competencies, entering into new business and broadening strategic options.

Need for Alliances
Most firms enter into alliances out of need. According to an executive, “With alliances, we can do more for less”. Whatever the needs driving alliance formation, managements must take the time to analyse why an alliance is the best strategy. The president of an Automotive industry had once explained, “Understanding why you need a partnership is the most critical step. Sorting out the whys in the equation will in turn dictate the answers to key issues such as with whom you want to collaborate, how the partners will combine their strengths, and how the venture will be structured and managed.” The record...
suggests that ten main strategic factors reduce the whys in most alliance equations:

1. Satisfy customer demands. Customer demands in many markets are changing. For example, in office automation, customers now prefer a “systems solution” and want to rely on a single company to service all equipment.

2. Share R & D costs. High financial stakes and a cut-throat global market have fuelled a spate of competitive alliances in a number of industries.

3. Fill knowledge gaps. Companies that are leaders in their fields can maintain that position by using alliances to capture new developments, and keep their technological resource base ahead of the competition.

4. Make scale economies. Alliances can achieve the scale needed to amortise investments.

5. Make scope economies. Alliances can enlarge dramatically the scope of a company's operations. Alliances focusing on scope help counter the ever shorter product cycle of modern technology.

6. Jump market barriers. However potent the producer company's name may be in its “home” markets, that company may not market even its mature products best in international markets. Alliance marketing, franchising, distribution and licensing deals can leave a development-focused company free to concentrate on new products.

7. Speed product introduction. The narrowing of the development-to-market lead time has been a crucial feature of the past decade. In many sectors, the first company to introduce a new product enjoys a dominant market position and stands the best chance of recouping costs before the competition arrives to drive prices down-or before patent protection expires.

8. Pre-empt competitive threats. In industries in which a few large players increasingly dominate markets, some companies resort to an “if you can't beat them, join them” approach.

9. Use excess capacity. A large number of companies have used the restructuring effect of manufacturing alliances to soak up excess capacity.

10. Cut exit costs. Participants can use alliances to cut the costs of leaving a business.

**Advantages of Alliances**

Alliances are the quickest way to grow a company, particularly in times of change. Without implementing difficult and time-consuming internal changes, they allow a company to:

- Rapidly move to decisively seize opportunities before they disappear.
- Respond more quickly to change.
- Adapt with greater flexibility.
- Increase a company's market share.
- Gain access to a new market or beat others to that market.
- Quickly shore up internal weaknesses.
- Gain a new skill or area of competence.

Alliances can rapidly meet a company's need for key resources such as more customers, additional capital, new/better products, new distribution channels, additional facilities, increased production capacity, or competent personnel etc.

**Strategic Alliance**

Any arrangement or agreement under which two or more firms cooperate in order to achieve certain commercial objectives is referred to as strategic alliance. A true strategic alliance is a written arrangement between two companies that complement each other in a particular identified area. It is not a partnership, and neither company has legal power to control or obligate the other. Instead, it is a commitment by the two companies to provide capabilities or cross servicing in certain identified areas.

By properly utilizing a strategic alliance, companies can expand their product and service offerings substantially, without the usual corresponding investment in staff, equipment, and facilities. Strategic alliances are motivated by considerations such as cost reduction, technology sharing, product development, market access etc., Strategic alliances have objectives similar to those of conventional acquisitions but such alliances can prove to be less expensive than acquisition, if they are structured properly. This is because if two or more companies pool their resources they can secure their joint objectives more easily and economically.

**Types of Strategic Alliance**

Such alliance may be in the form of:

- Management contract.
- Franchising.
- Supply or purchase agreement.
- Marketing or distribution agreement.
- Joint Venture.
- Agreement to provide technical services.
- Licensing of know-how, technology, design or patent.

These arrangements differ in scope mainly by virtue of the following:

- Capital commitment.
- Structure of organisation.
- Decision making.
- Proportion between risks and reward.

**Advantages**

A business strategic alliance is also means to an end, not just an end in itself. Strategic alliances often take place between firms of different industries and of varied sizes, for vertical or horizontal links, consolidation of positions or any of the following:

1. Gain a means of Distribution in International market - It may be beneficial for an exporter to ally with local partner, to understand the functioning and the local market network.

2. Overcome legal or Regulatory barriers - In some countries it is mandatory to have local partners in order to conduct business. Thus, alliances offer suitable options.

3. Diversification - It may be advantageous to enter into an alliance, as a business guide to minimise pitfalls in a new business territory.
4. Avoiding competition - An alliance may be entered into with a market leader or a major competitor to avoid competition.

5. Focus on New Products and Restructuring - An alliance in the form of a research and development alliance may focus at the development of new products. Apart from this, an alliance may also enable the firm to adapt to a more effective organisational structure.

In addition to the above, the various perceived gains which may motivate strategic alliances include establishment of a business network, gaining cost and quality competitiveness, defend business interests, updating technology, starting new project, sharing of risks, increasing efficiency through economies of scale, specialisation etc.

Developing a global strategic plan is critical for developing international opportunities, which can be leveraged only by using the alliance process and learning the skills of managing cross-cultural alliances. In the international arena, the need for local expertise, cultural interpreters and the legal ramifications of entering foreign markets virtually mandate the development of alliances. Creating a global strategic plan involves analyzing inputs from strategic regions and combining that with a competitive analysis.

**Options Analysis**

Analyzing options involves decisions on strategy, philosophy, corporate personality and structure. The process could be as follows:

1. Consider whether the company should be looking for an alliance and if so, why?
2. List and prioritize the reasons.
3. Identify the options for alliance structures, considering cost, risk and the commitment to human resources.
4. Focus on specific structures, keeping in mind an understanding of the organization's corporate personality. For example, if the corporate personality requires complete control rather than collaborative team building 'acquisition' may be the right alternative.
5. Relate the choices to the corporate strategy and strategic plan.

If the process generates specific options, the next step is a corpora analysis. After the corporate self analysis, the next major task is developing partner criteria. Following closely on criteria development will be the partner; and evaluation process, negotiation and 'closure'.

**Preparing for the Alliance**

Some companies have no problem in finding alliance partners. For companies, however, the partner search is a tiresome and confusing exercise important steps necessary for good alliance creation and management are:

- **a. Developing Qualitative and Quantitative Partner Criteria**
  
The organisational culture and norms should be analysed, personnel I should be analysed and the proposed criteria of partner to be selected outlined.

- **b. Developing a List of Prospective Partners**
  
It is essential that the partner analysis is proactive and not reactive. A partner that approaches a company may not be the optimum partner. It if necessary to examine other opportunities, if they exist. Accordingly a prospective partners should be prepared.

**Partner Selection**

While selecting a partner, companies must list the prospective standards which they can measure the merits of a prospective partner; the most important are the three C's of successful alliances namely, Compatibility, Capability, Commitment

**Compatibility**

In sizing up potential partners, the following need to be analysed:

- What is your partner’s strategy? The most competent partner in the won’t make a good alliance if contradictory strategies collide within: alliance.

- How manageable are differences in corporate cultures? Every company has its own unique corporate culture. Managements need to weigh what will impact this will have on the alliance.

- How much compatibility exists among management practices organisational structures? For instance, are both companies centralised or decentralised? Are both managements flexible enough and co- enough to overcome potential conflicts? Also, how compatible are custom service policies and philosophies? Is there any differences in pro strategies? Do you have the same attitude towards - and skills in - quality) management? If the alliance is to be a separate joint-venture company, which are your respective compensation programmes, hiring strategies, etc? do practices in labour relations compare? Are relations smooth or strike prone? How do managements view their employees?

- How do you and your prospective partner compare with respect to strength, risk orientation, dividend policies, reinvestment, debt-equity currency management, etc? Are the partners publicly held, privately state owned, etc?

- How compatible are policies on ethics and health, safety and environment? Many MNCs demand that partners share comparable philosophies and policies.

- What is a potential partner’s alliance record? No (alliance) news can be good (alliance) news. A company without alliance experience is no less capable of alliance success than a veteran alliance-builder.

- Considerations such as interpersonal relationships are equally important to success. Even when the above factors fit well, the alliance can fail miserably if the people involved cannot get along. Some questions to consider include:
  
1. Are they our kind of people?
2. How can partners build strong personal relationships?

**Capability**

The capabilities of the potential candidates are obviously of prime importance, and companies may want to compile a dossier on each and evaluate their strengths and weaknesses. Among the issues to be considered are:

- Have you checked for complementary strengths? What most companies look for in a partner is the ability to
contribute complementary strengths and resources to the alliance.

- Has a multi-functional team scrutinised the capabilities? Many alliance practitioners recommend establishing a team of experts to undertake a feasibility study of the relationship.
- Is "compatibility" interfering with a rigorous analysis? A former ICI executive says companies should not make the mistake of letting apparent compatibility interfere with thorough analysis of a partner's capabilities and resources. 
- Is the potential partner's management stable and coherent? The management structure of an ally may today appear capable of running the alliance but tomorrow it may prove to be otherwise.

- How does reality accord with a potential partner's own projection of itself? All companies try to present themselves in the best possible light. The danger sign should flash when investigations reveal the company's statements and what the balance sheet or independent analysts state are not the same.

Commitment
Finding a partner with an equal sense of commitment to the alliance is the third keystone to success. Even if partners appear capable and compatible, unless they are willing to invest the time, energy and resources to make the alliance a success, the chances of the alliance being able to change the market conditions are slim. Two important tips on how it can be tested whether their potential partners share a sufficient degree of commitment to the alliance:

1. Does the alliance fall within a core business or product line of the partner? If the proposed alliance is in a business area that is only peripheral to the partner's mainstream activities, several dangers may exist. First, the partner may not devote the time and resources necessary to making the venture succeed. Second, the partner could easily withdraw from the alliance and leave to your disadvantage.

2. Determine how difficult it would be for a potential partner to withdraw from an alliance. One partner may incorporate the objectives into its global strategy, pour in considerable effort and resources, and suddenly be left high and dry if the other partner suddenly leaves.

d. Partner Analysis
Once the potential partner has been identified, the next step is to analyse the strategic fit of the partner with the company. This can be done by asking some important questions like:

Will the relationship meet the mission statement goals? What is the strategic potential for the company resulting from a partnership? Is there another partner in the industry that would be a better prospect? What is the risk exposure for the company, arising out of the relationship, in terms of knowledge transfer?

As much information as possible should be gathered about the prospective partner so as to adapt and improve the understanding of the appropriateness of the partner for the stated goals of the company. The legal and accounting team of the company should be involved in researching the implications of the alliance.

e. Obtaining Internal Approvals
The policies should be completely unambiguous and clear. Internal approvals should be obtained from the CEO and top advisory personnel to avoid embarrassment later.

f. Creating an Implementation Plan
Alliances conceived entirely by the planning and corporate departments without the active participation of the operational managers, who will ultimately have responsibility for the implementation of projects are bound to fail. It is therefore, essential that the operating managers are involved in at least the later stage of the negotiation process.

g. Final Predeal Evaluation of all the Relevant Information

h. Negotiating the Deal

i. Managing the Legal Process
Briefly, many of the mistakes made in planning an alliance have their origin in the lack of preparation. If the preparation is done well, with constant review of the plan, the potential for managing the alliance is greatly enhanced. The various factors potentially conducive to successful alliances are:

1. Partnership should be based on an optimum balance of business strength and ownership amongst partners.
2. The partners to alliance should bring in complementary skills and capabilities to the alliance.
3. Conflict of interests by virtue of market overlap should be minimal and avoided as far as possible.
4. A degree of autonomy, strong leadership, continual commitment and support should be present.
5. Alliance should be capable of building trust and confidence among partners.
6. Sensitive and empathetic approach to be followed while dealing with divergence of management styles and corporate culture.

Cross Cultural Alliances
In a global economy with shifting labour markets, work migrates to wherever quality, cost and efficiency can be managed so as to derive a better return on capital and time invested. When an organization decides to enter the international marketplace, there are certain strategic management capabilities that must be modified and introduced into the corporate culture for the venture to be successful. The most important of these are flexible organizational culture, political risk awareness, decentralized strategic planning, multifaceted management structures and share authority/responsibility. Cross cultural joint ventures can thus reap enormous benefits, for companies.

The national culture in which an organization operates, will to some extent influence the type of culture and style of work, organisations will adopt. It has been observed that the first thing organisational members do in mergers, acquisitions and alliance situations is to make assessments and draw conclusions about the ‘other culture’. Olie (1990) has noted that the perceived threat of concentration and nationalism is a potential barrier to international alliances, M & A etc. One of the characteristics of culture is that it creates a form of ethnocen-
trism in which one tends to regard activities which do not conform to one’s own view of doing business, as abnormal or deviant.

Differences between national cultures on such dimensions are likely to influence attitudes towards long range planning and time pressures. Cultures which are more bound by tradition are likely to emphasise past historical precedents and require considerably more detailed information before deciding, than cultures which are tolerant of uncertainty and are more inclined to face risk. Differences in cultures have clear implications not only for the negotiation of alliance in terms of understanding how issues are perceived by the other party and presentation of the type and sources of information that are more congruent with their culture but also for joint formulation of future business strategies.

**Planning the Cross Cultural Alliance**

National or social culture is a pervasive influence on the behaviour of societal members. However, if alliances between organisations based in different national cultures are to prove successful both parties need first to appreciate and understand the different views and interpretations. This concerns identifying one’s own cultural paradigm including the values, assumptions and beliefs which shape perceptions about others; comparing differences in management style, reward and decision making process etc. Apart from this, cultural awareness and language skills are important aspects in negotiating and working within international partnerships and alliances. Also, important personal qualities such as patience, interpersonal tact and empathy are also required.

In cross-cultural situations, while the process of alliance building is similar, the managers selected should be trained to become experts in the extra complications caused by cultural dissimilarities. Another factor that must be taken into account by those looking to develop cross-cultural alliances is the fact that there are sub-cultures within many country cultures. Consequently, it is important to verify that the cultural assumptions that are being made for the alliance have been modified for the particular sub-cultural characteristics. For example, in a country like India, there are many regional, ethnic, religious and industry sub-cultures prevalent. Similarly, regional differences exist in other parts of the world. Cross-cultural competition for labour and technology is a reality that is impacting every company that does business internationally and cross-cultural alliances must adapt as well. Thus, important difference in developing a plan for a cross-cultural alliance is that the ‘key skill’ of the managers involved in building such alliances must be the ability to work in ambiguous, unfamiliar, cross-functional and trans-cultural relationships. Understanding the issue of cultural differences in the way information is communicated and applying these understandings is critical to the success of such alliances.

**Practice Questions**

1. what are the features of strategic alliance
2. what is the need for corporate alliances
LESSON 36:
IMPLEMENTING AND MANAGING THE ALLIANCE

Objective
This study lesson enables you to understand issues relating to,
• Implementation, and
• Managing an Alliance

The success or failure of an alliance is dependent on how the venture is structured, the kind of managers placed in charge and how the responsibilities and strategic missions are divided among the partners.

The alliance implementation or management plan must thus be formalized jointly with the partner. The plan is generally a written document, which should inter alia, answer the following questions.

Who will do what?
How will contributions be made?
What communications mechanism will be in place for approvals?
How will the information flow?
Who will be the liaison from each company?
How will the partnership fit in with the existing relationship of both companies?

Part of the implementation plan must be a process to keep the partner informed on both positive and negative developments, on all alliance-related activities. The implementation plan should outline both partners’ expectations. These need to be consistent and aligned in order for the partners to feel that they are gaining appropriate responses from the other side.

An important part in the management of an alliance is the creation of standards for project reporting and documentation.

A critical issue that must be agreed upon at the start of the alliance is what constitutes success for the alliance as a whole. However, success is a ‘moving target’ and the success criteria can be changed as the partnership matures.

Evaluating an Alliance

A good business alliance integrates the synergic talents of partners. It must be mutually beneficial to both the partners. For optimal results, it is important to work out both strategic fit and operational fit. Differences in corporate culture must not be allowed to spin out of contract at any time. Alliance operation should be mutually created to ensure that the gears of alliance mesh properly. There are two sides to strategic alliances. There may be a cost involved in dual dependence among partners. The alliance may lead to an uncertain income if there are long term agreements, but it can reduce the risk of a venture by sharing among partners. Alliance may create problems regarding locus of decision making, power and division of authority which may lead to conflict. On the other hand, it may reduce competition due to cooperation.

Clarity of vision, values and mutual understanding of core competencies are essential in evaluating the positive and negative aspects of an alliance. It has been commonly observed that alliances which do not support the key business goals of individual partners do not stand much chance of success. For smooth functioning of an alliance, partners must set clear priorities and expectations from each other.

It should be remembered that business is not about products, services or money alone, but also a gamut of personal egos, self esteem, historical perspectives, national and cultural pride, hidden human factors etc. A successful alliance will have complementary needs, complementary strength, shared power and balanced benefits. Thus, a critical factor in creating and sustaining alliance is the organization’s understanding of the importance of achieving its own business goals in the defined time frame, financial Success Factors

Successful alliances generally share the following strategic characteristics:
• Dynamic management structure
• Encouragement of calculated initiatives
• Systematic task setting
• Equal distribution of authority
• Streamlined communication channels
• Development of multi-manager roles

The benefits of alliances can be leveraged by adequate internal communication mechanisms. Managing alliances will test even the most competent of executives. The capabilities include not only careful planning and implementation, but also a broad perspective and an open mind.

Examples of Alliances

Global Scenario
There has been a growing tendency in recent years for Japanese companies to have joint investments mostly with American firms in research and products and also work out joint distribution arrangements. These alliances have blurred the distinction between corporate and national interests. Some such alliances are described below.

Toshiba

Toshiba has a long-term strategy based on the three G’s - growth, group management and globalization. Globalization is achieved by forming new joint ventures, research agreements and cooperative relationships in new business areas.

In 1996, Toshiba Corp. started its new US $1 billion chip-making facility at Nagoya, Japan. This was based on strategic alliances with the companies IBM and Siemens of Germany. Some of the other alliances which Toshiba entered into include:
• An agreement with Apple Computers for new technology creation for multimedia
• A technology-sharing agreement with IBM to develop new data storage devices using ‘NAND-flash’ memory chips
• An alliance with IBM and Siemens to develop advanced semiconductor devices; it has developed the world’s smallest 256-Mb D-Ram
• Through an alliance with IBM, Japan, it opened a second large-size thin-film transistor (TFT) LCD plant
• Alliances with National Semiconductor and Samsung Electronics of Korea to jointly develop and market flash memory chips.
• An alliance with Sun Microsystems Inc. of the US in the areas of rightsizing, Internet and interactive technology to share product development, marketing and distribution in these fast-growth areas.
• Alliances with MCA and Time Warner in the US, Thomson Multimedia in France, and Hitachi, Matsushita and Pioneer in Japan to develop digital video discs (DVD). These were attempts to establish an industry-wide unified format
• An alliance with Time Warner, its partner in TITUS communications, which aimed to work with cable TV operators throughout Japan to form a nationwide multiple system operator network.

Hitachi
Hitachi formed many strategic business relationships in the areas of computers, electronics and technology, which include:
• An R&D agreement with Texas Instruments to develop a next-generation computer memory chip
• Providing chip manufacturing technology to Goldstar Electron of Korea
• Supplying mainframe computers to Germany’s Comparex and Italy’s Olivetti
• A joint venture with GE to sell lighting products in Japan
• Joint development of a new gas turbine with GE
• Joint development of a new RISC computer chip with Hewlett Packard
• Joint development of medical equipment with Boehringer-Mannheim of Germany
• Research cooperation between Hitachi Cambridge Laboratory and Cambridge University for developing a single-electron memory device.

Mitsui GE
GE’s power system unit had joined with Mitsui to build Asian power projects. GE had the technology and Mitsui has the contacts and financial power to get power contracts in Asia.
They got an estimated US $85 million contract in China for two steam turbines. Mitsui played the role of the lead contractor. They also teamed up for a power project in Indonesia.

The Indian Scenario
Up to 1990, Indian companies were recipients of technology through licensing or joint ventures with foreign companies. Most companies had been concentrating on the domestic market for their products and had not integrated themselves with the global market. The economic liberalization measures initiated in 1991 have changed the scenario. Indian companies are orienting their operations towards greater integration with the global market.
In addition, there has also been a change in the strategies of Indian companies in relation to the global market place. The 1980s saw a significant growth in alliance formation with competitors in several industry groups.

Wipro Fluid Power (WFP)
Wipro Fluid Power was started in 1978. Labour troubles led to the closure of its manufacturing unit in 1993. However, it was able to recover owing to its strong research base built through alliances.

IFB
IFB Industries entered into a strategic alliance with the Asko group of Finland. The agreement envisaged the following:
• IFB would manufacture dishwashers at its Bhopal factory. This would also be utilized for manufacturing microwave ovens for which another technological tie-up was being negotiated. While IFB was to have access to the Asko technology to manufacture dishwashers, it could also plan the production of clothes dryers, refrigerators, electric cookers and other household items.
• The two partners planned that the components manufactured more economically at Asko would be imported for use in the Indian products and vice versa.
• The alliance also planned to undertake joint marketing efforts to reach world markets. Asko group was strong in the Baltic region including European markets, USA and Australia, while IFB was to access to opportunities in new markets and create a niche for its products there.

Tata - IBM
In February 1995, Peutronics Private Ltd entered into an original equipment manufacturer distributorship alliance with Tata - IBM to bundle the OS/2 Warp operating system software with Tally. Just over a year later, in March 1996, Peutronics terminated its alliance giving unacceptable levels of support from Tata - IBM as the reason for the break-up. This was the first occasion when such an alliance with Tata - IBM was terminated.

Tata Consultancy Services (TCS)
Formed in 1968, TCS was envisaged to cater to the growing demand for information technology and management consultancy. By the 1980s, TCS had become a leader in computer-related solutions in India.
TCS achieved success with E’X, its financial accounting package. Its package, RTWO, enabled an executive to monitor critical situations from his desk.
The business alliances TCS entered into were the following:
• TCS formed an alliance with Ernst & Young, an accountancy and financial consultancy firm with plans to enter the American and European markets.
• TCS also entered into an alliance with Microsoft Corp. where TCS would have access to Microsoft products, technology and information, while it would provide solutions to customers’ business information needs based on this 1
platform, several value-added services, such as integration consulting, custom and turnkey application development, technical support and training, etc.

Ranbaxy
in January 1995, Ranbaxy Laboratories and Eli Lilly of the US announced two joint ventures with an initial investment of US $90 million. The Indian joint venture was to focus on research, development and manufacture of generic products with 1 both partners having equal stakes in the US $60 million investment. The products manufactured included off-patent drugs, line extensions or new formulations of existing Lilly and Ranbaxy products and new products of both companies. The objective was to find new molecules for the cure of cancer, cardiovascular diseases; and infectious diseases.

The US joint venture with an investment of US $30 million, was to market the 1 products resulting from the Indian joint venture in the US market. Eli Lilly was to assist in Ranbaxy's global presence, targeting disease categories and enhancing critical capabilities.

Self Test Questions
1. What is 'Strategic alliance'? What are the different types of strategic alliances?
2. What are the preliminary steps required for an alliance?
3. What are the advantages of alliances? Enumerate the parameters of a successful alliance.
4. What are the benefits and problems of cross cultural alliances?

Case Study
Nicholas Piramal Limited takes over Roche Products Ltd.
Roche Products Ltd. Background
Roche Products Ltd. was one of the major manufacturers of Vitamin A products and had strengths in the manufacture of bulk drugs, fine chemicals, diagnostics and non-prescription drugs. Its product range also covered various anti-depressant drugs for psycholeptics and psychoanaleptics. Its well-known brand names are Bactrim, Valium and Becozyme.

The company was jointly promoted by F. Hoffmann La Roche and Volta Ltd. in 1958, with the parent company holding 89% of the share capital and Volta 11%. In August 1984, in compliance with FERA Regulations* the parent company diluted its equity stake to 74%, by making a public issue of shares.

The company had manufacturing facilities at Balkum, Thane for the manufacture of Vitamin A, high technology bulk drugs and fine chemicals. The company had been constantly improving the performance of its manufacturing facilities by undertaking substantial modernization based on the latest technology to enable efficient and economic production. A major modernization was carried out in 1984 at a cost of Rs. 2.45 crores which was financed by the public issue of shares and issue of Rs. 2.43 crores of 15% secured non-convertible debentures redeemable at a premium of 5% after the expiry of 7 years from the date of allotment.

In its 35 years of operations, the company's lackluster financial performance could be attributed to the rising cost of raw materials, high labor and rigid price controls on the company's products. Since 1989-90, about two-thirds of the company's turnover came from drugs under a DPCO, and accordingly, the sales growth during 1989-92 was very impressive. In 1992-93, the company achieved an increase in sales of 22.5 percent over the previous year, due to the price revisions approved by the Government. Although the company lost production during the year due to transportation bottlenecks and inadequate availability of Vitamin C, (a critical raw material), its profitability more than doubled to Rs.1.5 crores, though in terms of percentage, it was still only 2% of turnover whereas other companies achieved a higher percentage.

In 1993 the company undertook a major project for refurbishing its Vitamin A plant at Thane which was installed 30 years ago and was facing problems including corrosion of structures. This project required an investment of Rs. 4.4 crores in addition to an amount of Rs. 1 crore needed for compliance with revised statutory requirements of effluent treatment.

The marketing and distribution of the company's products were handled by Volta Ltd., till early 1993. In March 1993, the company decided to take over the marketing and distribution of its pharmaceutical products from Volta, and started the process.

The company had 1100 employees on its rolls, of which only 200 were in the field. Its large staff coupled with a high salary structure had increased the overheads, resulting in extremely low margins compared to industry norms.

The immediate steps that were required to improve profitability were expansion and improvement of distribution facilities, increasing the capacity of bulk drug plant and enhancing the productivity levels of its work force. The introduction of new products, which were outside the control of DPCO, was an area of prime importance.

Nicholas Piramal Limited Background
In 1987, Ajay Piramal bought out Aspro - Nicholas pic of U.K. and since then the company created pharmaceutical history by achieving substantial improvements in growth and profitability, despite the constraints of price control. In 1991, it was independently rated as the fourth fastest growing company in the industry.

The Nicholas Group's performance was a success story, as evidenced by an impressive increase in the turnover from Rs.18 crores in 1988 to Rs.103 crores in 1993. The growth of Nicholas Labs prior to Piramal's takeover was extremely slow (please see Annexure I given at the end of this case study). Though, the pharmaceutical business contributed 95% to the company's turnover, no new research based products were introduced and there was not much effort to improve the market share of its over the counter brands Aspro and Cleartone. The Piramal Group had to bring in a sizeable investment for R&D, import of technical know-how and sales promotion. Through a strategy of effective motivation of the existing management of these companies and through some reorganisation, the group...
was able to improve the financial performance of the companies acquired by it viz.

Morajee Gukuldas Mills Nicholas Laboratories and Gujarat Glass. Nicholas Laboratories, after the takeover by Piramal in 1988, launched 12 new products, took over Gujarat Glass in 1990 and increased net profit 8 times from 1.2 crores in 1988 to 10.1 crores in 1993. Besides, it earned Rs. 12.45 per share, in 1993, 95% more than that in 1987. Consequently, the share price moved up from about Rs. 45 in 1987 to Rs. 310 in 1993.

The company had strengths in the manufacture of formulations like antacids, cardio-vascular drugs and anti-ulcerants. It had also set up a sophisticated formulation plant, at a cost of Rs. 12 crore. It had a combined field force of 650 employees, one of the largest in the pharmaceutical industry, which acts as crucial factor for success in any industry.

Although, Nicholas Piramal had emerged as a fast growing, profitable company its growth plans were stymied as it no longer had access to new products from its foreign ex-parent. It is worth mentioning in this regard that Nicholas Piramal had been allowed to use the brand names Aspro and Cleartone which were held by Roche's parent company, in an earlier arrangement. Therefore, the company was on the lookout for a possible acquisition in the same industry. It was felt that, there should be realisable synergies in the operations of the target company, and the products should be complementary. Accordingly, since the company had strengths in formulations, its management wanted to increase its presence in bulk drugs. The company was also planning to enter the over-the-counter drugs and skincare market.

**Drugs and Pharmaceutical Industry - Overview of Scenario**

The drugs and pharmaceutical industry in India had emerged as one of the largest producers of Pharmaceuticals among the developing countries. However, India's share in world production was still insignificant at 0.3 percent although it accounted for 15 percent of the world population. The production of bulk drugs in 1988-89 was Rs. 630 crores and Rs. 2690 crores of formulations. The demand for drugs was estimated at Rs. 15,996 crores by 1999-2000.

Although the industry had shown a steady rise in sales, most companies found their growth stifled due to the drug price control order which covered 72 drugs. The margins in the industry had been falling due to rising input costs, increase in cost of packaging materials, and escalation in power and fuel costs. Accordingly, the profit margins fell from 15 percent of turnover in 1969-70 to 2 percent of the turnover in 1988-89. Declining domestic profitability had forced companies to change their product mix to include non-controlled drugs and over the counter products which were more lucrative.

The future of the industry was poised for substantial growth both in the domestic and global markets. There was a strong possibility of relaxation of the Control Order (DCPO) and it was assumed India may also be forced to accept the patent related clauses in GATT, paving the way for the transnational to launch a new product in India.

**Roche Products Ltd. - Rationale for Disinvestment**

The parent company F. Hoffmann La Roche had decided to disinvest its equity stake of 74% in Roche Products Ltd. Although the company was the major manufacturer of Vitamin A, the parent company had lost interest in this company due to low profit margins. In the last 17 years not a single new product was introduced and no formal growth plans were made, having an adverse impact on the company's financial performance. The other motivation for the foreign company divesting its equity stake had been the termination of the distribution agreement with Voltas Ltd. making it necessary for the company to set up its own distribution facilities, involving substantial expenditure.

F. Hoffman La Roche constituted a negotiating team consisting of two representatives from the parent company and 3-4 from Roche Products Ltd. Nicholas Piramal Ltd. had expressed keen interest in buying over the controlling shares in RPL.

**Roche Ltd's Mandate (before finalisation of deal)**

Get the best price for the company. However, the poor performance of the company and its deteriorating efficiency may be used by the other party to the maximum extent to bid down the price. The future prospects of company can get proper additional finance and good management support like NPL.

This mandate was based on the consideration that, it was only after a long search that a keen buyer had been identified and it was in the company's interest to conclude a deal, because if they failed, it could mean another 2-3 years of frustration, working in a losing company.

**Nicholas Piramal Ltd. - Rationale for takeover**

Some of the competitors entered into strategic alliances and tie-ups with multinational companies to gain access to new products. After considerable analysis, Roche Products was identified as one of the possible targets, as the parent company had decided to disinvest. Roche filled in well in the strategy for growth as there were realisable synergies in the operations of both the companies and the products were complementary. The company had strengths in distribution which complemented Roche's strength in R&D, as it was a multinational company.

**NPL's Mandate (before finalisation of deal)**

To negotiate with the management of Roche Products Ltd. and acquire the company at a competitive price. Give a justification for the price that would be offered to Roche. Accordingly, a meeting was scheduled between the representatives of the two companies to negotiate and conclude the deal.
Annexure 1

Nicholas Piramal Limited Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the year ended 31st March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shareholders' Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Equity Share Capital</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Reserves and Surplus</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Secured Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Unsecured Loans</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Block (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital WIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Inventories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sundry Debtors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Cash and Bank Balances</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>28.97</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Assets</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Current Liabilities and Provisions</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Creditors (b)</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Current Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Assets Not Written Off</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>103.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NICHOLAS PIRAMAL LIMITED
Profit and Loss Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the year ended 31st March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>58.04</td>
<td>77.94</td>
<td>103.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>59.85</td>
<td>82.31</td>
<td>107.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Consumed</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>26.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Expenditure</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>49.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>53.06</td>
<td>73.85</td>
<td>96.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Before Tax</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Other Income</td>
<td>1157.00</td>
<td>1440.00</td>
<td>1880.00</td>
<td>1607.00</td>
<td>1755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before tax</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>148.00</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Capital</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>146.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings per Share (EPS)</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>41.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Value per Share Rs.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend Rate</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For revaluation reserves in 1987 of 268.69 lakhs.

#### Annexure2

**Roche Products Limited Balance Sheet**

(Rs. in crore)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the year ended</th>
<th>31/12/88</th>
<th>13/3/90</th>
<th>31/3/91</th>
<th>31/3/92</th>
<th>31/3/93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sources of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shareholders' Funds: (a) Equity</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Capital (b) Reserves and Surplus</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Loan Funds

(a) Secured Loans | 5.46 | 8.05 | 12.41 | 11.65 | 13.80 |
(b) Unsecured Loans | 0.78 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.72 | 1.02 |
| Total            | 6.24  | 8.08  | 12.43  | 12.37  | 14.82  |

//. Application of Funds

1. Fixed Assets

(a) Net Block | 7.80 | 8.43 | 9.24 | 8.22 | 7.88 |
(b) Capital WIP | 0.14 | 0.61 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.35 |

2. Investments | 1.40 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 |

3. Current Assets |
### 3. Current Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Inventories</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>15.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sundry Debtors</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Cash and Bank Balances</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Loans and Advances</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>31.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Less: Current Liabilities and Provisions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Sundry Creditors</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>26.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ROCHE PRODUCTS LIMITED**

**Profit and Loss Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the year ended</strong></td>
<td>31/12/88</td>
<td>13/3/90</td>
<td>31/3/91</td>
<td>31/3/92</td>
<td>31/3/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>56.93</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>58.08</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>58.53</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Consumed</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>34.28</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Expenditure</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSON 37:
REVERSE MERGER

Objective
This study lesson enables you to understand,
• What is a reverse merger
• How a merger or amalgamation differs from reverse merger.

Reverse Merger
It must be understood at the outset that amalgamation and merger are corporate restructuring methods. Both the terms are synonymous. The procedure to be adopted for both is the same and the consequences of both are also the same. For achieving amalgamation as well as merger, an existing company (which is referred to as the “amalgamating or merging or transferor company”), under a scheme of amalgamation or merger, loses its own legal identity and is dissolved without being wound up and its assets, properties and liabilities are transferred to another existing company (which is referred to as the “amalgamated or merged or transferee company”).

Generally, a loss making or less profit earning company merges with a company with track record, to obtain the benefits of economies of scale of production, marketing network, etc. This situation arises when the sick company’s survival becomes more important for strategic reasons and to conserve the interest of community.

In a reverse merger, a healthy company merges with a financially weak company. The main reason for this type of reverse merger is the tax savings under the Income-tax Act, 1961. Section 72A of the Income-tax Act ensures the tax relief, which becomes attractive for such reverse mergers, since the healthy and profitable company can take advantage of the carry forward losses of the other company. The healthy units loses its name and surviving sick company retains its name. In the context of the Companies Act, there is no difference between a merger and a reverse merger. It is like any amalgamation. A reverse merger is carried out through the High Court route. However, where one of the merging companies is a sick industrial company in terms of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, such merger has necessarily to be through the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR). On the reverse merger becoming effective, the name and objects of the sick company (merged company) may be changed to that of the healthy company.

To save the Government from social costs in terms of loss of production and employment and to relieve the Government of the uneconomical burden of taking over and running sick industrial units, Section.72A was introduced in Income Tax Act 1961

Provisions relating to carry forward and set off of accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation allowance in amalgamation or demerger, etc.

Section 72A of Income Tax Act, 1961 is meant to facilitate rejuvenation of sick industrial undertaking by merging with healthier industrial companies possessing incentives of tax savings, to benefit the general public through continued productivity, increased avenues for employment and revenue generation.

Less diplomatic Glaxo staff saw Wellcome as an over-centralised organisation with employees who were unrealistic in their expectations for the business’s financial success. Academia-like penny-pitching officials had saddled Wellcome with out-of-date information technology.

Wellcome staff, in contrast, saw Glaxo as overly commercial mercenaries assaulting their worthy enterprise and driven by cash. They argued, in its enthusiasm for the latest high-tech research gadgetry. The Glaxo officials refused to study tropical diseases, where sufferers could not afford western prices.

To try to combat such sentiments, management declared that both old companies were history and decreed that a new company was to be built in its place. But, the most difficult aspect of merger was to lay off staff both on account of closing down of certain manufacturing units as well as to cut down on excess costs. To overcome the difficulties, management offered a very lucrative package. The solution was expensive but unavoidable, given that Glaxo management was trying not to give the impression that it was steamrolling Wellcome.

In France, the company established an organisation called Competence Plus, comprising employees who had been made redundant. They were guaranteed up to 15 months on full salary and given training courses on everything from “networking” to new skills. They were also the first to be interviewed for any vacancies that arose within the new group during that period. Employees hired by other companies for trial periods had their salaries paid by Glaxo-Wellcome. For those who remained, there were improvements too. Glaxo staff worked a 39-hour week, whereas Wellcome did 37 hours. Now Glaxo-Wellcome people work 37 hours. “We were concerned not to make mistakes in the social sphere,” said Mangeot, the Chairman of Glaxo-Wellcome, France.

Practice Questions
1. State features of a reverse merger.

Case Study: Reverse Merger
Wherever a profit making company merges with a loss making company, the amalgamated company would be entitled to carry forward and set off the accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation allowance since in such a case it is the loss and unabsorbed depreciation of the same company which is being carried onward. Whereas, in a case where a loss making unit is merged in a profit making unit the profit making unit would
seek to carry forward the loss and unabsorbed depreciation not of its own but of another company.

An amalgamated company is not entitled to carry forward the accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation allowance of the amalgamating company.

Case

ABC Ltd., a company engaged in manufacture of textiles, had faced marketing constraints and stiff competition from imported material at cheaper prices.

Financial Status

ABC Ltd. had suffered huge losses since commissioning, amounting to Rs.1342 lacs as at 31,12.92 (book loss) against paid up capital of Rs. 534 lacs. I.T. losses of Rs. 2248 lacs. Its term liabilities amounted to Rs.1722 lacs including defaults of interest payments (Rs. 632 lacs) on account of cash losses. Payments to suppliers (Rs. 334 lacs) remained unpaid due to liquidity constraints.

Case for Amalgamation

Prospects for the company’s products appeared reasonably good. Revival of the unit was possible provided financial help was forthcoming immediately. Borrowing from outside was impossible on account of financial difficulties. XYZ Limited a healthy unit was found willing for amalgamation with ABC Ltd.

A revival plan for ABC Ltd., was contemplated to which financial institutions and banks had agreed to a package of reliefs and concessions by way of interest concession, funding of interest and rescheduling of term loan repayment.

Incentives

The following incentives were available under the statutes:

1. The incentive for the healthy unit to take over the assets and liabilities of ABC Ltd. was the tax benefit under Section 72A of Income-tax Act. The total tax benefit to XYZ Ltd. amounted to Rs.1298 lacs. Since XYZ Ltd. was incurring huge tax liability on its profits, the amalgamation resulted into immediate improvement in its liquidity on account of ABC Ltd.’s losses.

2. One of the products of XYZ Ltd. was used as raw material for the products of ABC Ltd. Besides assured supplies, the amalgamation gave an advantage of savings in cost of raw material to ABC Ltd. because after amalgamation the raw material could be given at ‘transfer cost’.

Approval under Section 72A

The Specified Authority under Section 72A of the Income-tax Act approved the tax benefits of Rs. 1298 lacs on the basis of the revival plan for ABC Ltd. as prepared by XYZ Ltd.,

Immediate Revival Steps

1. ABC Ltd. had suffered in the past on account of uncertainty of supply of raw material. It therefore created storage capacity of about 4 weeks supplies to do away with fluctuations in the supply of raw material.

2. XYZ Ltd. assessed the needs of capital expenditure required for improving the working of ABCL, which were mainly on account of balancing of capacities, modification and replacements of existing equipment, etc.

Exchange Ratio

The exchange ratio of shares was worked out as under:

1. ABC Ltd. had negative net worth as on the amalgamation date. But, since amalgamation envisaged tax benefits to XYZ Ltd. on account of accumulated losses of ABC Ltd. the quantum of tax benefit was added to the net worth of ABC Ltd. to get a positive net worth.

2. Past earnings basis was not considered on account of losses of ABC Ltd.

3. Market price of shares was given due weightage.

Case Study: Takeover Of Profit Earning Company

Company Background

Hindustan Lever Limited (HLL) had in the last ten years used the takeover route to expand the base of the Company. Average sales growth in the last ten years had been 29.5 per cent, driven partly by successful acquisitions like Kwality, Dollops, TOMCO, Brooke Bond and Lakme. Sans the mergers, HLL would have maintained an average of 18 per cent year-to-year growth per annum. Net profit had grown at a compounded rate of 37 per cent during the same period. HLL acquired TOMCO in early nineties and at the same time acquired 20 per cent shareholding of Indian Perfumes Limited (IPL), a Company closely associated with operations of TOMCO and engaged in the aroma chemical business. TOMCO was merged with HLL in 1994 and IPL became HLLs subsidiary as TOMCO was holding approx. 32.5 per cent in IPL. Subsequently HLL acquired shares of IPL from other Tata companies to take its holding in IPL to 73 per cent. Also as a result of amalgamation with TOMCO, HLL acquired the 21.8 per cent stake in Vashisti Detergents Ltd. (VDL) and subsequently acquired 11 per cent stake of other promoter in VDL. In 1993, HLL acquired shares of Brooke Bond India Limited and with amalgamation of Brooke Bond with Lipton India Limited in 1994, got its holding in Lipton converted to Brooke Bond Shares. Subsequently, Pond’s and Brooke Bond Lipton India, both subsidiaries of Unilever, got merged with HLL.

Facts

Takeover of Lakme brands, sales and distribution network was through a complex deal for environmental and fiscal reasons. The sale was done in two stages:
Stage I - In January 1995, the Lakme trademark, technology and related intellectual property was transferred to a 100 per cent subsidiary of Lakme Ltd.-Lakme Brands Ltd. The transfer consideration was determined at Rs. 78 crore. Lakme Brand Ltd.’s capitalization was represented by equity capital of Rs. 3.25 crore subscribed by Lakme and optionally fully convertible debentures of Rs. 75 crore subscribed to by Hindustan Lever. At the same time, a new joint venture company Lakme Lever Limited was formed, wherein Hindustan Lever and Lakme both held 50 per cent of the 21 lakh equity shares each. Sales and marketing infrastructure in India as well as abroad owned by Lakme was transferred to the joint venture for a consideration of Rs. 32.39 crore. This included payment for goodwill, net current assets and relevant fixed assets. Also, Hindustan Lever paid Rs. 30 crore (Rs. 25 crore to Lakme Ltd. and Rs. 50 lac to Lakme’s wholly owned subsidiary Lakme Exports Ltd.) for non-compete agreement.

For Lakme, entry of Unilever group and other MNCs in the field was imminent, which would have led to heightened competition and decline in margins. Therefore, an alliance with an established MNC was a mutually beneficial arrangement. Further, technological/marketing inputs from Unilever group would give an edge over the competitors and allow the joint venture selling company to cash upon its distribution network. However, HLL’s traditional distribution network, although one of the largest, was not tuned to market cosmetic products which are primarily sold through specialised shops/boutiques. So tie up with Lakme enabled the company to leverage on the Lakme distribution channels also.

Stage II - In 1998, Lakme Limited divested its 50 per cent stake in Lakme Lever Ltd. to HLL for a consideration of Rs. 90.5 crore. The entire stake of Lakme Ltd. in its wholly owned subsidiary Lakme Brands Ltd. was also acquired by HLL. Lakme’s manufacturing facility at Deonar was taken over for Rs. 24 crore. The manufacturing plant at Kandla owned by Lakme Exports, the 100 per cent subsidiary of Lakme Ltd. was taken over by HLL for a consideration of Rs. 5.71 crore.

Statistics
The table given below displays the total consideration involved in the sale of Lakme Lever stake, manufacturing facility and brand by Lakme Ltd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration paid for</th>
<th>Rs. (crore)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stake in Lakme Lever Ltd.</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deonar manufacturing facility</td>
<td>24.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandla manufacturing facility (from Lakme Export)</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade mark, Designs, Brands, Copyrights (from Lakme Brands Ltd.)</td>
<td>110.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D infrastructure (from Lakme Brands Ltd.)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits Occurring
Lakme Limited utilized part of the proceeds to redeem the Rs.75 crore Optionally Convertible Debentures subscribed to by HLL in Lakme Brands Ltd. in 1996. Lakme, sans its cosmetics business then ventured into the retailing business, utilizing the funds garnered for acquisition of a Department Store Littlewoods. The entire cosmetic business under the Lakme brand is now owned and managed by HLL.

Case Study: Krone Communication Limited-Conditional Exemption
Krone Communications Ltd., M/s. GenTek Inc., USA (the acquirer company) entered into a re-construction and restructuring agreement with Jenoptik AG, through I its subsidiary, for the acquisition of its entire shareholding in Krone AG which holds I 51% of the issued, subscribed and paid up equity capital of Krone Communications I Limited (target company). Pursuant to this, it made an application dated July 22, 1999 to the Board seeking exemption from the applicability of the provisions of the SEBI I (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 1997 (the ‘Regulations’) for the said acquisition. The Board forwarded the application to the Takeover Panel which vide its report dated August 5, 1999 rejected the application on the ground that in the process of the acquisition of Krone AG, the control over the target company would be shifted in favour of the acquirer company through the holding company i.e. Krone AG and that Regulation 12 would be applicable. During the course of the personal hearing held on September 6, 1999, the acquirer brought to the notice of the Board certain additional facts. It was stated that the purpose of acquisition of Krone AG is not to secure the control of the target company and that it would not lead to an indirect acquisition of the target company by the acquirer. Also it contended that the said acquisition would not bring about any change in the shareholding of the target company and that the controlling stake of Krone AG in the target company i.e. 51% would not alter pursuant to the said acquisition. It was stated that they believed that the acquisition would not result in a change in management or a reconstitution of the Board of Directors of the target company. Therefore the Board referred the case back to the Panel for reconsideration of the case based on the new facts. On consideration of the same as well as the undertaking given by the acquirers that the acquirers were willing to abide with the conditional exemption granted by SEBI to the effect that the shareholders of the target company ratify the change in control by an appropriate resolution passed at the meeting of its shareholders. The Takeover Panel vide its report dated January 20, 2000 recommended the grant of exemption as sought by the acquirers subject to the shareholders of the target company passing a special resolution at the meeting of the shareholders permitting voting through postal ballot thereat, ratifying the change in control. Also a further condition was imposed that the notice of such a meeting to the shareholders of the target company should accompany an envelope for postal ballot with pre-paid postage stamps affixed. SEBI also noted that the acquisition of the target company was merely an unintended consequence of the global restructuring of Krone AG, and that the controlling stake of the acquirer company would not alter Krone AG pursuant to such acquisition. It was also noted that the acquisition would not constitute an indirect acquisition in terms of the Regulations and that adequate intimation of the acquisition was given to all the shareholders of the target.
company. On the basis of the same as well as after considering the recommendations of the Panel, SEBI, granted exemption to the acquirers from the applicability of the provisions of the Regulations for the proposed acquisition subject to the ratification by the shareholders of the target company as recommended by the Panel vide its report dated January 20, 2000.

Case Study: Share Valuation and Determination of Share Exchange Ratio in a Merger

The Companies
C Limited and S Limited were companies in the business engaged predominantly in manufacturing and trading, the former in Cement Industry and the latter in Sugar and Chemical Products.

C Limited was incorporated during the year 1989-90, with registered office at Hyderabad. It was a profit making and dividend paying company since its inception. C Limited had 600 tpd Mini Cement Plant in Andhra Pradesh. The paid-up capital of C Limited was Rs.7.4 crores, with promoter shareholding at 27.44%.

S Limited was incorporated in 1990, with registered office at Secunderabad. The plant was commissioned in March 1992 for production of Sugar and Molasses with 2500 tpd installed capacity. The company incurred losses since inception and the total accumulated losses as at March 31, 1997 stood at Rs.19.03 crores. The Paid-up-capital of the company was Rs.14.48 crores, with promoter shareholding at 40.60%. The company was a Sick Company under the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985.

C Limited and S Limited were listed on both the Bombay and Hyderabad Stock Exchanges. While the shares of C Limited were actively traded, there was not much of trading activity for S Limited shares.

The Industry
While there was steady growth in the cement industry, the sugar industry had to suffer on account of increase in sugar imports and no demand for molasses due to prohibition in the State of Andhra Pradesh.

Financials
Whilst the performance of C Limited was impressive in the last few years, there was negative growth in the case of S Limited, which resulted in negative net worth.

The Merger
The management of both the companies felt that among other reasons, a bigger and stronger company would be able to withstand more solidly the rigors of competition in the field of cement and sugar industries. It was therefore, proposed to merge S Limited into C Limited effective from April 1, 1997 and seek the benefit of set-off of losses of S Limited under Section 72A of the Income Tax Act 1961.

Objective
To value the shares of C Limited and S Limited to determine a suitable exchange ratio for merger of S Ltd. with C Ltd. effective from April 1, 1997.

The valuations as on March 31, 1997 were carried out to determine
a. fair value of share of C Limited
b. fair value of share of S Limited
c. exchange ratio for merger of S Limited with C Limited

Valuation Inputs
In carrying out the valuation of shares of both the companies, the following information among others, were considered:

b. Projected results of C Limited and S Limited

Valuation Methodology
In the case of valuation of shares for the purpose of a merger, the underlying assumption has to be made that after the merger the combined company will continue to carry on the same businesses as were individually carried on by the two companies using the same assets as were used by the two companies. Valuations are valid and can be used only for the specific purpose for a reasonable period of time after they are done.

In this case the valuation of shares was done to decide the fair value per share of C Limited and S Limited to arrive at the exchange ratio of shares for the merger of S Limited with C Limited.

The valuations in this study were done as on March 31, 1997.

In the valuation of the shares of the two companies for the purpose of determining the exchange ratio, the appropriate methodology was chosen, which would fairly state the relative values of the shares of the two companies rather than the absolute values.

Valuation of shares of C Limited Profit Earning Capacity Value (PECV)

In arriving at the future maintainable profits (FMP) of C Limited, the following were considered:

a. Profits of C Limited for the years 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97 as per the audited accounts.
b. Projected profits for the years 1997-98 to 2001-02.

The profits for the years 1994-95 to 1996-97 were adjusted for non-recurring/ unusual incomes and expenses.

The adjusted profits for the three years are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Profit before tax (Rs. Lakhs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>829.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>1,221.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>1,030.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average profit works out to Rs.1027.37 lakhs.

The profits were assigned weights starting with a weightage of 1 for the year 1994-95 and going on to a weightage of 3 for the year 1996-97. The weightages assigned represent probabilities.
with the most recent year having the highest weightage. The weighted average profits of C Limited for the period 1994-95 to 1996-97 worked out to Rs. 1060.89 lakhs.

In companies/industries having high growth in profits and significant increase in equity (including ploughing back of a significant portion of the profits), the past average profits would not be reflective of the future maintainable profits. In such circumstances, it would be appropriate to work out the future maintainable profits based on 'Return on Equity Funds' as at the valuation date. The future maintainable profits were, therefore worked out on the basis of Return on Equity Funds, as follows:

The rate of return on average equity funds employed during the year was calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Return} = \frac{\text{Profit before tax}}{\text{Average funds employed}}
\]

As the merger was effective from April 1, 1997, the weighted average rate of return was then applied to the “funds employed” as on March 31, 1997 to arrive at the future maintainable profits.

The average capital employed during the years 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97 were worked out, after adjusting for the period the funds which were employed during the financial years, i.e., after adjustments for issues of capital.

The average returns for the years 1994-95 to 1996-97 worked out to 25% and the weighted average returns for the same period 23.71%.

The FMP based on Adjusted Capital Employed as at March 31, 1997 worked out to Rs.1,254.52 lakhs.

For the purposes of arriving at the 'Profit Earning Capacity Value', the future maintainable profits were considered net of tax. C Limited was not currently enjoying the benefit of a tax holiday for new undertakings. There were, consequently, no significant prominent differences, which required adjustment.

Since 'timing differences' did not affect the total incidence of tax (though they may affect cash flows), the same were ignored in determining the appropriate rate of tax. The rate of tax was considered at 35%, which was the rate likely to be applicable in future years based on the indications.

The Future maintainable profit after tax worked out as under:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rs. lakhs} \\
\text{Future Maintainable profits before tax} & = 1254.52 \\
\text{Tax @ 35\%} & = 439.08 \\
\text{Future Maintainable profits after tax} & = 815.44
\end{align*}
\]

The next step in this method of valuation was the selection of the rate at which the future maintainable profit after tax could be capitalised to arrive at the total value of the equity capital of the company. The capitalisation factor is the inverse of the price/earnings ratio (P/E). Generally, in order to derive a reasonable capitalisation factor, an analysis of the prices and earnings of “comparable” companies in the same industry, to which, the company, whose share is being valued belongs to, is conducted. Having regard to the steep growth in profits of the company over the last four years, the P/E multiple was determined, which worked out to 8. The P/E ratio of
Based on the above, the Net Asset Value of C Limited as on March 31, 1997 worked out to Rs.5291.02 lakhs. The fair value of C Limited share under the Net Asset Value method was: 

- Fair value (NAV) Rs. 5291.02 lakhs
- Number of shares 74 lakhs
- Fair value per share Rs. 71.50

**Average Market Price of Shares**

Under this method the fair value of C Limited share was arrived at based on the market price of the share. In arriving at the market price to be considered, the following factors were considered relevant:

a. The shares of the company were traded on in the stock exchanges of Hyderabad and Bombay.
b. The price data was looked at in conjunction with volumes in order to rule out any manipulation.
c. The prices during the months around the merger date were considered rather than the price as on the effective date of the merger as this would be a more appropriate indicator of the relative values of the shares of the companies.

Based on the high/low of the share prices during the twelve months ended September 30, 1997, the average market price worked out to Rs. 21.36.

**Fair Value of C Limited Shares**

The fair value of C Limited share was arrived at after taking into account the value arrived at on the PECV method, the Future Earnings per Share method, the NAV method and the Market Price. The 'Yield Value' was determined by assigning weightages to the values arrived at based on the PECV method and the Future Earnings per Share method. The value as per the PECV method was assigned a higher weightage of 2 as this was computed based on actual results whereas the value as per the Earnings per Share method was assigned a lower weightage of 1 as this was computed based on future projections which are subject to uncertainties. Having determined the 'Yield Value' this was assigned a weightage of 2/5ths and weightages of 2/5ths and 1/5ths were assigned to Market Price and NAV respectively. This was in keeping with the principle of giving greater importance to the earning value of the business particularly since it was an existing and profitable business. Further, since the company was quoted on stock exchanges the market price was also given due weightage.

The fair value of C Limited share arrived as above was Rs.55.33.

Valuation of shares of S Limited had been incurring losses. Both the Yield Method (based on past and future earnings) and the Net Asset Value method did not reveal any positive value for the shares of this company.

The shares of S Limited, quoted on the stock exchanges of Hyderabad and Bombay, were thinly traded and there are no quotes in several months. The share prices revealed the following trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Rs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average price for the 6 months ended December 31, 1996</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price for the 6 months ended September 30, 1996</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price for 12 months ended December 31, 1996</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price for 12 months ended September 30, 1996</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average price for 12 months ended September 30, 1997</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in April, 1996</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price in April, 1997</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it appeared that the fair market value of the share of S Limited would be in the range of Rs. 2.25 to Rs. 2.50.

**Exchange Ratio**

The fair values of shares of C Limited and S Limited thus determined were:

- Value of share of C Limited Rs. 55.33
- Value of share of S Limited Rs. 2.25-Rs. 2.50

Having regard to the above values of the shares determined for the merger effective April 1, 1997 the recommended exchange ratio was as follows:

1 share of C Limited for every 25 shares of S Limited

**Case Study: Merger Creating Largest it Company in India**

Merger of Pro-Tech Inc. with Techno Inc. proposed to create a Rs. 3,650 crore conglomerate. What is in store for the new entity? Where will it gain and where will it lose? Here is a case study on the implications of the merger considered prior to decision-making.

By virtue of Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Repeal Bill, 2001; SICA is proposed to be repealed.

**Post-Merger Proposals**

It was expected that the merger will pose the following benefits and demands:

**The New Pro-tech, Inc. in India**

(Revenues: Rs. crore)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktops</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other systems</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workstations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unix servers</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC servers</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other hardware</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>3582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pro-Tech Inc.'s $25-billion acquisition of Techno Inc. (at 0.6325 of one newly-issued Pro-Tech Inc. share for one Techno Inc. share) ushers a new Pro-Tech Inc. at $87 billion, just below Moor Pte. Ltd. at $90 billion. Mr. ABC will remain chairman and CEO of the new entity and Techno Inc.'s Mr. PQR will be the President.

Last fiscal (ending March 2001) revenues for the two added up to Rs.3,301 crore. This takes it past the current top three in the Indian Industry.

Pro-Tech Inc. plus Techno Inc. group revenues for last fiscal, including software operations, adds to Rs.3,650 crore, keeping it at number 3 behind the PCL group (Rs.4,413 crore) and the Boon group (Rs.4,032 crore).

The system vendor toppers are Tin Ltd. (by total-not just systems -revenues), Techno Inc., Moor Pte. Ltd. Pro-Tech Inc. This now changes to the new Pro-Tech Inc. at number 1, followed by Tin Ltd., Moor Pte. Ltd., and, significantly below, PCL.

• Significantly, the new Pro-Tech Inc. entity, will assume the number 1 slot by revenue in PCs, Unix servers and workstations, PC servers, and printers, and tops by units in all these areas except for Unix servers, where Sun sold more units last year.

What do they Gain?

• The big gain for the combined entity is likely to be a larger customer base. Coupled with the elimination of overlapping computer product lines, this could lead to lower costs for the same revenues.

• The new entity becomes a mammoth one-stop shop spanning systems, printers, services and more, a global number 2. However, the product range was largely there with Pro-Tech Inc. anyway, though Techno Inc. was much stronger in PC servers, and consumer desktops.

• Pro-Tech Inc. gains Techno Inc.'s services business, its distribution network especially for consumer desktops, its handhelds, and of course its business customers. Product-line synergies stem from services (Techno Inc. gets 23 per cent of its global revenues from services - 13 per cent in India - with plans to push that up), peripherals (Pro-Tech Inc. is the global leader in printers and is very strong in other devices including scanners), and, to a smaller extent in systems (Techno Inc. is stronger in consumer desktops, with a far better distribution network, both in India and globally). Techno Inc. also brings in the very successful Pocket PC, which could replace the Pocket PC in Pro-Tech Inc.'s portfolio.

Techno Inc. has anyway outlined a shift in focus to software and services. Its systems margins have been under pressure in recent times; its PC division has been in the red for seven consecutive quarters now; it lost the number 1 PC slot both globally and in the US market. Pro-Tech Inc., under Mr. ABC, has also been under earnings pressure, aggravated by the slowdown and massive restructuring costs in 2001. Pro-Tech Inc. has been keen to ramp up services and consulting revenue, the reason for its abortive bid to buy consulting firm Y&P earlier.

What do they Lose?

Clearly, there will be product lines terminated, and jobs lost, if the "cost synergies" that Mr. ABC has spoken about before the press, have to happen effectively.

There are significant systems overlaps between Pro-Tech Inc. and Techno Inc. Globally, systems (PCs, servers, notebooks) bring in a third of Pro-Tech Inc.'s revenues, and one-half of Techno Inc.'s. Their Unix server businesses are similar. Both have proprietary computer processors and architectures. Both have announced a phase-out of these and a shift to Intel's 64-bit Itanium processor for high-end servers over the next three to five years.

Thus, some of the server product lines will have to converge, as will desktop and portables lines. The trimming could happen from either side. The Pro-Tech Inc. name will dominate, but some strong Techno Inc. brands may stay.

However, PCs would continue to be the largest source of revenue for the new company at a time when prices are plummeting and unit sales are declining. And PCs are where neither has been able to run an operation as efficient and profitable as Dell's.

Also, it will be interesting to see if the resulting organization behaves more like Techno Inc., which has been a fairly aggressive company driven by sales goals, or Pro-Tech Inc., which has been more consensus-driven.

However, at the top level, there could be some 'complementarity', among the two CEOs who came on board in July 1999. Mr. ABC is known for her high-level strategy focus; Michael Capellas, for his hands-on grasp of operations and the nitty-gritty.

What does the merger mean for the Indian market? The implications are far reaching. The merged entity will become the largest IT company in India, displacing Tin Ltd. We take a look at how the merger will create ripples in each of the segments the two companies operate.

1. Total Revenue
   - Techno Inc.: Rs.1,761 crore
   - Pro-Tech Inc.: Rs.1,540 crore
   - Post Merger: Rs.3,301 crore
   - Analysis: It will become the largest IT company in India displacing Tin Ltd. (Rs.3,142 crore) and existing number 2 company (Rs. 2,947 crore).

2. Group Revenue
   - Techno Inc.: Rs.1,945 crore
   - Pro-Tech Inc.: Rs.1,705 crore
   - Post Merger: Rs.3,650 crore
   - Analysis: It will become the third largest group in India behind PCL (Rs.4,413 crore) and Boon's (Rs. 4,032) with 'finger' in virtually every segment including mainframes, servers, workstations, PCs, notebooks, printers, storage, application software, services, etc.

3. Unix Servers (in units)
   - Techno Inc.: 394
Pro-Tech Inc.: 530
Post Merger: 924
Analysis: With a total market of 3,970 units, its market share will be more than 23 per cent but still way behind Sun whose share was almost 62 per cent.

1. **PC Servers (in units)**
Techno Inc.: 9,702
Pro-Tech Inc.: 5,500
Post Merger: 15,202
Analysis: With Proliants and Netservers in its kitty, the merged entity's share will be in excess of 38 per cent - more than double of nearest competitor Moor Pte. Ltd. who had under 17 per cent share-in a market which was slightly less than 40,000 units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Techno Inc.</th>
<th>Pro-Tech Inc.</th>
<th>Post Merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techno Inc.</strong></td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>15,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Tech Inc.</strong></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Traditional Workstations (in units)**
Techno Inc.: 330
Pro-Tech Inc.: 535
Post Merger: 865
Analysis: In a market, which saw sales numbering 4,784 units, its share would amount to 18 per cent - way behind Sun’s 67 per cent share.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Techno Inc.</th>
<th>Pro-Tech Inc.</th>
<th>Post Merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techno Inc.</strong></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Tech Inc.</strong></td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Personal Workstations (in units)**
Techno Inc.: 3,320
Pro-Tech Inc.: 2,300
Post Merger: 5,620
Analysis: In this segment, the merged entity will virtually control the market with nearly 80 per cent share of the total sales of 7,073 units. Moor Pte. Ltd, the closest competitor will be left way behind with just 14 per cent market share.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Techno Inc.</th>
<th>Pro-Tech Inc.</th>
<th>Post Merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techno Inc.</strong></td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Tech Inc.</strong></td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **PCs (in units)**
Techno Inc.: 1,51,568
Pro-Tech Inc.: 91,200
Post Merger: 2,42,768
Analysis: With several strong sub-brands in its fold - Deskpro, Presario, Brio, Pavilion the combined entity will be a formidable force. Its market share would amount to over 14 per cent as compared to less than nine per cent for HCL, four per cent each for Moor Pte. Ltd and Wipro - the closest competitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Techno Inc.</th>
<th>Pro-Tech Inc.</th>
<th>Post Merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techno Inc.</strong></td>
<td>1,51,568</td>
<td>91,200</td>
<td>2,42,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Tech Inc.</strong></td>
<td>91,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,42,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Notebooks (in units)**
Techno Inc.: 11,216
Pro-Tech Inc.: 750
Post Merger: 11,966
Analysis: In a market numbering 42,864 units, with Armada as the best selling brand, it would have nearly 28 per cent share closely followed by Moor Pte. Ltd. with its Thinkpads at 25 per cent and Toshiba at 20 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Techno Inc.</th>
<th>Pro-Tech Inc.</th>
<th>Post Merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Techno Inc.</strong></td>
<td>11,216</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>11,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Tech Inc.</strong></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>