

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910459848203321
Titolo	The European company law action plan revisited [[electronic resource]] : reassessment of the 2003 priorities of the European Commission / / edited by Koen Geens and Klaus J. Hopt
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Leuven, : Leuven University Press, c2010
ISBN	94-6166-008-1
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (376 p.)
Altri autori (Persone)	GeensK (Koen) HoptKlaus J. <1940->
Disciplina	346.4066
Soggetti	Corporation law - European Union countries Corporate governance - European Union countries Law - European Union countries - International unification Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references.
Nota di contenuto	THE EUROPEAN COMPANY LAW ACTION PLAN REVISITED; Table of Content; Preface; The European Company Law Action Plan Revisited: An Introduction; Stock-taking; Reform problems; 1. Capital; 2. Corporate governance; 3. One share/one vote; 4. Financial reporting; 5. Corporate mobility; Perspectives; Flexible mixed system solutions; Adequate enforcement; The financial markets crisis and beyond; I. Reforming Legal Capital: Harmonisation or Fragmentation of Creditor Protection?; Abstract; Table of Contents; 1. Introduction: the European path to reforming legal capital requirements to date; 2. Overview 3. Functions attributed to the legal capital 4. Legal capital: a merely transitional phase or a powerful regulatory tool?; 5. Alternative regimes: a brief overview; 5.1. Traditional mechanisms enhancing creditor protection; 5.2. Creditor protection: alternatives to the Second Directive distribution regime; 5.2.1. Second Directive: balance sheet test; 5.2.2. The High Level Group; 5.2.3. The Rickford proposal; 5.2.4. The Lutter proposal; 5.2.5. The Dutch proposal; 5.3. Initiatives at the European level; 5.3.1. Second Directive to remain unchanged 5.3.2. Proposal for a Regulation on the Statute for a European Private

Company 6. Reasons for such a vigorous legal capital debate?; 7. Should creditor protection be ensured by corporate law?; 8. Alternative protective techniques; 9. Creditor protection: does Europe still want a level playing field?; 10. Concluding remarks: the way forward...; Bibliography; Transcripts of Capital and Creditor Protection Session; A. Abstract; B. Response to paper by Jonathan Rickford; C. Discussion; Didier MARTIN; Henri OLIVIER , University of Liege; Jonathan RICKFORD; Didier MARTIN; Jonathan RICKFORD
Karel VAN HULLE, K.U.Leuven and European CommissionPhilippe PELLE, European Commission; Jonathan RICKFORD; Marieke WYCKAERT, K.U. Leuven; Didier MARTIN; Jean-Marie NELISSEN GRADE; Marieke WYCKAERT; Jean-Marie NELISSEN GRADE; Jonathan RICKFORD; II. Corporate Governance in a European Perspective; Abstract; Table of contents; 1. Introduction; 2. Growing Interest in Corporate Governance at European Level; 3. General Outline: European Corporate Governance and Ownership Structures; 4. Monitoring by The Market; 5. The Shareholders in the Corporate Governance Debate
6. Monitoring by an Independent Board of Directors 7. Monitoring by the Legislator; 8. What Should Be on the European Agenda?; Bibliography; Transcripts of Corporate Governance Session; A. Abstract; B. Response to paper by Eddy Wymeersch; C. Discussion; Paul DAVIES; Peter MONTAGNON, Association of British Insurers; Walter VAN GERVEN, K.U.Leuven; Jaap WINTER, University of Amsterdam; Bruno LAFORCE, GIMV NV; Philippe PELLE, European Commission; Klaus J. HOPT, Max Planck Institute; Jose GARRIDO GARCIA, University of Castilla-La Mancha; Didier MARTIN, Bredin Prat, Paris; Paul DAVIES; Hilde LAGA
Paul DAVIES

Sommario/riassunto

The harmonisation of company law has always been on the agenda of the European Union. Besides the protection of third parties affected by business transactions, the founders had two other objectives: first, promoting freedom of establishment, and second, preventing the abuse of such freedom. In fact, the fear of the Netherlands becoming the 'Delaware of Europe' (in terms of competition among Member States) seemed real, until, ironically, at the beginning of the 21st century, it was the privilege of the Dutch (and the Danish) state to fail in making the abuse argument before the European Court
