

11:30 AM | 15 DEC  
MARKET STATS ▾SENSEX  
26,580 ▼ -23.29NIFTY 50  
8,172 ▼ -10.25GOLD (MCX) (Rs/10g.)  
27,261 ▼ -326.00USD/INR  
67.78 ▲ 0.33CREATE  
PORTFOLIODownload ET  
MARKETS APPCHOOSE  
LANGUAGE  
ENG ▾LIVE  
TV

# Post HDFC Life-Max Life deal, Sebi reviews the concept of non-compete fees

By [Reena Zachariah](#), ET Bureau | Updated: Oct 10, 2016, 04:55 PM IST

Post a Comment

MUMBAI: The Securities and Exchange Board of India (Sebi) is reviewing the concept of [non-compete fees](#) paid to promoters selling stakes in mergers after the issue flared up in the HDFC Life-Max Life deal. The promoter of Max Life is getting an additional Rs 850 crore in the form of non-compete fees as part of the merger.



Currently, in case of takeovers, regulations do not allow non-compete fees to be paid to exiting promoters. Instead, any such payment has to be factored into the open-offer price to other shareholders. Sebi now wants to address the exemption given to such fees in case of merger schemes.

"We are reviewing existing provisions governing schemes of arrangement to plug loopholes," said a senior regulatory official familiar with the development. "We have noticed that corporates only follow the law in letter and not in spirit".

## Changing Stance

### WHAT IS NON-COMPETE FEE?


Consideration paid to selling shareholders so that they do not re-enter business and pose competition to acquiring shareholders

### ON WHAT IS IT APPLICABLE?

It is applicable only in the case of mergers. In 2011, Sebi scrapped non-compete fee in takeovers

### WHAT NEXT?

Sebi is examining as to why non-compete fee should be allowed in mergers when it is not allowed in takeovers as both deal with change in control



## Payment Sparked an Uproar

In the case of the [HDFC Life-Max Life merger](#), the non-compete fee of Rs 850 crore had sparked an uproar with proxy advisory firms and the mutual fund body voicing concerns that it was against the interests of minority shareholders.

A non-compete fee is paid to exiting promoters so they don't set up or join a rival entity. According to one proxy advisory firm, a non-compete fee may not have been needed in the HDFC Life-Max Life merger. The sizeable stake held by Max Life's promoters in the merged entity itself would have been deterrent enough.

Some market participants feel that since there is a change of control involved in both takeovers and in mergers, there should be uniformity in rules.

"The regulator needs to raise the standard now to proscribe non-compete clauses in the interests of minority shareholders to bring parity in restructuring mechanisms," said [Sumit Agrawal](#), ex-Sebi official and partner at Suvan Law Advisors. "There seems no rationale to have different set of minority shareholder protection norms in a takeover structure and in a merger or demerger."

## Protecting Minority Investors




Currently, the regulatory framework offers certain provisions that protect minority investors in both situations.

In a merger, the scheme has to be approved by the board of directors of the respective companies. Secondly, though there is no bar on non-compete fees, the minority shareholders have been empowered to approve or reject such an arrangement. Rules require that the entire merger scheme can be acted upon only if the votes of public shareholders favouring the resolution are at least twice those voting against it.


In a takeover, the committee of independent directors of the target company is required to give its recommendation on the open offer price, based as per Sebi's formula.


"While non-compete fee as a structure is prevalent in merger and acquisition transactions in private companies, in public companies this issue has been a matter of discussion due to the interests of minority shareholders involved," said Mehul Savla, director of RippleWave Equity Advisors.


Non-compete fees are justifiable in certain circumstances, said Sandeep Parekh, founder, Finsec Law Advisors and a former Sebi executive director. "Such payments are typically subject to approval of a high court as also majority of uninterested shareholders," he said. "With these safeguards, it is hard to argue for a complete ban."


Stay on top of business news with The Economic Times App. [Download it Now!](#)   


THE ECONOMIC TIMES


  
Live Market


  
News


  
Portfolio


  
Mobile


  
Live TV


  
Newsletter


  
Commodities

  
Speed

  
QnA

  
Blogs

  
Alerts

  
RSS

**Other Times Group news sites**

Times of India | इकनॉमिक टाइम्स  
 छंद्रेनामिड 2101-सु | Mumbai Mirror  
 Times Now | Indiatimes  
 नवभारत टाइम्स | महाराष्ट्र टाइम्स  
 ವಿಜಯ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ | Lifehacker  
 Gizmodo | Eisamay | IGN India  
 NavGujarat Samay

**Living and entertainment**

Timescity | iDiva | Zoom |  
 Luxpresso | Gaana | Happytrips |  
 Cricbuzz | Get Smartapp

**Networking**

itimes | MensXP.com

**Hot on the Web**

Budget 2017 | Sensex, Nifty Live  
 Year-End Special 2016 | UP &  
 Punjab Assembly Elections 2017  
 Live: Currency  
 Demonetisation | Gold Rate  
 RBI Monetary Policy

**Services**

ads2book | Gadgetsnow | Free Business Listings  
 Simplymarry | Astrospeak | Timesjobs | Magicbricks | Zigwheels | Timesdeal |  
 dineout | Filmipop | Remit2india | Gaana | Greetzap | Techradar | Alivear |  
 Google Play

[About us](#) / [Advertise with us](#) / [Terms of Use & Grievance Redressal](#) / [Privacy Policy](#) / [Feedback](#) / [Sitemap](#) / [Code of Ethics](#) / / [Disclaimer](#) Copyright © 2016 Bennett, Coleman & Co. Ltd. All rights reserved.