



Fineprint

In this issue:

- 1 Protecting Shareholder Advances and Guarantees
- 3 Changing Landscape in the Workplace
- 4 Are We in a De Facto Relationship?
- 5 Cyberbullying – stopping the trolls
- 6 Postscript



Protecting Shareholder Advances and Guarantees

All too often shareholders overlook the need to properly secure the advances they make to their company, or the guarantees they grant in favour of their company, without being aware of the consequences that can result from this oversight. By registering security over the assets of their company, shareholders can effectively and efficiently secure their advances to that company and feel assured that steps have been taken to safeguard their investment.

If you're a business owner, you should endeavour to structure your affairs in a manner that reduces risk. As part of mitigating your risk, it's important you understand that when you advance funds to your company, or grant guarantees for the benefit of your company, you're just as entitled as any other creditor to take security.

No one starts a business with the mindset that it will fail and, in the normal course of business, shareholders shouldn't need to call upon their security. However, circumstances change and if a company faces financial pressures or is put into liquidation or receivership, the shareholders may need to shift their focus to preserve their position ahead of the company and its creditors.

What is a shareholder advance?

Shareholder advances encapsulate all loans that a shareholder makes to their company. Whenever a company is incorporated, or a company requires more working capital, it's likely that its shareholders will lend funds to the company, whether by way of a term loan or through a shareholder current account. Both of these methods of lending to the company are considered to be shareholder advances and should be secured against the assets of the company.

Why register a security?

As a shareholder, when you register a security with respect to your advances, you become a secured creditor of your

company. By becoming a secured creditor, you will rank ahead of all the company's unsecured creditors, increasing the likelihood that your shareholder advances will be repaid if the company becomes insolvent.

There's nothing improper or immoral in you establishing a priority position in this manner. Other creditors have the right to search for shareholder security on the Personal Property Securities Register to determine who is ranked ahead of them. Creditors also have the right to demand security from a company or to rearrange the priority of various securities, before they sell goods to a company on an unsecured basis.

An additional and often overlooked benefit of securing shareholder advances is that by being a 'secured' creditor, you will have a greater degree of influence over liquidators and receivers – which is important at a time where shareholders and directors often have very little or no influence over their company.

Guarantees

Outside of the insolvency context, a well-drafted security agreement will also allow you to have recourse to the assets of the company in the event that a guarantee you enter into for the benefit of the company is enforced. Where you have given a shareholder guarantee to a creditor (usually a bank), it's not uncommon for a creditor to call upon the shareholder guarantee without first taking action against the company if the company cannot immediately pay. This is particularly relevant where the creditor has recourse to property held by the shareholder. In this situation, it is important that if you're the affected shareholder, you can legally and efficiently seek recourse against the company as compensation for your loss.

Preparing and registering a general security

Security for shareholder advances often takes the form of a general security over all of the company's present and after acquired assets. This security is recorded in a general security agreement (GSA) that's signed by the company.

The preparation of a GSA is relatively straightforward, meaning that the time and cost involved with instructing a lawyer or accountant to draft a GSA is insignificant when compared with the protection a GSA provides.

Once a GSA has been prepared, it's essential that the security described in the GSA is registered on the Personal Property Securities Register (often referred to as the PPSR), which is administered by the New Zealand Companies Office. The PPSR is the register where details of security interests in personal property are registered and can be publically searched.

The timing of the registration of your security is very important. Generally, the order of registration determines the order of priority between secured creditors – so it's critical to register your security as soon as possible.

Other practical considerations

Ideally shareholders should register their security arrangements before advancing funds to their company, no matter how healthy the business is at the time of the advance. Often shareholders only consider taking security when their company is already in financial difficulties. If the company is finding things tough financially and a shareholder registers a security should that company subsequently be placed into liquidation, the liquidator operating under the Companies Act 1993 regime will likely render the security taken by the shareholder as voidable. This means that the shareholder will end up being an unsecured creditor.

In addition to relying on shareholder advances, many companies will have borrowings with banks and lenders, which will often be secured by a GSA or other security arrangement in favour of the lender. It's important that you check the provisions of the lender's security before registering a shareholder security, as the terms of the lender's security may prohibit the creation of further security interests without their consent. Consent from an external lender should be obtainable as long as they can be assured that the obligations owed to them are sufficiently secured. Some lenders may require a deed of priority in this situation to provide sufficient comfort that the shareholders' security will rank behind the lender's security.

Exit of a shareholder

In addition to securing shareholder advances, if you're a shareholder in a multi-shareholder company, you should also turn your mind as to how shareholder advance/s will be repaid if another shareholder exits the company. Although many shareholders' agreements address what will happen to a shareholder's shares on exit, often no thought is given to repayment of shareholder advances. We recommended that shareholders get advice about the range of options available to cover repayment of shareholders' advances, and releases of guarantees on exit.

In summary, for minimal cost and no matter how healthy the company is at the time you make a shareholder advance to your company or provide a guarantee, you should always secure that advance and/or guarantee by taking security over the assets of your company. By becoming a secured creditor, you can give yourself the best chance of protecting your investment and maintaining as much control as possible in the event of a liquidation. ■



**SAFETY
FIRST**

Changing Landscape in the Workplace

New health and safety legislation comes into force in early April

Organisations should always be aware of their obligations and responsibilities regarding health and safety. This is even more so now as new law, the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015, comes into force on Monday, 4 April this year. A summary of the most significant changes is set out below. We follow this with some practical steps to take to give you and your organisation the best chance of complying with the new legislation.

The new legislation imposes an enhanced primary obligation on a PCBU (Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking) to take 'reasonably practicable' steps to ensure the health and safety of their workers. PCBUs include employers, principals, self-employed, partnerships and other people who manage or control a workplace. However, if you or your organisation don't have any employees then you will not be considered to be a PCBU.

The new duty

If you are a director of a company or an officer you are required to exercise due diligence to ensure compliance with the new Act. Officers include those who hold positions that allow them to exercise significant influence over the management of a business. 'Due diligence' involves taking reasonable steps to:

- Acquire and keep up-to-date knowledge of work health and safety matters
- Gain an understanding of the nature of the operations of the business and generally of the hazards and risks associated with those operations
- Ensure that the PCBU has available for use, and uses, appropriate resources and processes to eliminate or minimise risks to health and safety
- Ensure that the PCBU has appropriate processes for receiving and considering information regarding incidents, hazards and risks and responding in a timely way to that information
- Ensure that the PCBU has, and implements, processes for complying with any duty or obligation, and
- Verify the provision and use of necessary resources and processes.

The purpose of the due diligence requirement for health and safety compliance is for directors and officers to take a more hands-on approach to health and safety.

Defining the workplace

Earlier drafts of the new legislation originally defined 'workplace' in a manner viewed by commentators as being too wide. However, adjustments have been made in order to appease those who were concerned, particularly farmers. 'Workplace' will now be defined as where work 'is being' or 'is customarily' carried out.

This means that the duty of a PCBU in a farming context would not apply to the main dwelling house or to areas of the farm other than farm buildings unless work is being or is customarily carried out at that place.

Investigations, recording and notifying

There are new requirements on PCBUs to carry out internal health and safety investigations into incidents and, in some circumstances, to provide the findings of those investigations to a health and safety inspector. The purpose of an investigation is to identify and address contributing factors to prevent the incident happening again. In addition, there are new obligations concerning the recording and notifying of workplace accidents and serious harm.

Practical steps

The new Act will soon be in force. You should therefore:

- Familiarise yourself with the new legislation
- Understand your position under the new Act
- Review and update the current approach to health and safety of your organisation, business or company
- Inform your workers
- Talk with us if you need to, and
- Above all, don't leave it too late.

This new legislation increases the penalties for non-compliance and creates a new three-tiered hierarchy of offences.

1. Reckless Conduct: fines up to \$3,000,000 or \$600,000 and/or up to five years' imprisonment for individuals
2. Failure to comply with a duty exposing risk of death or serious injury/illness: fines up to \$1,500,000 or \$300,000 for individuals, and
3. Failure to comply with a duty not exposing death or serious injury/illness: fines up to \$500,000 or \$100,000 for individuals.

If you're unsure about these changes or how you and your organisation will be affected then please don't hesitate to be in touch with us. ■

Are We in a De Facto Relationship?

If you are in a de facto relationship, there could be significant financial implications for you if you separate, or if your partner (or you) dies

The principal piece of legislation which deals with the division of property belonging to couples or married couples is the Property (Relationships) Act 1976 (the PRA). Substantial reforms in 2001 extended the scope of the PRA to cover de facto relationships. But what exactly constitutes a de facto relationship in the eyes of the law?

The PRA states that the basic criteria for a de facto relationship are:

- There must be a relationship between two people
- The relationship may be heterosexual or homosexual
- Both parties must be aged 18 years or over
- They must not be married to each other, although they may be married to someone else, and
- The parties must *'live together as a couple'*.

Living together as a couple

The PRA sets out a list of matters to be taken into account in considering whether two people *'live together as a couple'*. These matters are:

- The duration of the relationship: the longer that two people have been associated together, the more likely it is they will be found to be living together as a couple
- The nature and extent of common residence: two people may live together (in terms of the PRA) even if they do not reside at the same address. But the more time they spend together at the same place, the easier it will be to regard them as a couple
- Whether a sexual relationship exists
- The degree of financial dependence or interdependence, and any arrangements for financial support between them
- The ownership, use and acquisition of property: co-ownership, particularly of the common residence, is a sign of living together as a couple. The same can be said of using property in common, such as a car, and buying items together
- The degree of mutual commitment to a shared life: commitment is an important test of whether there is a de facto relationship. Certain objective criteria such as a common address is important, but there must also be a subjective element of their commitment to a shared life
- The care and support of children: where two people have a child it does not follow that they are necessarily de facto partners. However, children of a relationship will often be relevant in identifying a further level of commitment by the couple

- The performance of household duties; for example, the sharing of domestic duties may indicate a commitment to a shared life, and
- The reputation and public aspects of the relationship; if two people appear together in public and attend events together as a couple this can provide evidence they are a couple.

This is not an exclusive list; any other circumstances can be considered. There will be situations where some circumstances are more relevant than others. Also, no one specific factor is a necessary condition to determine whether or not there is a de facto relationship.

There have been cases where the court has found there to be a de facto relationship even though the two people are not residing together. That said, whilst cohabitation isn't *absolutely* necessary for a de facto relationship to exist, it is a very persuasive factor.

What is not a de facto relationship?

Various relationships can easily be identified as falling outside the definition of a de facto relationship. For example, a boyfriend/girlfriend relationship where both people have independent lives and do not cohabit does not have the hallmarks of a de facto relationship, even if it is a close, personal and sexual one.

If two people's relationship is not a de facto relationship (or they're not married or not in a civil union) they fall outside the scope of the PRA. If these people have issues relating to property, they must therefore use some other legal remedy to try to resolve their property-related dispute.

The question that often arises in these cases is just when a relationship shifts from being a more casual type of relationship to a qualifying de facto relationship to which the PRA applies. In each case, that will involve a detailed consideration of the above factors, and possibly others.

How we can help

If you need further advice about how the PRA could apply to you, and possible steps you may be able to take to contract out of it, please be in touch. ■



Cyberbullying – stopping the trolls

In recent years there has been a significant increase in online abuse particularly of vulnerable young people. A high profile example was the 2013 'Roast Busters' case involving teenage boys bragging of sexual activities with girls. This article looks at what remedies are available when cyberbullying takes place.

Cyberbullying has become commonplace with dreadful consequences for the victims including depression and suicide.

In September 2015, a 24 year-old-man was arrested in Denmark after a joint investigation between New Zealand and Danish authorities. The man posted private photos of an Auckland schoolgirl on websites and subsequently hacked the computers of the girl's family and school.

New legislation will help

The Harmful Digital Communications Act 2015 came into effect on 1 July 2015. It aims to deter and prevent harm from digital communication and to provide victims of harmful communication with a means of redress. The definition of 'digital communication' includes posting on the internet and social media sites, and phone communications such as texts.

It's now an offence to post a digital communication that causes harm to a victim, if the post is intended to cause harm and if an ordinary reasonable person in the victim's shoes would have been harmed.

Since the Act came into force eight people have been charged and, to date, three have been convicted. The most recent conviction involved a Christchurch man sending numerous threatening images and messages to his former boss.

The Act provides limited protection from liability to websites (such as Facebook) that might host harmful content. However, the host must comply with certain procedures. It must be easy for users to make complaints. Any complaint must be forwarded to the author of the post and, unless the author objects, in most cases the post must be removed within 48 hours of the complaint.

The balance of the Act (coming into force on a date to be decided prior to 2 July 2017) contains additional remedies for victims. The legislation will establish a statutory agency to receive and investigate complaints about harmful digital communications.

If the agency cannot negotiate the removal of a post or has not deterred someone from posting on websites, the District Court will have the power to make various orders including that specific content be removed, that conduct be stopped, or that a correction, apology or right of reply be published.

These orders can be made against the original poster as well as the website host. If necessary, the court can order that the identity of an anonymous author be revealed to the court. This is aimed to stop those people, commonly known as 'trolls', who hide behind the internet to hurl abuse at others safe in the knowledge that no one knows who they are.

Commentators acknowledge the Act addresses an important and real need – protecting the vulnerable and limiting harmful behaviour. Critics fear unjustified complaints could be used to unfairly target a person, publication or field of discussion and limit freedom of speech.

Most people would agree that the law needed to address issues with cyberbullying. Time will tell whether the changes are effective. ■

NZ LAW Limited is an association of independent legal practices with member firms located throughout New Zealand. There are 59 member firms practising in over 70 locations.

NZ LAW member firms have agreed to co-operate together to develop a national working relationship. Membership enables firms to access one another's skills, information and ideas whilst maintaining client confidentiality.

Members of NZ LAW Limited

Allen Needham & Co Ltd – Morrinsville
 Argyle Welsh Finnigan – Ashburton
 Bannermans Lawyers – Gore
 Bartrop Graham – Feilding
 Berry & Co – Oamaru, Queenstown & Invercargill
 Boyle Mathieson – Henderson
 Breaden McCardle – Paraparaumu
 Corcoran French – Christchurch & Kaiapoi
 Cruickshank Pryde – Invercargill & Queenstown
 Cullinane Steele – Levin
 Daniel Overton & Goulding – Onehunga, & Pukekohe
 DG Law Limited – Panmure
 Dorrington Poole – Dannevirke
 Downie Stewart – Dunedin & Balclutha
 Dowthwaite Law – Rotorua
 Duncan King Law – Epsom, Auckland
 Edmonds Judd – Te Awamutu & Otorohanga
 Edmonds Marshall – Matamata
 AJ Gallagher – Napier
 Gawith Burridge – Masterton & Martinborough
 Gifford Devine – Hastings, Havelock North & Waipukurau
 Gillespie Young Watson – Lower Hutt & Upper Hutt
 Greg Kelly Law Ltd – Wellington
 Hannan & Seddon – Greymouth
 Horsley Christie – Wanganui
 Innes Dean-Tararua Law – Palmerston North & Pahiatua
 Jackson Reeves – Tauranga
 James & Wells Intellectual Property – Hamilton, Auckland, Tauranga & Christchurch
 Johnston Lawrence Limited – Wellington
 Kaimai Law Bethlehem – Bethlehem
 Knapps Lawyers – Nelson, Richmond & Motueka
 Koning Webster – Mt Maunganui
 Lamb Bain Laubscher – Te Kuiti
 Law North Limited – Kerikeri
 Le Pine & Co – Taupo, Turangi & Putaruru
 Lowndes Jordan – Auckland
 Mactodd – Queenstown & Wanaka
 Malley & Co – Christchurch & Hornby
 Mike Lucas Law Firm – Manurewa
 Norris Ward McKinnon – Hamilton
 David O'Neill, Barrister – Hamilton
 Osborne Attewell Clews – Whakatane
 Parry Field Lawyers – Riccarton, Christchurch & Hokitika
 Wayne Peters Lawyers – Whangarei
 Purnell Jenkison Oliver – Thames & Whitianga
 Rennie Cox – Auckland
 Chris Rejthar & Associates – Tauranga
 RMY Legal – New Plymouth
 RSM Law Limited – Timaru
 Sandford & Partners – Rotorua
 Simpson Western – Takapuna, North Harbour & Silverdale
 Sumpter Moore – Balclutha & Milton
 Thomson Wilson – Whangarei
 Till Henderson – New Plymouth & Stratford
 Wain & Naysmith Limited – Blenheim
 Walker MacGeorge & Co – Waimate
 Welsh McCarthy – Hawera
 Wilkinson Rodgers – Dunedin
 Woodward Chrisp – Gisborne

Postscript

Our News

We've opened in Hokitika



Joseph Morris

We're pleased to announce the opening of a new office in Hokitika which will help us keep in closer contact with our West Coast clients.

In January this year we took over the offices of the long-established Hokitika legal practice of Murdoch James & Roper.

Associate Joseph Morris has moved to Hokitika to lead the office. We're lucky that Murdoch James & Roper's legal secretary, Trudy Henderson, has joined Parry Field Lawyers so that Steve Woulfe's former clients will continue to have a familiar face in town.

Joseph has been based in Hokitika since January and says, "Although we're only two months in, it has been enormously enjoyable and rewarding to extend our firm to the Coast and to provide legal services to the community here."

Parry Field Lawyers has always had a strong link with the West Coast and, in particular, Hokitika. Partner Tim Rankin was born and bred there, and many will warmly remember him when he attended Westland High School.

"Establishing this new Parry Field Lawyers office is a great opportunity to help contribute to my home town. It was easy to convince my partners to expand our legal services to full on-the-spot local representation," adds Tim.

Welcome to Steven Moe and Nathan Simkiss



Steven Moe

To be involved in Christchurch's rebuild is the reason our new senior associate Steven Moe returned after 11 years in Tokyo, London and Sydney. A member of the corporate and commercial team, Steven focuses particularly on international companies investing in New Zealand, as well as advising Kiwi businesses on their domestic and overseas operations.

Outside of work, this University of Canterbury graduate enjoys family history and has written several books on some of his ancestors as well as the church he attended in Sydney. He and his wife Ellie are kept busy with their four young children.



Nathan Simkiss

Also a UC graduate, newly arrived law clerk Nathan Simkiss is working in our litigation team – primarily on employment and family law matters. As well as his LLB, Nathan has a BA with majors in history and English.

Nathan sings as a tenor in the Christchurch Youth Choir, and is very involved in his church where he has been a leader in the children's ministry since 2011.

PARTNERS

Grant Adams Lois Flanagan
Ken Lord Pat Rotherham
Kris Morrison Paul Cowey
Tim Rankin

CONSULTANT

Peter van Rij

SENIOR ASSOCIATE

Steven Moe

ASSOCIATES

Hannah Carey Luke Hayward
Joseph Morris Paul Owens

SOLICITORS

Alex Summerlee Judith Bullin
Doris Tu Viv Zhang

LEGAL EXECUTIVES & LAW CLERKS

Angela Boereboom Ruth Judkins
Nathan Simkiss Vinesh Prakash

GENERAL MANAGER

Andrea Lambie-Shaw

RICCARTON

1 Rimu Street
Riccarton
Christchurch 8041
PO Box 8020
Riccarton
Christchurch 8440

P: 03 348 8480 F: 03 348 6305

HOKITIKA

26 Weld Street
Hokitika 7810
PO Box 44
Hokitika 7842

P: 03 755 8673 F: 03 755 8073

E: legalease@parryfield.com

W: parryfield.com

To the heart of what matters. 