

Robin Hollington QC

Called: 1979

Silk Date: 1999

"He is a fearless advocate and I have heard him described as a "battle tank" when in court." Company & Partnership - Legal 500 2020
"He is just exceptional on his feet with his charm and ability to hold the judiciary in the palm of his hand. He carries his great intellect with such delicacy."
Restructuring/Insolvency - Chambers UK Bar 2019



+44 (0) 20 7419 8000



robin.hollington@newsquarechambers.co.uk

Practice Overview

Robin Hollington QC is a top ranked silk with a particular focus on company and insolvency law and litigation. His practice is both UK-based and international. He advises and appears in the BVI, Cayman Islands, and Hong Kong, and he continues to be in demand as an expert witness in courts and arbitral tribunals throughout the world. '

The 'first rate' Robin Hollington QC is recommended for his international practice, and has 'a real feel for company law principles' Legal 500.

He has appeared in many recent heavy and high-profile court cases, often reaching the appellate courts. Robin is author of the celebrated leading textbook

- 'Hollington on Shareholders' Rights' (Sweet & Maxwell), 1st (1990) to 8th (2016) editions and has contributed to both
- 'Directors' Duties & Shareholder Litigation in the Wake of the Financial Crisis' - Chapter 6
- 'Recent cases on the winding-up of hedge funds on treasure islands' (Edward Elgar, 2012) and
- The ICSA Directors Handbook 'Shareholder Remedies' (ICSA, 2009) - Chapter 15

Robin is currently recommended as a leading Silk in the following directories:

- **Chambers UK Bar:** Company (Star Individual), Offshore, Restructuring & Insolvency
- **Chambers Global:** Offshore
- **Legal 500:** Insolvency and Company & Partnership

Robin was Head of Chambers from July 2010 until June 2014.

Commercial Litigation

Commercial Chancery

Robin's practice encompasses virtually all aspects of contentious work in the Chancery Division, with a particular emphasis on company and insolvency law (both corporate and individual), and extends to non-contentious

advisory work in company and insolvency law.

Chambers UK Bar & Chambers Global 2015

Robin has acted in a stream of high-profile company cases in England, the Caribbean and Hong Kong (see further below), particularly the recent lengthy, complex high profile *Caldero v Beppler* shareholders' dispute case over an English Company with a Montenegrin operation subsidiary worth several \$million, culminating in final victory in the CoA [2014]. There were innumerable interim hearings, latterly over the removal of the provisional liquidators and costs, involving virtually every judge of the Chancery Division. The case received wide coverage in the national press.

"He is very steady and solid, and knows the law so comprehensively"

Chambers UK Bar & Chambers Global 2015

Robin was brought in to appear recently in the Court of Appeal in a dispute arising out of a transfer of a minority shareholding: *Blindley Heath Investments Ltd. v. Bass*.

Company

Robin is a well-respected leading Silk advocate who specialises in the field of corporate and personal insolvency cases.

He has developed a particular specialisation in the field of shareholders' disputes and is the author of the leading textbook in this field 'Hollington on Shareholders' Rights' (Sweet & Maxwell), 1st (1990) to 8th (2016) editions.

Robin is ranked as a "Star Individual" in **Chambers UK Bar**.

"The leading expert in shareholder disputes."

"What he doesn't know about Company law, you can write on the back of a stamp."

Chambers UK Bar 2017 - Company

"An exemplary Chancery Silk"

Legal 500 2016 - Company & Partnership

"He is Mr Shareholder Disputes" and "I regard him as being pre-eminent in the area of minority shareholder rights; his knowledge of the law and practice on that topic is encyclopaedic"

"He turned around the instructions very quickly and provided very thorough advice"

Chambers UK Bar 2015 - Company

Noteworthy cases include:

- *O'Neill v Phillips* [1999] 1 WLR 1092, [1999] 2 BCLC1. A ground breaking case dispute between quasi-partners who fell out over the management of an asbestos-removal business. Case heard at the House of Lords.
- *Cream Holdings v Davenport* [2012] 1 BCLC 365, [2011] EWCA Civ 1287, [2011] All ER (D) 59 (Nov). A successful Company case in which Robin resisted an appeal against an order appointing an expert to value shares under pre-emption provisions.

Robin also recently acted for a number of companies controlled by one of the Tchenguiz brothers in resisting attempts by RBS to gain administration orders against them.

Robin has also contributed to

- 'Directors' Duties & Shareholder Litigation in the Wake of the Financial Crisis' - Chapter 6
- 'Recent cases on the winding-up of hedge funds on treasure islands' (Edward Elgar, 2012) and
- The ICSA Directors Handbook 'Shareholder Remedies' (ICSA, 2009) - Chapter 15

Insolvency

Robin is a well-respected leading Silk advocate who specialises in the field of corporate and personal insolvency cases. He has developed a particular specialisation in the field of shareholders' disputes and is the author of the leading textbook in this field 'Hollington on Shareholders' Rights' (Sweet Maxwell), 1st (1990) to 8th (2016) editions.

Robin is ranked as a "Star individual" in **Chambers UK Bar**.

"He is extremely authoritative in his responses, you get a great level of comfort when he's on board. I'd recommend him for particularly complex questions and for precedent-setting disputes that will change the law."

Chambers UK Bar 2017 - Restructuring/Insolvency

Noteworthy cases include:

- *O'Neill v Phillips* [1999] 1 WLR 1092, [1999] 2 BCLC 1. A ground breaking case dispute between quasi-partners who fell out over the management of an asbestos-removal business. Case heard at the House of Lords.
- *Cream Holdings v Davenport* [2012] 1 BCLC 365, [2011] EWCA Civ 1287, [2011] All ER (D) 59 (Nov). A successful Company case in which Robin resisted an appeal against an order appointing an expert to value shares under pre-emption provisions.

Robin also recently acted for a number of companies controlled by one of the Tchenguiz brothers in resisting attempts by RBS to gain administration orders against them.

Robin has also contributed to:

- 'Directors' Duties & Shareholder Litigation in the Wake of the Financial Crisis' - Chapter 6
- 'Recent cases on the winding-up of hedge funds on treasure islands' (Edward Elgar, 2012) and
- The ICSA Directors Handbook 'Shareholder Remedies' (ICSA, 2009) - Chapter 15

Offshore

Robin has an extensive and long-standing offshore practice.

"He literally wrote the book on shareholder disputes and is someone judges listen to."

Chambers UK Bar & Chambers Global 2017 - Offshore

"He is very steady and solid and knows the law so comprehensively"

Chambers UK Bar & Chambers Global 2015 - Offshore

He *"Has built a truly global insolvency practice"*

Chambers Global 2013

"Has great experience of litigating in the BVI and Cayman Islands"

Chambers UK Bar 2012 - Offshore

Notable cases include:

- *Pioneer Iron & Steel* - The removal of liquidators of BVI company (with interests in China) in voluntary creditor's liquidation. Heard at the High Court BVI.
- *Dragon Capital Group Ltd* - A current major ongoing case for Robin dealing with unfair prejudice for one of the two major shareholders in fund managers in Vietnam and the Far East. Proceedings have been issued in the BVI.

Robin recently acted in a Cayman Islands case concerning the provisional liquidation of a company listed on the New York Stock Exchange after its listing had been suspended due to alleged mismanagement.

Robin is also regularly instructed as an expert witness abroad on UK, BVI, Cayman Islands and Hong Kong company and insolvency law. Most recently Robin has been retained in the USA for advice on English law concerning derivative claims arising out of oil pollution by UK-based companies and in Hong Kong concerning distributions made by BVI-based companies.

Mediation

"On nobody's side"

An experienced High Court and overseas litigator and Deputy High Court Judge and Recorder, Robin has conducted numerous mediations since accreditation by the ADR Group. He has expertise in the field of company and insolvency law, particularly in the field of shareholders' and partners' disputes. He is the author of

"Shareholders' Rights", due to appear in its 9th Edition later this year.

Robin, after almost 40 years' practice at the commercial Chancery Bar and over 15 years as a part-time judge in civil cases, is keen to help resolve disputes rather than fight them in the highly pressurised atmosphere of the courts. He has come more and more to regard litigation as a lottery and luxury to be avoided if at all possible.

Robin sees that senior and experienced practitioners like him are able to perform a wide variety of roles in resolving disputes away from the courts. Robin believes that shareholders' disputes, or corporate divorces as they are sometimes called, are peculiarly amenable to alternative dispute resolution and ill-suited to litigation. And as an experienced practitioner in the field, he believes that he knows where the impediments to settlement lie and how they can be addressed and overcome.

The role will be tailored to the circumstances of the dispute and might be one or a combination of the following:

Mediation
Neutral evaluation
Non-binding adjudication
"MOT" - a second opinion, "playing devil's advocate"
Arbitration

Cases

Name: Re Dragon Capital Ltd (Shrimpton and anr v Scriven and ors)

Reference: BVI HC (COM) 2014/0171

Date: 15th June 2016

Court: High Court, British Virgin Islands

Facts:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay are instructed for the Petitioners in a claim under section 184I BVI Business Companies Act 2004 to have their shares in Dragon Capital Ltd ('the Company') bought. The Company is a large Vietnamese investment fund, of which Mr Shrimpton, the First Petitioner, was the co-founder. Mr Shrimpton owns approximately 35% of the issued shares (personally and through a company, the Second Petitioner). Mr Shrimpton claims, inter alia, that he was unfairly excluded from management.

Mr Shrimpton claims that the Company was, from its inception, a quasi-partnership between him and Mr Scrivener, the co-founder, subject to equitable understandings, including a right to participate in management. A number of Vietnamese individuals subsequently became partners, but with their shareholdings held indirectly by Mr Shrimpton and Mr Scrivener.

Some time thereafter, the International Finance Corporation (part of the World Bank) ('IFC') and Promotion et Participation pour la Cooperation Economique ('Proparco') acquired shareholdings, at which time formal shareholders' agreements were executed. The Vietnamese partners did not execute the shareholders' agreements.

The Company, which had taken an active stance in the proceedings and filed a Defence which inter alia denied the existence of a quasi-partnership, applied for declarations (1) that the Company had been and remained entitled to be an active defendant in the proceedings; and (2) to sanction the costs already incurred and to be incurred by the Company in defending the proceedings.

The Judge examined the authorities on participation by a company in unfair prejudice proceedings, including, in particular, *Re A Company* [1994] 2 BCLC 146, *Power v Ekstein* [2010] NSCWC 137, *Trojan Equity Ltd v CMI Ltd* (2011) 87 ACSR 144 and *Annuity & Life Re & or v Full Apex (Holdings) Ltd* [2012] SC (Bda) 73 Com.

The Judge dismissed the application, ordering the Company to pay the Petitioners' costs. As to the Company's entitlement to participate, there had been no application by the Petitioners to restrain it from doing so. The Company was free to participate if it chose to do so. As to the sanction of costs incurred or to be incurred, that was an issue for trial: it was quite impossible at this stage to determine whether historic and proposed participation by the Company would amount to a misfeasance on the part of the directors causing it to do so. [Click here to view judgment](#)

Judge: Judge Sir Bernard Eder QC (Ag)

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Blindley Heath Investments Ltd v. Bass

Reference: [2016] 4 Costs L.O. 627; [2016] EWCA Civ 548

Date: 10th June 2016

Court: Court of Appeal EWCA Civ

Facts:

This involved multiple appeals and cross-appeals in respect of the main appeal, reported as [2015] EWCA Civ 1023. Robin's client, the successful claimant in the court below and the successful respondent in the main appeal, was cross-appealing against the decision of the first instance Judge to award him only part of his costs of the claim. The Judge below had been particularly influenced by the fact that the claim had been brought not only against the shareholders who had unsuccessfully opposed the claim but also against the shareholders who had sold their shares to the claimant and who succeeded in demonstrating that they were not in breach of warranty. The claimant argued that a Bullock order was appropriate, and there should be no discount to the costs recoverable, on the basis that he had to sue both sets of shareholders in the alternative.

Held, allowing the claimant's cross-appeal on costs, a Bullock order without a discount was appropriate and would be substituted for the order made by the Judge. The Judge below had clearly erred in the exercise of her discretion.

Judge: Longmore LJ, Jackson LJ and Hildyard J

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Re Dragon Capital Ltd (Shrimpton and anr v Scriven and ors)

Reference: BVI HC (COM) 2014/0171

Date: 2nd June 2016

Court: High Court, British Virgin Islands

Facts:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay are instructed for the Petitioners in a claim under section 184I BVI Business Companies Act 2004 to have their shares in Dragon Capital Ltd bought. Dragon Capital Ltd is a large Vietnamese investment fund, of which Mr Shrimpton, the First Petitioner, was the co-founder. Mr Shrimpton owns approximately 35% of the issued shares (personally and through a company, the Second Petitioner). Mr Shrimpton claims, inter alia, that he was unfairly excluded from management.

Mr Shrimpton claims that Dragon Capital Ltd was, from its inception, a quasi-partnership between him and Mr Scrivener, the co-founder, subject to equitable understandings, including a right to participate in management. A number of Vietnamese individuals subsequently became partners, but with their shareholdings held indirectly by Mr Shrimpton and Mr Scrivener.

Some time thereafter, the International Finance Corporation (part of the World Bank) ('IFC') and Promotion et Participation pour la Cooperation Economique ('Proparco') acquired shareholdings, at which time formal shareholders' agreements were executed. The Vietnamese partners did not execute the shareholders' agreements.

Mr Scrivener and Mr Pasikowski, the First and Second Respondents, applied for summary judgment on the issue of whether Dragon Capital Ltd was a quasi-partnership and/or whether the quasi-partners were bound by equitable understandings. They relied upon two principal arguments (1) the allegation of the existence of a quasi-partnership was so weak as to have no real prospect of success; and (2) in any event, the Petitioners had no real prospect of showing that the quasi-partnership survived the execution of the shareholders' agreements.

The application was dismissed, the judge ordering the applicants to pay the Petitioners' costs. As to the first ground, the Judge held that the question of whether a quasi-partnership existed was highly fact-sensitive and unsuitable for summary disposal and that there was ample evidence to suggest that Dragon Capital Ltd was a quasi-partnership. As to the second ground, there was a real prospect that, looking at the shareholders' agreement in its proper context, the quasi-partnership survived the execution of the shareholders' agreements (or that it revived, thereafter). The Judge commented '[6] *This application for summary judgment… is a particularly good example of how such an application can delay and derail proceedings as they progress towards trial and how such an application can increase costs.*'

[Click here to view judgment](#)

Judge: Judge Jules Sher QC (Ag)

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: TOC Investments Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Limited and ors

Reference: [2016] EWHC 20 (Ch)

Date: 8th January 2016

Court: High Court

Comment:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay acted for TOC Investments Limited (a subsidiary of the former TNK-BP oil company) in an application to be reimbursed approximately £2,800,000 which it had advanced for the fees and expenses of provisional liquidators of Beppler & Jacobson Limited ('BJUK') (a company which owns two prestigious hotels in Montenegro which was the subject of a minority shareholders petition in the proceedings *Caldero Trading Limited v Beppler & Jacobson Limited* [2013] EWHC 2191 (Ch), [2014] EWCA Civ 935 in which Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay acted for the petitioner)

Pursuant to a partial compromise of the petition, it was ordered in 2012 ('the Newey Order') that, after a share buy-out and the dismissal of the petition, the costs of the PLs be paid by BJUK. TOC shortly thereafter entered into a funding agreement with the PLs and BJUK which provided for the 'advance' of monies for the costs of the

PLs. TOC advanced c. £2,800,000 in relation to the costs of the PLs before BJUK emerged from provisional liquidation at the end of 2014, Caldero's shares having been purchased by the majority shareholders pursuant to the Newey Order. The shareholders of BJUK maintained that TOC had no right to be reimbursed for the costs of the provisional liquidation. Hildyard J held that, while the Funding Agreement had no express provision for repayment, it was clear from the factual context, that TOC was not making a gift but it was intended that TOC have recourse. The agreement was premised on such a right, to which the Newey Order and Rule 4.30 of the Insolvency Rules gave expression and the mode and means of enforcement. Alternatively, TOC was entitled to be subrogated to the PLs' rights to payment under the Newey Order or Rule 4.30.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Blindley Heath Investments Ltd v. Bass

Reference: [2015] EWCA Civ 1023

Date: 9th September 2015

Court: Court of Appeal EWCA Civ

Facts:

There was a relatively informal shareholders' agreement in place. It contained pre-emption provisions, obliging a shareholder to serve a transfer notice in respect of his shares in the event that he wished to transfer them. Many years later, a third party purchaser, for whom Robin acted in the appeal, entered into negotiations for the purchase of some shares. A share sale agreement was entered into, with the vendor (who had forgotten about the earlier agreement and pre-emption provisions) representing that there was no impediment to the sale. The other shareholders, who had previously raised no objection to the sale, then claimed to have found the earlier agreement and relied upon its pre-emption provisions. Robin's client relied inter alia upon the doctrine of estoppel by convention.

Held: dismissing the appeal, the other shareholders were estopped by convention from relying upon the earlier agreement - the parties' mutual assumption that there were no pre-emption provisions was evident from their mutual conduct.

Judge: Longmore LJ, Jackson LJ and Hildyard J

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Caldero Trading Limited v Beppler & Jacobson Limited and ors

Reference: LTL 2/12/2014

Date: 1st December 2014

Court: High Court

Comment:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay act for the successful petitioner in a dispute relating to two prestigious hotels in Montenegro. At a hearing in relation to the implementation of a share purchase order, the petitioner sought and obtained freezing relief against the shares of the majority shareholders and those to be transferred

by the petitioner pursuant to the share purchase in relation to numerous orders for payment of costs to be subject to detailed assessment. The dishonesty shown by the respondents justified an inference of a risk of dissipation of assets and their repeated failures to comply with orders to pay assessed costs until it suited them indicated a propensity to prefer their own interests over those of their creditors.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Caldero Trading Limited v Beppler & Jacobson Limited and ors

Reference: [2014] EWCA Civ 935

Date: 8th July 2014

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay act for the Petitioner (Respondent to the appeal) in a long-running dispute relating to two prestigious hotels in Montenegro. The Petitioner is a minority shareholder in a UK holding company which owns land in Montenegro and, through a Montenegrin subsidiary, the two hotels. The Appellants sought to overturn the decision of Mr Justice David Richards [2013] EWHC 2191 (Ch) in which he accepted the Petitioner's case that all sums (in the order of €50,000,000) provided for the purchase and renovation/refurbishment of the hotels were agreed to be provided by way of capital rather than loan and not to be deducted from the Petitioner's share. The Court of Appeal upheld Mr Justice David Richards' decision, rejecting the Appellants' submission that the agreement was commercially improbable and that the findings were inconsistent with certain documents. The Court of Appeal held that the judge had been entitled to make the findings which he did and that the appeal should never have been brought.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Caldero Trading Limited v Beppler & Jacobson Limited and ors

Reference: [2013] EWHC 2191 (Ch)

Date: 23rd July 2013

Court: High Court

Comment:

Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay act for the petitioner in a dispute relating to two prestigious hotels in Montenegro. Following a trial, Mr Justice David Richards accepted the petitioner's case that funds (in the order of €50,000,000) invested by the company's majority shareholder had been invested by way of capital rather than loan. Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay subsequently succeeded in upholding the decision in the Court of Appeal.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Re Ambow Education Holding Limited

Date: 9th June 2013

Court: Grand Court, Cayman Islands

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Caldero Trading Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Ltd Ors

Reference: [2012] EWHC 4031 (Ch)

Date: 14th December 2012

Court: High Court

Comment:

Under the terms of a consent order, provisional liquidators were no longer entitled to all of the books and records of a company which was the subject of a winding up petition, as the order had restricted the liquidators' entitlement to documents reasonably necessary solely for protecting and preserving the company's assets.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Caldero Trading Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Ltd & Ors

Reference: LTL 10/1/2013

Date: 14th December 2012

Court: High Court

Comment:

An application to re-amend amended points of defence was refused where the draft amendments had not made out any case as to why a final order to wind-up a company on an agreed basis ought to be varied.

Practice Area: Insolvency

Name: Caldero Trading Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Ltd and ors

Reference: [2012] EWHC 2286 (Ch)

Date: 13th November 2012

Court: High Court

Comment:

A company case in which Robin Hollington QC and Adrian Pay successfully applied for the appointment of provisional liquidators of a company with interests in Montenegro, fought off challenges to the jurisdiction of the English court, and subsequently obtained final relief in the petition seeking relief on the unfair prejudice ground

and winding up on the just and equitable basis.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Confidential

Date: 5th November 2012

Court: High Court, Texas

Comment:

Expert evidence before Texan High Court on maintainability of derivative claim under UK and Bermuda law.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Caldero Trading Ltd v Beppler & Jacobson Ltd and ors

Reference: [2012] EWHC 1609 (Ch)

Date: 14th June 2012

Court: High Court

Comment:

Joinder of additional parties to a section 994 petition; service outside the jurisdiction (Russia, Nevis); resisting strike-out application by a director of the company in relation to which the petition was presented, where no cause of action alleged but director was a central actor in the wrongdoing and should provide disclosure; resolution of dispute as to entitlement of the petitioner to show documents and witness statements provided by Respondents to its funder; argument as to relationship between CPR 31.22 and implied undertakings in disclosure orders attached to freezing-type orders.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: In the Matter of Mister Dee International plc (Shah v Shah)

Reference: [2011] EWHC 1902 (Ch)

Date: 26th July 2011

Court: High Court

Comment:

To determine the value of the company, which involved a number of novel issues of valuation, in particular the allowance to be made for contingent tax liabilities affecting assets. Roth J gave judgment in July 2011, resulting ultimately in a favourable costs order.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Mengiste v Effort

Date: 24th May 2011

Court: High Court

Comment:

Anonymisation of expert evidence in civil claim on ground of fear of intimidation.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Name: Re AJW II Limited

Date: 6th April 2011

Court: High Court, Cayman Islands

Comment:

Winding up of hedge-fund on just and equitable basis; dispute over identity of liquidators; conflicts of interest; views of creditors.

Practice Area: Company

Name: BP Litigation

Date: 7th January 2011

Court: High Court, Alaska

Comment:

Expert evidence before Alaskan High Court on maintainability of derivative claim under UK law.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Cream Holdings v Davenport

Reference: [2012] 1 BCLC 365, [2011] EWCA Civ 1287, [2011] All ER (D) 59 (Nov)

Date: 5th November 2010

Court: High Court

Comment:

A company case in which Robin Hollington QC and Sebastian Prentis successfully resisted appeal against order appointing an expert to value shares under pre-emption provisions.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Re Wyser-Pratte Limited

Date: 8th September 2010

Court: High Court, Cayman Islands

Comment:

Winding up of hedge fund on just and equitable basis; conflict of authority between Cayman Islands and BVI on loss of substratum.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Carlisle United Supporters Trust v Story

Reference: [2010] EWCA Civ 463

Date: 5th May 2010

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:

Derivative claim; costs.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Re China Sun

Date: 4th May 2010

Court: High Court, Cayman Islands

Comment:

Resisting "soft-touch" provisional liquidation of insolvent C.I. company listed on Hong Kong stock exchange with interests in China; dispute over identity of liquidators.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Shah v Shah

Reference: [2010] EWHC 313 (Ch)

Date: 24th February 2010

Court: High Court

Comment:

Where a family company was a quasi-partnership with characteristics which, on principles of equity, engaged obligations that were common to partnership relations, it had been unjust or unfair to exclude a member from participation in its management without an offer to buy the minority shareholder's shares or make some other fair

arrangement.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Re Neath Rugby Ltd

Reference: [2009] EWCA Civ 261; [2008] EWHC 210 (Ch); [2008] BCC 390 (Lewison J); [2007] BCC 671; [2008] BCC 125 (C.A.)

Date: 2nd April 2009

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:
section 994 petition - interlocutory applications; trial and appeal.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Oxford Legal Group v Sibbasbridge

Reference: [2007] EWHC 2265 (Ch); [2008] 2 BCLC 381 (C.A.)

Date: 18th April 2008

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:
Claim by a director/shareholder to inspect company's books and records.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Battlebridge Group Limited and another v Millar

Date: 31st January 2008

Court: High Court

Practice Area: Company

Name: Millar v Battlebridge Group

Reference: [2008] EWHC 265 (Ch)

Date: 31st January 2008

Court: High Court

Comment:

Settlement of issues in section 994 petition

Practice Area: Company

Name: Carlisle & Cumbria United Supporters Trust v CUFC Holdings

Reference: [2008] BCC 558

Date: 2nd January 2008

Comment:

Derivative claim

Practice Area: Company

Name: Gupta v Gupta

Date: 17th February 2006

Court: High Court

Comment:

Dispute between brothers who fell out over the management of the family steel-fabrication business.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Mahfoodh v Davenport

Date: 3rd February 2006

Court: High Court

Comment:

2 week witness action in Chancery Division- dispute between beneficiaries over property portfolio held on off-shore but allegedly sham trusts.

Practice Area: Property

Name: Re Capital Cabs

Reference: [2006] BCC 276, LTL 25/11/2005

Date: 25th November 2005

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:

Dispute between quasi-partners who fell out over the sale of their taxi cab business in Cardiff.

Practice Area: Company

Name: Infiteland Ltd v Artisan Contracting Ltd

Reference: [2006] 1 BCLC 632

Date: 25th November 2005

Court: Court of Appeal

Comment:

Share sale agreements and warranty claims . Upholding [2004] EWHC 955 (Ch), 3 week witness action before Park J., raising complex legal and factual issues on accounting standards, purchaser's knowledge of breaches of warranty, and disclosure by the vendor.

Practice Area: Commercial Litigation

Articles

Date	Title	Contributors
2nd July 2014	Robin Hollington Counsel Magazine Interview Published In <i>Counsel Magazine</i>	Robin Hollington QC
4th March 2011	Derivative Claims: who pays? Published In <i>New Square Chambers</i>	Robin Hollington QC
22nd April 2008	Directors' Duties under the Companies Act 2006 Published In <i>New Square Chambers</i>	Robin Hollington QC

Date	Title	Contributors
28th February 2007	An Introduction to the Companies Act 2006 Published In <i>New Square Chambers</i>	Robin Hollington QC
30th September 2006	Misconduct and unfair prejudice - and divorces (Grace v Biagioli and Richardson v Blackmore) Published In <i>New Square Chambers</i>	Robin Hollington QC
31st March 2002	Piercing the corporate veil -where are we now? Published In <i>New Square Chambers</i>	Robin Hollington QC

Publications

Date	Title	Contributors
13th December 2016	Hollington on Shareholders' Rights 8th Edition 2016 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
28th January 2015	Supplement to the 7th Edition of Shareholders' Rights 2015 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
31st December 2013	Hollington on Shareholders' Rights 7th Edition 2013 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
31st December 2012	'Directors' Duties & Shareholder Litigation in the Wake of the Financial Crisis' 2012 Edward Elgar	Robin Hollington QC

Date	Title	Contributors
30th December 2012	Shareholders Rights (6th Edition) - 1st Supplement 2012 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
31st December 2010	Shareholders' Rights (6th Edition) 2010	Robin Hollington QC
30th September 2009	Shareholders' Rights (5th Edition) - 1st Supplement 2009 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
30th April 2009	The ICSA Directors Handbook 2009 ICSA Publishing	Robin Hollington QC
31st January 2008	Shareholders' Rights (5th Edition) 2008 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC
30th June 2004	Shareholders' Rights (4th Edition) 2004 Sweet & Maxwell	Robin Hollington QC