



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

## Shareholder claims for reflective loss in company law and international investment law

Gulu Zada, T.

### Citation

Gulu Zada, T. (2026, March 26). *Shareholder claims for reflective loss in company law and international investment law*. *Business and Law Research Network Series*. Boom, Den Haag. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4299342>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4299342>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. TREATIES (BITs, MITs, FTAs, MODEL BITs, AND UNCITRAL LEGISLATIVE TEXTS)

1. Additional Protocol to the Agreement on Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection between the Government of the Argentine Republic and the Government of the Italian Republic, 22 May 1990
2. Agreement between Japan and the United Mexican States for the Strengthening of the Economic Partnership, 17 September 2004
3. Agreement between Canada and the Republic of Peru for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 2 September 2006
4. Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Republic of Hungary for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 1991
5. Agreement Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Republic of Poland for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 6 April 1990
6. Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Government of Romania on Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, April 1994
7. 7. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Lithuania and the Government of Ukraine for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 8 February 1994
8. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Singapore and the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar on the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 24 September 2019
9. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Turkey and the Government of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the Reciprocal Protection and Promotion of Investments, 25 October 2011
10. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Malaysia for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 21 May 1981
11. Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Slovenia for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 3 July 1996
12. Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 6 April 1989
13. Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Uruguay for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 21 October 1991

14. Agreement between Japan and the Kingdom of Morocco for the Promotion and Protection of Investment, 8 January 2020
15. Agreement between Japan and the State of Israel for the Liberalization, Promotion and Protection of Investment, 11 March 2019
16. Agreement between Japan and Turkey concerning the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investment (with Protocol), 12 February 1992
17. Agreement between the Swiss Federal Council and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 27 January 2009
18. Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada (USMCA), 30 November 2018
19. Agreement between the Government of Barbados and the Republic of Venezuela for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 15 July 1994
20. Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Serbia and the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria on the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, 25 November 2013
21. Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Republic of Singapore for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 22 July 1975
22. Agreement between the Government of the Argentine Republic and the Government of the Italian Republic concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 22 May 1990
23. Agreement for the Promotion and Protection of Investments between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Singapore, 22 July 1975
24. Agreement on Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, 29 April 1991
25. Agreement on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Government of Romania, 15 September 1994
26. Agreement on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of Argentina, 11 December 1990
27. Agreement on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments between the People's Republic of China and the United Mexican States, 11 July 2008
28. Agreement on the Reciprocal Promotion of Investments and Protection between the Government of the Republic of Colombia and the Government of the Republic of Türkiye, 28 July 2014
29. Agreement on the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments between the Argentine Republic and the State of Qatar, 6 November 2016
30. Agreement to Amend the Singapore-Australia Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA), 28 July 2003
31. ASEAN Comprehensive Investment Agreement, 26 February 2009

32. Belgium–Luxembourg Economic Union (BLEU) Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2009
33. BLEU–Venezuela Bilateral Investment Treaty (Treaty concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments), 1998
34. Bilateral Investment Treaty between the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic and the Government of the Republic of India, 3 June 2019
35. Brazil Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2015
36. Canada Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2021
37. Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement (FTA), 2 January 1988
38. Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the European Union, 30 October 2016
39. Convention between the Belgo-Luxembourg Economic Union and the United Republic of Cameroon concerning the Reciprocal Promotion and Protection of Investments, 27 March 1980
40. Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (ICSID Convention), 18 March 1965
41. Energy Charter Treaty, 17 December 1994
42. EU–Singapore Free Trade Agreement, Investment Protection Agreement and Digital, 19 October 2018
43. EU–Vietnam Investment Protection Agreement, 2019
44. France–India Bilateral Investment Treaty concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 1997
45. France Model Bilateral Investment Treaty 2006
46. Free Trade Agreement between Central America, the Dominican Republic, and the United States of America (CAFTA-DR), 2004
47. Free Trade Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the People’s Republic of China, 6 June 2015
48. Free Trade Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Government of the Republic of Chile, 5 February 2003
49. Free Trade Agreement between the Republic of Chile and Mexico, 1998
50. Germany Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2008
51. Germany Model Bilateral Investment Treaty concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 2008
52. Investment Cooperation and Facilitation Treaty between the Federative Republic of Brazil and the Republic of India, 25 January 2020
53. Investment Promotion and Protection Agreement between Japan, Republic of Korea, and China, 13 April 2012
54. Investment Protection Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, of the other part, 17 October 2018
55. Multilateral Agreement on Investment, Draft Consolidated Text, 22 April 1998
56. Morocco Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2019
57. Netherlands Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2019

58. Netherlands Model Investment Agreement, 2019
59. North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), 17 December 1992
60. Protocol to the Agreement between the People's Republic of China and the Federal Republic of Germany on the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 1 December 2003
61. Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 20 March 1952
62. SADC Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2012; Finance and Investment Protocol, 2016
63. Sweden Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2002
64. Treaty between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the United States of America concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, 22 October 1991
65. Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and Pakistan for the Promotion and Protection of Investments, 25 November 1959
66. Treaty between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Republic of India concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 2008 (Model BIT)
67. Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Turkey concerning the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, 3 December 1985
68. Treaty between the United States of America and the Argentine Republic concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, 14 November 1991
69. Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Ecuador concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, 27 August 1993
70. Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), 17 December 2007
71. UK Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 1991
72. UK Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2008
73. UNCITRAL Rules on Transparency in Treaty-based Investor-State Arbitration, 2014
74. US Model Bilateral Investment Treaty, 2012

## II. LAWS (RULES, PRINCIPLES)

### **Brazil**

1. Brazilian Corporations Law, 1976

### **China**

2. Administrative Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China, October 1, 1990

### **Czech Republic**

3. Czech Civil Code, 2012

**France**

4. French Civil Code (*Code civil*), 1804
5. French Commercial Code (*Code de commerce*), 1807, amended in 2025.
6. French Code of Civil Procedure (*Code de procédure civile*), 2007

**Germany**

7. German Act on Limited Liability Companies (*GmbHG*), 1892, lastly amended in 2025.
8. German Civil Code (*BGB*), 1900
9. German Stock Corporation Act (*Aktiengesetz – AktG*), 1965, amended in 2024.
10. German Criminal Code (*StGB*), 1998

**Italy**

11. Italian Civil Code, 1942, amended in 2016.

**Japan**

12. Kaishahō [Japanese Companies Act], 2005

**New Zealand**

13. New Zealand Companies Act, 1993

**South Africa**

14. Protection of Investment Act, 2015

**Spain**

15. Spanish Company Act, 2010, amended in 2021.

**United Kingdom**

16. Companies (Unfairly Prejudicial Applications) Proceedings Rules 1986 (SI 1986/2000)
17. UK Civil Procedure Rules (CPR), 1999
18. UK Companies Act, 2006

**United States of America**

19. US Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), 1937
20. Delaware General Corporation Law, 1967
21. California Corporation Code, 1977
22. Model Business Corporation Act (MBCA), 1984
23. Pennsylvania Business Corporation Law (PBCL), 1988
24. American Law Institute (ALI), Principles of Corporate Governance, 1994

### III. CASE LAW

#### National Case law:

##### Australia

1. *Gambotto v. WCP Ltd* [1995] HCA 12, (1995) 182 CLR 432
2. *Gould v. Vaggelas* [1984] HCA 68; (1984) 157 CLR 215
3. *Peters' American Delicacy Co Ltd v. Heath* (1939) 61 CLR 457

##### Canada

4. *Burland v. Earle* [1902] A.C. 83 PC

##### France

5. Cour de cassation 2002
6. Cour de cassation [Cass.] com., Jan. 28, 2014, Bull. civ. IV, No. 12-27901
7. Cour de Cassation, Commercial Division, appeal no. 19-12.342, Nov. 4, 2021
8. Cour d'appel Douai, 29 Apr. 1997, JCP, la Semaine Juridique, note J.-J. Daigre
9. Court of Cassation, Commercial Chamber, Mar. 11, 2020, appeal no. 18-22.472
10. Court of Cassation, Commercial Chamber, No. 97-10886 (15 Jan. 2002)
11. Court of Cassation, Criminal Chamber, Nos. 97-80664, 99-80387, 99-84855 (13 Dec. 2000)
12. Versailles Ct. App. No. 04-1262 (Sep. 13, 2005)

##### Germany

13. ARAG/Garmenbeck (BGH – Federal Court of Justice) 135, 244, pp. 249-250 and pp. 252-253) 1997
14. Bundesgerichtshof (BGH – Federal Court of Justice) 10 November 1986, WM 1987, 13 (Dubai)
15. Bundesgerichtshof (BGH – Federal Court of Justice), Sept. 18, 1989, Neue Juristische Wochenschrift [NJW] 1990, 108
16. Bundesgerichtshof (BGH – Federal Court of Justice) 20 March 1995, NJW 516 hat im Fall Girmes/Effectenspiegel.
17. Bundesgerichtshof (BGH – Federal Court of Justice), Mar. 20, 1995, II ZR 205/94
18. Bundesverfassungsgericht (BVerfG – Federal Constitutional Court) 1 BvR 284/96, Mar. 14, 2000
19. Bundesverfassungsgericht (BVerfG – Federal Constitutional Court) 1 BvR 611/07, Jul. 21, 2010
20. Bundesverfassungsgericht (BVerfG – Federal Constitutional Court), 2 BvL 4/09, Jan. 17, 2012, para. 66
21. Bundesverfassungsgericht (BVerfG – Federal Constitutional Court), 1 BvL 21/11, Jan. 24, 2012, para. 44

22. Bundesgerichtshof (BGH – Federal Court of Justice), Case No. IX AR (VZ) 1/12, para. 31, 19 September 2013
23. Bundesverwaltungsgericht (BVerwG – Federal Administrative Court), 8 C 50.12, para. 45, April 9, 2014

### **Hong Kong**

24. Chime Corp Ltd, Re, Nina Kung v. Tan Man Kou [2004] 7 H.K.C.F.A.R. 546
25. Hengwell Development Pte Ltd v. Thing Chiang Ching [2002] 2 SLR(R) 454
26. Waddington Ltd. v. Chan Chun Hoo, [2009] 4 HKC 381

### **Japan**

27. Azai v. Iwasaki (Nikko Securities), 121 SHIRYFBAN SH6JI HOMU 149 (Sup. Ct., Mar. 10, 1994)
28. Ikenaka v. Tabuchi (Nomura Securities), 1427 HANREI JiHO 137 (Tokyo Dist. Ct., Feb. 13, 1992)
29. Ikenaka v. Tabuchi (Nomura Securities), 1469 HANREI JIH5 25 (Tokyo Dist. Ct., Sept. 16, 1993)
30. Nichibei Sh6ji Kabushiki Gaisha v. [anonymous] (Nihon K6kti Denshi Krgy6), 1527 HANJI 27, 33-34 (Tokyo Dist. Ct., June 20, 1996)

### **Netherlands**

31. Hoge Raad, 2 Dec. 1994, NJ 1995, 288 (Poot/ABP)
32. Hoge Raad, 29 Nov. 1996, NJ 1997, 178

### **Republic of Korea**

33. Republic of Korea v. Dayyani [2019] EWHC 3580 (Comm) – UK decision applying Korean law

### **Singapore**

34. Miao Weiguo v. Tendcare Medical Group Holdings Pte Ltd [2022] 1 SLR 884
35. Townsing Henry George v. Jenton Overseas Investment Pte Ltd (in liquidation) [2007] SGCA 13

### **United Kingdom (UK)**

36. Allianz Global Investors v. Barclays Bank & Ors [2022] EWCA Civ 353
37. Atlasview Ltd v. Brightview Ltd [2004] EWHC 1056 (Ch); [2004] BCC 542
38. Barings v. Coopers & Lybrand (No.1) [2002] 2 B.C.L.C. 365
39. Breeze v. Chief Constable of Norfolk [2022] EWHC 942 (QB)
40. Brown [2015] EWHC 473 (Ch)
41. Daniels v. Daniels [1978] 2 All E.R. 89 Ch D
42. Day v. Cook [2003] B.C.C. 256; [2001] EWCA Civ 592

43. *European Partner Ltd v. Robinson* [2018] EWHC 1230 (Comm), [92]
44. *Foss v. Harbottle* (1843) 67 ER 189
45. *Garcia v. Marex Financial Ltd* [2018] EWCA Civ 1468, [53]
46. *Gardner v Parker* [2004] EWCA Civ 781; [2005] BCC 46 [47]
47. *George Fischer (Great Britain) Ltd v. Multi-Construction Ltd* [1995] B.C.C. 310
48. *Gerald Cooper Chemicals Ltd* [1978] Ch 262
49. *Gerber Garment Technology Inc v. Lectra Systems Ltd* [1995] R.P.C. 383 (20 Mar 1995)
50. *Giles v. Rhind* ([2003] 1 BCLC I (CA))
51. *Hailey Group Ltd, Re* [1993] B.C.L.C. 459 Ch D at 473
52. *In Cullen Investments Ltd v. Brown* [2015] EWHC 473 (Ch)
53. *Johnson v. Gore Wood & Co.*, (2002) 2 AC 1 (House of Lords)
54. *Kleanthous v Paphitis* [2012] BCC 676, [75]
55. *Lee v. Sheard* [1956] 1 QB 192
56. *Little Olympian, Re* [1995] 1 B.C.L.C. 636
57. *MacDougall v. Gardiner* (1875-76) L.R. 1 Ch. D. 13
58. *Macaurea v. Northern Assurance Co* [1925] AC 619
59. *Naibu Global International Company plc v. Daniel Stewart & Company plc* [2020] EWHC 2719 (Ch)
60. *Norcross v. Georgallides* [2015] EWHC 1290 (Comm), [65]
61. *O'Neill v. Phillips* [999] 1 WLR 1092; [1999] BCC 600
62. *O'Sullivan v. Williams* [1992] 3 All ER 385
63. *Parry v. Bartlett* [2011] EWHC 3146 (Ch) [88] [92]
64. *Pavlides v Jensen* [1956] 2 All E.R. 518 Ch D
65. *Peak Hotel & Resorts Ltd v. Tarek Investments Ltd* [2015] EWHC 3048 (Ch), [58]
66. *Primeo v. Bank of Bermuda* [2021] UKPC 22
67. *Prudential Assurance Co Ltd v. Newman Industries Ltd & Others (No 2)* ([1982])
68. *Rayfield v. Hands* (1960) Ch 1
69. *Russell v. Wakefield Waterworks* (1875) LR 20 Eq 474
70. *Saul D Harrison, Re* [1995] 1 B.C.L.C. 14 CA (Civ Div)
71. *Shaker v. Al Bedrawi* (2003) 5 ITEL 429
72. *Short v. Treasury Commissioners* [1948] 1 KB 116, affirmed [1948] AC 534
73. *Smith v. Croft (No.2)* [1987] 3 All E.R. 909 Ch D
74. *St Vincent European Partner Ltd v. Robinson* [2018] EWHC 1230 (Comm), [92]
75. *Stein v. Blake (No.2)* [1998] B.C.C. 316
76. *Taylor v. NUM* [1985] BCLC 23
77. *Towler v. Mills* [2010] EWHC 1209 (Comm), [25]
78. *Wallersteiner v Moir (No 2)* [1975] QB 373
79. *Webster v. Sandersons Solicitors (A Firm)* [2009] 2 BCLC 542
80. *Wilson v. Jones* (1867) LR 2 Exch 139
81. *Wishart v. Castlecroft Securities Ltd* [2009] CSIH 65 [2010]
82. *Wood v. Odessa Waterworks Co.* (1889) 42 ChD 65

**United States (US)**

83. Alan Dignam & John Lowry, *Company Law* (9th ed., OUP 2016)
84. *Alford v. Frontier Enter., Inc.*, 599 F.2d 483, 484 (1st Cir. 1979)
85. *Alford v. Shaw*, 72 N.C. App. 537, 324 S.E.2d 878 (1985)
86. *Allison on behalf of General Motors Corp. v. General Motors Corp.*, 604 F. Supp. 1106, 1121 (D. Del. 1985)
87. *Alpha Telecommunications, Inc. v. Fort Wayne Community Sch.*, Case No. 1:05 CV 2660 (N.D. Ohio May 8, 2006)
88. *Argo Contracting Corp. v. Mashburn* No. 5:01 CV 1642 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 11, 2002)
89. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805, at 812 (Delaware 1984)
90. *Atwood Grain Supply v. Growmark, Inc.*, 712 F. Supp. 1360 (N.D. Ill. 1989)
91. *Auerbach v. Bennett*, 47 N.Y.2d 619 (1979)
92. *Benihana of Tokyo, Inc. v. Benihana, Inc.*, 906 A.2d 114, 120 (Del. 2006)
93. *Brehm v. Eisner*, 746 A.2d 244 (Del. 2000)
94. *Burks v. Lasker*, 441 U.S. 471 (1979)
95. *Canderm Pharmacal, Ltd. v. Elder Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 862 F.2d 597, 601 (6th Cir. 1988)
96. *Canderm Pharmacal, Ltd.*, 862 F.2d at 603
97. *Clark v. Lomas & Nettleton Financial Corp.*, 625 F.2d 49, 52-54 (5th Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 1029 (1981)
98. *Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. Davis*, 140 Tex. 398, 168 S.W.2d 216 (1943)
99. *Dodge v. Woolsey*, 18 How. (59 U.S.) (1855), at paras. 331, 341-344
100. *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336 (2005).
101. *Elster v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 34 Del. Ch. 94, 100A.2d 219, 222 (1953)
102. *Erie Railway Company v. Tomkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938)
103. *Feldman v. Cutaia*, 951 A.2d 727, 729 (Del. 2008)
104. *Franchise Tax Bd. of California v. Alcan Aluminum Ltd.*, 493 U.S. 331, 336 (1990)
105. *Gaubert v. United States*, 855 F.2d 1284 (5th Cir.1989)
106. *Goodwin v. Castleton*, 19 Wash. 2d 748, 144 P.2d 7
107. *Harker v. Troutman* (in *Re Troutman Enters., Inc.*), 286 F.3d 359, 364 (6th Cir. 2002)
108. *Hartsel v. Vanguard Group, Inc.*, C.A. No. 5394-VCP, 2011 WL 2421003, at \*16 (Del.Ch. 2011)
109. *Hernandez v. Alexander*, 152 F.R.D. 192, 194 (D.Nev.1993)
110. *Hurt v. Cotton States Fertilizer Co.*, 145 F.2d 293, 295 (5th Cir. 1944)
111. *Independent Investors Protective League v. Time, Inc.*, 50 N.Y.2d 259, 263, 406 N.E.2d 486, 488 (1980)
112. *In re Dish Network Derivative Litigation*, 401 P3d 1081, 1085 (Nev 2017)
113. *In re Gerald Cooper Chemicals Ltd* [1978] Ch 262, 268-269
114. *In re Kauffman Mutual Fund Actions*, 479 F.2d 257, 264 (1st Cir.), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 857 (1973)
115. *In re Massey Energy Co. Deriv. & Class Action Litig.*, C.A. No. 5430-CB (Del. Ch. May 4, 2017)

116. *In re Orchard Enterprises, Inc.*, 88 A.3d 1, 42 (Del. Ch. 2014)
117. *Kramer v. Western Pacific Industries, Inc.*, 546 A.2d 348, 351-52 (Del. 1988)
118. *Kush v. American States Ins. Co.*, 853 F.2d 1380, 1383 (7th Cir. 1988)
119. *Landy v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.*, 486 F.2d 139 (3d Cir.1973), cert. denied, 416 U.S. 960
120. *Lawson v. Baltimore Paint & Chem. Corp.*, 298 F. Supp. 373, 375 (D.C. Md. 1969)
121. *Levine v. Smith*, 591 A.2d 194, 212 (Del. 1991), overruled on other grounds by *Brehm v. Eisner*, 746 A.2d 244 (Del. 2000)
122. *Lewis v. Anderson*, 477 A.2d 1040 (Delaware 1984)
123. *Litman v. Prudential-Bache Properties, Inc.*, 611 A.2d 12, 15 (Del. Ch. 1992)
124. *Marvin D. Putzier, Hometown Hardware, Inc. v. Ace Hardware Corp.* No. 13 C 2849 (N.D. Illinois, Mar. 30, 2016)
125. *McKee v. Rogers*, 18 Del. Ch. 81, 156 A. 191 (1931)
126. *Mid-State Fertilizer Co. v. Exchange National Bank of Chicago*, 877 F.2d 1333, 1335-36 (7th Cir. 1989)
127. *Miller v. Register & Tribune Syndicate, Inc.*, 336 N.W.2d 709 (Iowa 1983)
128. *Nicholson v. Ticketmaster*, 42 F. App'x 696, 697 (6th Cir. 2002)
129. *Nishimura v. Abekawa*, 1573 SHOJI HOMU 3 (Osaka Dist. Ct., 2000) [*Daiwa Bank Case*]
130. *Park Bank v. Westburg*, 2013 WI 57 (Wis. 2013)
131. *Pergament v. Frazer*, 93 F. Supp. 9, 12 (E.D. Mich. 1949)
132. *Potthoff v. Morin*, 245 F.3d 710, 716-717 (8th Cir. 2001)
133. *Quarles v. City of East Cleveland*, 1999 US App. LEXIS 34061 (6th Cir. 1999)
134. *Re Brightview Ltd* (2004) BCC 542
135. *Re Charnley Davies Ltd* (No. 2) [1990] BCLC 760, 783
136. *Rice v. Wheeling Dollar Savings & Trust Co.*, 130 N.E.2d 442 (Ohio Ct. Com. Pleas 1954)
137. *Saxe v. Brady*, 40 Del. Ch. 474, 184 A.2d 602 (1962)
138. *Schaffer v. Universal Rundle Corp.*, 397 F.2d 893, 896 (5th Cir. 1968)
139. *Smith v. Van Gorkom*, 488 A.2d 858 (Del. 1985)
140. *Tooley v. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc.*, 845 A.2d 1031, 1033 (Del. 2004)
141. *Torian ex rel. EnvironMax, Inc. v. Craig*, 2012 UT 63 (Utah 2012)
142. *Twohy v. First Nat'l Bank of Chicago*, 758 F.2d 1185, 1194 (7th Cir. 1985); 95 F.3d 1185 (3d Cir. 1996)
143. *United States v. Palmer*, 578 F.2d 144 (5th Cir. 1978)
144. *Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.*, 457 A.2d 701, 714 (Del. 1983)
145. *Williams v. City of Detroit*, Case No. 16-14112 (E.D. Mich. Jun. 7, 2019)
146. *Womble v. Dixon*, 585 F. Supp. 728 (E.D.Va.1983), aff'd in part & vacated in part, 752 F.2d 80 (4th Cir.1984)
147. *Zahn v. Transamerica Corp.*, 162 F.2d 36, 48 (3d Cir. 1946)
148. *Zapata Corp. v. Maldonado*, 430 A.2d 779 (Del. 1981)

**ISDS Case law (International Investment Arbitration – ICSID, PCA, UNCITRAL etc.):**

1. *Abaclat v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/5, Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (2011)
2. *Achmea B.V. (formerly Eureko B.V.) v. Slovak Republic*, PCA Case No. 2008-13, Award on Jurisdiction, Arbitrability and Suspension (26 Oct. 2010)
3. *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*, Merits, Judgment (2010) ICJ Rep. 639
4. *Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo)*, Preliminary Objections, Judgment (2007) ICJ Rep. 582
5. *Agip Spa v. The Government of the People’s Republic of Congo*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/77/1 (Award) (30 Nov. 1979)
6. *Alapli Elektrik B.V. v. Republic of Türkiye*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/13
7. *Alicia Grace v. Mexico*, Non-disputing Party Submission of the Government of Canada Pursuant to NAFTA Article 1128 (24 Aug. 2021)
8. *Alcia Grace and Others v. United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/18/4
9. *Amco Asia Corp. and Others v. The Republic of Indonesia*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/81/1 (Award on Jurisdiction) (25 Sept. 1983)
10. *American Manufacturing & Trading, Inc. v. Democratic Republic of Congo*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/93/1 (21 Feb. 1997)
11. *Ampal-American Israel Corp. v. Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/12/11, Decision on Jurisdiction (1 Feb. 2016)
12. *Anglo American PLC v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/14/1, Award (18 Jan. 2019)
13. *Antonio Del Valle Ruiz and others v. Kingdom of Spain*, PCA Case No. 2019-17, Final Award (13 Mar. 2023)
14. *Argentina, Reply on Jurisdiction*, quoting *Renco Group Inc v. Peru*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/13/1, Partial Award on Jurisdiction (15 Jul. 2016)
15. *Asian Agricultural Products Limited (AAPL) v. Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka*, ICSID Case No. ARB/87/3, Award (27 Jun. 1990)
16. *Antoine Goetz and others v. Republic of Burundi*, (2 Sept. 1998)
17. *Banro American Resources v. Democratic Republic of Congo*, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/7, Award (1 Sept. 2000)
18. *BG Group plc v. The Republic of Argentina*, Ad Hoc Arbitral Tribunal, Final Award (24 Dec. 2007)
19. *Bilcon of Delaware et al. v. Government of Canada*, PCA Case No. 2009-04, Award of Damages (10 Jan. 2019)
20. *Camuzzi Int’l S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/7, Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction (10 Jun. 2005)
21. *Caratube International Oil Company LLP v. Republic of Kazakhstan*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/12

22. *Carlyle Group LP v. Kingdom of Morocco*, Respondent's Reply on Objections to Jurisdiction and Admissibility (7 Sept. 2020)
23. *CEMEX Caracas Investments B.V. and CEMEX Caracas II Investments B.V. v. Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela*, ICSID Case No. ARB/08/15, Decision on Jurisdiction (30 Dec. 2010)
24. *Champion Trading Company and Ameritrade International, Inc v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/9, Decision on Jurisdiction (21 Oct. 2003)
25. *CME Czech Republic BV v. Czech Republic*, Ad Hoc Arbitral Tribunal, Final Award (14 Mar. 2003)
26. *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/01/8, Award (12 May 2005)
27. *CMS Gas Transmission Company v. Argentine Republic*, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction, Case No. ARB/01/8 (17 Jul. 2003)
28. *Compañía de Aguas del Aconquija S.A. and Vivendi Universal v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/97/3, Decision on Annulment (3 Jul. 2002)
29. *Cont'l Cas. Co. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/9, Decision on Jurisdiction (22 Feb. 2006)
30. *Deutsche Telekom AG v. The Republic of India*, PCA Case No. 2014-10
31. *Enkev Beheer BV v. Republic of Poland*, PCA Case No. 2013-01, First Partial Award (29 Apr. 2014)
32. *Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets L.P. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3, Decision on Jurisdiction (14 Jan. 2004)
33. *Enron Corporation and Ponderosa Assets L.P. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/01/3, Award (22 May 2007)
34. *Enron Creditors Recovery Corp. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/01/3, Decision on Jurisdiction (2 Aug. 2004)
35. *Eskosol SpA in liquidazione v. Italian Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/15/50, Decision on Respondent's Application under 41(5) (20 Mar. 2017)
36. *Eur. Am. Inv. Bank AG (Austria) v. Slovak Republic*, PCA Case No. 2010-17, Award on Jurisdiction (22 Oct. 2012)
37. *Flemingo DutyFree Shop Private Limited v. Republic of Poland*, PCA Case No. 2014-11, Award (12 Aug. 2016)
38. *GAMI Investments, Inc. v. The Government of the United Mexican States*, UNCITRAL, Final Award (15 Nov. 2004)
39. *Gas Nat. SDG, S.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/10, Decision of the Tribunal on Preliminary Questions on Jurisdiction (17 Jun. 2005)
40. *Gemplus S.A., SLP S.A., Gemplus Industrial S.A. de C.V. v. The United Mexican States*, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/04/3, Part XII–XIII (16 Jun. 2010)
41. *George W. Hopkins (U.S.A.) v. United Mexican States*, 4 Rep. Int'l Arbitral Awards 41 (1926)
42. *Hassan Awdi, Enterprise Business Consultants, Inc. and Alfa El Corporation v. Romania*, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/13

43. *Hochtief AG v. The Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/07/31, Decision on Jurisdiction (24 Oct. 2011)
44. *Hulley Enterprises Ltd. v. Russian Federation*, PCA Case No. 2005-03/AA226, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (2009)
45. *IMFA v. Indonesia, Indian Metals & Ferro Alloys Ltd v. Republic of Indonesia*, PCA Case No. 2015-40
46. *Impregilo S.p.A. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/17
47. *Joy Mining Machinery Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/11, Decision on Jurisdiction (6 Aug. 2004)
48. *Lanco International Inc. v. The Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/97/6, Preliminary Decision on Jurisdiction (8 Dec. 1998)
49. *Lauder v. Czech Republic*, Ad Hoc Arbitral Tribunal, Final Award (3 Sep. 2001)
50. *LG&E International, Inc. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/02/1, Award (25 Jul. 2007)
51. *Louis Dreyfus Armateurs SAS v. Republic of India*, PCA Case No. 2014-26, Award (11 Sep. 2018)
52. *Michael Anthony Lee-Chin v. Dominican Republic*, ICSID Case No. UNCT/18/...
53. *Mohammad Reza Dayyani et al. v. Republic of Korea*, PCA Case No. 2015-38, Judgment of the English High Court of Justice (20 Dec. 2019)
54. *Mondev International Ltd. v. United States of America*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB(AF)/99/2, Award (11 Oct. 2002)
55. *Mr. Franz Sedelmayer v. The Russian Federation*, SCC (Arbitration Award) (7 Jul. 1998)
56. *Paso Energy Int'l Co. v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/15, Decision on Jurisdiction (27 Apr. 2006)
57. *Petrobart Limited v. The Kyrgyz Republic*, Arbitration No. 126/2003, Arbitration Institute of the Stockholm Chamber of Commerce, Award (29 Mar. 2005)
58. *Phoenix Action Ltd v. Czech Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/06/5, Award (15 Apr. 2009)
59. *Plama Consortium Limited v. Republic of Bulgaria*, ICSID Case No. ARB/03/24, Decision on Jurisdiction (8 Feb. 2005)
60. *Pope & Talbot v. Canada*, Award in Respect of Damages (31 May 2002)
61. *Poštová Banka v. Hellenic Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/13/8, Award (9 Apr. 2015)
62. *Salini Costruttori S.P.A. and Italstrade S.P.A. v. Kingdom of Morocco*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/00/4, Decision on Jurisdiction (23 Jul. 2001)
63. *Saluka Investments B.V. (The Netherlands) v. The Czech Republic*, Partial Award (17 Mar. 2006), UNCITRAL
64. *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/02/16, Award (28 Sept. 2007)
65. *Sempra Energy International v. Argentine Republic*, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/16, Decision on Objections to Jurisdiction (11 May 2005)
66. *Sergei Paushok and others v. Government of Mongolia*, UNCITRAL, Award on Jurisdiction and Liability (28 Apr. 2011)

67. Siemens A.G. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/8, Decision on Jurisdiction (6 Feb. 2007)
68. South American Silver Limited v. Plurinational State of Bolivia, PCA Case No. 2013-15, Dissenting Opinion (30 Aug. 2018)
69. ST-AD GmbH v. Republic of Bulgaria, PCA Case No. 2011-06, Award on Jurisdiction (18 Jul. 2013)
70. Standard Chartered Bank v. United Republic of Tanzania, ICSID Case No. ARB/10/12, Award (2 Nov. 2012)
71. Strabag SE v. State of Libya, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/15/1, Award (29 Jun. 2020)
72. Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona, S.A. and Vivendi Universal v. Argentine Republic, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/03/19, Decision on Jurisdiction (3 Aug. 2006)
73. Suez, Sociedad General de Aguas de Barcelona, S.A. and Vivendi Universal v. Argentine Republic, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/03/19, Decision on Liability (30 Jul. 2010)
74. The Lopez-Goyne Family Trust and others v. Republic of Nicaragua, ICSID Case No. ARB/17/44, Award (1 Mar. 2023)
75. Tokios Tokels v. Ukraine, ICSID Case No. ARB/02/18, Decision on Jurisdiction (29 Apr. 2004)
76. Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/01, Decision of the Tribunal on Objections to Jurisdiction (25 Aug. 2006)
77. Total S.A. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/04/1, Decision on Liability (27 Dec. 2010)
78. TSA Spectrum de Argentina S.A. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID (W. Bank) ARB/05/5, Award (19 Dec. 2008)
79. Urbaser S.A. v. Argentine Republic, ICSID Case No. ARB/07/26, Decision on Jurisdiction (19 Dec. 2012)
80. United Parcel Service of America Inc. v. Government of Canada, UNCITRAL, Award on the Merits (24 May 2007)
81. Veteran Petroleum Ltd. (Cyprus) v. Russian Federation, PCA Case No. 228, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (30 Nov. 2009)
82. Vladislav Kim and others v. Republic of Uzbekistan, ICSID Case No. ARB/13/6, Decision on Jurisdiction (8 Mar. 2017)
83. Wena Hotels Limited v. Arab Republic of Egypt, ICSID Case No. ARB/98/4, Decision on Jurisdiction (29 Jun. 1999)
84. Webuild S.p.A. (formerly Salini Impregilo S.p.A.) v. Argentine Republic, Decision on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (23 Feb. 2018)
85. Waste Management, Inc. v. United Mexican States, ICSID Case No. ARB(AF)/98/2, Award (2 Jun. 2000)
86. Yukos Universal Limited (Isle of Man) v. The Russian Federation, PCA Case No. 2005-04/AA227, Interim Award on Jurisdiction and Admissibility (2009)
87. Zhongshan Fucheng Industrial Investment v. Federal Republic of Nigeria, UNCITRAL, Final Award (26 Mar. 2021)

**International Court of Justice (ICJ) Case law:**

88. Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo), Merits, Judgment (2010) ICJ Rep. 639
89. Ahmadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of the Congo), Preliminary Objections, Judgment (2007) ICJ Rep. 582
90. Elettronica Sicula S.p.A. (ELSI) (United States v. Italy) (Judgment) [1989] ICJ Rep. 15
91. Barcelona Traction (Belgium v. Spain) (Judgment) [1970] ICJ Rep. 3

**Court of Justice of European Union (CJEU) Case law:**

92. Slowakische Republik v. Achmea BV, CJEU, Case C-284/16 March 2018,
93. Slowakische Republik v. Achmea BV, CJEU, Case C-284/16, Opinion of Advocate General Wathelet (19 Sept. 2017)

**IV. LITERATURE****Company law:**

1. Afsharipour, A., & Gelter, M. (2021) Direct and derivative shareholder suits: towards a functional and practical taxonomy', in Comparative Corporate Governance. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham, UK, p.438
2. Alexander, J. C. (2000) 'An Introduction to Class Action Procedure in the United States, Presented Conference': Debates over Group Litigation in Comparative Perspective, Geneva, Switzerland. pp.4-5
3. Anon (2020) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): 'Private Enforcement of Shareholder Rights – A Comparison of Selected Jurisdictions and Policy Alternatives for Brazil'. Washington, D.C: Targeted News Service, p.25
4. Armour, J. (2006) Legal Capital: An Outdated Concept? European business organization law review. [Online] 7 (1), p.5–27
5. Armour, J. (2019) Derivative Actions: A Framework for Decisions'. *Law Quarterly Review*, 135, p.412
6. Aronson, B. (2003) Reconsidering the importance of law in Japanese corporate governance: Evidence from the Daiwa Bank shareholder derivative case. *Cornell International Law Journal* 36 (1), 11–57
7. Bainbridge, S. M. (2002) Corporation law and economics: hc. Foundation Press, New York, NY, United States, p.374
8. Balotti, R. F., & Finkelstein, J. A. (2014) *The Delaware Law of Corporations & Business Organizations: Statutory Deskbook*. 2014 ed. Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, New York, NY, United States, pp. 23-24
9. Barbieri, J.-F. (2001) Exercice ut singuli de l'action sociale par un associé : étendue du droit de formuler des demandes pour la société et d'exercer les voies de recours en son nom, *Bulletin Joly sociétés*. p.509

10. Barbièri, J.-F. (2012) Préjudice social du fait d'un tiers versus préjudice personnel d'un associé [Social harm caused by a third party versus personal harm caused by an associate]. *Bulletin Joly des Sociétés*, 9, 634. p.5
11. Baums, T. & Scott, K. E. (2005) Taking Shareholder Protection Seriously? Corporate Governance in the U.S. and Germany. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*. [Online] 17 (4), 44–63
12. Baums, T. (2002) Company Law Reform in German, p. 2
13. Baxter, C. (1987) The true spirit of Foss v Harbottle. *N. Ir. Legal Q*, 6
14. Bayer, W. (2008) *Empfehlen sich besondere Regelungen für börsennotierte und nichtbörsennotierte Gesellschaften?* [Are specific legal provisions for listed and non-listed companies advisable?]. München: Beck
15. Beebeejaun, A. & Bissessur, P. (2024) The Business Judgment Rule as a Protective Armor for Directors' Responsibilities: A Comparative Study Among Mauritius, United Kingdom, and United States. *Statute law review*. [Online] 45 (2), p.10
16. Bernd Singhof & Oliver Seiler (1998), *Shareholder Participation in Corporate Decisionmaking Under German Law: A Comparative Analysis*, 24 *Brook. J. Int'l L.* 493
17. Bertrand, A. & Coibion, A. (2009) Shareholder Suits against the Directors of a Company, against other Shareholders and against the Company itself under Belgian Law. *European company and financial law review*. [Online] 6 (2–3), 270–306. p.305
18. Bhat, P. I. (2020) *Idea and Methods of Legal Research*, 1st ed. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, p. 145
19. Bishop, J. W. & Berger, J. L. (2008) *The law of corporate officers and directors: indemnification and insurance*. Thomson/West, Eagan, MN, USA, pp. 3-10
20. Bottenberg, K. et al. (2017) Corporate Governance Between Shareholder and Stakeholder Orientation: Lessons from Germany. *Journal of management inquiry*. [Online] 26 (2), p.167
21. Bottomley, S. (2007) *The Constitutional Corporation: Rethinking Corporate Governance*. 1st edition. [Online]. Oxford: Routledge., p. 167
22. Bourveau, T. et al. (2018) Shareholder Litigation and Corporate Disclosure: Evidence from Derivative Lawsuits. *Journal of accounting research*. [Online] 56 (3), 797–842. pp.801-802
23. Boyle, A. J. (2002) *Minority Shareholders' Remedies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 24–59, p.80
24. Brandes, H. (1988) Ersatz von Gesellschafts- und Gesellschafterschaden. In R. Goerdeler et al. (eds.), *Festschrift für Hans-Joachim Fleck*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 13-22
25. Hannigan, B. (2016) *Company Law*, 4th ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom para. 20.1
26. Kershaw, D. (2015) The Rule in Foss v Harbottle is Dead: Long Live the Rule in Foss v Harbottle. *Journal of business law*. (3), p.274
27. Buckle, P. (2010) The rule against reflective loss, trusts, and Freeman v Ansbacher in Jersey. *Trusts & trustees*. [Online] 16 (9), 767–781., pp. 767–781

28. Burazin, L. et al. (2022) Legal systems as abstract artifacts', in *The Artifactual Nature of Law*. [Online]. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. p. 2
29. Bussani, M., & Palmer, V. V. (2003) *Pure Economic Loss in Europe*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. xlviii-xlviii
30. Cahn, A. & Donald, D. C. (2010) *Comparative company law: text and cases on the laws governing corporations in Germany, the UK and the USA / Andreas Cahn and David C. Donald*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., pp.602-603
31. Chaisse, J., & Li, L. Z. (2016). Shareholder protection reloaded redesigning the matrix of shareholder claims for reflective loss. *Stanford Journal of International Law*, 52(1), 51–94, p.53
32. Chen, J. (2022) What Is the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (PSLRA)'. *Investopedia*.
33. Chen, W. (2015) Funding of shareholder derivative and class litigation: a comparative study. Ghent University. Faculty of Law. 49
34. Cheung, R. (2008) Corporate Wrongs Litigated in the Context of Unfair Prejudice Claims: Reforming the Unfair Prejudice Remedy for the Redress of Corporate Wrongs. *Company Lawyer*, [Online] 29 (4), pp. 98-104
35. Chia, H. Y. (2022) Rethinking the reflective loss principle. *Law Quarterly Review*, 138 (July), pp. 342–348
36. Chris, J. (1999) Conflict and Aggregation: Appointing Institutional Investors as Sole Lead Plaintiffs under the PSLRA, *University of Chicago Law Review*, Volume 66(4), p.1199
37. Chua, R. Y. (2022) The spectre of reflective loss. *Singapore journal of legal studies*. pp. 309-333
38. Clark, R. C. (1986) *Corporate law*. Little, Brown. The United States. 645
39. Coffee, J. C. (1993) New Myths and Old Realities: The American Law Institute Faces the Derivative Action. *Business lawyer*. 48 (4), pp.1407–1441
40. Coffee, J. C. (2017) The Globalization of Entrepreneurial Litigation: Law, Culture, and Incentives. *University of Pennsylvania law review*. 165 (7), pp. 1895–1925
41. Cox, J. D. & Hazen, T. L. (2003) *Cox & Hazen on Corporations: including unincorporated forms of doing business: set*. 2nd ed. Aspen Publishers. New York, NY, United States, 421
42. Cox, J. D. & Thomas, R. S. (2018) 'The Evolution in the U.S. of Private Enforcement via Litigation and Monitoring Techniques: Are There Lessons for Germany?', in *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Law and Governance*. [Online]. Oxford University Press. p. 922
43. Cox, J. D. & Thomas, R. S. (2018) 'The Evolution in the U.S. of Private Enforcement via Litigation and Monitoring Techniques: Are There Lessons for Germany?', in *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Law and Governance*. [Online]. Oxford University Press. p.923
44. Danos F. (2008). La réparation du préjudice individuel de l'actionnaire, 5 *Revue De Jurisprudence De Droit Des Affaires* 473. p.7
45. Davies, P. (2020) *Introduction to Company Law*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, p. 1
46. Davies, P. L. (Paul L. et al.) (2021) *Gower: principles of modern company law: pbk*. 11th ed. Sweet & Maxwell/Thomson Reuters. para 14-012

47. Davis, K. (2005) Structural bias, special litigation committees, and the vagaries of director independence. *Iowa law review*. 90 (4), Volume 90. pp. 1305–1360
48. Davies, P. L., & Worthington, S. (2016) *Gower's Principles of Modern Company Law*, 10th ed., Sweet and Maxwell, London, United Kingdom, p.595
49. De Dier, S. (2013) Friends with Benefits: A Comparative View on Legal Standing to Challenge Board Decisions. *European company and financial law review*. [Online] 10 (3), p.499
50. D. De Marez. (2004). *De afgeleide schade van aandeelhouders van een naamloze vennootschap*, unpublished doctoral thesis. pp.130-194
51. de Jong, B. J. (2013). Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss: A Comparative Legal Analysis. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 14(1), 97–118
52. de Wulf, H. (2010) Direct Shareholder Suits for Damages Based on Reflective Losses. In S. Grundmann, et al. (eds.), *Festschrift für Klaus J. Hopt zum 70. Geburtstag am 24. August*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, pp. 1537-1564
53. DeMott, D. A. (2003) *Shareholder Derivative Actions: Law and Practice*. West Group, Eagan, Minnesota, United States, section 5.11
54. DeMott, D. A. (2022) *Shareholder Derivative Actions: Law and Practice 2022-2023 ed.* Thomson Reuters, Thomson Reuters, Danvers, MA, USA
55. Dignam, A. & Lowry, J. (2016) *Company Law*. 9th ed. 9th ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, at para. 10.28
56. Donaldson, R. M. (2005) Mapping Delaware's Elusive Divide: Clarification and Further Movement Toward a Merits-Based Analysis for Distinguishing Derivative and Direct Claims in *Agostino v. Hicks*, and *Tooler v. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc.* *The Delaware journal of corporate law*. 30 (2), pp. 389-412
57. Donelson, D. C. et al. (2022) The need to validate exogenous shocks: Shareholder derivative litigation, universal demand laws, and firm behavior. *Journal of accounting & economics*. [Online] 73 (1), 101427-. p.4
58. Douglas, Z. (2009) *The International Law of Investment Claims*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, p. 416
59. Duffy, M. J. (2011) Developments in United States Securities Class Actions: The Status of 'Fraud on the Market' Causation and Implications for Australia. *Common law world review*. [Online] 40 (4), pp.345–377
60. Dundas, S., & De Kerloy, K. (2007) 'Shareholder claimants may rank alongside ordinary creditors: Sons of Gwalia Ltd "shareholder test case"', *Australian Resources and Energy Law Journal*, 26(1), pp.83–91, p.87
61. Embley, J., Goodchild, P., & Shephard, C. (2020) *Legal Systems and Skills: Learn, Develop, Apply* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. p. 36
62. Erickson, J. (2010) Corporate governance in the courtroom: an empirical analysis. *William and Mary law review*. 51 (5), p.1781
63. Erickson, J. (2020) The Lost Lessons of Shareholder Derivative Suits. *Washington and Lee law review*. 77 (3), pp.1131–1195

64. Ferran, E. (2001) Litigation by Shareholders and Reflective Loss. *Cambridge law journal*. 60 (2), pp.245–247
65. Ferrara, R. C., Abikoff, K. T., & Gansler, L. L. (2013) ‘Shareholder Derivative Litigation’: Besieging the Board. *Law Journal Seminars-Press*, section 4.06
66. Fisch, J. E. (1997) Class Action Reform, Qui Tam’, and the Role of the Plaintiff. *Law and contemporary problems*. [Online] 60 (4), 167–202. Volume 60, p.168
67. Fleischer, H. (ed.) (2023) German and East Asian Perspectives on Corporate and Capital Market Law: Investors versus Companies. [Online]. Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG. p.22
68. Fletcher, W. (1984) *Cyclopedia of the Law of Private Corporations*, Permanent ed., pp.215–23, para.5981
69. Foote QC, S. (2021) *The Bona Fide Investor: Corporate Nationality and Treaty Shopping in Investment Treaty Law*. 1st edition. Alphen and den Rijn: Wolters Kluwer Law International. (Chapter 4 Comparative 1: Corporate Personality, Corporate Nationality, and the Corporate Veil, *International Arbitration Law Library*, Volume 63), pp. 47 – 60
70. Garry, P. M., Spurlin, C. J., Owen, D. A., Williams, W. A., & Efting, L. J. (2004) The Irrationality of Shareholder Class Action Lawsuits: A Proposal for Reform’, *South Dakota Law Review*, 49(2), p.275
71. Gazzini, T. (2009) General Principles of Law in the Field of Foreign Investment. *The journal of world investment & trade*. [Online] 10 (1), 103–119. p.111
72. Gaukrodger, D. (2013) Investment Treaties as Corporate Law: Shareholder Claims and Issues of Consistency. OECD, Working Paper No. 2013/3, OECD Publishing, Paris, France
73. Gaukrodger, D. (2014) *Investment Treaties and Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss: Insights from Advanced Systems of Corporate Law*, OECD Working Papers on International Investment, No. 2014/02. OECD Publishing, Paris, France, p. 9
74. Gelter, M. (2018) Mapping types of shareholder lawsuits across jurisdictions’, in *Research Handbook on Representative Shareholder Litigation*. [Online]. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing. pp. 459–481
75. Gelter, M. (2012) Why do Shareholder Derivative Suits Remain Rare in Continental Europe? [Online]
76. Germain, M. & Magnier, V. (2011) *Les sociétés commerciales*. 20e éd. L.G.D.J./Lextenso 577ff
77. Gibbs-Kneller, D. & Gindis, D. (2019) De Jure Convergence, De Facto Divergence: A Comparison of Factual Implementation of Shareholder Derivative Suit Enforcement in the United States and the United Kingdom. *European business law review*. [Online] 30 (6), pp.909–930
78. Golestani, Z. R. (2022) ‘TPT Patrol Pty Ltd v Myer Holdings Limited: Why shareholders can rely on market-based causation’, *University of Western Australia Law Review*, 49(1), pp.377–403, p.386
79. Gordon, J. N. (Jeffrey, N., & Ringe, W.-G. (eds.) (2018) *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Law and Governance*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

80. Gray, A. M. (2012), The statutory derivative claim, an outmoded superfluosity, *Company Lawyer*, 33(10), p.297
81. Grelon, B. (2009) Shareholders' Lawsuits Against the Management of a Company and its Shareholders under French Law. *European company and financial law review*. [Online] 6 (2-3), p.212
82. Gundel, J. (2007) 'Die Inländerdiskriminierung zwischen Verfassungs- und Europarecht: Neue Ansätze in der deutschen Rechtsprechung'. *Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt*. pp.269, 272
83. Guyon, Y. (2001) *Droit des affaires. Tome 1. Droit commercial général et Sociétés*. XI ed. Paris, France, p. 496
84. Hannigan, B. (2009) Drawing Boundaries between Derivative Claims and Unfairly Prejudicial Petitions. *Journal of business law*. (6), p.606
85. Hardman, J. (2022) 'Sevilleja v Marex Financial Ltd': Reflective loss and the autonomy of company law. *Modern law review*. [Online] 85 (1), pp.232-246
86. Hardman, J. (2023) An institutional analysis of UK ostensible minority shareholder protection mechanisms. *The journal of corporate law studies*. [Online] 23 (2), p.402
87. Hirt (2003) In what circumstances should breaches of directors' duties give rise to a remedy under ss 459-461 of the CA 1985, 24(4) *The Company Lawyer* 100, p.109
88. Hirt, H. C. (2004) *The enforcement of directors' duties in Britain and Germany: a comparative study with particular reference to large companies*: Peter Lang, New York, NY, USA, pp. 262-266.
89. Hirst, S. (2010) *Special Litigation Committees in Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, *Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance and Financial Regulation*, 25 April
90. Hofmann, F. & Kurz, F. (eds.) (2019) *Law of remedies: a European perspective*. Cambridge: Intersentia., *Economics of Remedies, The Perspective of Corporate Law*. Klaus Ulrich Schmolke. p.101
91. Hollington, R. (2007) *Shareholders' Rights*, 5th edn. Sweet & Maxwell, London, UK, Chs 7-9
92. Hommelhoff, P. (2002) 'Protection of minority shareholders, investors and creditors in corporate groups: the strengths and weaknesses of German corporate group law', in Hopt, K.J., Jessel-Holst, C. & Pistor, K. (eds.), *Unternehmensgruppen in mittel- und osteuropäischen Ländern: Entstehung, Verhalten und Steuerung aus rechtlicher und ökonomischer Sicht*, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, pp. 59-78
93. Hopt, K. J. (1992) Directors' Duties to Shareholders, Employees, and Other Creditors: A View from the Continent. In E. McKendrick (ed.), *Commercial Aspects of Trust and Fiduciary Obligations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 115
94. Hoebanx, O., & Le Grand de Belleroche, D. (2006) 'L'Evaluation Contentieuse Du Prejudice' : Quelles Regles ? 5, pp. 37-47
95. Hornstein, G. D. (1967) The Shareholder's Derivative Suit in the United States. *Journal of Business Law*, London, United Kingdom, pp. 282-289
96. Hüffer, U. (2004) *AktG*. 6th ed. AktG, s.147, recital 9
97. Hüffer, U. (2008) *Aktiengesetz*. 8., neubearbeitete Aufl. C.H. Beck. § 148 note 1

98. Hüffer, U. (2012) *Aktiengesetz*, 10th ed., C.H. Beck, p.865
99. Ireland, P. (1999) Company Law and the Myth of Shareholder Ownership. *Modern law review*. [Online] 62 (1), pp.32–57
100. Jain, S.N. (2010) Doctrinal and Non-doctrinal Legal Research'. In: S.K. Verma & Afzal Wani (eds), *Legal Research and Methodology*. 2nd ed. Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, India, p.68
101. Jarass, H. D. (2018) Art. 3', in Jarass, H.D. & Pieroth, B. (eds), *Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Kommentar*, 15th edn., C.H. Beck, München, Germany, para. 111 – (Jarass, H. D. (2018) Art. 3, in *the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany: Commentary*, Jarass, H.D. & Pieroth, B. (eds), 15th ed., para. 111)
102. Joffe, V., Drake, D., Richardson, G. & Lightman, D. (2008) *Minority Shareholders: Law, Practice and Procedure*, 3rd edn. Oxford University Press, Oxford & New York , Chs 5-6
103. Joffe, V. Q. C., et al. (2019) *Minority Shareholders: Law, Practice, and Procedure*. 6th ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, p. 47
104. Jullian, N. (2021) À la recherche de l'introuvable préjudice personnel de l'associé. *Recueil Dalloz*. (38). p.1
105. Keay, A. (2016) Assessing and rethinking the statutory scheme for derivative actions under the Companies Act 2006. *The journal of corporate law studies*. [Online] 16 (1), pp.39–68
106. K.J. Hopt (1997) Shareholder Rights and Remedies: A View from Germany and the Continent. *CfILR* 261.pp. 272-273
107. Kleindiek, D. (1993) Protection of Minority Shareholders under German Law. *I.C.C.L.R.* 4(4),138-147 p. 144
108. Klement, A. & Klonoff, R. (2018) Class Actions in the United States and Israel: A Comparative Approach. *Theoretical inquiries in law*. [Online] 19 (1), pp.155-156
109. Klonoff, R. H. et al. (2006) *Class actions and other multi-party litigation: cases and materials*. 2nd ed. Thomson/West. St, Paul, Minnesota, United States, pp.68-70 and pp.78-82
110. Koch, J. (2006) Das Gesetz zur Unternehmensintegrität und Modernisierung des Anfechtungsrechts (UMAG) – ein Überblick. *Zeitschrift für Unternehmens- und Gesellschaftsrecht*. [Online] 35 (6), pp. 3525, 3526
111. Koh, A. K. (2016). Reconstructing the reflective loss principle. *The Journal of Corporate Law Studies*, 16(2), 373–401, p.374-375
112. Koh, A. K. (2022) Direct Suits and Derivative Actions: Rethinking Shareholder Protection in Comparative Corporate Law. *Washington University global studies law review*. 21 (3), p. 398
113. Koh, P. (2005) Directors' Fiduciary Duties: Unthreading the Joints of Shareholder Ratification. *The journal of corporate law studies*. [Online] 5 (2), 363–399., p.389
114. Koh, P. (2010) Derivative Actions 'Once Removed'. *Journal of business law*. (2), pp.101-106
115. Koh, P. (2011) The shareholder's personal claim: Allowing recovery for reflective losses. *Singapore Academy of Law journal*. 23 (Special issue), 863–889., p.863

116. Koniak, S. P. & Cohen, G. M. (1996) Under Cloak of Settlement. *Virginia law review*. [Online] 82 (7), 1051–1280. Volume 82. p.1051
117. Kondo, M. (1988) *Kaisha Keiesha No Kashitsu*. Management Liability for Negligence, pp.155-157
118. Korzun, V. (2018) Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss: How International Investment Law Changes Corporate Law and Governance. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 40, 189
119. Kraakman, R. et al. (2017) *The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Incorporated. p. 3
120. Krishnan, C. N. V. et al. (2020) How do legal standards matter? An empirical study of special litigation committees. *Journal of corporate finance* (Amsterdam, Netherlands). [Online] 60101543-p.3
121. Kuntz, T. (2018) ‘German corporate law in the 20th century’, in *Research Handbook on the History of Corporate and Company Law*. [Online]. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, United Kingdom, pp. 205–243
122. Latella (2005) *L'azione sociale di responsabilità esercitata dalla minoranza*, Torino. Passim
123. Latella, D. (2009) Shareholder Derivative Suits: A Comparative Analysis and the Implications of the European Shareholders’ Rights Directive. *European company and financial law review*. [Online] 6 (2–3), pp.307–323
124. Lawyers, I. A. of Y. & Stecher, M. W. (1997) *Protection of Minority Shareholders*. 1st edition. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International. p. 94
125. Lee Suet Lin, J. (2007). Barring Recovery for Diminution in Value of Shres on the Reflective Loss Principle, *Cambridge Law Journal*, 66(3), pp. 537–558
126. Lee, P.-W. (2008) Creditors’ Claims for Reflective Loss. *Journal of business law*. (6), p.484
127. Levy, B. H. (1991) *Anglo-American philosophy of law: an introduction to its development and outcome*. Transaction Publishers
128. Li, X. (2007) *A comparative study of shareholders’ derivative actions: England, the United States, Germany, and China*: Kluwer, Deventer, The Netherlands, p.94
129. Likillimba, G.-A. (2009) Le préjudice individuel et/ou collectif en droit des groupements. *RTDCom. Revue trimestrielle de droit commercial et de droit économique*. 1.p.6
130. Lim, E. (2019). A Case for Shareholders’ Fiduciary Duties in Common Law Asia. In *A Case for Shareholders’ Fiduciary Duties in Common Law Asia* (pp. iii–iii)
131. Lockwood, B. L. & Barsch, K. L. (1996) ‘United States: Protection of Minority Shareholders’ Interests — Legal Framework and Remedies’, in Campbell, D. & Buckley, S. (eds.) *Protecting Minority Shareholders*. Kluwer Law International, London & Boston, pp. 667-669
132. Lowe, T. (2014) Mixed and multiple derivative claims to address reflective loss problems. *Trusts & trustees*. [Online] 20 (9), 930–932
133. Macey, J. R. & Miller, G. P. (1991) The Plaintiffs’ Attorney’s Role in Class Action and Derivative Litigation: Economic Analysis and Recommendations for Reform. *The University of Chicago law review*. [Online] 58 (1), 1–118.

134. Mann, T. (2010) *Australian Law Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, p.197, cited in: Watkins, D. & Burton, M. (eds), 2013. *Research Methods in Law*. Routledge, p.9
135. Merkt, H. (2018) '§ 13 Juristische Person; Handelsgesellschaft', in Holger Fleischer & Wulf Goette (eds.), *Münchener Kommentar zum Gesetz betreffend die Gesellschaften mit beschränkter Haftung - GmbHG* [Munich Commentary on the Law on Limited Liability Corporations], 3rd ed., pp.203–204, Rn 98, Rn 200
136. Mitchell, C. (2004) 'Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss', *Law Quarterly Review*, 120, pp.457, 475–476
137. Mitchel, L. E. (2010) Gentleman's agreement: The antisemitic origins of restrictions on stockholder litigation. *Queen's law journal*. 36 (1), p.77
138. McConville, M. & Chui, W. H. (eds.) (2017) *Research methods for law*. Second edition. [Online]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. p.24.
139. McLennan, J. S. (2005) Companies, shareholders and 'reflective losses': analyses. *SA mercantile law journal*. 17 (2), 195–201., p.195
140. Merle, P. & Fauchon, A. (2000) *Droit commercial: sociétés commerciales*. 7e éd. Dalloz. p. 409
141. Milani, L. M. (1986) The Continuous Ownership Requirement: A Bar to Meritorious Shareholder Derivative Actions? *Washington and Lee law review*. 431013-, p.1019
142. Milman, D. (2005) 'Shareholder remedies and the scope of the reflective loss (or no reflective loss) principle.', *Sweet and Maxwell's Company Law Newsletter*, vol. 2005, no. 4, pp. 1-5
143. Mitchell, C. (2004). Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss. *Law Quarterly Review*, 120, pp.457 – 479
144. Mustokoff, M. L. (2008) California Supreme Court requires continuous ownership. *Insights (Clifton, N.J.)*. 22 (3), p.36 -
145. Nagy, D. M. et al. (2003) *Securities litigation and enforcement: cases and materials*. Thomson/West, St. Paul, Minnesota, United States, pp.2-11
146. Naruisch, T. & Liepe, F. (2007) Latest Developments in the German Law on Public Companies by the Act on Corporate Integrity and Modernisation of the Right of Resolution-Annulment (UMAG)--Shareholder Activism and Directors' Liability Reloaded. *Journal of business law*. p.10
147. Neacșu, D. (2005) *Introduction to U.S. law and legal research*. Transnational Publishers, Ardsley, New York, USA, p. 44
148. Noack, U. & Zetzsche, D. (2005) Corporate Governance Reform in Germany: The Second Decade. *European business law review*. [Online] 16 (5), pp.1033–1064
149. Olson, Z. D. (2008) Direct or Derivative: Does It Matter After *Gentile v. Rossette*? *The Journal of Corporation Law*. 33 (2), pp.595-624
150. Paschos, N., & Neumann, K.-U. (2005) 'Die Neuregelung des UMAG im Bereich der Durchsetzung von Haftungsansprüchen der Aktiengesellschaft gegen Organmitglieder', *DB*, pp.1779, 1780

151. Patrick M Garry et al (2004) 'The Irrationality of Shareholder Class Action Lawsuits: A Proposal for Reform', *South Dakota Law Review*, Volume 49(2), pp.276-277
152. Paul, C. A. (2010) 'Derivative Actions under English and German Corporate Law – Shareholder Participation between the Tension Filled Areas of Corporate Governance and Malicious Shareholder Interference', *European company and financial law review*. [Online] 7 (1), 81–115. p.100
153. Payne, J. (2004) 'Shareholders' Remedies Reassessed', *Modern law review*. [Online] 67 (3), 500–507., p.504
154. Payne, J. (2005) 'Sections 459–461 Companies Act 1985 in flux: the Future of Shareholder Protection', *Cambridge law journal*. [Online] 64 (3), pp. 647–677
155. Ponta, M. and Catana, R.N. (2015) 'The Business Judgment rule and its reception in European Countries', *The MacrotHEME Review*. p.128
156. Poole, J. & Roberts, P. (1999) 'Shareholder remedies – Corporate wrongs and the derivative action', *Journal of business law*. p.99
157. Pritchard, A. C. (1999) 'Markets as Monitors: A Proposal to Replace Class Actions with Exchanges as Securities Fraud Enforcers', *Virginia law review*. [Online] 85 (6), 925–1020. Volume 85, p.928
158. Puchniak, D. W. (2012) *The Derivative Action in Asia: A Comparative and Functional Approach*, Cambridge University Press
159. Raymonde, V. (2003) 'La réparation du préjudice causé par la faute des dirigeants sociaux, devant les juridictions civiles', *Revue des sociétés*. (2). p.15
160. Redish, M. H. (2014) 'Rethinking the Theory of the Class Action: The Risks and Rewards of Capitalistic Socialism in the Litigation Process', *Emory law journal*. 64 (2), p.451
161. Redish, M. H. (2003) 'Class Actions and the Democratic Difficulty: Rethinking the Intersection of Private Litigation and Public Goals', *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 2003, pp. 71, 75
162. Reisberg, A. (2004) 'Funding Derivative Actions: A Re-Examination of Costs and Fees as Incentives to Commence Litigation', *The journal of corporate law studies*. [Online] 4 (2), pp.345–383
163. Roberts, P. & Poole, J. (2007) 'Shareholder Remedies – Corporate Wrongs and the Derivative Action', in *International Themes in Business Law*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp. II262–II262. p.113 14
164. Roth, M. (2008) 'Outside Director Liability: German Stock Corporation Law in Transatlantic Perspective', *The journal of corporate law studies*. [Online] 8 (2), p.356
165. Ripert, G., Roblot, M., Germain, M., & Vogel, L. (1998) *Traité de droit commercial*, I, Paris : Montchrestien, pp.1308, 1765
166. Rust, U. (2015) 'Artikel 18a EUV', in J. Hans von der Groeben, Schwarze, & A. Hatje (eds.), *Europäisches Unionsrecht*, vol. 1, para. 10. 7th ed. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany
167. Scaggs, J. R. Jr. & Whitesell, A. C. (2014) 'Derivative Lawsuits, Part II.A', *Bloomberg BNA*

168. Schmidt, J. (2008) Reforms in German Stock Corporation Law – The 67th German Jurists Forum. *European business organization law review*. [Online] 9 (4), 637–656
169. Schröder-Frerkes, A. & Göhring, A. (2020) The Limited Liability Company under German Law (the GmbH). *Globe Law and Business*. pp.43-44
170. Shintani, M. (1993) *Kabunushidaihy soshō to sogaku no santei* [Shareholder derivative suit and the calculation of the value of the subject matter of the suit]. *Tegata Kenkyū*, 485. p.14
171. Scruby, R. (2022) Reflective loss and the policy of the law. *Australian bar review*. 51 (2), pp.225–263
172. Seenacherry, M. (2020) Liability of Company Directors: The Business Judgement Rule as Developed in the US and Adopted by Germany Compared to the Netherlands' Approach. *Amsterdam law forum*. [Online] 12 (1), pp. 75–105
173. Shapira, G. (2003) Shareholder Personal Action in Respect of a Loss Suffered by the Company: The Problem of Overlapping Claims and 'Reflective Loss' in English Company Law. *The International lawyer*. 37 (1), 137–152., p.144
174. Sharfman, B.S. (2014) The Enduring Legacy of *Smith v. Van Gorkom*. 26 (3) *Delaware Journal of Corporate Law*. pp.2-23
175. Siems, M.M. (2007) 'References', in *Convergence in Shareholder Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation), pp. 401–450
176. Sin, I. (2021) The No Reflective Loss Principle in *Marex v Sevilleja*: One Step Forward, One Step Back. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Online], pp. 285-297
177. Singhof, B., & Seiler, O. (1998) Shareholder Participation in Corporate Decision Making under German Law: A Comparative Analysis. *Brooklyn Journal of International Law*, 24, pp. 493, 563
178. Smith, D. G. (2016) 'The Modern Business Judgment Rule', in Hill, C. A. & Davidoff Solomon, S. (eds.), *Research Handbook on Mergers and Acquisitions*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 83-98. [Online]
179. Spindler, G. & Stilz, E. (2010) *Kommentar zum Aktiengesetz / herausgegeben von Gerald Spindler, Eberhard Stilz*. 2. Aufl. München: C.H. Beck. Section 148 note 48
180. Spindler, G. & Stilz, E. (2007) *Kommentar zum Aktiengesetz*. Verlag C H Beck, § 142 note 56
181. Spindler, G., in: Schmidt, K. & Lutter, M. (eds.) (2008) *Aktiengesetz*. Verlag Dr Otto Schmidt, Section 148 note 25
182. Spotorno, A. (2018) Why Is the Rule in *Foss v. Harbottle* Such an Important One? *Business law review* (London). [Online] 39 (6), p.191
183. Stanley, C. (2013) The personal liability of directors to third parties and shareholders. *Trusts & trustees*. [Online] 19 (5), pp. 388–429
184. Stengel, A. (1998) Directors Powers and Shareholders: A Comparison of Systems. *International Company and Commercial Law Review*, p. 52
185. Sterling, M. J. (1987) the Theory and Policy of Shareholder Actions in Tort. *Modern law review*. [Online] 50 (4), 468–491., pp.470-471

186. Subramanian, G., et al. (2021), American Law Institute (1994), Principles of Corporate Governance: Analysis and Recommendations. In *Commentaries and Cases on the Law of Business Organizations*. Aspen Publishing, Boston, MA, USA §§ 7.01(b), 7.01
187. Suraweera, A. (2024) Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss in Investor-State Dispute Settlement: Proposing Reform Options for States. *ICSID Review*, [Online] 38 (3), pp. 595-624, p. 598
188. Swanson, C.B. (1993) Juggling shareholder rights and strike suits in derivative litigation: the ALI drops the ball. *Minnesota Law Rev.* 77, pp.1339–1392
189. Sykes, J. P. (2010) ‘The continuing paradox: a critique of minority shareholder and derivative claims under the Companies Act 2006’, *Civil Justice Quarterly*, 29(2), pp. 205–234
190. Tang, J. (2012) ‘Shareholder Remedies: Demise of the Derivative Claim?’, *UCL Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, 1(2), p. 183
191. Tang, S. S. (2020). The anatomy of Singapore’s statutory derivative action: why do shareholders sue – or not? *The Journal of Corporate Law Studies*, 20(2), 327–357., p.327 and 344
192. Tang, S. S. (2016) Corporate avengers need not be angels: rethinking good faith in the derivative action. *The journal of corporate law studies*. 16 (2), pp. 471–491
193. Teffo F. (2019). Réflexions sur le fondement de la reconnaissance du préjudice individuel de l’associé, 4 *Revue Des Sociétés* 237. p. 3
194. Tettenborn, A. (2019). Creditors and reflective loss – a bar too far? *Law Quarterly Review*, 135, pp. 182-186
195. Thomas, R. S. & Thompson, R. B. (2004) The Public and Private Faces of Derivative Lawsuits., 57 *Vand. L. Rev.* pp.1747, 1760
196. Thomas, R. S. et al. (2023) ‘Shareholders’ Inspection and Investigation Rights in France. In P. Giudici, R. S. Thomas, & U. Varottil (eds.), *Research Handbook on Shareholder Inspection Rights*. [Online]. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited., Cheltenham, UK
197. Thompson, E. J. (2009) Direct Harm, Special Injury, or Duty Owed: Which Test Allows for the Most Shareholder Success in Direct Shareholder Litigation? *The Journal of corporation law*. 35 (1), pp.216-237
198. Tian, J. et al. (2024) Piercing the corporate veil system and creditors protection: Based on the investigation of debt paying ability--Empirical evidence from the 2005 Company Law amendment. *PLoS one*. [Online] 19 (5), e0302561–e0302561., pp. 1-22
199. Tschepik, N. T. (2020) The Executive Judgment Rule: A New Standard of Dismissal for Qui Tam Suits Under the False Claims Act. *The University of Chicago law review*. 87 (4), pp.1089-1090
200. Valasek, M. J., & Dumberry, P. (2011) Developments in the Legal Standing of Shareholders and Holding Corporations in Investor-State Disputes. *ICSID Review – Foreign Investment Law Journal*, [Online], 26, p. 34
201. Vatinet, R. (2003) ‘La réparation du préjudice causé par la faute des dirigeants sociaux, devant les juridictions civiles’, *Revue des sociétés*, 251(12)

202. Welch, E. P., Turezyn, A. J., & Saunders, R. S. (2010) *Folk on the Delaware General Corporation Law*. Aspen Publishers, New York, NY, USA
203. Wilsing, H.-U. (2004) 'Neuerungen des UMAG für die aktienrechtliche Beratungspraxis', *ZIP*, pp.1082, 1088
204. Wright, C., & Miller, A. (1982), *Federal Practice and Procedure*, Michigan Law Review, para.1826, 325–330
205. Zhao, J. (2024) The "No Reflective Loss" Principle: Towards to the "Priority Rule". SHS web of conferences. [Online] 1832001-. pp.1-7
206. Zouridakis, G. (2016) The introduction of the derivative action into the greek law on public limited companies as a means of shareholder protection: a comparative analysis of the british, german and greek law. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. p.260

### **International Investment Law:**

1. Alexandrov, S. (2005) The 'Baby Boom' of Treaty-Based Arbitrations and the Jurisdiction of ICSID Tribunals: Shareholders as 'Investors' and Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis. The law and practice of international courts and tribunals. [Online] 4 (1), pp.19–59
2. Amerasinghe, C. F. (1964) State breaches of contracts with aliens and international law. *The American journal of international law*. 58 (4), 881–913. p. 881
3. Arato, J. (2019) 'The private law critique of international investment law', *American Journal of International Law*, 113(1)
4. Arato, J., Claussen, K., Lee, J., & Zarra, G. (2019) *Reforming Shareholder Claims in ISDS*, *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, 14 (forthcoming 2023). Academic Forum on ISDS Concept Paper
5. Arato, J. (2022) The elastic corporate form in international law'. *Virginia Journal of International Law*, 62, p.383
6. Arato, J. et al. (2023) *Reforming Shareholder Claims in Investor-State Dispute Settlement*. *Journal of international dispute settlement*. [Online] 14 (2)
7. Armour, J., et al. (2017) *The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-2
8. Asouzu, A. A. (2002) A Review and Critique of Arbitral Awards on Article 25 (2) (b) of the ICSID Convention. *The journal of world investment & trade*. [Online] 3 (3), vii–454. pp.397-398
9. Bartlett, C. A. & Ghoshal, S. (1998) *Managing across borders: the transnational solution*. 2nd ed. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, USA, p.15
10. Bermann, G. A. (2023) 'Res judicata in international arbitration', in Kröll, S., Bjorklund, A. K. & Ferrari, F. (eds.), *Cambridge Compendium of International Commercial and Investment Arbitration*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK; New York, NY, USA, pp. 1680-1681.
11. Bjorklund, A. K. (2008) Investment Treaty Arbitral decisions as Jurisprudence Constante. In C. B. Picker, D. D. Bunn & D. W. Arner (eds.), *International Economic Law: The State and Future of the Discipline*. Hart Publishing. pp. 265–280

12. Binder, C. et al. (2009) *International investment law for the 21st century: essays in honor of Christoph Schreuer*. [Online]. Oxford: Oxford University Press
13. Bischoff, J. A. & Happ, R. (2015) 'A. The notion of investment', in Bungenberg, M., Griebel, J., Hobe, S. & Reinisch, A. (eds.), *International Investment Law: A Handbook*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany; Verlag C.H. Beck, Munich, Germany; Hart Publishing, Oxford, UK, p. 500, para. 8
14. Bottini, G. (2008) Indirect claims under the ICSID convention. *University of Pennsylvania journal of international economic law*. 29 (3), p.563
15. Brandes, H. (1988) Ersatz von Gesellschafts- und Gesellschafterschaden. In: *Festschrift für Hans-Joachim Fleck*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp.13–22
16. Branson, D. M. (1986) *The American Law Institute Principles of Corporate Governance and the Derivative Action: A View from the Other Side*. Washington and Lee law review. 43399-. p.408
17. Broches, A. (1972) *The Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States (Volume 136)*. Collected Courses of the Hague Academy of International Law. p.359
18. Broches, A. (1995) *Selected Essays: World Bank, ICSID, and Other Subjects of Public and Private International Law*. First edition. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers
19. Bronckers, M. (2015) Is investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) superior to litigation before domestic courts? An EU view on bilateral trade agreements. *Journal of international economic law*. [Online] 18 (3), pp. 655–677
20. Brown, C. (2007) *A common law of international adjudication*. Oxford University Press. [Online], Oxford, UK, p. 77
21. Brown, C., & Miles, K. (eds.) (2011) *Evolution in investment treaty law and arbitration*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK
22. Brown, C. (2013) *Commentaries on selected model investment treaties: hbk*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, p. 826
23. Bryer, L., & Asbell, M. (2008) Combining Trademarks in a Jointly Owned IP Holding Company', *The Trademark Reporter*, 98(3), p.834
24. Bussani, M., & Palmer, V. V. (2003) *Pure Economic Loss in Europe*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, pp. xlviii-xlviii
25. Cancela, J. L. (2019) The current work plan of the WTO Informal Working Group on MSMEs: Recognizing trade financing as a decisive factor in achieving economic growth and Sustainable Development Goals. *International trade forum*. (2), p.18
26. Caplan, L. et al. (2013) Commentary on the US 2012 Model BIT. In: Brown, C. (ed.), *Commentaries on Selected Model Investment Treaties*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, p. 826
27. Cavallo, P. (2019) Brazil, BITs, and FDI: A Synthetic Control Approach. *The journal of world investment & trade*. [Online] 20 (1), pp.68–97

28. Chaisse, J. & Li, L. Z. (2016) Shareholder protection reloaded redesigning the matrix of shareholder claims for reflective loss. *Stanford journal of international law*. 52 (1), pp.51–94
29. Chaisse, J. (2013) Exploring the Confines of International Investment and Domestic Health Protections—Is a General Exceptions Clause a Forced Perspective? *American journal of law & medicine*. [Online] 39 (2–3), p. 332
30. Chaisse, J. (2015) Demystifying Public Security Exception and Limitations on Capital Movement: Hard Law, Soft Law, and Sovereign Investment in the EU Internal Market *University of Pennsylvania journal of international law*. 37 (2), pp.583–646
31. Chase, P. H. (2015) TTIP, Investor–State Dispute Settlement and the Rule of Law. *European View*, 14, p.217, 218, p.222
32. Chen, W. (2017) *A Comparative Study of Funding Shareholder Litigation*. 1st edition. [Online]. Singapore: Springer Singapore Pte. Limited.p.18
33. Chestek, P. S. (2001) Control of Trademarks by the Intellectual Property Holding Company’, *The Journal of Law and Technology*, 41(1), p.1
34. Cheung (2008) Corporate Wrongs Litigated in the Context of Unfair Prejudice Claims: Reforming the Unfair Prejudice Remedy for the Redress of Corporate Wrongs. *Company lawyer*. [Online] 29 (4), pp.98–104
35. Clumsier, M. (2016) Chapter 2: Characteristics of International Investment Law. In M. Clumsier (ed.), *Arbitral Awards as Investments: Treaty Interpretation and the Dynamics of International Investment Law, International Arbitration Law Library*, vol. 39. Kluwer Law International, Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands, pp. 23–52
36. Collins, D. (2017) *An introduction to international investment law: hardback*. Cambridge University Press., Cambridge, UK, p. 217
37. Crawford, J. & Nouwen, S. (2012) The Limits of Depoliticisation in Contemporary Investor-State Arbitration’, in *Select Proceedings of the European Society of International Law, Volume 3 2010*. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, London, UK, pp. 271–282
38. Crawford, J. (2019) *Brownlie’s Principles of Public International Law*. 9th ed. Oxford University Press, p.514
39. Davitti, D. et al. (2020) *COVID-19 and the Precarity of International Investment Law*
40. de Jong, B. J. (2013) Shareholders’ Claims for Reflective Loss: A Comparative Legal Analysis. *European business organization law review*. [Online] 14 (1), pp.97–118
41. De Luca, A., & Sacerdoti, G. (2019) Investment Dispute Settlement. In M. Krajewski & R. T. Hoffmann (eds.), *Research Handbook on Foreign Direct Investment*, [Online]. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 193–240
42. de Mestral, A., & Morgan, R. (2017) Does Canadian Law Provide Remedies Equivalent to NAFTA Chapter 11 Arbitration? In A. de Mestral (ed.), *Second Thoughts: Investor-State Arbitration between Developed Democracies*. McGill-Queen’s University Press, Montreal, Quebec & Kingston, Ontario, Canada, pp. 155–156, 178
43. Dimsey, M. (2008) *The Resolution of International Investment Disputes: Challenges and Solutions*. 1st edition. Vol. 1. The Hague: Eleven International Publishing

44. Bentolila, D. (2017) *Arbitrators as lawmakers*. 1st edition. Vol. 43. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International. Chapter 4: Arbitrators' Constraints in Arbitral Decision-Making, paras. 406, 460
45. Doller, R., & Stevens, M. (1995) *Bilateral Investment Treaties*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, The Hague, The Netherlands; Boston, MA, USA; London, UK
46. Dolzer, R. & Schreuer, C. (2012) *Principles of International Investment Law*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Incorporated. p. 52
47. Schill, S. W. & Djanic, V. (2018) Wherefore Art Thou? Towards a Public Interest-Based Justification of International Investment Law. Vol. 33. [Online]. Oxford University Press., Oxford, UK, pp. 31, 38
48. Douglas, Z. (2009) *The International Law of Investment Claims*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, p. 452
49. Dumberry, P (2010) 'The Legal Standing of Shareholders before Arbitral Tribunals: Has Any Rule of Customary International Law Crystallized?' 18(3) Michigan State Journal of International Law 353
50. D'Agostino, J. (2012) Rescuing International Investment Arbitration: Introducing Derivative Actions, Class Actions and Compulsory Joinder. Virginia law review. 98 (1), pp.177-229
51. Echandi, R. (2009) The new generation of international investment agreements: recent developments in the Asia-Pacific region. Asia Europe journal. [Online] 7 (1), pp.127-144
52. El-Kady, H. (2020) 'Morocco's New Model BIT: Innovative features and policy considerations', *Investment Treaty News*, May 14
53. Erickson, J. (2010) Corporate governance in the courtroom: an empirical analysis. William and Mary law review. 51 (5), p.1781
54. Essien, V. (1995) Aron Broches, Selected Essays: World Bank, ICSID and Other Subjects of Public and Private International Law (Book Review). Fordham International Law Journal 19 (2)
55. Ferran, E. (2001) Litigation by Shareholders and Reflective Loss. Cambridge law journal. 60 (2), p.249
56. Gallagher, N. & Shan, W. (2009) Chinese investment treaties: policies and practice / Norah Gallagher, Wenhua Shan. New York: Oxford University Press. p 55
57. Gaukrodger, D. & Gordon, K. (2012) Investor-State Dispute Settlement: A Scoping Paper for the Investment Policy Community. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc.*, n.59., p. 27
58. Gertz, G. et al. (2018) Legalization, diplomacy, and development: Do investment treaties de-politicize investment disputes? World development. [Online] 107 pp.239-252
59. Gaukrodger, D. (2013) Investment Treaties as Corporate Law: Shareholder Claims and Issues of Consistency. OECD, Working Paper No. 2013/3, OECD Publishing, Paris, France.
60. Gaukrodger, D. (2014) *Investment Treaties and Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss: Insights from Advanced Systems of Corporate Law*, OECD Working Papers on International Investment, No. 2014/02, OECD Publishing, Paris, France

61. Gaukrodger, D. (2020) Claims for Reflective Loss under Investment Treaties, (“Gaukrodger Presentation”), OECD Publishing, Paris, France
62. Gaukrodger, D. (2021) Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss in Investment State Dispute Settlement: A “Component-by- Component” Approach to UNCITRAL Reform Proposals, Informal Discussion Paper, OECD Publishing, Paris, France
63. Gordon, K., & Gaukrodger, D. (2012). *Investor-state dispute settlement: A scoping paper for the investment policy community*. [Online]. n.59., p. 27
64. Greenawalt, K. (2013) Statutory and common law interpretation. New York; Oxford University Press. pp. 257-258
65. Griebel, J. (2008) Internationales Investitionsrecht, Publisher. Beck C. H. pp. 24–25
66. Hamamoto, S. & Nottage, L. (2013) Japan. In: Chester Brown (ed.), *Commentaries on Selected Model Investment Treaties*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, p. 356 et seq
67. Hannigan, B. (2009) Drawing Boundaries between Derivative Claims and Unfairly Prejudicial Petitions. *Journal of business law*. (6), pp. 606–626
68. Hoffman, R. T. (2019) *Divergenz und Transformation: Verfassungstheoretische Untersuchung des Eigentumsschutzes in der Demokratischen Eigentumsverfassung und im Investitionsschutzregime*. Germany: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Company KG, Baden-Baden, Germany, pp. 310-311
69. Jacob, M. & Schill, S. W. (2015) I. Fair and Equitable Treatment: Content, Practice, Method’, in *International Investment Law*. 1st edition [Online]. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. pp. 749–812. paras. 143, 148, 157
70. Joubin-Bret, A., & Kalicki, J. E. (2015) *Reshaping the Investor-State Dispute Settlement System: Journeys for the 21st Century*. Vol. 4. Brill Nijhoff, pp. 609-611
71. Jovanovic, F. (2023) Katharina Pistor, The Code of Capital: How the Law Creates Wealth and Inequality, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2019 / Le code du capital, Paris, Seuil, 2023. *Interventions économiques*. [Online] 70 (70)
72. Kang, S. (2021) Jurisdictional objections and defenses (Raison d’être, Ratione Personae, Ratione Materiae, and Ratione Temporis). In: Chaisse, J. et al. (eds.), *Handbook of International Investment Law and Policy*. Springer, Singapore, pp. 1–30
73. Kaufmann-Kohler, G. (2007) Arbitral precedent: Dream, necessity, or excuse? ‘The 2006 Freshfields lecture’. *Arbitration international*. [Online] 23 (3), pp.357–378
74. Kekeletso Mashigo et al. (2012) Dispute Settlement Provisions in International Investment Agreements: A Large Sample Survey. [Online]. OECD Working Paper on International Investment. p. 20
75. Kinnear, M. N. et al. (2006) *Investment Disputes under NAFTA: an annotated guide to NAFTA Chapter 11*. Kluwer Law International, Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands, pp. 1116-1117
76. Koh, A. K. (2022) Direct suits and Derivative Actions: Rethinking Shareholder Protection in Comparative Corporate Law. *Washington University global studies law review*. 21 (3)
77. Koh, H. H. (2001) Transnational Legal Process. In *The Nature of International Law*. by Gerry Simpson, 1st ed. [Online]. Routledge, London, UK, pp. 183-184

78. Koskeniemi, M. (2017) It's not the Cases, It's the System. *The journal of world investment & trade*. [Online] (2), pp.343–353
79. Korzun, V. (2018) Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss: How International Investment Law Changes Corporate Law and Governance. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 40, 189
80. Kröll, S., Bjorklund, A. K. & Ferrari, F. (eds.) (2023) *Cambridge Compendium of International Commercial and Investment Arbitration*. Chapter: *Applicable Law in International Investment Arbitration*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 514-517
81. Kriebaum, U. (2018) Evaluating Social Benefits and Costs of Investment Treaties: Depoliticization of Investment Disputes. Vol. 33. [Online]. Oxford University Press
82. Lee, J. S. (2021) Shareholder Claims for Reflective Loss in Investor-State Disputes and Reform Options'. *International Trade Law*, (2), pp. 55, 60
83. Lee Suet Lin, J. (2007) Barring Recovery for Diminution in Value of Shares on the Reflective Loss Principle. *Cambridge law journal*. [Online] 66 (3), pp.537–558
84. Li, T. & Jiang, Z. (2018) Human Rights, Justice, and Courts in IEL: A Critical Examination of Petersmann's Constitutionalization Theory. *Journal of international economic law*. [Online] 21 (1), pp.193–211
85. Lowe, V. (2008) Changing Dimensions of International Investment Law. SSRN Electronic Journal. [Online] in *Collected Courses 2006*, Vol. 1, 431–32 (XiamenAcademy of International Law ed.)
86. Lim, E.-G. (2001) *Determinants of, and the Relation Between, Foreign Direct Investment and Growth: A Summary of the Recent Literature*. International Monetary Fund. Paper No. 01/175.
87. Lunenberg, M., Graebel, J., Hobe, S. & Rheinische, A. (eds.) (2005) *International Investment Law*. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany; Verlag C.H. Beck, Munich, Germany; Hart Publishing, Oxford, UKp. 1, para. 1
88. Mattes, J. (2010) Innovation in Multinational Companies: Organizational, International and Regional Dilemmas. New Ed. [Online]. Peter Lang.p.14
89. Maurer, H. & Waldhoff, C. (2017) *Allgemeines Verwaltungsrecht*. 19.überarbeitete und erg. Aufl. C.H. Beck. § 27, para. 92
90. Mbori, H. (2020) 'Exit is the Only Way Out: A Polemic Response to John Nyanje's "Hegemony in Investor-State Dispute Settlement: How African States Need to Approach Reforms,' *Afronomicsla*
91. McLachlan, C., Shore, L., & Weiniger, M. (2008) *International Investment Arbitration: Substantive Principles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. at paras. 6.77 and 6.79
92. Mclachlan C. (2009) *Lis Pendens in International Litigation*. 1st edition. Vol. 5. [Online]. Boston: BRILL
93. McLachlan, C., Shore, L., & Weiniger, M. (2017) *International Investment Arbitration: Substantive Principles*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, p.189. [Online]
94. Merle, P., & Fauchon, A. (2000). *Droit commercial : sociétés commerciales* (7e éd). Dalloz. p. 409

95. Muschlinski, P. (2018) 'Human rights in business: Removal of barriers to access to justice in the European Union', in Álvarez Rubio, J.J. & Yiannibas, K. (eds), *Human Rights in Business*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge, i–xii, 146, index, *Business and Human Rights Journal* [Online], 3(2). pp.299–301
96. Oppenheim, L., et al. (1992) *Oppenheim's International Law*. 9th ed., edited by Sir Robert Jennings and Sir Arthur Watts. Longman, Longman, Harlow, UK, p. 927
97. Ozdel, M. (2017) 'The doctrine of *res judicata* in international commercial arbitration: the preclusionary effects of court decisions', *International Arbitration Law Review*, 20(6)
98. Paporinskis, M. (2016) Investors' Remedies under EU Law and International Investment Law. *The journal of world investment & trade*. [Online] 17 (6), pp.919–941
99. Parra, A. R. (2012) *The history of ICSID*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
100. Paulsson, J. (2009) Awards—and Awards. In A. K. Bjorklund, I. A. Laird & S. Ripinsky (eds.), *Investment Treaty Law, Current Issues III (BIICL)*, p. 95
101. Paulsson, J. (2014) 'The Pyramids Case', in *Collected Courses of the International Academy for Arbitration Law* (2012). Vol. 1, 19
102. Payne, J. (2004) Shareholders' Remedies Reassessed. *Modern law review*. [Online] 67 (3), 500–507., p.504
103. Perkins, M. (2015) Protection for Legal Persons. In M. Lunenberg, J. Graebel, S. Hobe, & A. Rheinische, & Y.-I. Kim (eds.), *International Investment Law: A Handbook*. C.H. Beck – Hart – Nomos
104. Peters, A. (2016) Rights and Duties in Investment Protection Law. Published online by Cambridge University Press, 13 October
105. Pietzcker, J. (2013) '§ 125 Der allgemeine Gleichheitssatz', in Merten, D. & Papier, H.-J. (eds), *Handbuch der Grundrechte in Deutschland und Europa, Vol V: Grundrechte in Deutschland – Einzelgrundrechte II*, at paras 32, 39.– (Pietzcker, J. (2013) '§ 125 The general principle of equality', In D. Merten, D. & H.-J. Papier, H.-J. (eds), in *Handbook of Fundamental Rights in Germany and Europe, Vol. V: Fundamental Rights in Germany – Individual Fundamental Rights II*, at paras. 32, 39)
106. Popa Tache, C. E. (2020) *Introduction to International Investment Law*. Bucharest: Adjuris – International Academic Publishers
107. Powell, C. (2015) The NAFTA alternative: saving Korus FTA dumping appeals from the dumps. *Canada-United States law journal*. p.36-
108. Puig, S. & Shaffer, G. (2018) Imperfect Alternatives: Institutional Choice and the Reform of Investment Law. *The American journal of international law*. [Online] 112 (3), pp.361–409
109. Reed, L. F., & Davis, J. E. (2015) A. Who is a Protected Investor? In M. Lunenberg, J. Graebel, S. Hobe, A. Rheinische, & Y. I. Kim (eds.), *International Investment Law: A Handbook*. 1st ed. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. [Online], pp. 663-686
110. Ren, R. (2023) Shareholder reflective loss: a bogeyman in investment treaty arbitration? *Arbitration international*. [Online] 39 (3), pp.425–444. p.430

111. Repousis, O. G. (2016) Standing of Locally Incorporated Entities in International Investment Law and the Notion of ‘Foreign Control’. *Tulane Journal of International & Comparative Law*, 24 (2), p. 332
112. Riffel, C. (2020) Does Investor-State Dispute Settlement Discriminate Against Nationals? *German law journal*. [Online] 21 (2), pp.197–222
113. Ripinsky, S., & Williams, K. (2008) *Damages in International Investment Law*. British Institute of International and Comparative Law, London, UK , p. 148
114. Rubins, N. (2004) The Notion of ‘Investment’ in International Investment Arbitration. In N. Horn & S. Kröll (eds.), *Arbitrating Foreign Investment Disputes: Procedural and Substantive Legal Aspects*. Studies in Transnational Economic Law, vol. 19. Kluwer Law International, The Hague, The Netherlands, pp. 283, 291-292
115. Salacuse, J. W. (2015) *The Law of Investment Treaties* S 75–78 (2nd ed. 2015)., pp. 254–55.
116. Sasson, M. (2010) Shareholders’ Rights. In *Substantive Law in Investment Treaty Arbitration: The Unsettled Relationship between International Law and Municipal Law*. Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands: Kluwer Law International
117. Sasson, M. (2017) *Substantive law in investment treaty arbitration: the unsettled relationship between international law and municipal law*. 2nd ed. Kluwer Law International B.V. chapter 5
118. Schaffstein, S. (2016) *The Doctrine of Res Judicata Before International Commercial Arbitral Tribunals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
119. Schill, S. W. & Djanic, V. (2018) *Wherefore Art Thou? Towards a Public Interest-Based Justification of International Investment Law*. Vol. 33. [Online]. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
120. Schill, S. W. et al. (2022) *Schreuer’s Commentary on the ICSID Convention: A Commentary on the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States*. 3rd edition. [Online]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., Article 25, p. 226-280.
121. Schreuer, C. (1996) ‘Commentary on the ICSID Convention’, *ICSID Review – Foreign Investment Law Journal*, 11(2), pp.372–373, at para.122
122. Schreuer C.H et al. (2009) *The ICSID convention: a commentary*, 2nd ed.. [Online]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
123. Schreuer, C., & Weiniger, M. (2008) A Doctrine of Precedent? In C. Schreuer, P. Muchlinski & F. Ortino (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Investment Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK p. 1189
124. Schreuer, C. (2005) Shareholder protection in international investment law’. *Transnational Dispute Management*, 2(3) [Online], 4(1) pp. 19–59
125. Shan, W., & Wang, L. (2019) The Definition of “investment”: Recent Developments and Lingering Issues. In J. E. M. Kalika & M. Abdel Raouf (eds.), *Evolution and Adaptation: The Future of International Arbitration*, ICCA Congress Series, vol. 20. Kluwer Law International/International Council for Commercial Arbitration, pp. 169-197

126. Smutny, A. C. (2009) Claims of Shareholders in international investment law', in *International Investment Law for the 21st Century*. [Online]. Oxford: Oxford University Press
127. Soloveva, K. (2024) Revisiting different definitions of 'investor' in international investment agreements: the issue of permanent residents, Stateless persons, and dual nationals. *Cambridge International Law Journal* [Online] 13 (1), pp. 103–128
128. Sornarajah, M. (2010) *The international law on foreign investment / M. Sornarajah*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.220-225
129. Sornarajah, M. (2016) 'An International Investment Court: panacea or purgatory?' *Columbia FDI Perspectives*, No. 180
130. St John, T. (2018) *The Rise of Investor-State Arbitration: Politics, Law, and Unintended Consequences*. First edition. [Online]. Oxford: Oxford University Press
131. Stephan W. Schill (2017) Authority, Legitimacy, and Fragmentation in the (Envisaged) Dispute Settlement Disciplines in Mega-Regionals, in *Mega-Regional Trade Agreements: CETA, TTIP, and TISA: New Orientations for EU External Economic Relations*
132. Szczekalla, P. (2015) Christoph Grabenwarter, *European Convention on Human Rights*. Commentary. Vol. 130. [Online]. Wolters Kluwer. pp.3–6
133. Şabāhī, B. et al. (2019) *Investor-state Arbitration*. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 367-411
134. Thorn, R., & Doucleff, J. (2010) 'Disregarding the Corporate Veil and Denial of Benefits Clauses: Testing Treaty Language and the Concept of 'Investor''. In M. Waibel (ed.), *The Backlash Against Investment Arbitration: Perceptions and Reality*. Kluwer Law International., Alphen aan den Rijn, The Netherlands, pp. 3–28
135. Titi, C. (2015) Are Investment Tribunals Adjudicating Political Disputes? *Journal of international arbitration*. [Online] 32 (3), pp.261–288
136. Valihora, M. S. (1998) NAFTA Chapter 19 or the WTO's dispute settlement body: A Hobson's choice for Canada? *Case Western Reserve journal of international law*. 30 (2,3), p. 447–487
137. Van Harten, G. (2016) Key Flaws in the European Commission's Proposals for Foreign Investor Protection in TTIP', *SSRN Electronic Journal*. [Online]
138. Vandavelde, K. J. (2009) A Brief History of International Investment Agreements. In: *The Effect of Treaties on Foreign Direct Investment: Bilateral Investment Treaties, Double Taxation Treaties, and Investment Flows*. New York: Oxford Academic, Chapter 1, pp. 3-36
139. Vanhonnaeker, L. (2020) *Shareholders' Claims for Reflective Loss in International Investment Law*. 1st edition. [Online]. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
140. Vargiu, P. (2009) Beyond Hallmarks and Formal Requirements: A 'Jurisprudence Constante' on the Notion of Investment in the ICSID Convention. *The Journal of World Investment & Trade*, [Online] 10 (5), Brill | Nijhoff, Leiden, The Netherlands, p. 753
141. Webster, T. H. (2012) *Handbook of Investment Arbitration*. Sweet & Maxwell

## V. OTHERS

1. American Law Institute (1994 & 2012 Supp) Principles of corporate governance: analysis and recommendations v. 1. Philadelphia: American Law Institute Publishers. Volume 1 and 2, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA, pp.17-22
2. Arato, J. (2019) *Presentation on Reforming Shareholder Claims in ISDS*. Brooklyn Law School.
3. Company Law Review, *Modern Company Law for a Competitive Economy: Completing the Structure*, 2000, London, DTI, at para 5.75
4. Council of the European Union, Brussels, 20 April 2020 WK 3937/2020 INIT, ECT Modernization: Revised Draft EU proposal
5. Council of the European Union, Energy Charter Treaty Modernization: Draft EU proposal<sup>7</sup> 2430/ 2020 INIT, Brussels, 02 March 2020
6. Davies, P. (2020). *Reflecting on “Sevilleja v Marex Financial.”* Oxford Business Law Blog
7. Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress Amending the Administrative Procedure Law of the People’s Republic of China (Nov. 1, 2014, effective May 1, 2015)
8. Deutscher Richterbund, *Stellungnahme zur Errichtung eines Investitionsgerichts für TTIP – Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission vom 16.09.2015 und 12.11.2015* (No. 4/16, Feb. 2016) – (German Judges’ Association, Statement on the Establishment of an Investment Court for TTIP – Proposal of the European Commission of 16 September 2015 and 12 November 2015 (No. 4/16, February 2016)
9. Eilís Ferran, *Reflective Loss* (presentation to FOI Roundtable, 16 October 2013)
10. Explanatory notes of the governmental draft, Bundestag (German parliament), printed papers, 15/5092, 11
11. Explanatory Notes to UK Companies Act 2006
12. Fletcher (2009) *Cyclopedia of Corporations*
13. Gomez Palacio Ines, DAF/INV (2024) Comments and reform proposals with regard to Draft provision 10 (Shareholder claims) of UNCITRAL Secretariat note on Possible reform of Investor-State dispute settlement (ISDS): Draft provisions on procedural and cross-cutting issues, A/CN.9/WG.III/WP.231
14. House of Commons, Hansard Debates text for 17 October 2006, Volume No.450, Part No.201, Column 835
15. OECD, FOI Roundtable 18, Summary of discussion, p. 5 (March 2013)
16. OECD, FOI Roundtable Progress Report on ISDS (Dec. 2012)
17. Freedom of Investment 19 (15-16 October 2013), Summary of Roundtable discussions by the OECD Secretariat, pp. 18-19
18. ICSID, *The ICSID Caseload – Statistics* (Issue 2017–1) (ICSID 2017) pp. 7–8
19. ICCA Congress Series, Volume 20. Kluwer Law International; International Council for Commercial Arbitration/Kluwer Law International. pp. 169 – 197
20. ILC Articles, commentary to Article 4, para. (6), commentary to Article 12, paras. (9)-(10).

21. Joint Webinar no. 6 on Reflective Loss: UNCITRAL Secretariat & ISDS Academic Forum (minutes 13-29)
22. Law Commission, Shareholder Remedies: Report on a Reference under section 3(1)(e) of the Law Commissions Act 1965 (Law Coin No 246, Cm 3769) (London, Stationery Office, 1997), at para 6.4. and para 7
23. Lord Goldsmith, 27 February 2006, Hansard, Col GC8
24. Multilateral Investment Court Project, European Commission (Oct. 10, 2018)
25. Modern Company Law for a Competitive Economy Final Report, Final Report. 2001, paras 7.46 to 7.51
26. NAFTA, Implementation Act, Statement of Administrative Action, H.R. Doc. 103-159, Vol. 1 (1993) at para.145
27. Note by the UNCITRAL Secretariat on shareholder claims and reflective loss (A/CN.9/WG.III/WP.170), 9 August 2019
28. OECD Summary of FOI Roundtable 16 (March 2012), p. 13
29. Opinion of Advocate General Bot, CETA Opinion, ECLI:EU:C:2019:72 (Jan. 29, 2019).at para. 252 fn. 177
30. Report of the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of Other States, Mar. 18, 1965, para. 9
31. *Sevilleja v Marex Financial Ltd* [2020] UKSC 31: The Supreme Court's review of the law on Reflective Loss. Exchange Chambers. 17 July 2020
32. Southern African Development Community (SADC) Model Bilateral Investment Treaty Template with Commentary (July 2012) pp.9-11
33. Statement by the Council Legal Service on the legal nature of the Joint Interpretative Instrument, 2017 O.J. (L 11) 9, 22
34. Public Statement on the International Investment Regime ("Osgoode Hall Statement"), 31 August 2010
35. United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3281 (XXIX): Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, 12 December 1974
36. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) Working Group III (Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform) Thirty-eighth session Vienna, 14–18 October 2019 "Possible reform of investor-State dispute settlement (ISDS) Shareholder claims and reflective loss", Note by the UNCITRAL Secretariat, A/CN.9/WG.III/WP.170, 9 August 2019
37. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), forty-eighth session, Concurrent proceedings in investment arbitration, Note by the UNCITRAL Secretariat, A/CN.9/848, 17 April 2015, 13-14
38. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (1999), Scope and Definition, pp. 22-23
39. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2013), Recent Developments in Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) No.1

40. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2016), "Investor-State Dispute Settlement: Review of Developments in 2015," IIA Issues Note, no. 2., p.2
41. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2018), World Investment Report 2018: Investment and New Industrial Policies, 4
42. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2018), Reform Package for International Investment Regime, p.42
43. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (2007) Bilateral investment treaties 1995-2006: trends in investment rulemaking. United Nations. pp.10-11
44. US Securities Exchange Commission Rule 10b-5
45. Verfassungsbeschwerde und Antrag auf Erlass einer einstweiligen Anordnung, Aug. 29, 2017, CETA-Klage and for an English translation of the relevant parts of the complaint, see International Economic Law and Policy Blog, "The German Constitutional Complaint on CETA"
46. World Trade Organization (WTO), Working Group on the Relationship between Trade and Investment, Scope, and Definitions: "Investment" and Investor" by the WTO Secretariat 21 March 2002
47. World Trade Organization (WTO) Working Group on the Relationship between Trade and Investment, Development Provisions, Note by the WTO Secretariat, 11 June 2002, WT/WGTI/W/119, p. 1

# CURRICULUM VITAE

Toghrul Gulu zada was born on June 1989 in Baku. Toghrul Gulu zada has graduated from Baku State University with bachelor degree in law. He received his master's degree in law from Riga Graduate School of Law, Latvia with a specialization in Transborder and International Commercial Law with merits. He further pursued Master of Laws with a specialization in International and European Union business law at Ghent University, Belgium. He also obtained certificate on the course "Contract Law: From Trust to Promise to Contract" from Harvard University and on the program "International Commercial Arbitration" from the University of Cologne and German Arbitration Institute.

In June 2022 Toghrul Gulu zada embarked on his academic career as a PhD candidate (*promovendus*) at the Department of Company law at Leiden University, under the supervision of prof. Harold Koster and prof. Eric De Brabandere. During his research at Leiden University, he visited the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) as a visiting researcher. Along with participation as a researcher in other working groups of UNCITRAL, he conducted thorough research on Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reform as a part of the team of Working Group III. He also delivers courses on company law, corporate governance, conflict of laws, international arbitration law, international business law, legal aspects of management at various domestic universities such as ADA University, Azerbaijan State University of Oil, and Industry, and UNEC. He coaches ADA University teams in Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot and currently holds a position as Adjunct Lecturer at the Faculty of Law at ADA University. He also supervised the theses of bachelor and master students.

On professional level, Toghrul Gulu zada possesses extensive legal and managerial experience gained through his work with both local and international firms, including BHM Law Firm and Baku City Circuit Operations Company (Formula 1 Azerbaijan) and service as an arbitrator in distinguished London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA). He also served as Chief Legal Officer/Head of Legal Department at Agro Procurement and Supply OJSC and Azerbaijan Industrial Corporation OJSC. He is currently Chief Legal Officer/Head of Legal Department at Azerbaijan Transportation and Communication Holding (AZCON). He is also a member of Azerbaijani Bar Association.

Besides his academic and professional achievements, Toghrul Gulu zada is also the Rapporteur for Azerbaijan at Arbitration Subcommittee on Recognition and Enforcement of Awards of the International Bar Association (IBA) and the Regional Representative for Azerbaijan at Young ICCA.

He has proficiency in English, French, Russian and Turkish.