

Milbank

November 2, 2011

Corporate Governance Group

Client Alert

Beijing Frankfurt Hong Kong London Los Angeles Munich New York São Paulo Singapore Tokyo Washington, DC

DELAWARE COURT DENIES APPRAISAL RIGHTS TO STOCKHOLDERS IN CASH ELECTION MERGER

Statutory appraisal rights not available to stockholders who fail to make timely election and are therefore required to accept cash

In *Krieger v. Wesco Financial Corp.*,¹ the Delaware Court of Chancery recently ruled that public company stockholders who are given a choice of electing cash or stock in a merger, but are required to accept cash if they fail to make a timely election, are *not* entitled to assert appraisal rights under § 262 of the Delaware General Corporation Law (the “DGCL”).

Background

Wesco Financial Corporation, which operates in the insurance, furniture rental and steel service center businesses, was indirectly 80.1%-owned by Berkshire Hathaway Inc. The remainder of Wesco’s shares were publicly traded on NYSE Amex.

In February 2011, Berkshire Hathaway agreed to acquire the publicly held minority shares in a merger transaction. Under the terms of the merger agreement, Wesco’s minority stockholders were given the option to elect to exchange their Wesco shares for either (i) cash at a price of \$385 per share, (ii) “an equivalent value in publicly traded shares of Berkshire Class B common stock” or (iii) a combination of the foregoing. Election forms were due two days prior to the special meeting held to consider the merger. Stockholders who failed to make a timely election were required to accept cash for their shares. The merger proxy statement sent to Wesco minority stockholders disclosed that they would not be entitled to appraisal rights under DGCL § 262.

On February 8, 2011, the day after the merger announcement, Joel Krieger, the owner of 10 Wesco shares, brought suit against Wesco in the Delaware Court

For further information about this Client Alert, please contact:

Roland Hlawaty
Partner
212-530-5735
rhlawaty@milbank.com

David Schwartz
Of Counsel
212-530-5260
dschwartz@milbank.com

Meghan Gabriel
Associate
212-530-5744
mgabriel@milbank.com

You may also contact any member of Milbank’s Corporate Governance Group. Contact information can be found at the end of this Client Alert. In addition, if you would like copies of our other Client Alerts, please visit our website at www.milbank.com and choose “Client Alerts” under “News.”

This Client Alert is a source of general information for clients and friends of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP. Its content should not be construed as legal advice, and readers should not act upon the information in this Client Alert without consulting counsel. © 2011 Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP. All rights reserved. Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

Editor: Bob Reder

www.milbank.com

¹ 2011 WL 4840686 (Del.Ch. 2011).

of Chancery and moved for a preliminary injunction on the ground that (i) Wesco stockholders were denied appraisal rights and (ii) “the disclosures regarding appraisal rights in the proxy statement were false and misleading.” The Court refused to enjoin the merger, and the parties cross-moved for partial summary judgment on the availability of statutory appraisal rights.

Subsequently, prior to the special meeting, holders of 539,613 Wesco shares elected to receive cash, holders of 624,921 Wesco shares elected to receive Berkshire Hathaway stock and holders of 232,356 Wesco shares failed to make an election. The merger was approved at the special meeting. No Wesco stockholder demanded an appraisal.

The Court’s Analysis

The Court began its analysis by explaining the structure of the appraisal rights statute. DGCL § 262(b) provides that appraisal rights “shall be available for the shares of any class or series of stock of a constituent corporation in a merger or consolidation to be effected pursuant to” various enumerated sections of the DGCL, including the section governing the Wesco merger. DGCL § 262(b)(1) contains a “market-out” exception which provides that appraisal rights are not available “for the shares of any class or series of stock, which stock ... were ... listed on a national securities exchange”

DGCL § 262(b)(2), however, contains an “exception to the exception,” which restores appraisal rights to a class or series of stock otherwise covered by the “market-out exception” if its holders are required to accept anything in the merger other than “shares of stock ... listed on a national securities exchange” and/or “[c]ash in lieu of fractional shares” Krieger argued that Wesco stockholders were entitled to appraisal rights by virtue of this “exception to the exception” because stockholders who failed to make a timely election were required to accept cash.

In response to this argument, the Court pointed out that “holders of ... Wesco common stock were not ‘required’ to accept any type of consideration that would restore appraisal rights under the ‘exception to the exception.’” Rather, they were given three options, two of which included stock of Berkshire Hathaway listed on a national securities exchange. Moreover, Berkshire Hathaway placed no cap on the number of shares it would issue in the merger so, if they so elected, the minority stockholders could elect to receive 100% of the merger consideration in publicly traded Berkshire Hathaway stock.

Krieger, however, focused on the individual Wesco stockholders who failed to make an election and thus, by default, received cash for their shares. Krieger argued that “this ‘select group of Wesco shareholders’ is being ‘required’ to accept cash and should receive appraisal rights.” The Court rejected this approach, explaining that “the transactional triggering of appraisal rights does not turn on the elections of individual stockholders,” but “rather depends on ... the type of consideration that the merger requires the holders of the class or series of stock to receive” The Court saw nothing in the merger agreement that could be construed to support a conclusion that any Wesco stockholder was “required” to accept cash.²

Krieger also complained that the proxy statement equivocated over the availability of appraisal rights. The Court disagreed, stating that “[t]he proxy statement accurately disclosed Wesco’s correct belief that

² To drive his point home, Vice Chancellor Laster quoted Jean Paul Satre: “[W]hat is impossible is not to choose. I can always choose, but I must also realize that if I decide not to choose, that still constitutes a choice.”

appraisal rights were not available. When disclosure is required about an unsettled question of law, a disclosure document can express the filer's view." In this instance, "[t]he defendants had strong statutory bases for concluding that appraisal rights were not available, but recognized the absence of specific decisional law on point." In the Court's opinion, the inclusion of this view did not render the proxy statement disclosures inaccurate or incomplete.

Conclusion

While the decision of the Court of Chancery in *Krieger v. Wesco Financial Corp.* is not particularly surprising, it does plug a potential loophole in DGCL § 262. As such, the decision will certainly be of comfort to dealmakers and their legal counsel.

Please feel free to discuss any aspect of this Client Alert with your regular Milbank contacts or with any of the members of our Corporate Governance Group, whose names and contact information are provided below.

Beijing

Units 05-06, 15th Floor, Tower 2
China Central Place, 79 Jianguo Road, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100025, China

Anthony Root	+86-10-5969-2777	aroot@milbank.com
Edward Sun	+86-10-5969-2772	esun@milbank.com
Gary Wigmore	+86-10-5969-2769	gwigmore@milbank.com

Frankfurt

Taunusanlage 15
60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Norbert Rieger

+49-89-25559-3620	nrieger@milbank.com
-------------------	---------------------

Hong Kong

3007 Alexandra House, 18 Chater Road
Central, Hong Kong

Anthony Root	+852-2971-4842	aroot@milbank.com
Gary Wigmore	+852-2971-8815	gwigmore@milbank.com
Joshua Zimmerman	+852-2971-4811	jzimmerman@milbank.com

London

10 Gresham Street
London EC2V 7JD, England
Stuart Harray

+44-20-7615-3083	sharray@milbank.com
------------------	---------------------

Los Angeles

601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ken Baronsky	+1-213-892-4333	kbaronsky@milbank.com
Neil Wertlieb	+1-213-892-4410	nwertlieb@milbank.com

Munich

Maximilianstrasse 15 (Maximilianhöfe)
80539 Munich, Germany
Peter Nussbaum

+49-89-25559-3430	pnussbaum@milbank.com
-------------------	-----------------------

New York

One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005

Scott Edelman	+1-212-530-5149	sedelman@milbank.com
Roland Hlawaty	+1-212-530-5735	rhlawaty@milbank.com
Thomas Janson	+1-212-530-5921	tjanson@milbank.com
Joel Krasnow	+1-212-530-5681	jkrasnow@milbank.com
Alan Stone	+1-212-530-5285	astone@milbank.com
Douglas Tanner	+1-212-530-5505	dtanner@milbank.com
Paul Wessel	+1-212-530-5077	pwessel@milbank.com

São Paulo

Rua Colombia, 325
Jardim América
São Paulo, SP
01438-000

Andrew Janszky	+55-11-3927 7701	ajanszky@milbank.com
----------------	------------------	----------------------

Singapore

30 Raffles Place, #14-00 Chevron House
Singapore 048622

David Zemans	+65-6428-2555	dzemans@milbank.com
Naomi Ishikawa	+65-6428-2525	nishikawa@milbank.com

Tokyo

21F Midtown Tower, 9-7-1 Akasaka, Minato-ku
Tokyo 107-6221 Japan

Mark Plenderleith	+813-5410-2842	mplenderleith@milbank.com
-------------------	----------------	---------------------------

Washington, DC

International Square Building, 1850 K Street, NW
Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20006		
Glenn Gerstell	+1-202-835-7585	gerstell@milbank.com