

	(New Draft of SECOND R	H.P. 1529, L. EGULAR SESSIO	
	ONE HUNDRED AN	D TWELFTH LEG	ISLATURE
Legislative	e Document		No. 23
Commerce Representat	ed by Representative M and printed under Join tive Stevens of Bangor h, Representative Pries	Murray from the Co nt Rule 2. Original . Cosponsored by F	bill sponsored by Representative Warren
			EDWIN H. PERT, C
	STAT	E OF MAINE	
		EAR OF OUR LO DRED AND EIGH	
AN A	CT to Amend the Shareholders i		
Be it en follows:	nacted by the Pe	ople of the S	tate of Maine a
	MRSA §910, 394, §3, is a		
shal sess any port uita shar whom		by the court controlling p osts and expe ssed as the c y or all o e parties to	and shall be as erson, but all o nses may be ap ourt may deem eo f the demandin the proceeding a hall have made a

clude reasonable compensation for and reasonable 1 2 expenses of the appraisers, but shall exclude the 3 fees and expenses of counsel for any party and shall exclude the fees and expenses of experts 4 5 employed by any party, unless the court otherwise 6 orders for good cause. The court shall award 7 each shareholder who is a party to the proceeding 8 reasonable compensation for any expert or experts employed by the shareholder in the proceeding and 9 the shareholder's reasonable attorney's fees 10 and 11 expenses, if:

12

(1) No offer was made; or

13 (2) The fair value of the shares as deter14 mined materially exceeds the amount which
15 the controlling person offered to pay there16 for; or and

17(3) The amount which the controlling person18offered to pay, on a per share basis, is19less than the highest price per share paid20by the controlling person in the 2 years im-21mediately preceding the date of the com-22plaint; and

STATEMENT OF FACT

2 This new draft would not eliminate all of the 3 Maine Revised Statutes, Title 13-A, section 910, but 4 would only eliminate the requirement that the controlling person reimburse the shareholders for the 5 6 cost of their attorneys and experts if the control-7 ling person offered the shareholders less than the 8 highest price per share which he paid during the pre-9 ceding 2 years. The requirement is unreasonable in that it would apply even if the court were to hold 10 11 that the controlling person offered "fair value" for 12 the shares. Furthermore, the requirement is unnecessary since the court is already mandated to order re-13 14 imbursement if it finds that the fair value of the 15 shares materially exceeds the amount offered.

16

1

7224040486