

Should Directors be Held Liable for Corporate Losses? A Doctrinal Analysis Under Malaysian Company Law

¹Mohd Nazir Mohd Adi*, ¹Mohd Asmadi Mohd Angsor, ²Nur Yuhanis Ismon, ³Noraizalian Ghazali,
⁴Achmad Husen

¹Johor Business School, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Batu Pahat, Johor, Malaysia

²Tamhidi Centre, Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia, Bandar Baru Nilai, Nilai, Malaysia

³Messrs Aizalian Asmadi and Co, Johor Bahru, Malaysia

⁴Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900064>

Received: 10 September 2026; Accepted: 15 September 2026; Published: 30 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Corporate loss frequently prompts demands for personal accountability where directors approved the transaction or strategy that produced the loss. Malaysian company law does not impose liability on directors merely because the decision they make results in corporate loss. Personal liability requires a legally recognised basis for attributing the loss, or another legally relevant consequence, to the director's conduct. This article employs doctrinal legal research to examine the integrated operation of the Companies Act 2016 (CA 2016), Malaysian corporate-governance materials and selected Malaysian authorities, supported by comparative analysis from Australia, the United Kingdom, Singapore and Canada. It argues that corporate-loss liability should rest on the proven breach and a clear causal link between breach and loss. Particular attention is given to the relationship between board authority under section 211, directors' duties under section 213, conditional business-judgment protection under section 214, reliance and delegation under sections 215–216, loyalty and conflict rules, corporate enforcement, causation, remedies and financial distress. The article proposes a five-stage Corporate Loss Liability Framework that sequentially identifies the loss-bearing entity and proper claimant; classifies the applicable duty and alleged breach; determines the relevance and application of business-judgment protection; establishes causation and quantum; and matches the remedy to the character of the wrong. Its contribution lies not in treating these components as individually novel, but in integrating dispersed doctrines into a differentiated liability sequence that separates unsuccessful commercial judgment from legally attributable corporate loss. The framework seeks to preserve legitimate commercial risk-taking while maintaining accountability for breach of statutory and fiduciary duties where resulting loss is attributable to that breach.

Keywords: Directors' Duties; Corporate Loss; Business Judgment Rule; Malaysian Company Law.

INTRODUCTION

When a company suffers a substantial loss, attention frequently turns from the commercial outcome to the personal responsibility of the directors who approved the relevant transaction or strategy. The apparent inference is straightforward: the board authorised the decision, the company lost money, and the directors should therefore compensate the company. As a proposition of company law, however, that reasoning collapses two analytically distinct questions. The existence of corporate loss establishes an economic consequence; it does not, without more, establish breach of duty or personal liability on the part of a director.

The distinction is fundamental to the allocation of corporate decision-making authority. Companies undertake investments, acquisitions, disposals, financing arrangements and strategic projects under conditions of uncertainty. A transaction may fail because of market developments, technological change, counterparty

default, regulatory intervention or risks that could not reasonably have been eliminated when the decision was made. If adverse commercial outcomes were themselves sufficient to establish director liability, the law would convert directors into de facto guarantors of corporate performance and create incentives for excessive risk aversion. Conversely, managerial authority cannot justify immunity where corporate loss results from conduct that breaches the legal standards governing the exercise of that authority. The relevant distinction is therefore not between successful and unsuccessful decisions, but between protected commercial risk-taking and conduct for which the law attributes responsibility to the director.

The Malaysian statutory framework reflects this authority-accountability relationship. Section 211 of the Companies Act 2016 (CA 2016) entrusts management of the company's business and affairs to the board, while section 213 imposes requirements concerning proper purpose, good faith, care, skill and diligence. Section 214 provides conditional statutory protection within its prescribed field for qualifying business judgments, and sections 215 and 216 regulate reliance and delegation. Sections 217–222 address further dimensions of directors' obligations, including loyalty, conflicts and the use of corporate property, information, position and opportunities. These provisions operate alongside rules governing derivative proceedings, indemnity and insurance, judicial relief and conduct in financial distress. Director liability for corporate loss should therefore be analysed through this statutory architecture as a whole rather than through section 214 or the eventual financial outcome of a transaction in isolation.

Recent Malaysian decisions illustrate the different doctrinal pathways through which corporate-loss disputes may arise. Tengku Dato' Ibrahim Petra Tengku Indra Petra v Petra Perdana Berhad & Another Case demonstrates at Federal Court level the importance of board authority and restraint in retrospectively reassessing bona fide commercial decisions. Iris Corporation Berhad v Tan Sri Razali bin Ismail & Ors provides recent Court of Appeal consideration of sections 214 and 215 in the context of an unsuccessful investment. By contrast, Bester Malaysia Sdn Bhd v Tan Tee Kung & Ors provides a High Court illustration of liability associated with inadequately independent or informed decision-making, while FGV Holdings Bhd (formerly known as Felda Global Ventures Holdings Bhd) v Mohd Isa bin Abdul Samad & Anor illustrates at first instance the fundamentally different character of misuse of corporate assets for personal benefit. Low Cheng Teik & Ors v Low Ean Nee adds an antecedent question at Federal Court level: where the loss belongs to the company, the identity of the proper claimant and the availability of derivative proceedings must be addressed before personal recovery by a shareholder can be considered.

This article addresses three questions. First, under what circumstances should corporate loss expose a director to personal liability under Malaysian company law? Secondly, what doctrinal conditions distinguish protected commercial risk-taking from loss attributable to breach of duty? Thirdly, how can those conditions be organised into a coherent analytical sequence for courts, practitioners and boards? The central thesis is that directors should not be personally liable merely because a company has suffered a loss. Liability must instead be grounded in the applicable legal duty and breach, considered together with any relevant statutory protection, causation and the remedial principles governing the particular wrong.

The article makes two related contributions. First, it develops an integrated account of corporate-loss liability by reading the board's management authority under section 211 together with the duties imposed by section 213, the statutory business judgment rule in section 214, reliance and delegation under sections 215 and 216, the loyalty and conflict provisions in sections 217–222, derivative proceedings under sections 347–350, and the financial-distress provisions in sections 539 and 540. Recent Malaysian authorities are incorporated according to their doctrinal function and judicial status rather than treated as isolated illustrations.

Secondly, the article proposes a five-stage Corporate Loss Liability Framework that reorganises these otherwise dispersed doctrines into a sequential liability inquiry. Its contribution does not lie in claiming that standing, breach, business-judgment protection, causation or remedies are individually novel concepts. Rather, the framework identifies the legally significant order in which those questions should be addressed: the court first identifies the loss-bearing entity and proper claimant; classifies the duty and alleged breach; determines whether the impugned conduct constitutes a business judgment and, where applicable, whether section 214 is satisfied; establishes the causal connection between breach and the particular loss claimed; and only then

selects the remedy appropriate to the character of the wrong. This sequencing prevents the magnitude or eventual failure of a transaction from functioning, explicitly or implicitly, as evidence of breach.

The framework further distinguishes liability pathways that should not be collapsed into a single business-failure inquiry. Care-based claims require particular attention to the quality of the decision-making process and causal counterfactual; loyalty, conflict and misuse-of-assets claims engage different doctrinal and remedial considerations; reflective-loss questions determine who may pursue recovery; and financial distress may engage specific statutory provisions. The contribution is therefore an integrated and differentiated Malaysian analytical structure rather than the creation of a new substantive duty of directors.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This article adopts doctrinal legal research to determine the circumstances in which corporate losses may give rise to personal liability of directors under Malaysian company law. The method is principally interpretive and analytical rather than empirical. It examines the content, interaction and application of statutory rules governing board authority, directors' duties, business judgments, reliance and delegation, conflicts of interest, corporate enforcement, remedies and liability in financial distress. The analysis is directed not merely at describing these rules individually but at determining how they operate together when a company seeks to attribute financial loss to alleged misconduct by a director.

The primary Malaysian sources comprise the CA 2016, including sections 211 and 213–222, the derivative-action provisions in sections 347–350, the indemnity and insurance provisions in sections 288–289, the financial-distress provisions in sections 539–540 and judicial relief under section 581. The Companies (Amendment) Act 2024, the Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance 2021 (MCCG), relevant Securities Commission Malaysia guidance and Bursa Malaysia governance requirements are considered where they illuminate the governance context in which statutory duties operate. These materials are distinguished according to their legal status so that statutory obligations are not conflated with regulatory or governance expectations.

Malaysian judicial authorities are examined according to their relevance to the principal components of the corporate-loss inquiry. Particular attention is given to authorities addressing board management powers, proper purpose and good faith, standards of care and independent judgment, business-judgment protection, reliance and delegation, misuse of corporate assets, the identity of the proper claimant, reflective loss, causation and remedies. *Petra Perdana* provides Federal Court guidance concerning board authority and commercial decision-making. *Low Cheng Teik* addresses proper-plaintiff and reflective-loss questions. *Iris Corporation* provides recent Court of Appeal treatment of sections 214 and 215. *Bester Malaysia* and *FGV Holdings* are used as recent High Court illustrations of inadequately informed decision-making and misuse of corporate assets respectively.

Judicial hierarchy is treated as an express component of the doctrinal method. Federal Court and Court of Appeal decisions are accorded greater precedential weight than first-instance decisions. High Court authorities are therefore used principally to demonstrate the application of statutory principles to particular factual circumstances and are not treated as displacing inconsistent appellate authority. Where authorities support different formulations, the analysis considers the statutory text, judicial level, factual context and scope of the proposition for which the authority is relied upon.

The article also employs selective comparative analysis. Comparative authorities are used for interpretation rather than transplantation. Australian law is particularly relevant because section 214 of the CA 2016 has structural affinities with the statutory business judgment rule in section 180(2) of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth). United Kingdom authorities are considered in relation to standards of care, fiduciary principles and creditor interests in financial distress, while Singaporean and Canadian authorities assist with issues including corporate groups and identification of the entity suffering the relevant loss. Foreign authorities are persuasive materials only. They are used where they illuminate a concept already relevant to the Malaysian statutory framework and are not presented as establishing Malaysian law.

The primary materials are interpreted textually and contextually. Textual analysis identifies the statutory elements and limits of the relevant provisions, while contextual analysis examines their relationship within the broader architecture of the CA 2016. The study distinguishes three categories of proposition throughout: existing Malaysian law derived from legislation and Malaysian authority; comparative reasoning derived from foreign jurisdictions; and normative recommendations advanced by the authors. This distinction is particularly important in relation to the scope of section 214, creditor interests during financial distress and possible reform of wrongful-trading liability.

The analysis is both descriptive and evaluative. It examines the policy tension between managerial autonomy and director accountability with reference to agency-cost theory, board-authority theory and the economic rationale underlying business-judgment protection. These perspectives are used to evaluate the coherence of the legal structure rather than as substitutes for statutory and judicial authority.

The study is confined to losses suffered by the company arising principally from directors' statutory, common-law and equitable duties. It does not provide a comprehensive treatment of securities fraud, environmental liability, taxation offences, employment obligations or directors' personal tort liability to third parties. Nor does the comparative analysis purport to establish foreign rules as part of Malaysian law. The research record available for this article does not establish a reproducible systematic database search with specified databases, search strings and search dates; accordingly, no such methodology is claimed.

Why Corporate Loss Alone is an Unsound Basis for Liability

Separate Personality and the Loss-Bearer

The first doctrinal error is to treat the company, its shareholders and directors as though they were the same legal person. Since *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd*, an incorporated company has possessed separate legal personality. Its assets, obligations, causes of action and losses are its own. Directors manage corporate assets but do not own them, while shareholders own shares rather than aliquot interests in each corporate asset. A reduction in share value that merely reflects loss suffered by the company therefore does not ordinarily create a separate shareholder claim.

The Federal Court's decision in *Low Cheng Teik* makes this distinction operational under the CA 2016. The wrongful assignment of company trademarks constituted a wrong to the company. Any corresponding reduction in share value or distributable dividends was reflective of that corporate loss. Where those controlling the company would not pursue the corporate claim, the relevant mechanism was the statutory derivative action rather than conversion of corporate loss into personal shareholder damages.

The distinction prevents duplicate recovery, restores compensation to the corporate fund where the company owns the cause of action, and ensures that litigation concerning corporate rights proceeds through the appropriate procedural mechanism. The first question in a corporate-loss case should therefore be who suffered the legally cognisable loss and who owns the corresponding cause of action.

Commercial Risk, Board Authority and Hindsight

Section 211 assigns management to the board. Management necessarily requires decisions under uncertainty: whether to invest or wait, dispose of assets during liquidity pressure, borrow for expansion, enter a new market or pursue an innovative strategy. Even carefully considered decisions may fail because of market movements, technological disruption, regulatory change, counterparty default or information that could not reasonably have been known.

Outcome-based liability would undermine this allocation of authority by allowing courts, liquidators or successor boards to reconstruct an ideal decision after uncertainty has disappeared. Hindsight creates a particular risk because warning signs may appear more obvious and alternatives safer after failure is known. The relevant legal inquiry should therefore focus upon the circumstances in which the decision was made rather than treat the subsequent result as a proxy for the quality of the process.

Petra Perdana illustrates this temporal discipline. The board's disposal of shares occurred in circumstances of serious liquidity pressure. The relevant issue was not whether a better price could subsequently be imagined but whether the directors' exercise of their powers could be justified by reference to their purpose, belief and the circumstances confronting the company. Iris Corporation similarly demonstrates that the eventual failure of an investment does not retrospectively determine whether the directors' conduct satisfied the statutory requirements applicable when approval occurred.

This restraint also has an economic rationale. If directors personally internalised every company-specific commercial loss, rational directors would have incentives to avoid projects that might benefit the company but carry meaningful downside risk. Corporate law therefore requires decisional space without abandoning accountability.

Accountability for Disloyal and Deficient Conduct

The rejection of outcome-based liability is not an argument for director immunity. Directors control or supervise assets belonging to another legal person. Information asymmetry and agency costs create opportunities for private benefit, entrenchment, prestige projects and related-party conduct unless law and governance constrain the exercise of corporate power.

The CA 2016 accordingly distinguishes commercial judgment from disloyal or conflicted conduct. Section 218 regulates the use of corporate property, information, position and opportunities, while sections 221 and 222 address interests and participation in relevant transactions. Serious failures of care may also attract liability. A director who approves a material transaction without considering available information, asking basic questions or understanding the company's financial capacity presents a different case from a director whose reasonably informed decision subsequently proves unsuccessful.

Section 213(2) reinforces this distinction through its objective-subjective standard. Personal inexperience does not provide a complete answer to the objective standard expected of a director with equivalent responsibilities, while additional knowledge, skill and experience actually possessed by the particular director remain relevant.

The resulting policy is deliberately asymmetric: legitimate, disinterested and reasonably informed risk-taking receives substantial decisional protection, whereas conflicted, bad-faith, materially uninformed or asset-diverting conduct does not receive equivalent deference.

Malaysian Statutory Framework

Board Management Authority under Section 211

Section 211(1) provides that the company's business and affairs are to be managed by or under the direction of the board. Section 211(2) confers the powers necessary to manage, direct and supervise the company, subject to the Act and constitution. The provision establishes both the institutional competence of the board and the context in which directors' corresponding responsibilities operate.

In Petra Perdana, the Federal Court resisted the proposition that an ordinary shareholder resolution could simply displace management powers vested in the board. Shareholders retain statutory and constitutional powers, including mechanisms concerning the appointment and removal of directors, but do not become a parallel management organ merely because they disagree with a commercial decision.

Directors' Duties under Section 213

Section 213 contains distinct but related obligations. Section 213(1) requires directors to exercise their powers in accordance with the Act, for a proper purpose and in good faith in the best interest of the company. Section 213(2) requires reasonable care, skill and diligence by reference both to what may reasonably be expected of a director with the same responsibilities and to the additional knowledge, skill and experience actually possessed by the particular director.

Proper purpose concerns the purpose for which corporate power is exercised. Comparative authorities such as

Howard Smith Ltd v Ampol Petroleum Ltd illustrate why an exercise of power may be objectionable even where the director asserts that the overall transaction benefited the company. Good faith and the company's best interest involve a related but analytically distinct inquiry.

Petra Perdana indicates that the director's state of mind is relevant but may be assessed against objective circumstances. An assertion of honest belief is not necessarily conclusive where the surrounding transaction points strongly towards an improper or self-interested exercise of power. Equally, substantial corporate loss does not itself establish absence of good faith.

Section 213(2) reflects the movement away from the historically lax approach to directors' care associated with Re City Equitable Fire Insurance Co Ltd. Comparative authorities including Dorchester Finance Co Ltd v Stebbing, Re D'Jan of London Ltd and Daniels v Anderson illustrate the development of an objective minimum standard supplemented by the actual competence of the individual director. In Malaysia, however, the statutory formulation itself provides the controlling standard.

Business-Judgment Protection under Section 214

Section 214 should be analysed according to its precise statutory relationship with section 213 rather than treated as a general immunity from directors' duties. The provision concerns a director who makes a business judgment, namely a decision on whether or not to take action in respect of a matter relevant to the company's business. Its protection operates within its statutory field and should not be treated as displacing independent proper-purpose, good-faith, loyalty, conflict or misuse-of-assets requirements.

For a business judgment falling within section 214, the statutory conditions must be examined individually. The director must make the judgment for a proper purpose and in good faith; must not have a material personal interest in its subject matter; must be informed about the subject matter to the extent reasonably believed to be appropriate; and must reasonably believe that the judgment is in the company's best interest. The provision is consequently process-sensitive. The commercial outcome does not determine whether these conditions were satisfied.

Iris Corporation illustrates the importance of this contemporaneous inquiry. The Court of Appeal's treatment of the challenged investment directs attention to the circumstances in which the directors evaluated the opportunity, including the relationship between the project and the company's business, the directors' knowledge and experience, the information available to them and the basis for believing that the transaction served the company.

The substantive requirements of section 214 should also be distinguished from questions concerning formal and evidential burdens. This article does not contend that the wording of section 214 necessarily places the formal legal burden of proving every element upon the director. More cautiously, a director seeking to rely upon section 214 will ordinarily need to identify the relevant business judgment and adduce evidence capable of supporting reliance upon the provision. Formal allocation of legal and evidential burdens remains subject to applicable Malaysian procedural and evidentiary principles and authority.

Australia's section 180(2) remains a useful comparative aid because of its structural similarity. ASIC v Rich illustrates the importance of identifying an actual business judgment and examining the statutory conditions, while ASIC v Healey demonstrates more generally the limits of passive reliance in the discharge of directors' responsibilities. These authorities remain persuasive rather than determinative of Malaysian law.

Section 214 is therefore better understood as conditional statutory protection for qualifying business judgments within its prescribed field of operation rather than as a general defence to directors' liability.

Reliance and Delegation under Sections 215–216

Boards cannot personally possess every technical competence required by modern corporate activity. Section 215 accordingly permits reliance on information, professional advice and other persons within its statutory conditions. The provision does not, however, reduce directorship to passive acceptance. The director must

independently assess the information or advice having regard to the director's knowledge of the company and the complexity of its structure and operations.

Iris Corporation demonstrates that independent assessment is contextual. The extent of inquiry reasonably expected may vary according to the director's role, existing knowledge, the nature of the matter, the expertise of the adviser and the materiality of the decision.

Section 216 similarly addresses delegation. Delegation is an organisational necessity, but the statutory conditions governing responsibility for delegated powers remain significant. The analytical question is not simply whether a task was delegated but whether the statutory basis for avoiding responsibility for the delegatee's exercise of power has been established.

Loyalty, Conflicts and Misuse of Corporate Assets

Care-based commercial judgment should be distinguished from loyalty-based misconduct. Sections 217–222 address dimensions of directors' loyalty, conflicts and use of corporate resources that cannot be reduced to whether an entrepreneurial forecast was reasonable.

Section 218 is particularly important because the use of company property, information, position or opportunities for unauthorised benefit or corporate detriment concerns the exploitation of entrusted power rather than merely the quality of a commercial prediction. Comparative fiduciary authorities such as *Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver* and *Industrial Development Consultants Ltd v Cooley* illustrate the distinct policy underlying gain-stripping and conflict regulation.

FGV Holdings provides a Malaysian High Court illustration of this boundary. The use of company-owned residential units, renovation funds, vehicles and fuel facilities for private benefit is analytically different from the board's underlying commercial acquisition decisions. The law's willingness to tolerate commercial risk does not translate into equivalent deference towards unauthorised personal use of corporate assets.

Malaysian Judicial Development

Petra Perdana: Board Authority and Commercial Judgment

Petra Perdana is an important Federal Court authority concerning board autonomy and commercial decision-making. The litigation arose from share disposals undertaken during serious liquidity pressure and subsequently challenged as breaches of directors' duties.

The significance of the decision is not that urgency excuses every transaction. Rather, the directors' conduct was assessed in the circumstances confronting them when the relevant powers were exercised. Contemporaneous information, purpose and deliberation were central to the analysis. The case supports restraint against replacing bona fide board judgment with a judicial assessment of commercial merits while preserving scrutiny of the directors' actual exercise of power.

Iris Corporation: Process-Sensitive Business-Judgment Protection

In *Iris Corporation*, the company invested approximately £2 million in a business pursuing a United Kingdom border-control privatisation project. The venture failed and the counterparty was subsequently wound up. The company sued former executive and non-executive directors, alleging inadequate information, due diligence and assessment. The High Court dismissed the claim, and the Court of Appeal affirmed that result.

The Court of Appeal considered the statutory requirements of section 214 and the operation of section 215. Relevant circumstances included the relationship between the project and the company's trusted-identification business, the absence of a material personal interest, the directors' knowledge and experience, information supplied to the board and the basis for believing that the opportunity furthered the company's interests.

The case therefore illustrates protection of an identifiable decision-making process rather than protection based merely on directorial status. It also demonstrates that the sufficiency of information is contextual. A

materially larger, more novel or more complex transaction may require a correspondingly more extensive process.

Bester Malaysia: Limits of Passive or Dependent Judgment

Bester Malaysia provides a recent High Court decision of the limits of passive or insufficiently independent decision-making. As a first-instance decision, it should not be treated as displacing inconsistent appellate authority. Its relevance lies in its application of sections 213–215 to allegations that deficient decision-making contributed to losses sustained by the company.

The decision illustrates why the mere description of conduct as commercial does not determine the applicability of section 214. The statutory inquiry concerns whether there was a qualifying business judgment and whether the applicable conditions were satisfied.

The case is also relevant to causation. Even where deficient decision-making is established, the claimant must connect the identified breach to the particular loss for which recovery is sought. A defect in one aspect of a decision-making process should not automatically transform the entire accounting loss associated with a project into personal liability.

FGV Holdings: Private Benefit and Misuse of Corporate Assets

The High Court decision in FGV Holdings demonstrates claims of conflict of interests and misappropriation of corporate assets require a different analytical approach from claims concerning duty of care and the exercise of commercial judgment. The use of corporate property and expenditure for personal benefit concerns control of existing company resources rather than a business decision based on the expectation of future corporate returns.

The doctrinal lesson is one of classification. The acquisition of an asset may involve commercial judgment, while subsequent unauthorised personal use of the same asset may engage loyalty and misuse-of-property rules. Treating both events as one undifferentiated business decision risks extending the rationale of section 214 beyond its appropriate field.

Low Cheng Teik: Proper Claimant and Reflective Loss

Low Cheng Teik adds a procedural and remedial dimension. Where the legally cognisable loss is suffered by the company, a shareholder cannot ordinarily convert that corporate loss into personal damages merely because the value of the shareholder's investment has declined.

This principle is integral rather than peripheral to directors' liability. Even a properly pleaded breach cannot justify recovery by the wrong claimant. Corporate-loss litigation should therefore identify the entity owning the cause of action before turning to breach, statutory protection, causation and remedy.

Causation, Quantum and Financial Distress

Causation and Recoverable Corporate Loss

Establishing breach does not, without more, establish compensable loss. A claimant seeking compensation must identify the causal relationship between the impugned conduct and the particular loss claimed. This prevents the size of an unsuccessful transaction from functioning as a proxy for the amount recoverable from the director.

In cases involving duty of care, the counterfactual inquiry is particularly important. The court should consider what probably would have occurred had the director complied with the relevant standard. The same loss may have resulted despite an adequate process because of market conditions, counterparty default, regulatory change or another independent cause. Conversely, proper inquiry may have prevented the company from entering the transaction or reduced its exposure.

Benefits received, recoveries, mitigation and third-party responsibility may also affect quantum. Corporate groups introduce a further boundary. A loss suffered by a subsidiary should not automatically be treated as a loss suffered by its parent. *Goh Chan Peng v Beyonics Technology Ltd* illustrates comparatively the danger of awarding one corporate entity losses that legally belong to another.

Causation therefore provides the bridge between breach and compensable corporate loss. It prevents a finding of breach from becoming automatic liability for every adverse financial consequence associated with the transaction.

Financial Distress as a Boundary Condition

Financial distress presents a boundary condition to the Corporate Loss Liability Framework. It does not justify a separate rule under which directors become personally liable merely because a distressed company continues trading and subsequently incurs greater losses. It does, however, require attention to statutory provisions governing the incurrence of debt and fraudulent continuation of business.

The principal Malaysian statutory starting points are sections 539 and 540 of the CA 2016. Section 539(3) addresses knowing participation in contracting a debt where, having regard to the company's other liabilities, there was no reasonable or probable ground of expectation that the company would be able to pay it. Section 540 addresses circumstances in which the company's business has been carried on with intent to defraud creditors or for a fraudulent purpose and provides for personal responsibility where its statutory requirements are established.

For present purposes, these provisions should not be transformed into a general insolvency-based duty. They demonstrate instead that the characterisation of corporate loss may change where directors continue to incur obligations in circumstances specifically addressed by the statute. A distressed rescue decision should therefore not be analysed precisely like an ordinary investment without first determining whether specific financial-distress provisions are engaged.

The United Kingdom Supreme Court's decision in *BTI 2014 LLC v Sequana SA* is useful as persuasive comparative material concerning the relevance of creditor interests as a company approaches insolvency. It does not establish the trigger, content or consequences of any corresponding Malaysian rule. Those matters remain questions of Malaysian legislation and Malaysian judicial authority.

Accordingly, this article does not contend that the thresholds articulated in *Sequana* have been incorporated into Malaysian law, nor does it use the decision to enlarge sections 539 or 540. Within the proposed framework, financial distress functions principally as a classification issue. Insolvency or increased corporate loss alone remains insufficient to establish personal liability.

Corporate Loss Liability Framework

The preceding analysis supports a five-stage framework. Standing, breach, business-judgment protection, causation and remedies are established legal concepts. The contribution of the framework lies in integrating them into an ordered Malaysian corporate-loss inquiry and differentiating the substantive pathway according to the character of the alleged misconduct.

Table 1. Five-Stage Corporate Loss Liability Framework

Stage	Central Question	Principal Legal Sources	Consequence
1. Loss and standing	Who suffered the legally cognisable loss and who owns the cause of action?	Separate personality; CA 2016, ss 346–350; <i>Low Cheng Teik</i>	Corporate loss should be pursued by the company or through the appropriate derivative mechanism; distinct personal harm may support a separate claim.

2. Duty and breach	What duty governs the conduct, and what is the alleged breach?	CA 2016, ss 213, 217–222; Petra Perdana; FGV Holdings	Liability requires identification of the applicable obligation and breach; the amount of loss does not substitute for this inquiry.
3. Business-judgment protection	Does the conduct constitute a qualifying business judgment, and if so are the requirements of s 214 satisfied?	CA 2016, ss 214–216; Iris Corporation	Section 214 is considered within its statutory scope; it is not a universal defence to loyalty, conflict or misuse claims.
4. Causation and quantum	Is the pleaded loss legally attributable to the breach?	Bester Malaysia; Goh Chan Peng; applicable compensatory principles	Recovery is limited by causation, counterfactual analysis, benefits, mitigation, external causes and entity boundaries.
5. Remedy and relief	What legal response corresponds to the character of the wrong?	CA 2016, ss 288–289, 539–540, 581; applicable equitable principles	Compensation, gain-based or transaction-specific remedies, statutory consequences and relief must be distinguished according to their legal basis.

The framework is sequential, but the substantive analysis is not automatically identical across different breaches.

Table 2. Doctrinal Classification of Director Liability for Corporate Loss

Alleged Conduct	Principal Legal Source	Relevance of Section 214	Causation/ Liability Focus	Potential Remedial Response
Care, skill and diligence in commercial decision-making	s 213(2)	May apply to a qualifying business judgment	Connect deficient process to the corporate loss claimed	Compensation for legally attributable loss
Proper purpose and good faith	s 213(1)	Should not be treated as general immunity from these independent requirements	Purpose, good faith and, where compensation is claimed, causal loss	Transaction-specific or compensatory relief where legally available
Reliance	s 215	May interact with s 214 where a business judgment is involved	Good faith, reasonable reliance and independent assessment	Follows the remedy applicable to the underlying breach
Delegation	s 216	Delegation does not itself create business-judgment immunity	Statutory conditions governing responsibility for delegated powers	Compensation where responsibility and resulting loss are established
Conflict or interested transaction	ss 221–222 and fiduciary principles	Material personal interest is directly relevant; conflict rules remain independently applicable	Existence, disclosure and legal treatment of conflict	Depending on doctrine, rescission, account of profits, compensation or other equitable relief
Misuse of property, information,	s 218 and fiduciary principles	Ordinarily outside the rationale for protecting	Unauthorised benefit and/or corporate detriment	Account of profits, restitutionary/proprietary relief or

position or opportunity		disinterested entrepreneurial judgment		compensation as appropriate
Nominee-director loyalty	s 217	Does not displace duties owed to the company	Whether the company's interests were subordinated to the nominator	Appropriate compensatory or equitable relief
Financial-distress misconduct	ss 539–540	Ordinary business-judgment analysis cannot substitute for the specific statutory inquiry	Statutory requirements; insolvency alone is insufficient	Consequences grounded in the applicable statutory provision

Stage One: Identify the Claimant and Loss

The pleading should identify the transaction or omission, the asset or opportunity, the legal entity suffering the alleged loss and the person asserting the claim. Where a shareholder complains only of diminution in share value reflecting corporate loss, the proper-plaintiff and derivative-action principles should be addressed before the merits of directors' liability are considered.

Stage Two: Classify the Duty and Breach

The court should classify the alleged misconduct as involving care, proper purpose, good faith, loyalty, conflict, disclosure, misuse of assets, reliance, delegation or financial distress. This classification determines the applicable statutory rules and materially affects both the relevance of section 214 and the eventual remedy.

Stage Three: Determine the Relevance of Section 214

Where the claim concerns a qualifying business judgment within section 214, the statutory conditions should be addressed individually on the evidence. Contemporaneous board papers, professional advice, declarations of interest, minutes, questions, dissent and other materials may assist the inquiry.

The required process should remain context-sensitive. The information reasonably appropriate for a routine operational decision may differ materially from that required for a transformative acquisition, entry into an unfamiliar jurisdiction or a transaction threatening the company's solvency.

Stage Four: Establish Causation and Quantum

The claimant must establish the relationship between the identified breach and the loss claimed. The court should consider whether compliance would probably have prevented or reduced the loss, whether independent events produced the same loss, whether the company obtained offsetting value and whether the amount claimed belongs to another corporate entity.

Where the claim concerns loyalty or misuse of assets, the inquiry may differ because the appropriate legal response may focus on stripping an unauthorised gain rather than solely compensating transactional loss.

Stage Five: Match the Remedy to the Character of the Breach

Stage Five requires the court to identify the remedial consequence appropriate to the duty breached rather than assume that every established breach produces an award equal to the company's transactional loss.

Where liability arises from breach of care, skill and diligence, compensation should correspond to the corporate loss legally attributable to that breach. The accounting loss associated with a transaction does not necessarily represent the measure of personal liability. Causal counterfactuals, intervening causes, benefits and recoveries remain relevant. Loyalty, conflict and misuse-of-assets cases require a different analysis. Depending upon the applicable doctrine and facts, an account of profits, rescission, restitutionary or

proprietary relief, equitable compensation or other appropriate relief may be relevant. The selection of remedy should avoid duplicative recovery. FGV Holdings illustrates the importance of this classification. Misuse of company assets for personal benefit should not be treated merely as an unsuccessful exercise of commercial judgment. Once conduct is characterised as misuse of entrusted corporate resources, the rationale for deference towards entrepreneurial risk is substantially diminished.

Judicial relief, indemnity and insurance should be considered separately from the primary remedy. Section 581 concerns judicial relief where its statutory requirements are satisfied and should not be treated as an extension of section 214. Sections 288 and 289 similarly regulate indemnification and insurance within their statutory limits. Where sections 539 or 540 apply, personal responsibility must likewise arise from the applicable statutory requirements rather than from insolvency itself.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Courts and Litigation

Corporate-loss litigation should be pleaded and determined according to the sequence developed above. The claimant should identify the corporate right, relevant director, applicable duty, conduct constituting breach, causal mechanism and remedy sought rather than rely principally on the magnitude of the financial loss.

The allocation of proof should be distinguished from the substantive elements of liability. The claimant ordinarily bears the burden of establishing the cause of action, subject to the rules governing the particular claim. Where section 214 is relied upon, the court must determine whether its statutory conditions are satisfied on the evidence. Because the judgment, information considered, deliberative process and interests of the director may substantially lie within the knowledge of the director and board, a director relying upon section 214 will ordinarily need to identify the judgment and adduce evidence supporting the factual basis for reliance. This article does not contend, in the absence of clear Malaysian authority, that section 214 itself necessarily places the formal legal burden of proving every element upon the director.

Judicial analysis should also distinguish the hierarchy of authority. Federal Court and Court of Appeal decisions provide the principal precedential guidance, while recent High Court decisions remain valuable illustrations of statutory application without carrying equivalent precedential status.

Board Practice

Boards should treat decision-making process as substantive governance rather than merely defensive documentation. Decision papers for material matters should identify the proposal, strategic rationale, financial exposure, reasonably available alternatives, principal risks, conflicts and relevant expert input. Minutes should record material questions, reasoning and dissent without becoming artificial transcripts prepared solely for anticipated litigation.

Reliance protocols should identify the competence of advisers, material assumptions underlying advice and the manner in which directors independently evaluated that advice. Decisions outside the company's established business, unusually large transactions and decisions undertaken during financial distress may warrant greater scrutiny because their novelty, complexity and exposure affect the information reasonably appropriate to the decision.

The MCGG and Securities Commission guidance may operate as governance benchmarks even where non-compliance does not itself establish a private cause of action. For listed issuers, governance disclosures may also provide evidence of structures represented as existing within the company.

Targeted Reform

Wholesale expansion of directors' liability is unnecessary on the analysis developed here. Sections 211 and 213–222 already provide a substantial authority-accountability structure. Reform should instead concentrate on clarity, accessibility and enforcement.

First, regulatory guidance could provide practical illustrations of the operation of section 214 across different contexts, including ordinary investment, transformative acquisition, reliance on professional valuation, conflicted transactions and distressed rescue financing. Such guidance should preserve contextual assessment rather than prescribe a single model of board process.

Secondly, listed-company guidance could encourage decision records that identify material reasons, assumptions, risks and conflicts without requiring excessively detailed minutes.

Thirdly, further clarification of the interaction between statutory contraventions, preserved common-law and equitable duties, and private remedies could improve accessibility. Any reform should nevertheless avoid implying that every breach of a statutory duty automatically entitles the company to recover the full amount of a failed transaction.

Finally, the relationship between directors' general duties and sections 539 and 540 warrants further scholarly and legislative examination. Comparative wrongful-trading regimes may provide useful reference points, but reform should not be proposed merely because another jurisdiction adopts a broader civil mechanism. A Malaysian reform case would first require systematic assessment of the operation and limitations of the existing provisions, their relationship with insolvency law and the extent to which identifiable enforcement gaps remain. A comprehensive design for such reform falls beyond the scope of this article.

CONCLUSION

Directors should not be personally liable merely because a company has suffered a loss. Corporate loss is an economic outcome, whereas director liability requires a legally recognised basis for attributing that outcome, or another legally relevant consequence, to the director's conduct. Under Malaysian company law, the appropriate inquiry therefore begins not with the magnitude of the loss but with the identity of the claimant, the duty allegedly breached, the character of the impugned conduct, the applicability of any statutory protection, the causal connection between breach and loss, and the remedy appropriate to the wrong.

The CA 2016 reflects this distinction between managerial authority and legal accountability. Section 211 entrusts management of the company's business and affairs to the board, while section 213 subjects the exercise of directors' powers to requirements of proper purpose, good faith, care, skill and diligence. Section 214 provides conditional statutory protection within its prescribed field for qualifying business judgments, while sections 215 and 216 regulate reliance and delegation. Sections 217–222 separately address matters including loyalty, conflicts and misuse of corporate position or assets. These provisions should be read as an integrated structure rather than isolated rules.

The Malaysian authorities examined illustrate why the legal character of the conduct matters more than the eventual commercial outcome. Petra Perdana and Iris Corporation demonstrate the importance of assessing commercial decisions in light of the information, purposes and circumstances existing when those decisions were made. Bester Malaysia, as a High Court illustration, demonstrates the potential consequences of inadequately independent or informed decision-making. FGV Holdings, also at first instance, illustrates the fundamentally different character of misuse of corporate assets for private benefit. Low Cheng Teik confirms at Federal Court level that the identity of the party suffering the legally cognisable loss and owning the relevant cause of action must also be established.

The five-stage Corporate Loss Liability Framework integrates these principles into a sequential inquiry: identify the loss-bearing entity and proper claimant; classify the applicable duty and alleged breach; determine whether section 214 and, where relevant, the reliance or delegation provisions apply; establish causation and quantum; and match the remedy to the character of the wrong. The contribution of the framework does not lie in treating these individual doctrines as novel. It lies in integrating them into a disciplined sequence that prevents commercial failure from becoming a substitute for proof of breach and prevents an established breach from automatically becoming proof of the entire loss claimed.

The framework is deliberately differentiated rather than uniformly applied across distinct categories of director's misconduct. A care-based challenge to commercial judgment requires close attention to decision-making process, statutory protection and causal counterfactuals. Loyalty, conflict and misuse-of-assets claims engage different doctrinal and remedial considerations and should not be absorbed into a general business-judgment analysis. Financial distress constitutes a further boundary condition: insolvency or increased corporate loss does not itself establish director liability, and any personal responsibility must remain grounded in applicable Malaysian law.

The resulting principle is one of qualified, conduct-based liability. Malaysian law should preserve sufficient decisional space for directors to undertake legitimate commercial risk while imposing accountability where directors act in breach of the duties governing corporate power and the requirements for liability and remedy are established. Courts should therefore neither infer misconduct from business failure nor permit the language of business judgment to shield conduct falling outside the protection afforded by law. The central question is not simply whether the company lost money, but whether the particular loss or other legally relevant consequence is attributable to conduct for which the director is legally responsible.

REFERENCES

Legislation, Codes and Regulatory Materials

1. Australian Corporations Act 2001 (Cth), s 180(2).
2. Bursa Malaysia Securities Berhad. (2024). Main Market Listing Requirements, para 15.25.
3. Companies Act 2006 (UK), ss 172, 174 and 1157.
4. Companies Act 2016 (Malaysia) (Act 777), ss 210–222, 288–289, 346–350, 539–540 and 581.
5. Companies (Amendment) Act 2024 (Malaysia) (Act A1701).
6. Corporate Law Reform Committee. (2006). Clarifying and Reformulating the Directors' Role and Duties. Companies Commission of Malaysia.
7. Insolvency Act 1986 (UK), s 214.
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. OECD Publishing.
9. Securities Commission Malaysia. (2021a). Guidelines on Conduct of Directors of Listed Corporations and Their Subsidiaries (revised 12 April 2021).
10. Securities Commission Malaysia. (2021b). Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance.

Cases

11. ASIC v Healey [2011] FCA 717; (2011) 196 FCR 291.
12. ASIC v Rich [2009] NSWSC 1229; (2009) 75 ACSR 1.
13. Bester Malaysia Sdn Bhd v Tan Tee Kung & Ors [2025] MLJU 2441.
14. Board of Trustees of the Sabah Foundation & Ors v Datuk Syed Kechik bin Syed Mohamed & Anor [2008] 5 MLJ 469.
15. BTI 2014 LLC v Sequana SA [2022] UKSC 25; [2024] AC 211.
16. Charterbridge Corporation Ltd v Lloyds Bank Ltd [1970] Ch 62.
17. Daniels v Anderson (1995) 37 NSWLR 438.
18. Dorchester Finance Co Ltd v Stebbing [1989] BCLC 498.
19. FGV Holdings Bhd (formerly known as Felda Global Ventures Holdings Bhd) v Mohd Isa bin Abdul Samad & Anor [2024] 12 MLJ 503.
20. Goh Chan Peng & Ors v Beyonics Technology Ltd & Anor [2017] SGCA 40; [2017] 2 SLR 592.
21. Howard Smith Ltd v Ampol Petroleum Ltd [1974] AC 821.
22. Industrial Development Consultants Ltd v Cooley [1972] 1 WLR 443.
23. Iris Corporation Berhad v Tan Sri Razali bin Ismail & Ors [2025] MLJU 3079.
24. Low Cheng Teik & Ors v Low Ean Nee [2024] 5 MLJ 579.
25. Marex Financial Ltd v Sevilleja [2020] UKSC 31; [2021] AC 39.
26. Peoples Department Stores Inc (Trustee of) v Wise 2004 SCC 68; [2004] 3 SCR 461.
27. Pioneer Haven Sdn Bhd v Ho Hup Construction Co Bhd & Anor [2012] 3 MLJ 616.

28. *Re City Equitable Fire Insurance Co Ltd* [1925] Ch 407.
29. *Re D'Jan of London Ltd* [1994] 1 BCLC 561.
30. *Re Smith & Fawcett Ltd* [1942] Ch 304.
31. *Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver* [1967] 2 AC 134.
32. *Salomon v A Salomon & Co Ltd* [1897] AC 22.
33. *Tengku Dato' Ibrahim Petra Tengku Indra Petra v Petra Perdana Berhad & Another Case* [2018] 2 MLJ 177.

Secondary Sources

34. Abdullah Abdul Rahman. (2019). The business judgment rule under the Malaysian Companies Act 2016. *Praxis: The Chronicle of the Malaysian Bar*, April–August, 44–48.
35. Armour, J., Hansmann, H., Kraakman, R., & Pargendler, M. (2017). What is corporate law? In R. Kraakman et al., *The Anatomy of Corporate Law* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
36. Bainbridge, S. M. (2004). The business judgment rule as abstention doctrine. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 57, 83–130.
37. Bishop, J. W. (1968). Sitting ducks and decoy ducks: New trends in the indemnification of corporate directors and officers. *Yale Law Journal*, 77, 1078–1103.
38. Davies, P. L., & Worthington, S. (2021). *Gower: Principles of Modern Company Law* (11th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
39. Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (1991). *The Economic Structure of Corporate Law*. Harvard University Press.
40. Hannigan, B. (2021). *Company Law* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
41. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305–360.
42. Kraakman, R., Armour, J., Davies, P., Enriques, L., Hansmann, H., Hertig, G., Hopt, K., Kanda, H., Pargendler, M., Ringe, W.-G., & Rock, E. (2017). *The Anatomy of Corporate Law: A Comparative and Functional Approach* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.