



Centre for Banking & Finance Law  
Faculty of Law

## Working Paper

**An empirical look at the consequences of oppression actions in Singapore**

CBFL-WP-HT01

**Hans TJIO**

Director, Centre for Banking & Finance Law; Professor, Faculty of Law, National University of  
Singapore

[lawtjioh@nus.edu.sg](mailto:lawtjioh@nus.edu.sg)

6 February 2017

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s). They do not necessarily represent or reflect the views of the Centre for Banking & Finance Law (CBFL), or of the National University of Singapore.

© Copyright is held by the author(s) of each CBFL Working Paper. The CBFL Working Papers cannot be republished, reprinted, or reproduced in any format (in part or in whole) without the permission of the author(s).

<http://law.nus.edu.sg/cbfl/>

**Centre for Banking & Finance Law**

Faculty of Law

National University of Singapore

Eu Tong Sen Building

469G Bukit Timah Road

Singapore 259776

Tel: (65) 66013878

Fax: (65) 6779 0979

Email: [cbfl@nus.edu.sg](mailto:cbfl@nus.edu.sg)

The Centre for Banking & Finance Law (CBFL) at the Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore, seeks to generate scholarship and promote thinking about the vibrancy, robustness and soundness of the banking sector, capital markets and other financial services. Through the research our scholars undertake and the events we organise, we seek to create and share knowledge, to engage stakeholders in an exchange of ideas, and to enhance the appreciation of legal and regulatory issues. We aim to bring greater theoretical and analytical clarity to these issues, to examine their policy impact, and to be a catalyst for ideas on how to improve banking and financial systems at the national, regional and global levels.

## **An empirical look at the consequences of oppression actions in Singapore**

**Hans Tjio**

Director, Centre for Banking & Finance Law; Professor, Faculty of Law, National University of Singapore

6 February 2017

### **ABSTRACT:**

Oppression actions in Singapore have been the subject of empirical research in light of the possibility that the use of 'commercial unfairness' as the test for oppression in Singapore has favoured plaintiffs to the extent that businesses have been damaged by successful or even unsuccessful oppression suits. The findings, however, only prove that the complexity of oppression actions has increased. Consideration should still be given to whether some form of contractarianism ought to guide this area of law.

This article has been published in the *Journal of Corporate Law Studies* on 10 March 2017. To access the full article, please visit <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14735970.2017.1298889>.