 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23347635

Fiduciary Duties and Minority Shareholder Protection under New York Corporate Law

Michael Mayer[1]

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Oxford Law Review 2026.

Abstract

New York occupies a distinctive position in United States commercial law. Its courts hear disputes involving public companies, private enterprises, investment structures and closely held businesses, while state statutes provide a framework for corporate governance, shareholder remedies and limited liability companies. This article examines the relationship between directors' fiduciary obligations, the business judgment rule and minority-investor protection under New York law. It argues that the system is best understood as a set of interacting doctrines: statutory duties of care and good faith; judicial deference to informed, disinterested business decisions; heightened scrutiny of conflicts and controller transactions; and procedural remedies through derivative actions and, in limited circumstances, judicial dissolution. The article compares corporations under the Business Corporation Law (BCL) with limited liability companies (LLCs), whose operating agreements can play a central role in allocating authority and risk. It also considers the direct–derivative distinction, corporate records and litigation strategy. The central conclusion is that effective minority protection depends on matching the alleged wrong to the correct legal vehicle and developing evidence that identifies either corporate injury or a distinct personal injury.

Keywords: New York Corporate Law; Fiduciary Duties; Business Judgment Rule; Minority Shareholders; Derivative Actions; Limited Liability Companies

1. Introduction: New York as a commercial-law jurisdiction

New York's importance to commercial law is not confined to the number of businesses headquartered in the state. New York courts regularly encounter disputes involving directors, controlling shareholders, closely held companies, investment structures and sophisticated commercial transactions. The governing framework combines statutes, common-law fiduciary principles and procedural doctrines. For a student studying commercial law from New York, the interaction between these sources is often more significant than any single provision.

This article asks how New York law balances managerial discretion with the need to protect corporations and minority investors against disloyalty, conflicted transactions and misuse of corporate assets. The question is especially acute in closely held corporations and LLCs, where ownership and management overlap and a minority investor may have no realistic market for an exit.

[1] Brooklyn Law School, Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.; ✉ Email: michaelmlaw@gmail.com

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

The argument is that New York uses a layered model of accountability. Business Corporation Law § 717 establishes a statutory standard for directors' conduct, while the business judgment rule limits judicial second-guessing of good-faith decisions made for legitimate corporate purposes. Where self-interest, bad faith or breach of duty is credibly alleged, ordinary deference may not resolve the dispute. A minority investor may need to choose between a direct action, a derivative action, inspection of corporate records or—if statutory requirements are met—a dissolution petition. This choice is substantive, not merely procedural.

The discussion is doctrinal and educational, not jurisdiction-specific legal advice. It focuses on New York state law while recognising that federal securities law and the law of another state may govern particular questions, especially where an entity was organised elsewhere.

2. Sources and structure of New York corporate law

New York corporate law is principally statutory, but statutes operate alongside judicially developed fiduciary rules. The Business Corporation Law governs domestic business corporations and addresses directors' duties, shareholder rights, derivative actions and judicial dissolution. Section 717 requires directors to act in good faith and with the degree of care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would use under similar circumstances. It also permits reliance on specified officers, employees, professional advisers and board committees, provided the director acts in good faith and the reliance is warranted (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 717).

Section 720 permits actions concerning neglect or violation of duties in the management of corporate assets, certain unlawful transfers, and proposed transfers that may be enjoined. It does not displace all other liabilities; it forms part of a wider system of statutory and common-law remedies (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 720).

Limited liability companies are governed by the New York Limited Liability Company Law. Their management may be vested in members or managers, and the operating agreement can be central to allocating authority. Sections 401 and 408 address member-managed and manager-managed arrangements; § 409 sets a statutory standard for managers; and § 417 addresses operating agreements (N.Y. Ltd. Liab. Co. Law §§ 401, 408–409, 417). The LLC regime is not simply corporate law under another label: contractual terms may determine who exercises authority, which approvals are required and how disputes are resolved.

The internal affairs doctrine is also important. Questions concerning relationships among a corporation, its directors and shareholders are generally governed by the law of the state of incorporation, even where the business operates in New York. In Ezrasons, Inc. v. Rudd, the Court of Appeals reaffirmed the importance of that doctrine in analysing derivative standing involving a foreign corporation (44 N.Y.3d 532 (2025)). A New York forum therefore does not automatically mean New York substantive corporate law governs every internal-governance issue.

3. Directors' duties: care, good faith and loyalty

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)
URN:OXF:UK:0000OXFLR:V1Iz.040

Section 717's express language emphasises good faith and ordinary prudence. The duty of care concerns the quality of the decision-making process: directors should obtain information appropriate to the decision, understand the matter before them and exercise reasonable diligence. They need not personally recreate every professional analysis. The statute recognises reliance on competent officers, employees, lawyers, accountants and authorised committees, but reliance is not a safe harbour where a director knows facts making it unwarranted (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 717(a)).

The statutory text should not be treated as an exhaustive code of fiduciary obligation. New York courts have long recognised directors and officers as fiduciaries and scrutinised disloyal conduct, self-dealing and diversion of corporate opportunities. Loyalty is analytically distinct from care: a director may make a poor decision without being disloyal, but may breach loyalty by putting personal interests ahead of the corporation or using corporate power to obtain an improper benefit. An allegation of an unwise decision will ordinarily encounter stronger judicial deference than a properly pleaded conflict.

Care and loyalty should be assessed through facts rather than labels. A transaction with an affiliate may require examination of the decision-maker's interest, disclosure to independent directors, the quality of the approval process and whether the company received fair value. Board minutes recording approval are evidence, but not conclusive proof of an informed and independent process. Conversely, a transaction that later produces a loss is not, by itself, proof of a fiduciary breach.

Companies should maintain a defensible contemporaneous record: board papers, valuation analyses, conflict disclosures, minutes, expert advice and evidence that alternatives were considered. This is not merely litigation hygiene. It improves governance by recording the assumptions underlying a decision and making it possible to revisit them when circumstances change.

4. The business judgment rule: deference and its limits

The business judgment rule is central to New York corporate adjudication. It reflects reluctance to substitute a judge's commercial assessment for a good-faith decision entrusted to corporate managers. In Auerbach v. Bennett, the Court of Appeals explained the rule's role in limiting judicial inquiry into business decisions made in good faith and in the lawful and legitimate furtherance of corporate purposes (47 N.Y.2d 619, 629 (1979)). The rule protects commercial risk-taking; it does not license fraud, disloyalty or decisions corrupted by improper interests.

The rule is best understood as a standard of review, not a complete statement of directors' duties. A court must identify the challenged act and determine whether the prerequisites for deference are present. If a decision was made by disinterested decision-makers, after an appropriate process and in good faith, courts ordinarily avoid reassessing its commercial merits. If the evidence instead indicates conflict, bad faith, illegality or a failure to exercise honest judgment, the rationale for deference weakens.

In re Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc., the Court of Appeals considered a going-private transaction approved by an independent special committee and a majority of minority shareholders. It held that the business judgment rule could apply when specified shareholder-protective conditions

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

were satisfied; otherwise, entire-fairness review would apply (27 N.Y.3d 268 (2016)). The decision demonstrates that process can affect the standard of review. It should not be generalised into a claim that any shareholder vote automatically validates a conflicted transaction.

Levandusky v. One Fifth Avenue Apartment Corp. applied the business judgment rule by analogy to a residential cooperative board, emphasising good faith and legitimate corporate purposes (75 N.Y.2d 530 (1990)). 40 West 67th Street v. Pullman further considered the rule in cooperative governance (100 N.Y.2d 147 (2003)). These cases help explain New York's preference against hindsight review, but their cooperative-housing context should not be treated as interchangeable with every commercial-company dispute.

The practical limit is clear: a shareholder ordinarily cannot prevail merely by showing that a board chose a strategy that later failed. A stronger claim identifies the duty, the act or omission, any relevant conflict or process defect, and a legally cognisable injury. The rule channels courts away from hindsight and toward evidence of disloyalty, bad faith or defective decision-making.

5. Conflicts of interest and controller transactions

Conflicts arise when a director, officer or controlling shareholder has an interest that may diverge from the company's interests. Examples include a sale of corporate assets to an affiliate, insider compensation, appropriation of a corporate opportunity or a merger in which the controller receives a different economic benefit from minority investors. Disclosure, independence and approval are therefore central questions.

A court may examine whether material facts were disclosed, whether independent decision-makers had authority and adequate information, whether the process was genuinely independent, and whether the company received fair value. The applicable burden and standard depend on the transaction, statute, governing documents and precedent. It is inaccurate to treat entire fairness as an automatic standard for every related-party transaction or to assume independent approval always has the same effect.

Kenneth Cole connects procedural safeguards with judicial review in the specific setting of a going-private merger. An independent committee is meaningful only if its members are genuinely independent, adequately informed and authorised to negotiate. A minority vote is meaningful only if voters receive material information and the process satisfies applicable law. Independent advice, meaningful negotiation and full disclosure can reduce litigation risk, but none substitutes for legal compliance.

A conflict policy should define what must be disclosed, when an interested person must recuse themselves, who approves the transaction and how the decision is recorded. It should also address conflicts that emerge after initial approval. If a director's interests change or new information comes to light, the company should not assume that the original approval permanently cures the problem.

6. Minority shareholders in closely held corporations

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)
URN:OXF:UK:0000OXFLR:V1Iz.0:0

Minority protection is especially difficult in a closely held corporation. Shares may not be publicly traded, a minority investor may have no ready buyer, and the majority may control board composition, distributions, employment and access to information. Yet minority status does not itself establish a legal wrong; the claimant must identify the applicable statutory or fiduciary basis for relief.

Business Corporation Law § 1104-a provides a dissolution remedy for qualifying holders of at least 20 per cent of the votes of certain non-public corporations. A petition may allege illegal, fraudulent or oppressive actions toward the complaining shareholders, or looting, waste or diversion of assets for non-corporate purposes. Courts consider whether liquidation is the only feasible means by which petitioners may reasonably expect a fair return and whether liquidation is reasonably necessary to protect shareholder rights and interests (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 1104-a).

Dissolution is powerful because it may destroy going-concern value and affect employees, creditors and other shareholders. It is not a general mechanism for expressing dissatisfaction with management. The statutory threshold, the nature of alleged oppression, evidence of asset diversion and availability of a fair return all matter. Not every dispute about dividends or strategy qualifies.

Section 1104 addresses deadlock among directors or shareholders, including circumstances where required votes for board action or director elections cannot be obtained (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 1104). It should be distinguished from § 1104-a: deadlock and oppression are related commercial problems but arise under different statutory tests. Shareholder agreements can reduce deadlock through buy-sell clauses, escalation procedures, tie-break mechanisms and reserved-matter rules, provided valuation, financing and enforceability are addressed carefully.

7. Derivative actions and the direct–derivative distinction

A derivative action is brought by a shareholder to enforce a right belonging to the corporation. Recovery ordinarily belongs to the entity, not directly to the shareholder who initiated the case. Business Corporation Law § 626 authorises a qualifying shareholder to sue in the right of a domestic or foreign corporation and establishes standing-related requirements, including contemporaneous ownership or a qualifying devolution of the interest (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 626). Section 627 may permit security for expenses in specified circumstances, subject to statutory thresholds and judicial determination (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 627).

The direct–derivative distinction asks who suffered the alleged injury and who should receive the remedy. If directors diverted company assets, the immediate injury is ordinarily to the corporation; a shareholder's reduced share value may be consequential rather than a distinct personal injury. A claim involving denial of a shareholder's voting right or a separate contractual injury may be direct, depending on facts and governing law. Pleading a corporate injury as personal risks dismissal; treating a genuinely personal injury as derivative can misidentify the proper plaintiff and remedy.

Derivative litigation also raises demand-related questions: must the shareholder ask the board to pursue the claim, or can demand be excused under the applicable law? New York statutory and common-law rules must be examined in context. Where a foreign corporation is involved, the

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

internal affairs doctrine may make another jurisdiction's law relevant. Ezrasons is a reminder that New York's statutory framework does not automatically displace the law governing the internal affairs of a foreign corporation (44 N.Y.3d 532 (2025)).

Derivative actions provide a remedy where those controlling a company might otherwise prevent it from suing. They also carry costs: discovery, management distraction, reputational consequences and the risk of weak or duplicative litigation. Courts must balance access to a remedy with procedures designed to ensure the claim is pursued for the company's benefit.

8. LLC governance: contract, duties and derivative remedies

New York LLCs are widely used for real-estate ventures, investment structures and privately held operating companies. Their flexibility makes the operating agreement particularly important. It may allocate management authority, voting thresholds, distributions, transfer restrictions, information rights, exit rights and dispute procedures. Reading only statutory defaults can overlook the provisions that actually govern the relationship.

Section 409 provides that an LLC manager must act in good faith and with the degree of care an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would use under similar circumstances. It permits reliance on information from employees, professional advisers and authorised manager classes in specified conditions (N.Y. Ltd. Liab. Co. Law § 409). The operating agreement and related statutes should be reviewed before concluding what duties apply or which modifications are permissible.

Tzolis v. Wolff is a foundational Court of Appeals decision on LLC derivative suits. The Court held that LLC members may bring derivative actions on behalf of an LLC even though the statute did not expressly provide a detailed procedure for such suits (10 N.Y.3d 100 (2008)). The dispute involved allegations that those in control arranged a lease and sale of the LLC's principal asset on terms alleged to be below market value and personally benefited. The decision reflects the importance of preserving a remedy where entity assets are allegedly misused.

Tzolis does not mean every member can recover personally for every injury to the LLC. The derivative form exists because the company's claim is distinct from a member's own claim. Nor does the decision eliminate the need to analyse the operating agreement, standing, limitations and governing law. Its enduring point is that statutory silence did not leave the LLC without a derivative remedy for alleged fiduciary wrongdoing.

The operating agreement should address conflicts, related-party transactions, access to records, distributions, deadlock, manager removal, transfers, buyout mechanics and dispute resolution. Drafting should distinguish mandatory rules from defaults and state how the agreement interacts with statutory duties.

9. Evidence, records and litigation strategy

Commercial disputes are often decided as much by documents as by abstract fiduciary principles. A claimant alleging self-dealing may need evidence of transaction terms, the decision-maker's interest,

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

alternatives available to the company and economic impact. A director defending a decision may rely on board papers, expert reports, minutes and evidence that the issue was investigated. The question is not merely whether documents exist, but whether they show a credible contemporaneous process.

Books-and-records rights can help establish whether a claim exists and who suffered the injury. Business Corporation Law § 624 addresses corporate records and shareholder inspection. A request should satisfy applicable statutory conditions and identify a proper purpose. Inspection is not a substitute for pleading a claim, but it may help a shareholder assess suspected misconduct and avoid speculative litigation (N.Y. Bus. Corp. Law § 624).

Before proceedings begin, counsel should identify the entity's jurisdiction of formation, governing statute, forum-selection or arbitration clauses, limitation periods, standing requirements and proper plaintiff. A derivative complaint should explain the company's injury and why the shareholder may litigate on its behalf. A direct claim should identify the separate injury to the claimant. Damages to the entity, rescission, injunction, accounting, inspection and dissolution are not interchangeable remedies.

Settlement analysis should consider the company's future as well as immediate litigation goals. In a closely held enterprise, a negotiated buyout may be more commercially sensible than dissolution. Valuation, access to financial information, contingent liabilities, payment security and release scope require careful treatment. A settlement that resolves the immediate dispute but leaves governance unchanged may merely postpone the next conflict.

10. Practical governance lessons for New York businesses

First, boards should distinguish business risk from conflicts. A risky decision made after informed deliberation may deserve deference; a transaction designed to enrich a decision-maker requires different scrutiny. Minutes should record material information and the decision process without attempting to manufacture a litigation narrative after the event.

Second, independent review should be genuine. A special committee needs independent members, adequate authority, information and access to independent advice. A shareholder vote is meaningful only when voters receive material information and the process meets applicable legal requirements.

Third, closely held businesses should not treat informal trust as a substitute for written governance. Shareholder and operating agreements should address information access, distributions, transfers, management authority, conflicts and exit mechanisms. The smaller the group controlling a business, the more costly ambiguity may become when relationships deteriorate.

Fourth, legal analysis should begin with the remedy. If the wrong belongs to the company, a derivative claim may be appropriate. If the claimant suffered a separate injury, a direct action may be available. If the problem is deadlock or oppression in an eligible closely held corporation, dissolution provisions may be relevant. Choosing a cause of action before identifying the injury reverses the proper analytical sequence.

Finally, New York's role in national and international commerce requires attention to choice of law. A transaction negotiated in Manhattan may involve a Delaware corporation, a New York

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)
URN:OXF:UK:0000OXFLR:V1Iz.040

 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23347635

LLC, foreign investors and federal securities questions. The location of the court does not determine every substantive issue; the internal affairs doctrine, contract provisions and federal law may all matter.

11. A structured analytical framework

A disciplined analysis asks five questions: (1) What is the entity, and what law governs its internal affairs? (2) What duty or contractual obligation is alleged to have been breached? (3) Was the decision disinterested, informed and made in good faith, such that business-judgment deference is appropriate? (4) Who suffered the legally relevant injury—the company, the shareholder personally, or both in distinct ways? (5) What procedural vehicle and remedy fit that injury?

This sequence prevents common analytical errors. It stops the business judgment rule from being treated as immunity for all managerial conduct; prevents minority status from being mistaken for an independent cause of action; and avoids pleading company injuries as though corporate assets belonged proportionately to each shareholder. It also directs attention to evidence early enough to preserve records and evaluate settlement realistically.

The framework is not a substitute for case-specific research. Outcomes may depend on the entity's state of formation, governing documents, transaction type, allegations and procedural posture. Nevertheless, it offers a disciplined starting point for students, founders, directors and practitioners.

12. Conclusion

New York corporate law seeks to preserve managerial freedom without placing corporate power beyond legal control. Section 717 establishes a statutory standard for directors' conduct; the business judgment rule protects legitimate commercial decision-making from hindsight review; and Auerbach and Kenneth Cole illustrate both the value and limits of judicial deference. Minority investors are not guaranteed a particular return or the right to dictate business strategy, but they may have remedies where control is used to breach fiduciary duties, divert assets or violate distinct shareholder rights.

The central practical insight is doctrinal precision. Poor strategy is not automatically a fiduciary breach. Corporate injury is not automatically personal injury. A New York courtroom does not necessarily mean New York law governs an entity formed elsewhere. And an LLC operating agreement can be as important as the statute that created the entity. Sound analysis begins with the entity, duty, injury and remedy, supported by evidence of the decision-making process and the transaction's economic substance.

For a student approaching commercial law from New York, these doctrines reveal a core governance tension: businesses need discretion to act under uncertainty, while investors need enforceable boundaries against disloyalty and misuse of control. New York's layered approach does not eliminate the tension; it provides legal tools for managing it.

OXFORD LAW REVIEW
Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

URN:OXF:UK:0000OXFLR:V1Iz.040

References

Auerbach v. Bennett, 47 N.Y.2d 619 (1979).

Business Corporation Law (N.Y.), §§ 624, 626–627, 717, 720, 1104, 1104-a.

Ezrasons, Inc. v. Rudd, 44 N.Y.3d 532 (2025).

In re Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc., 27 N.Y.3d 268 (2016).

Levandusky v. One Fifth Avenue Apartment Corp., 75 N.Y.2d 530 (1990).

Limited Liability Company Law (N.Y.), §§ 401, 408–409, 417.

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 717: Duty of directors. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/717

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 720: Action against directors and officers for misconduct. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/720

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 624: Books and records; prima facie evidence. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation.

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 626: Shareholders' derivative action. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/626

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 627: Security for expenses in derivative actions. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/627

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 1104: Petition in case of deadlock. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/1104

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Business Corporation Law § 1104-a: Judicial dissolution under special circumstances. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/BSC/1104-A

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Limited Liability Company Law § 401: Management by members. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/LLC/401

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Limited Liability Company Law § 409: Duties of managers. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/LLC/409

New York State Senate. (n.d.). Limited Liability Company Law, Article 4: Management by members or managers. NYSenate.gov Open Legislation. https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/LLC/A4

Tzolis v. Wolff, 10 N.Y.3d 100 (2008).

OXFORD LAW REVIEW
Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23347635

40 West 67th Street v. Pullman, 100 N.Y.2d 147 (2003).

New York State Legislature. Business Corporation Law, Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Laws of New York.

New York State Legislature. Limited Liability Company Law, Chapter 34 of the Consolidated Laws of New York.

Publisher's Note

Oxford Law Review remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. Oxford Law Review or its licensors retain the rights to this article pursuant to the applicable publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s). Any self-archiving, reproduction, distribution, or reuse of the accepted manuscript or published version is subject to the terms of the applicable publishing agreement and applicable law.