1. Every Australian corporation should be governed by some regulations. They should select among having their own “corporation constitution; utilizing the Corporations Act 2001 replaceable rules; or a mixture of both”.

Replaceable Rules

The essential standards for internal administration of a corporation are incorporated into this Act as “replaceable rules”. “Section.141 of the Act” states the necessities of the Act that apply as “replaceable rules”.

A corporation might take benefit of the “replaceable rules in the Act” to administer its inner administration. it doesn't require to have a “written constitution” of its own. This implies corporations selecting to be administered by the replaceable principles won't acquire the cost of keeping up with the constitutions up to date with the law- even if the “replaceable rules” are revised.

Special rules for sole director/shareholder Proprietary Corporation

A proprietary corporation with a single shareholder who is likewise the sole executive has no requirement for a formal arrangement of regulations administering its inner connections - whether those regulations are the “replaceable rules” in the Act, or generally specified in a “constitution”. Consequently, section.135 (1) of the Act gives that the “replaceable rules” don't apply for such organizations.

Where the replaceable rules” don't apply by action of s.135 of the Act, it doesn't imply that sole director/shareholder proprietary organizations need to embrace a “constitution” (despite the fact that they might do that if they want to). Such organizations just need regulations to permit them to carry out business and which manages possibilities.

Constitution

A Company's Constitution oversees the corporation’s inner administration. A Constitution is a fundamental document that oversees the relationship of a corporation director and shareholders, and the actions of the corporation (Corporation Law(a), 2001).

Case Studies

2. **Discharge of contracts**

- **Discharge by performance**

Contracts are most regularly discharged by method for performance, by the parties, of their contractual obligations.

Exceptions - There are a few special cases to the regulation that exact performance is necessary. The parties might likewise change this necessity - by expressly or implicitly giving that exact performance is not necessary. Deciding the important level of performance will, along these lines, rely on legitimate construction of the contract concerned.

Case – *"In Sumpter v Hedges [1898] 1 QB 673"*

- **Discharge by agreement**

Parties are allowed to end their contract by agreement. This may take the type of termination procurement in the contract itself or through another and separate contract.

- **Discharge for breach**

"Discharge of a breach of contract" could be either done by "breach or anticipatory breach". The time when an agreement is set free via a "breach", for the most part implies that one of the party has either "expressly or impliedly" declined to execute out their part of the contract (findlaw.com.au, 2016)

Case – *"Avery v Bowden (1855) 5 E&B 714."*

- **Discharge by frustration**

In few cases a contract would be conveyed to an end on due to of a supervening occasion that is ahead of the ability to control of the parties. For instance, "In Taylor v Caldwell (1863) 3 B and S 826)". (australiancontractlaw.com, 2010)

2. Contracts before registration

According to “section131 (1) of the CA 2001” it expresses that: "if a person entered in a contract on behalf of the organization before its registration the organization gets bounded”. These implies when an individual had signed to the arrangement they should take after its legally binding obligation.

“s.131(2)” - an individual is accountable to pay damages to every other party to the pre-registration contract if the organization is not registered or the organization is registered but doesn’t approve the contract or go into a substitute for it.

“s.131(3)”- If procedures are conveyed to recuperate damages under subsection (2) as the organization is “registered” however does not approve the “pre-registration” agreement or go in a alternate for it, the “court” might held to: pay every or part of the damages that the individual is accountable to pay; transfer property that the organization got as a result of the contract to a party to the agreement; reimburse a sum to a party towards the agreement.

“s.131 (4)” - If the organization approves the “pre—registration” agreement yet neglects to execute out all or a portion of it, the court might order the individual to reimburse every or portion of the damages that the organization is ordered to reimburse (Corporations Act(b), 2001).

A noteworthy case is “*Kelner v Baxter (1866) LR 2 CP 174*”, for this situation the advocate who consented to sign the agreement on behalf of an unregistered organization where held at accountable. Since the organization has not yet been created the advocate who endorsed the agreement was not seen as the organization's agent. Therefore the court found that the advocate was personally accountable. However for this situation show that the advocate was informed of the agreement that the organization did not exist (Fox, 1991).

Critical Thinking

1. **The doctrine of precedent**

“The doctrine of precedent” implies that the ruling of a “court” on a subject of law is obligatory on every court lower in the legal hierarchy. The operation of the doctrine of precedent depends on “Stare Decisis” which a Latin expression is implying that stand by the past ruling. The doctrine of precedent alludes that the legitimate choices made by judges in higher courts are stayed as a precedent, so the choices made by lower or equivalent courts in future are required to be taken after the previous ruling made in the higher courts. For every situation, judges are to

give judgments upon their ruling. This judgment needs to give two sorts of states, which are “the Ratio dicidendi and the Obiter dicta” (peterjepson.com, 2016).

“In *Imbree v McNeilly [2008] HCA 40*, the High Court needed to settle on a case emerging due to a beginner driver had a car misfortune and wounded one of his travelers as well as the standard of care the beginner driver be indebted to a traveler who is likewise also administering or teaching the beginner? In the case of *Cook v Cook [1986] HCA 73*, the High Court had decided that a beginner driver owes a standard of care to an administering traveler that is inferior than the standard of care that a customary driver have to a normal traveler. However, the Court chose not to go after the *Cook v Cook*, and rather overruled that previous judgment in *Imbree v McNeilly*. In other words, in *Imbree v McNeilly*, the High Court dismisses the analysis of one of its own past judgment, for a situation raising comparable realities” (casenotes.curwoods.com.au, 2016).

2. Powers of commonwealth

Parts in which just the “Commonwealth” could build regulations are known as “exclusive powers”. “Section 51 of the Constitution” gives that “the Commonwealth Parliament” has influence “to build laws for the peace order and good quality government of the Commonwealth regarding a detailed listing of topics”. “Section 51 of the Constitution” contains a big listing of parts in which the “Commonwealth” could build laws. Few of those areas are; – “defense, foreign affairs, overseas trade etc – the Commonwealth has the exclusive (sole) power to build laws. Others – education, health etc – are shared to the states. Sections 52, 86 and 90 (customs), and 122 (territories) likewise contain exclusive powers of the Commonwealth”.

“Concurrent powers” allude to parts within which together “the Commonwealth and States” could build laws. “Section 109 of the Constitution” expresses that where a “state law” clashes with a “federal law”, the “state law” is called off.

For current reasons, the most critical resource of authority is the “races power (s 51(26))”, despite the fact that the suggestions for the acknowledgment of “traditional Aboriginal wedding” might likewise depend on “s. 51(21), the marriage authority”. It is likewise important to believe the extent of some additional applicable authorities “the express or implied” preventions on “Commonwealth power”, which includes the extent of any insinuation ensuring the composition of “State courts or powers”, and the state assurance of “freedom of religion (s 116)” (alrc.gov.au, 2016)

Whichever part not secured in the “Constitution” is thought to be inside the “states” authorities towards making rules and is known as a “residual power”. These are the authorities that are not conveyed towards “the Commonwealth at federation’. “Residual powers” incorporate “city planning and civil regulation”. (austlii.edu.au(a), 2016)

3. The defenses available to director when they breach the Corporation Act 2001

The 2 major defenses that directors could use;

SECT 180 - (Corporation Act(c), 2001)

- The business judgment principle.

This defense might apply if a director is defending a matter for “breach of duty of care and diligence” when agreeing on a resolution which recognizes with the normal commerce of the corporation. Towards being effective, the director should explain they: made the selection in good faith and for an appropriate basis; didn’t comprise a personal significance for the subject of the judgment; informed themselves regarding the matter of the resolution towards the degree they wisely acknowledged to be proper; and rationally believed the resolution was towards the maximum benefit of the corporation.

- Reliance on others.

In some situations, a director would not be responsible of exercising a authority if they assumed: on rational grounds; and in good faith; and after building proper enquires within the conditions, that the recommendation specified was made by an individual who was dependable as well as capable.

This defense might apply for instance, where a director follows up on the suggestion of an attorney or a bookkeeper in settling on a choice of the organization.

- Use of a delegated power.

A director might in some situations, relies on the fact that some other person was responsible of the action and resolutions and rulings. The director will likewise need demonstrating that they rational on rational basis and in good faith that that a person were reliable and able in association towards the power assigned.

Case law – *"ASIC v Healey & Ors [2011] FCA 717 (Centro Case)"* (lexology.com, 2014)

When a director finds them in breach of "s588G of the CA 2001", they might depend on the "statutory defenses" accessible under s588H, in so far as it might be appropriate (Corporation Act(d), 2001).

According to "s.588H", a director might have a legitimate defense if they could demonstrate on the equalization of possibilities that:

- The director had rational basis towards anticipating that the organization was "solvent" and shall stay "solvent" if the organization had acquired that liability; or
- The director had sensibly depended on data given by others; or
- The director had as a result of sickness or some additional justifiable reason, unsuccessful to take an interest in the administration of the organization; or
- The director had taken every sensible measure to keep the organization from acquiring the liability.

Case Law – *"The Stake Man Pty Ltd v Carroll [2009] FCA 1415"* (cornwalls.com.au, 2010)

References

alrc.gov.au, 2016. *Scope and Limits of Constitutional Power*. [Online] Available at: http://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/38.%20Federal-State%20Issues/scope-and-limits-constitutional-power [Accessed 22 June 2016].

austlii.edu.au(a), 2016. *COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION ACT - SECT 51*. [Online] Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/coaca430/s51.html [Accessed 22 June 2016].

australiancontractlaw.com, 2010. *Overview of Australian contract law*. [Online] Available at: http://www.australiancontractlaw.com/law.html [Accessed 22 June 2016].

casenotes.curwoods.com.au, 2016. *Imbree v McNeilly*. [Online] Available at: http://casenotes.curwoods.com.au/?p=921 [Accessed 22 June 2016].

cornwalls.com.au, 2010. *Case Note: The Stake Man Pty Ltd v Carroll [2009] FCA 1415*. [Online] Available at: http://cornwalls.com.au/media/34781/article_23%20june%202010_case%20note%20-%20the%20stake%20man%20pty%20ltd%20v%20carroll%20[2009].pdf [Accessed 22 June 2016].

Corporation Act(c), 2001. *CORPORATIONS ACT 2001 - SECT 180*. [Online] Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca2001172/s180.html [Accessed 22 June 2016].

Corporation Act(d), 2001. *CORPORATIONS ACT 2001 - SECT 588H*. [Online] Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca2001172/s588h.html [Accessed 22 June 2016].

Corporation Law(a), 2001. *CORPORATIONS LAW - Part 1.5 -- Small business guide*. [Online] Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/repealed_act/cl184/sbg.html [Accessed 21 June 2016].

Corporations Act(b), 2001. *CORPORATIONS ACT 2001 - SECT 131*. [Online] Available at: http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ca2001172/s131.html [Accessed 22 June 2016].

findlaw.com.au, 2016. *How can contracts be discharged from further performance?* [Online] Available at: http://www.findlaw.com.au/articles/4551/how-can-contracts-be-discharged-from-further-perfo.aspx [Accessed 22 June 2016].

Fox, D.W., 1991. Pre-Incorporation Contracts; Delimiting the Operation of Section 36(4) and Section 36C(1). *Company Lawyer, Comp. Law.*, 12(6), pp.113-14.

lexology.com, 2014. *Honest and reasonable…or irresponsible?* [Online] Available at: http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=104265b0-6172-4af9-a807-bbf8d4ff9a8e [Accessed 22 June 2016].

peterjepson.com, 2016. *Precedent*. [Online] Available at: http://www.peterjepson.com/law/G152-2%20Barnes.pdf [Accessed 22 June 2016].

registeracompany.com.au, 2016. *Company governance*. [Online] Available at: http://www.registeracompany.com.au/faq/company-governance.cfm [Accessed 21 June 2016].