

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

OCTOBER 2025

VOL. 11 NO. 8

PRATT'S

PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT



LexisNexis

EDITOR'S NOTE: TERRITORIAL SCOPE

Victoria Prussen Spears

**NIS 2 DIRECTIVE: WHAT TERRITORIAL SCOPE
FOR ADDRESSING THE CYBER THREAT?**

Romain Perray

**CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY
APPROVES REGULATIONS ON AUTOMATED
DECISIONMAKING TECHNOLOGY, RISK
ASSESSMENTS, CYBERSECURITY
AUDITS AND MORE**

Peter A. Blenkinsop, Doriann H. Cain,
Reed Abrahamson, Simonne Brousseau
and Aliyah N. Price

**NEURAL DATA PRIVACY REGULATION: WHAT
LAWS EXIST AND WHAT IS ANTICIPATED?**

Kristina Iliopoulos and Nancy Perkins

**OHIO ENACTS LAW REGULATING RANSOMWARE
PAYMENTS AND CYBERSECURITY**

Steven G. Stransky, Thomas F. Zych,
Thora Knight and Kimberly Pack

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE DATA SECURITY
PROGRAM: INSIGHTS ON THE GOVERNMENT-
RELATED LOCATION DATA LIST**

Adam S. Hickey and Aaron Futerman

**THE EMPEROR UNCLOTHED: THE ABOLITION
OF THE SHAREHOLDER RULE**

James Brady-Banzet and Emma Williams

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 11

NUMBER 8

October 2025

Editor's Note: Territorial Scope	237
Victoria Prussen Spears	
NIS 2 Directive: What Territorial Scope for Addressing the Cyber Threat?	239
Romain Perray	
California Privacy Protection Agency Approves Regulations on Automated Decisionmaking Technology, Risk Assessments, Cybersecurity Audits and More	248
Peter A. Blenkinsop, Doriann H. Cain, Reed Abrahamson, Simonne Brousseau and Aliyah N. Price	
Neural Data Privacy Regulation: What Laws Exist and What Is Anticipated?	253
Kristina Iliopoulos and Nancy Perkins	
Ohio Enacts Law Regulating Ransomware Payments and Cybersecurity	258
Steven G. Stransky, Thomas F. Zych, Thora Knight and Kimberly Pack	
Department of Justice Data Security Program: Insights on the Government-Related Location Data List	262
Adam S. Hickey and Aaron Futerman	
The Emperor Unclothed: The Abolition of the Shareholder Rule	265
James Brady-Banzet and Emma Williams	

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:
Deneil C. Targowski at (908) 673-3380
Email: Deneil.C.Targowski@lexisnexis.com
For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:
Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
LexisNexis® Support Center <https://supportcenter.lexisnexis.com/app/home>
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call
Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print)
ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print)
ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online)

Cite this publication as:
[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);
Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [7] PRATT’S PRIVACY &
CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [179] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt Publication
Editorial

Editorial Offices
630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2025–Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, the editor(s), RELX, LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc, or any of its or their respective affiliates.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

The Emperor Unclothed: The Abolition of the Shareholder Rule

*By James Brady-Banzet and Emma Williams**

In this article, the authors discuss a landmark decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which has abolished the longstanding “Shareholder Rule” exception to the law of privilege, which brings certainty and clarity for companies, shareholders, and their advisors while at the same time re-emphasizing a fundamental tenet of company law – that the company is a separate legal entity.

In its landmark decision in *Jardine Strategic Ltd v. Oasis Investments II Master Fund Ltd and Others (No 2)*, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) has abolished the longstanding “Shareholder Rule” exception to the law of privilege.¹

The JCPC held that the Rule – which prevented a company from asserting legal advice privilege against its shareholders, save in relation to documents produced for the dominant purpose of litigation between the company and those shareholders – is, and always has been, “a rule without justification” and “Like the emperor wearing no clothes in the folktale, it is time to recognise and declare that the Rule is altogether unclothed.”

The decision of the JCPC is the latest, and likely last, in a run of recent decisions concerning the existence and scope of the Shareholder Rule as a matter of English law.² Although an appeal concerning Bermudian law, the JCPC accepted the appellant company’s invitation to issue a *Willers v. Joyce* direction, thereby declaring that the domestic courts of England and Wales should treat the JCPC’s decision in *Jardine* as also representing the law of England and Wales. As such, the Shareholder Rule no longer forms any part of the laws of England and Wales and companies are entitled to assert legal advice privilege against their shareholders, save where the usual exceptions apply. An appeal from the English High Court’s decision regarding the Shareholder Rule in *Aabar Holdings SARL v. Glencore Plc*³ has now been vacated, the outcome of that appeal having been rendered academic.

* The authors are attorneys at Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP in London. They may be reached at jbradybanzet@cgsh.com and emwilliams@cgsh.com, respectively.

¹ *Jardine Strategic Ltd v. Oasis Investments II Master Fund Ltd and Others (No 2)* [2025] UKPC 34, <https://jcpc.uk/cases/judgments/jcpc-2024-0077>.

² See, in particular, *Various Claimants v. G4S Plc* [2023] 2863 (Ch) and *Aabar Holdings SARL v. Glencore Plc & Ors* [2024] EWHC 3046 (Comm).

³ *Ibid.*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case arose from the amalgamation of two companies within the Jardine Matheson corporate group – Jardine Strategic Holdings Ltd and JMH Bermuda Ltd – resulting in the formation of the appellant company, Jardine Strategic Limited (the Company).

The amalgamation led to the cancellation of all shares in Jardine Strategic Holdings Ltd, with those shareholders who had voted against the amalgamation being offered \$33 per share as “fair value.” Dissatisfied with this valuation, a group of shareholders initiated appraisal proceedings under the Bermuda Companies Act 1981, seeking a judicial determination of the fair value of their shares. As part of the litigation, the claimant shareholders sought disclosure of legal advice received by the Jardine Matheson group during the valuation process. The Company resisted inspection of these documents on the basis that they were covered by legal professional privilege, in particular legal advice privilege.

The claimant shareholders accepted that the advice received by the group was of a type that would ordinarily be protected by legal advice privilege from production to the other party in litigation, but relied on the Shareholder Rule as an exception to the Company’s right to assert privilege.

DECISIONS OF LOWER COURTS

At first instance, the Chief Justice held that the Company was not entitled to maintain legal advice privilege in respect of the advice on the basis of the Shareholder Rule. This was upheld on appeal, with the Bermudian Court of Appeal holding that the Shareholder Rule was an established class of joint interest privilege in the application of which there was no reason why Bermuda should not follow England and Wales.

THE DECISION OF THE JCPC

The Issue Before The JCPC

The Company’s appeal to the JCPC did not simply challenge the transposition of the Shareholder Rule into Bermudian law, but argued that the Rule should no longer be recognized as forming part of English law.

The central issue for the JCPC was therefore whether the Shareholder Rule should continue to exist in some form. The JCPC noted that this issue had been carefully framed “to accommodate any possible basis by which legal advice privilege might be resisted” between the claimant shareholders and the Company. This was necessary because over the course of its almost 140-year existence, the stated justification for the Shareholder Rule had evolved. Historically, the Rule had been justified on the basis that shareholders in a company were in an analogous position to beneficiaries under a trust and that the shareholders therefore had a proprietary interest in the company’s assets, including funds used to pay for the legal advice.

More recently, however, the Rule had been justified on the basis of joint interest privilege – in other words, that the company-shareholder relationship should be treated akin to relationships such as trustee-beneficiary, principal-agent, or partners, and therefore benefit from the joint interest privilege that such relationships attract. This was, as noted, the basis on which Bermudian Court of Appeal had upheld the Chief Justice’s first instance decision in *Jardine*.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The JCPC undertook a comprehensive review of the origins and justifications for the Shareholder Rule, both under English law and the law of other common law jurisdictions.

Following this review, the JCPC concluded that the Shareholder Rule forms no part of the law of Bermuda, and that it ought not to continue to be recognized in England and Wales either:

- The JCPC rejected the historical proprietary justification for the rule, observing that it was wholly inconsistent with modern company law, which recognizes the company as a separate legal entity such that shareholders have no proprietary interest in the funds used to pay for the advice.
- The JCPC also rejected the joint interest privilege justification for the Rule, noting that this was not the original justification and that in any event it could not sensibly be said that there was always a community of interest between a company and its shareholders. The JCPC noted that the interests of companies and shareholders are not always aligned and that shareholders are not a homogeneous group with a single shared interest. *Jardine* was a case in point, given the fundamental divergence of interest between the minority shareholders (who were to be paid out at fair value) and the majority shareholders (who were to receive shares in the Company and were therefore, in effect, paying for the minority’s shares): while the minority’s interests would be favored by a high valuation, the majority’s and the Company’s interests favored a low price. The JCPC therefore held that the company-shareholder relationship should be removed “from the growing family of relationships qualifying for what is now called joint interest privilege.”
- The JCPC also considered and rejected a more nuanced, case-by-case approach, advanced by the Bermuda Court of Appeal for occasionally depriving a company of legal professional privilege in litigation with its shareholders. This approach would allow shareholders to override privilege where, on the facts, there was a “sufficient joint interest” in the subject matter of the legal advice. The JCPC found this approach to be problematic as it would introduce unacceptable uncertainty. Directors and companies would be unable to predict, at the time they seek legal advice, whether

that advice would be protected from disclosure in future litigation with shareholders. The JCPC observed that the need for certainty as to whether legal advice will be privileged or not demands a bright line, otherwise it will fail to serve the objective of encouraging the taking of legal advice.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The result of the High Court's decision in *Aabar* was a patchwork of first-instance decisions regarding both the existence and scope of the Shareholder Rule. The decision of the JCPC in *Jardine* brings certainty and clarity for companies, shareholders, and their advisors while at the same time re-emphasizing a fundamental tenet of company law – that the company is a separate legal entity.

As noted by the JCPC, the directors of large modern sophisticated companies have:

the constant and difficult task of finding their way to a reliable perception of their company's best interests while paying appropriate attention to the interests and wishes of their many different classes of stakeholders, when making decisions, large and small, about the management and direction of the company's business. Many of those decisions will need, or at least benefit from, candid, confidential, legal advice.

As a result of the decision in *Jardine*, companies can now seek and receive that legal advice safe in the knowledge that it will not, by default, be disclosable in the event of future litigation with its shareholders.

The judgment will be well received by companies currently facing shareholder claims, since it removes a route for accessing a company's privileged documents which was previously potentially available to shareholders. The decision will be especially impactful for large public companies, who were particularly exposed to risks from the exercise of the Shareholder Rule. Shareholders pursuing litigation against a company will now need to find supporting evidence for their claim in non-privileged documents and will not be able to delve into the company's legal advice.