

COMPANY LAW TIPS AND TRAPS

One legal mistake could destroy your company secretarial practice

Why company secretarial practitioners must understand the law behind every transaction they process

By Mark Silberman CA(SA)
Chairman: Professional Company Secretarial Practitioners (PCSP)

Contents

COMPANY LAW TIPS AND TRAPS 1
Introduction: Are you a company secretarial practitioner or merely a CIPC administrator? 4
Do I actually understand the company law governing the transactions I am processing? 4
PART 1 — CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: THE RISKS THAT PRACTITIONERS OFTEN OVERLOOK 5
1. The Turquand rule: Did the person signing the contract have authority? 5
2. Constructive notice: The dangerous misunderstanding of ring-fenced companies 5
3. Prescribed officers: Personal liability without being a director 6
4. Removal of directors: The resolution that can lead to litigation 6
5. Company rules: The forgotten extension of the MOI 7
PART 2 — SHARE CAPITAL: SMALL ERRORS WITH ENORMOUS FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES 7
6. Par value share conversions: Regulation 31 is not merely a filing exercise 7
7. Incorrect share allotments: The mistake that could cost millions 8
8. Pre-emptive rights: The shareholders who were never offered shares 8
9. Share buybacks: The danger of overlooking the Takeover Regulation Panel 9
10. When a private company becomes regulated 9
PART 3 — DIRECTORS, SHAREHOLDERS AND COMPANY DECISIONS 10
11. Dividend declarations: Shareholders cannot simply demand payment 10
12. Directors' conflicts of interest 10
13. Financial assistance to directors, shareholders and related companies 10
14. Invalid shareholder meetings and resolutions 11
15. Invalid board meetings and round-robin resolutions 11
16. Unauthorised director appointments 12
PART 4 — COMPANY HIJACKING, OWNERSHIP AND FRAUD 12
17. Company hijacking: Can you prove who instructed you? 12
18. Beneficial ownership: Do you know who actually controls the company? 13
19. False resolutions and misleading CIPC submissions 13
20. The statutory registers: The real evidence of ownership 14

PART 5 — OTHER LEGISLATIVE RISKS THAT CAN DAMAGE A PRACTICE 14
21. FICA: Are you an accountable institution without realising it?..... 14
22. POPIA: The risk hidden in every client file..... 15
23. Incorrect public interest scores 15
24. Audits, annual financial statements and auditor appointments..... 15
25. Social and ethics committees..... 16
26. Reckless trading and financial distress 16
27. Deregistration and reinstatement..... 16
28. Amendments to the MOI 17
29. Remuneration governance: New requirements now in force..... 17

Introduction: Are you a company secretarial practitioner or merely a CIPC administrator?

There are thousands of practitioners in South Africa who provide company secretarial services to businesses. They register companies, prepare resolutions, appoint and remove directors, maintain share registers, amend Memoranda of Incorporation (MOIs), submit annual returns and attend to beneficial ownership declarations.

Many perform these administrative functions efficiently. But there is a fundamental question that every practitioner should ask:

Do I actually understand the company law governing the transactions I am processing?

It is one thing to know how to submit a form to the Companies and Intellectual Property Commission (CIPC). It is something entirely different to understand whether the underlying transaction is legally valid.

The Companies Act 71 of 2008 contains numerous provisions that govern the relationships between shareholders, directors, prescribed officers, creditors and the company itself.

A transaction that appears perfectly straightforward can have serious, sometimes catastrophic, legal consequences.

Consider the practitioner who:

- Issues shares without understanding pre-emptive rights.
- Removes a director without following the statutory procedures.
- Prepares a resolution for a share buyback without considering whether the company is regulated.
- Changes the directors of a company without verifying the authority of the person instructing them.
- Submits a beneficial ownership declaration without establishing who ultimately owns or controls the company.
- Prepares a dividend resolution without considering the solvency and liquidity test.

These are not simply administrative errors. They can result in ownership disputes, legal proceedings, regulatory sanctions, substantial financial losses and professional negligence claims.

A company secretarial practitioner might successfully administer 500 companies for 20 years. Yet one serious error involving a valuable company could put the entire practice at risk.

The greatest risk to a company secretarial practice is not necessarily missing a filing deadline. It is failing to understand the legal consequences of the work being performed.

This article examines 30 areas of company law and related legislation that practitioners should understand. The examples are illustrative, but the risks are real.

PART 1 — CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: THE RISKS THAT PRACTITIONERS OFTEN OVERLOOK

1. The Turquand rule: Did the person signing the contract have authority?

Companies Act, section 20(7); common-law Turquand rule.

Suppose a company enters into a major contract through one of its directors. The contract is signed, commitments are made and substantial money changes hands.

A dispute later arises as to whether that director had authority to bind the company.

The Turquand rule protects certain outsiders dealing with companies in good faith by allowing them to assume that internal formalities have been properly complied with. However, it does not automatically give every individual director authority to bind the company.

That distinction is fundamental.

A practitioner who prepares a resolution or confirms authority without understanding the difference between actual authority, ostensible authority and internal procedural compliance could expose the client to a substantial dispute.

The trap: Assuming that a person is authorised merely because they are a director.

Practitioner safeguard: Verify the relevant authority, MOI requirements and board approvals. For significant transactions, obtain properly authorised written resolutions.

2. Constructive notice: The dangerous misunderstanding of ring-fenced companies

Sections 11, 15 and 19.

Under the 1973 Companies Act, the doctrine of constructive notice generally operated on the premise that outsiders were deemed to know a company's publicly registered constitutional documents.

The 2008 Companies Act substantially changed that position.

However, certain restrictions contained in an MOI may have specific consequences, particularly where the company is identified by the designation RF.

A practitioner who fails to understand these distinctions may incorrectly advise a client about the restrictions governing a company.

The trap: Assuming that all restrictions in an MOI automatically bind outsiders, or that restrictions in an RF company's MOI can safely be ignored.

Practitioner safeguard: Examine the MOI and identify restrictions, authority requirements and the circumstances in which statutory constructive notice applies.

3. Prescribed officers: Personal liability without being a director

Regulation 38; sections 75–77.

Many people exercise significant management authority within companies without being appointed as directors.

They may be general managers, financial executives, divisional heads or individuals who exercise general executive control over a substantial portion of the business.

Depending on their functions, they may qualify as prescribed officers.

The consequences can be substantial because prescribed officers are subject to important statutory duties and potential liabilities similar to those applying to directors.

A practitioner who advises a company without recognising these obligations may leave senior managers unaware of their personal exposure.

The trap: Believing that avoiding appointment as a director necessarily avoids statutory responsibility.

Practitioner safeguard: Identify management functions and assess whether individuals meet the prescribed-officer criteria.

4. Removal of directors: The resolution that can lead to litigation

Sections 66, 69 and 71.

One of the most dangerous assumptions in company secretarial practice is that directors can simply be removed by passing a resolution.

Section 71 prescribes different procedures for shareholder removal and board removal. The applicable notice requirements, grounds, opportunities to make representations and remedies must be considered.

The MOI and the manner in which the director was originally appointed may also be relevant.

Imagine removing a director from a family company without following the statutory process.

That director may challenge the removal, seek legal relief and dispute decisions made subsequently.

The trap: Treating the removal of a director as a routine CIPC change.

Practitioner safeguard: Determine the correct statutory procedure before preparing the resolution or submitting the director change.

5. Company rules: The forgotten extension of the MOI

Section 15.

The Companies Act permits companies to adopt rules governing certain aspects of their internal affairs.

These rules are subject to statutory requirements and cannot override the Act or the MOI.

Practitioners often focus exclusively on the MOI, forgetting that properly adopted company rules may affect internal rights and obligations.

A practitioner could prepare a resolution that appears compliant with the MOI but conflicts with an applicable company rule.

The trap: Assuming that the MOI is the only document regulating internal governance.

Practitioner safeguard: Maintain and review the company's rules, together with the MOI, before advising on governance matters.

PART 2 — SHARE CAPITAL: SMALL ERRORS WITH ENORMOUS FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES

6. Par value share conversions: Regulation 31 is not merely a filing exercise

Companies Regulations, Regulation 31; Schedule 5.

Many older South African companies still have historical par value share structures.

When changes to authorised share capital are contemplated, the conversion requirements may become relevant.

Depending on the circumstances, the process may involve shareholder approvals, a board report, consideration of shareholder rights and prescribed regulatory filings.

There may also be tax implications.

The trap: Treating the conversion of par value shares as a simple amendment to the share register.

Practitioner safeguard: Establish the share classes, rights, issued and authorised capital, applicable conversion procedure and potential tax consequences before implementation.

7. Incorrect share allotments: The mistake that could cost millions

Sections 36–41.

This is one of the highest-risk areas of company secretarial practice.

Imagine a company with two shareholders, each holding 50%.

One shareholder instructs the practitioner to issue sufficient new shares to a third party to reduce the other shareholder's interest substantially.

The practitioner prepares the resolutions and changes the share register.

But what if the shares were not properly authorised? What if shareholder approval was required? What if pre-emptive rights were ignored?

The resulting dispute could concern the control and value of the entire business.

A share allotment is not merely an entry in a register. It changes ownership and may change voting control, dividend entitlements and economic value.

The trap: Issuing shares without determining whether the legal requirements have been satisfied.

Practitioner safeguard: Review the MOI, authorised share capital, consideration, approval requirements and shareholders' rights before any issue.

8. Pre-emptive rights: The shareholders who were never offered shares

Section 39.

Section 39 provides statutory pre-emptive rights in specified circumstances for private companies and personal liability companies, subject to the Act and the MOI.

A practitioner may issue shares to a new investor without checking whether existing shareholders must first be offered those shares.

The transaction may be challenged, particularly where the allotment changes control of the company.

The trap: Assuming the board may always issue shares to whomever it chooses.

Practitioner safeguard: Check applicable statutory rights, the MOI and any relevant shareholders' agreement.

9. Share buybacks: The danger of overlooking the Takeover Regulation Panel

Sections 46, 48, 114–118.

Share buybacks are particularly dangerous because they combine company law, shareholder rights, distributions and potentially takeover regulation.

The 2024 amendments changed aspects of section 48, including the previous automatic linkage of certain buybacks to the fundamental-transaction provisions.

However, practitioners must still establish whether the transaction is governed by section 48 alone or forms part of a transaction requiring compliance with other provisions, including section 114.

Where the company is regulated and an affected transaction is involved, the Takeover Regulation Panel (TRP) may have an important role.

The consequences of failing to comply can be severe.

The trap: Assuming that because the company is private, the TRP cannot be involved.

Practitioner safeguard: Analyse the nature of the transaction, the company's regulated status and the applicable statutory approvals before processing the buyback.

10. When a private company becomes regulated

Sections 117–119.

One of the most misunderstood concepts in South African company law is that a private company may become subject to the takeover provisions.

Practitioners sometimes assume these provisions apply only to listed or public companies.

That assumption is wrong.

The application of the takeover provisions to private companies must be assessed against section 118 as currently in force.

This is particularly important because amendments to section 118 were included in the 2024 legislation but have not all commenced.

A practitioner who applies a proposed threshold as though it were current law could give dangerously incorrect advice.

The trap: Overlooking TRP requirements because the client operates a small private company.

Practitioner safeguard: Perform a regulated-company assessment before affected transactions and seek specialist advice where appropriate.

PART 3 — DIRECTORS, SHAREHOLDERS AND COMPANY DECISIONS

11. Dividend declarations: Shareholders cannot simply demand payment

Sections 4 and 46.

A profitable company does not automatically have an obligation to distribute its profits.

The board generally has the statutory role of authorising distributions, subject to the Act and the MOI.

The company must satisfy the applicable solvency and liquidity requirements.

A practitioner who prepares a dividend resolution based solely on shareholder instructions may overlook those requirements.

The trap: Treating a shareholder request as sufficient authority to declare a dividend.

Practitioner safeguard: Confirm the necessary board authorisation, solvency and liquidity assessment, and any additional MOI requirements.

12. Directors' conflicts of interest

Section 75.

Imagine a director who arranges for the company to purchase property from a business in which that director has a personal financial interest.

The practitioner prepares the board resolution without recognising the conflict.

Section 75 prescribes important disclosure and procedural requirements.

Failure to comply may undermine the transaction and expose those involved to legal consequences.

The trap: Recording a board approval without investigating whether a conflict of interest exists.

Practitioner safeguard: Include declarations of personal financial interests in the board approval process.

13. Financial assistance to directors, shareholders and related companies

Sections 44–45.

Company loans, guarantees and security arrangements require careful attention.

The statutory requirements differ depending on the nature of the assistance, the recipient and the transaction.

Importantly, the amendment to section 45 that took effect in December 2024 changed the position regarding certain financial assistance to subsidiaries.

Using an outdated template can therefore produce the wrong legal result.

The trap: Assuming every intercompany loan or guarantee can be approved by an ordinary board resolution.

Practitioner safeguard: Identify the correct statutory provision and determine whether a special resolution, solvency and liquidity assessment or other condition applies.

14. Invalid shareholder meetings and resolutions

Sections 61–65.

Shareholders' resolutions can be invalidly adopted because of errors involving:

- Notice periods.
- Quorum requirements.
- Voting rights.
- The correct resolution threshold.
- The use of written resolutions.
- The requirements of the MOI.

Consider a major transaction approved by shareholders where the wrong voting threshold was used.

The transaction may subsequently be challenged.

The trap: Believing that a signed resolution is automatically a valid resolution.

Practitioner safeguard: Verify the voting rights and procedural requirements before obtaining signatures or holding the meeting.

15. Invalid board meetings and round-robin resolutions

Sections 73–74.

The Companies Act permits board decisions to be made through prescribed procedures, including certain written decisions.

However, notice, participation, quorum and voting requirements still matter.

A board resolution may be defective even where most directors have signed it.

The trap: Sending resolutions to directors without checking whether the legal procedure is available and properly followed.

Practitioner safeguard: Maintain a board decision checklist addressing notice, quorum, participation, voting and any MOI restrictions.

16. Unauthorised director appointments

Sections 66–70.

A practitioner is instructed to appoint a new director.

But who has the right to make that appointment?

Has the appointment been authorised by the relevant person or body? Is the individual eligible? Have the required consents and records been obtained?

Incorrect director appointments can result in significant disputes over who controls the company.

The trap: Treating the acceptance of a director change by CIPC as proof that the appointment was lawful.

Practitioner safeguard: Keep documentary evidence of the authority and validity of every appointment.

PART 4 — COMPANY HIJACKING, OWNERSHIP AND FRAUD

17. Company hijacking: Can you prove who instructed you?

This is an area that should concern every company secretarial practitioner.

The modern company secretarial environment allows changes to company information to be processed electronically.

Electronic systems are efficient, but they create opportunities for impersonation, false instructions, forged resolutions and unauthorised changes.

Imagine a practitioner receiving an instruction to remove two directors and appoint replacements.

The instruction appears to come from an existing client.

The changes are processed.

It later emerges that the instruction was fraudulent.

The company may have been exposed to the loss of banking access, contractual authority or other assets.

The question then becomes whether the practitioner took reasonable steps to verify the instruction.

The trap: Relying on an email, WhatsApp message or third-party instruction without independent verification.

Practitioner safeguard: Use documented authorisation procedures, including independent verification for high-risk changes and secure retention of supporting evidence.

18. Beneficial ownership: Do you know who actually controls the company?

Sections 24, 50 and 56, together with the applicable regulations.

Beneficial ownership compliance is no longer a peripheral administrative task.

A practitioner must understand the applicable definitions and reporting requirements, including the distinctions between registered ownership, beneficial interests and ultimate control.

Complex structures involving trusts, holding companies and indirect ownership require additional attention.

Incorrect beneficial ownership information can result in regulatory enforcement and, where knowingly false or misleading information is supplied, potentially criminal consequences.

The trap: Assuming that the registered shareholder is necessarily the ultimate beneficial owner.

Practitioner safeguard: Establish the relevant ownership and control structure and maintain documentary support for declarations and subsequent updates.

19. False resolutions and misleading CIPC submissions

Sections 214–216.

The fact that documents can be submitted electronically does not diminish their legal significance.

A resolution that falsely records a meeting, shareholder approval or director consent can create serious consequences.

The Companies Act contains offences concerning false statements and related misconduct.

The position becomes particularly dangerous where a practitioner knowingly submits misleading information.

The trap: Preparing documents to support a desired filing without establishing that the underlying events and approvals actually occurred.

Practitioner safeguard: Never backdate, fabricate or knowingly misrepresent corporate approvals. Preserve the evidence supporting every material submission.

20. The statutory registers: The real evidence of ownership

Sections 24, 26 and 50.

The securities register and other statutory records are central to the company's legal identity and ownership history.

An incorrect register can affect voting rights, ownership disputes, distributions and corporate transactions.

A practitioner who maintains incomplete or inconsistent records may be unable to substantiate the company's position when a dispute arises.

The trap: Treating the securities register as an administrative spreadsheet rather than a legally significant record.

Practitioner safeguard: Reconcile resolutions, share transactions, certificates, registers and beneficial ownership records.

PART 5 — OTHER LEGISLATIVE RISKS THAT CAN DAMAGE A PRACTICE

21. FICA: Are you an accountable institution without realising it?

Financial Intelligence Centre Act 38 of 2001.

Certain trust and company service providers qualify as accountable institutions because of the services they perform.

Their obligations may include registration, risk management and compliance programmes, customer due diligence, beneficial ownership verification, record retention and specified reporting requirements.

The classification depends on the actual services performed, not merely the practitioner's professional title.

A company secretarial practice that carries out qualifying activities without understanding its FICA obligations can face significant regulatory consequences.

The trap: Assuming company secretarial practitioners are automatically outside FICA because they are not banks or attorneys.

Practitioner safeguard: Determine whether the practice performs activities listed in Schedule 1 and implement the requirements that apply.

22. POPIA: The risk hidden in every client file

Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013.

Company secretarial practices process substantial personal information.

This may include identity numbers, residential addresses, copies of identity documents, shareholder information and beneficial ownership records.

A practice that stores these documents insecurely or discloses them without a lawful basis may contravene POPIA.

Practitioners also need to understand the requirements concerning security safeguards and notification of certain security compromises.

The trap: Assuming that because information relates to company secretarial compliance, it is not protected personal information.

Practitioner safeguard: Implement access controls, secure document storage, retention policies and an incident-response procedure.

23. Incorrect public interest scores

Regulation 26.

A company's public interest score can determine important reporting and assurance obligations.

Practitioners who misunderstand the calculation may incorrectly advise clients on audit requirements, independent reviews and associated compliance obligations.

The trap: Assuming that every private company is exempt from statutory financial reporting and assurance requirements.

Practitioner safeguard: Calculate and document the public interest score each year and reassess the resulting obligations.

24. Audits, annual financial statements and auditor appointments

Sections 28–30 and 84–94.

Company secretarial practitioners frequently assist with maintaining compliance calendars and statutory records.

Failure to recognise that a company requires an audit, independent review or other statutory reporting may create substantial downstream problems.

The trap: Treating all private companies as if they have identical financial reporting obligations.

Practitioner safeguard: Determine the company's classification, applicable reporting requirements and mandatory appointments.

25. Social and ethics committees

Section 72 and applicable regulations.

Certain companies must have social and ethics committees.

The requirements depend on the current legislation and relevant regulations, including the categories of companies affected, exemptions, composition and reporting.

These requirements have also been affected by legislative amendments.

The trap: Ignoring the committee requirement because a company is privately owned.

Practitioner safeguard: Determine whether the company falls within the statutory requirements and review its position periodically.

26. Reckless trading and financial distress

Sections 22, 77 and 129.

Company secretarial practitioners may become aware of financial distress during the ordinary course of their work.

A company may be unable to pay its debts, yet continue approving significant transactions or distributions.

Practitioners must understand the legal significance of reckless trading and the board's obligations concerning financial distress and business rescue.

The trap: Continuing to prepare corporate resolutions without recognising that the transactions raise serious statutory questions.

Practitioner safeguard: Escalate warning signs to the board and recommend appropriate legal or insolvency advice.

27. Deregistration and reinstatement

Sections 82–83.

Failure to submit annual returns can place companies at risk of deregistration.

Deregistration may have significant legal consequences, particularly where the company owns property, has contractual rights or is involved in legal proceedings.

Reinstatement should not be treated as a universal solution to every legal complication that arose during deregistration.

The trap: Advising that restoring a company's CIPC status automatically cures all historical problems.

Practitioner safeguard: Monitor annual returns, verify company status before transactions and seek legal advice where activities occurred during deregistration.

28. Amendments to the MOI

Sections 15–16.

The MOI regulates fundamental aspects of a company's structure.

Amendments may affect voting rights, director appointments, shareholder rights, transfer restrictions and governance.

The 2024 amendments to section 16 also introduced changes to the statutory provisions governing the effective date of MOI amendments.

The trap: Preparing an amendment without understanding its substantive consequences or the date on which it legally takes effect.

Practitioner safeguard: Review the legal effect of the changes and the current filing requirements before implementation.

29. Remuneration governance: New requirements now in force

Sections 30A and 30B.

The commencement of sections 30A and 30B on 22 May 2026 introduced important remuneration policy and remuneration reporting obligations for public companies and state-owned companies.

Although these provisions do not generally apply to ordinary private companies, practitioners servicing affected entities must understand them.

The trap: Using outdated annual general meeting agendas and failing to deal with new statutory requirements.

Practitioner safeguard: Update compliance calendars, AGM documentation and reporting procedures for affected companies.

30. Using legislation that has not yet commenced

Companies Amendment Act 16 of 2024.

Perhaps one of the most overlooked dangers is the assumption that every amendment appearing in an enacted statute is already operative.

The 2024 Companies Amendment Act has commenced in stages.

Several provisions took effect on 27 December 2024, while further provisions commenced on 22 May 2026.

Other amendments, including the proposed changes to section 118, have not yet commenced.

There is a material difference between a law having been enacted and that law having commenced.

A practitioner who applies an uncommenced amendment could use an incorrect threshold, apply the wrong approval procedure or give inaccurate advice.

The trap: Treating published amendments as operative without verifying commencement.

Practitioner safeguard: Maintain a legislation register recording the operative provisions, amendments and commencement dates.

PART 6 — THE GREATEST RISK OF ALL: PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE

The thirty issues discussed above have one common feature: they require practitioners to exercise knowledge and judgement.

The fact that a practitioner is not an attorney does not necessarily protect them from a claim arising out of work they agreed to perform.

Where a practitioner undertakes responsibility for preparing documents, implementing transactions or advising clients, the terms of the mandate and the standard of reasonable professional care become important.

The Companies Act also contains provisions dealing with statutory liability. However, it is important not to confuse a company's breach with automatic personal liability on the part of its secretarial practitioner.

Liability depends on the applicable legal duty, the conduct complained of, the resulting loss and other legal requirements.

Nevertheless, the financial consequences of a professional negligence dispute can be devastating.

Consider a practitioner earning R60,000 annually from a client.

That client enters into a transaction worth R20 million.

The practitioner processes an improperly authorised share issue, and the transaction is subsequently challenged.

Even where liability is disputed, the cost of defending legal proceedings may far exceed years of fees earned from the client.

Professional fees may be modest. The financial consequences of negligent work may not be.

This is why practitioners must understand the distinction between administrative work and substantive legal advice.

PART 7 — THE IMPORTANCE OF A PROPER CLIENT MANDATE

Every company secretarial practice should have a written engagement agreement.

A proper mandate should clearly establish:

1. What services the practitioner has agreed to perform.
2. Whether those services include legal advice or are limited to specified administrative functions.
3. Who is authorised to instruct the practitioner on behalf of the company.
4. Which documents and approvals the client must provide.
5. Whether the practitioner is required to verify supporting information and to what extent.
6. When specialist legal or tax advice must be obtained.
7. Responsibility for maintaining and updating statutory records.
8. Procedures for changes involving directors, shareholders and beneficial ownership.
9. The handling and protection of confidential and personal information.
10. Appropriate limitations of liability, subject to applicable law.

A mandate is not a substitute for competence, and a disclaimer will not necessarily protect a practitioner from liability for negligent or unlawful conduct.

However, a properly structured engagement is an important first line of defence.

PART 8 — TEN QUESTIONS EVERY PRACTITIONER SHOULD ASK

Before undertaking significant company secretarial transactions, practitioners should consider the following:

1. Have I identified the correct section of the Companies Act governing the transaction?

2. Have I confirmed that the legislation I am applying is currently in force?

3. Have I examined the company's MOI and any applicable rules?

4. Have I established who has authority to instruct me?

5. Have the correct approvals and resolutions been obtained?

6. Have I considered the interests and rights of all affected shareholders?

7. Could the transaction trigger solvency and liquidity requirements, financial assistance rules or takeover regulation?

8. Have I considered any resulting changes to the securities register and beneficial ownership records?

9. Can I substantiate the transaction with proper documentary evidence?

10. Am I sufficiently competent to advise on this matter, or should I recommend specialist legal or tax advice?

If a practitioner cannot satisfactorily answer these questions, there is a strong argument that the transaction should not proceed until the relevant issues have been resolved.

PART 9 — COMPANY SECRETARIAL PRACTICE IS CHANGING

Historically, many company secretarial practices built their businesses around document preparation, company registrations and CIPC filings.

Technology has changed that environment.

Increasingly, software can prepare standard documents, maintain statutory records, manage workflows and assist with filing requirements.

Artificial intelligence is also making it easier to identify relevant legislation, research legal questions and analyse documents.

But technology does not remove the professional obligation to understand the work being performed.

In fact, automation creates an additional risk: a practitioner may process more transactions, more quickly, without recognising the underlying legal problems.

Automating an incorrect legal procedure does not make that procedure lawful. It merely allows the mistake to be repeated faster.

The future of company secretarial practice cannot be built exclusively around the ability to submit forms.

It must be built on statutory knowledge, sound judgement, reliable systems and proper professional controls.

CONCLUSION — YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF COMPANY LAW IS YOUR GREATEST PROTECTION

Company law is not an optional extra for company secretarial practitioners.

It is the foundation of the services they provide.

The Companies Act contains obligations that may appear technical or insignificant until something goes wrong.

An invalid share issue may create an ownership dispute.

An improperly removed director may challenge the removal.

An unlawful distribution may expose directors to personal liability.

A defective transaction involving a regulated company may attract regulatory consequences.

A false beneficial ownership declaration may result in an investigation.

A negligently processed corporate transaction may result in a claim against the practitioner.

These are not reasons to abandon company secretarial work. They are reasons to take it seriously as a professional discipline.

Practitioners who have been performing the same work for twenty years should not assume that their experience automatically means they understand the current law.

The legislation has changed. Regulatory expectations have changed. Technology has changed. The risks have changed.

The professional response must be continuous education, proper documentation, suitable systems, clear client mandates and an understanding of when specialist advice is necessary.

The question every practitioner must ask is not simply whether the client is compliant with CIPC requirements.

The question is whether the practitioner understands enough company law to protect the client—and their own practice—from the consequences of getting it wrong.

A practitioner may spend decades building a successful business, only to face a major claim arising from one transaction that should never have been processed.

One mistake may cost your client millions. The same mistake could cost you your practice.

If you earn your living doing company secretarial work, can you really afford not to know company law?

This article is intended as professional education and risk awareness. It does not replace transaction-specific legal advice. The consequences of statutory non-compliance and the potential liability of practitioners depend on the facts and applicable law.

Prepared October 2026.