INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MERGERS AND JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES

AUTHOR – VARSHA DAS, STUDENT AT CHRIST (DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY)

BEST CITATION – VARSHA DAS, SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS OF CROSS-BORDER MERGERS AND JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 6 (2) OF 2026, PG. 603-615, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Abstract

Cross-border mergers represent a pivotal strategy for global corporate expansion, enabling companies to access new markets, optimise operations, and achieve synergies amid economic globalisation. These transactions involve the amalgamation of entities from different jurisdictions, governed by a complex interplay of domestic and international laws, but they frequently encounter substantive hurdles rooted in divergent legal systems, regulatory frameworks, and enforcement mechanisms.

In India, the legal architecture for cross-border mergers crystallised with Section 234 of the Companies Act, 2013[1507], supplemented by Rule 25A of the Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016[1508], and the Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018[1509]. Inbound mergers, where foreign entities merge into Indian companies, enjoy streamlined approvals via deemed RBI consent and tax exemptions under Sections 47(vi) and (vii) of the Income-tax Act, 1961[1510], facilitating capital gains relief and loss carry-forwards. Conversely, outbound mergers, allowing Indian firms to merge into foreign entities from notified jurisdictions (e.g., USA, UK, Singapore, Mauritius), face stringent FEMA compliance, sectoral FDI caps, and the absence of tax neutrality, often triggering capital gains taxation and eroding shareholder value.

[1507] Companies Act, 2013, § 234, No. 18, Acts of Parliament, 2013 (India).
[1508] Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016, r. 25A.
[1509] Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018.
[1510] Income-tax Act, 1961, §§ 47(vi), 47(vii), No. 43, Acts of Parliament, 1961 (India).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Jurisdictional challenges amplify these substantive issues, manifesting as regulatory fragmentation across multiple authorities: RBI for forex, SEBI for listed entities, CCI under the Competition Act, 2002[1511], for anti-trust scrutiny (with extraterritorial reach and 210-day review periods), and NCLT for scheme sanction. Overlaps lead to procedural delays, duplicated due diligence, and inconsistent valuations, compounded by uncertainties in foreign judgment recognition, non-harmonised insolvency (lacking UNCITRAL Model Law alignment[1512]), and stamp duty disparities. Judicial precedents underscore these frictions; in ***Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.*** **(2019)**[1513], NCLT rejected an outbound demerger for exceeding Section 234's merger-only scope, while ***Tata Chemicals*** **(2020)**[1514] and ***Right Match Holdings*** **(2021)**[1515] affirmed approvals post-compliance certification, emphasising shareholder prudence over appellate interference.

Comparatively, regimes in the US (Hart-Scott-Rodino Act[1516] with coordinated clearances), UK (Enterprise Act[1517] efficiencies), and Singapore (single-window merger notifications)[1518] mitigate challenges through harmonisation, reducing timelines to months versus India's multi-year odysseys. Cultural mismatches, transfer pricing under arm's-length mandates, and post-merger integration risks, such as IP transfers and employee liabilities, further erode efficiencies, deterring FDI inflows.

Reforms are imperative: enact single-window clearances, extend tax neutrality to outbound deals, notify reciprocal insolvency jurisdictions, and align with OECD guidelines[1519] for convergent merger reviews. Such measures would bolster India's M&A competitiveness, fostering investor confidence and economic integration in a multipolar world.

Introduction

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions (M&A) entail combining companies across different nations, creating unique structural, legal, and regulatory challenges. These transactions are driven by market expansion, technology acquisition, diversification, and economies of scale but are complicated by divergent legal frameworks, cultural differences, and regulatory barriers. The research underscores the importance of understanding substantive legal frameworks and jurisdictional hurdles to ensure efficient deal execution and post-merger success.

I. Substantive Analysis of Cross-Border Mergers

1. Concept and Types

Cross-border mergers integrate distinct companies, transforming assets and liabilities across borders to form new or affiliated legal entities. The types include horizontal (same industry), vertical (supply chain relationships), and conglomerate mergers (unrelated businesses), all requiring nuanced legal treatment depending on jurisdictional overlap.

Cross-border mergers, governed by frameworks like India's Section 234 of the Companies Act, 2013, and FEMA (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018, are classified by direction (inbound/outbound) and business alignment (horizontal, vertical, conglomerate). These structures enable global expansion but demand navigating regulatory overlaps, tax implications, and jurisdictional variances.

[1511] Competition Act, 2002, No. 12, Acts of Parliament, 2002 (India).
[1512] United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.
[1513] In re Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., NCLT Ahmedabad Bench, Order dated 19 December 2019.
[1514] Tata Chemicals Ltd., NCLT Mumbai Bench, Order dated 10 January 2020.
[1515] In re Scheme of Amalgamation of Right Match Holdings Ltd. with R Systems International Ltd., NCLT New Delhi Bench, Order dated 1 February 2021.
[1516] Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-435 (US).
[1517] Enterprise Act 2002 (UK).
[1518] Companies Act and Merger Notification Regime under Competition Act (Singapore).
[1519] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, https://www.oecd.org (last visited March 9, 2026).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

a. Inbound Mergers

Inbound mergers involve a foreign company merging into an Indian entity, with the Indian firm emerging as the surviving company, thereby facilitating foreign direct investment (FDI) into India. This type benefits from streamlined processes, including deemed RBI approval upon NCLT sanction, tax neutrality on capital gains under Section 47 (vi) of the Income-tax Act (allowing tax-free transfer of shares), and carry-forward of pre-merger losses subject to conditions like 50% continuity of business.

Key procedural steps include valuation certification, creditor notices, and CCI clearance if thresholds are met, often taking 12-18 months. Risks involve foreign exchange compliance and minority shareholder dissent.

Examples:

- Walmart-Flipkart (2018): Walmart (US) acquired 77% of Flipkart for $16 billion, structured with inbound elements merging Flipkart's operations into Walmart's Indian subsidiary (now Flipkart Group). This integrated e-commerce logistics boosts Walmart's India market share amid FDI e-commerce norms.
- Daiichi Sankyo-Ranbaxy (2008-2014): Japanese pharma giant Daiichi merged with Ranbaxy Laboratories (India), gaining access to generics despite later Sun Pharma buyout complications from US FDA issues. It highlighted IP transfer and pricing challenges.

b. Outbound Mergers

Outbound mergers see an Indian company merging into a foreign entity from notified jurisdictions (e.g., USA, UK, Singapore, UAE, Mauritius), with the foreign company as the resultant.

They require prior RBI approval, compliance with sectoral FDI caps (e.g., 100% in most sectors), fair valuation under FEMA, and no capital gains tax relief, triggering shareholder taxation, plus NCLT oversight for creditor protection.

c. Horizontal Cross-Border Mergers

Horizontal mergers unite competitors in the same industry and supply chain stage to achieve economies of scale, eliminate rivalry, and dominate markets.

In cross-border contexts, they trigger rigorous antitrust review (e.g., India's CCI with global turnover thresholds, US HSR Act), focusing on market concentration via the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index. Synergies arise in R&D, branding, and distribution, but integration risks cultural clashes and layoffs.

Examples:

- Vodafone-Idea (2018): UK-based Vodafone merged with India's Idea Cellular, forming Vodafone Idea Ltd. (40% market share), consolidating telecom spectrum/assets amid 4G rollout. CCI approved post-remedies.
- Exxon-Mobil (1999): US oil majors merged horizontally ($81 billion), creating the world's largest energy firm then, streamlining refining/marketing globally.

d. Vertical Cross-Border Mergers

Vertical mergers integrate different supply chain levels (e.g., supplier-manufacturer) for efficiency, cost reduction, and supply assurance. They face less competition scrutiny but invite transfer pricing audits (arm's-length under OECD/India rules) and vertical foreclosure concerns. Benefits include inventory control and bargaining power, though regulatory caps (e.g., defence sectors) apply.

Examples:

- Tata Motors-Jaguar Land Rover (2008): Tata (India) acquired/merged JLR (UK), linking auto manufacturing with luxury design/distribution, enhancing tech transfers and exports.
- IKEA's Supply Chain Acquisitions (2015-2021): Swedish IKEA bought Romanian forests and US timber firms, vertically securing wood for furniture amid sustainability mandates.

e. Conglomerate Cross-Border Mergers

Conglomerate mergers combine unrelated businesses for diversification, risk mitigation, and financial synergies without direct competition. They bypass heavy antitrust but complicate governance, cultural integration, and focus dilution; tax structuring via a holding company's aid.

Examples:

- Reliance Industries-Hamleys (2019): India's Reliance (energy/petrochemical) merged with the UK toy retailer, diversifying retail amid Jio's digital pivot.

2. Legal Frameworks

Cross-border mergers enable global corporate restructuring but operate under multifaceted legal frameworks balancing corporate, forex, competition, and tax laws.

Indian Framework

India's regime, introduced via the Companies (Amendment) Act, 2017[1520], centres on Section 234 of the Companies Act, 2013 (read with Rule 25A, Companies (Compromises, Arrangements and Amalgamations) Rules, 2016), enabling inbound/outbound mergers with foreign companies from notified jurisdictions (e.g., USA, UK, Singapore, UAE). Schemes require NCLT sanction under Sections 230-232[1521], involving board resolutions, creditor/shareholder meetings (75% approval), disclosures, and NOCs from regulators/creditors; timelines span 12-24 months. Foreign Exchange Management (Cross Border Merger) Regulations, 2018 (under FEMA, 1999[1522]) provide "deemed RBI approval" for compliant deals, with a two-year compliance grace; mandate fair valuation (DCF/net assets), land-border country declarations, and sectoral FDI caps (automatic up to 100% in most sectors).

Competition oversight falls under the Competition Act, 2002 via CCI, reviewing combinations exceeding thresholds (₹2,500 crore global assets/turnover); gun-jumping penalties apply, with a 210-day review including extraterritorial effects. SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015[1523] govern listed entities, mandating disclosures, stock exchange observations, and pricing norms.

Tax aspects: Inbound mergers enjoy capital gains exemption (Section 47(vi)/(vii), Income-tax Act, 1961) and loss carry-forwards; outbound lacks neutrality, attracting 20% LTCG tax, plus GAAR/transfer pricing scrutiny (arm's-length). Insolvency interplay: IBC, 2016[1524] aligns via NCLT, but cross-border lacks full UNCITRAL Model Law adoption.

Judicial precedents like Sun Pharma (2019) (outbound rejection) and Tata Chemicals (2020) (approval) clarify prudence standards.

International Frameworks

United States: Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act, 1976 mandates pre-merger notifications to FTC/DOJ for deals over $119.5 million (2025 thresholds), with 30-day waits and second requests; Clayton Act Section 7[1525] prohibits anti-competitive effects. CFIUS reviews national security[1526] for inbound FDI. State attorneys general and sector regulators (e.g., FCC for telecom) add layers; tax under IRC Sections 368/354 offers reorganisation non-recognition.

European Union: EU Merger Regulation (139/2004)[1527] imposes one-stop notification for turnovers >€5 billion (global) or €2.5 billion (EU), with Phase I (25 days)/II (90 days) reviews by European Commission focusing on dominance; Article 101/102 TFEU[1528] curbs cartels/abuse. Member states handle non-concentrations.

[1520] Companies (Amendment) Act, 2017, No. 1, Acts of Parliament, 2017 (India).
[1521] Companies Act, 2013, §§ 230-232, No. 18, Acts of Parliament, 2013 (India).
[1522] Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999, No. 42, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India).
[1523] SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015.
[1524] Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, No. 31, Acts of Parliament, 2016 (India).
[1525] Clayton Act, § 7 (US).
[1526] Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS).
[1527] Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 (EU Merger Regulation).
[1528] Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, art. 101, 102.

Harmonized corporate directives (e.g., Cross-Border Mergers Directive 2019/2121[1529]) simplify intra-EU deals.

Singapore: Companies Act and Merger Notification Regime under Competition Act require CCMAW filings >S$200 million; MAS oversees finance, with streamlined inbound FDI. Aligns with ASEAN for regional ease.

United Kingdom: Enterprise Act 2002 via CMA mandates voluntary notifications >£100 million; public interest tests cover media/security; post-Brexit, independent from EU.

3. Substantive Challenges

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions (M&A) represent a cornerstone of global economic integration, enabling firms to access new markets, technologies, and efficiencies. In 2024-2025, they accounted for roughly 30% of global deal value despite geopolitical headwinds. Yet jurisdictional challenges arising from overlapping regulatory oversight across sovereign legal systems create profound substantive obstacles. These are not merely procedural filing burdens but deep conflicts in substantive law: how jurisdictions define competitive harm, assess efficiencies, allocate remedies, and balance commercial interests against national security or public policy goals. Divergences stem from differing economic philosophies, market definitions, and policy priorities, often leading to prolonged reviews, conflicting outcomes, abandoned deals, and escalated costs (estimated at $3.3-5.4 million per deal on average for multiple filings).

The core jurisdictional framework exacerbates these issues through extraterritorial application of merger control. No universal treaty governs cross-border concentrations; instead, regimes like the US Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act, EU Merger Regulation (EUMR), UK Enterprise Act, and China's Anti-Monopoly Law[1530] assert jurisdiction based on local effects, turnover thresholds, or "nexus" criteria. A transaction involving a US target and European buyer may trigger simultaneous reviews by the FTC/DOJ, European Commission (EC), and national authorities. Substantive tests diverge: the US employs a "substantial lessening of competition" (SLC) standard with 2023 Merger Guidelines emphasizing labor markets and innovation harms; the EU uses "significant impediment to effective competition" (SIEC) with greater weight on dynamic effects in digital markets; the UK's "material influence" test under the new Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers (DMCC) Act 2024[1531] captures vertical and conglomerate theories more aggressively.

These differences produce substantive uncertainty. Market definition, geographic and product vary: what constitutes a global tech market in the US may be segmented nationally elsewhere. Efficiencies (e.g., innovation synergies in AI deals) receive inconsistent credit. Remedies clash: one authority may demand structural divestitures while another accepts behavioural commitments. The OECD has documented these divergences arising from varying competitive conditions, legal frameworks, and enforcement priorities, undermining predictability and increasing litigation risks.

Concrete examples underscore the friction. Microsoft's partnership with Inflexion AI was deemed a reportable concentration by the EC (acqui-hire with lasting influence) and reviewed by the UK CMA (cleared on chatbot/foundation-model merits), while German authorities lacked jurisdiction absent "substantial operations." Adobe's $20 billion Figma deal collapsed amid EC concerns over "reverse killer acquisition" foreclosure in design software. Booking Holdings' eTraveli prohibition relied on novel conglomerate leveraging theory rejected in other jurisdictions. In the US, FTC challenges like Tapestry/Capri highlighted labour-market monopsony harms novel under prior guidelines. China's SAMR has called in below-threshold

[1529] Directive (EU) 2019/2121 (Cross-Border Mergers Directive).
[1530] Anti-Monopoly Law (China).
[1531] Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act 2024 (UK).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

deals (e.g., Synopsys/Ansys, Keysight/Spirent) amid geopolitical sensitivities.

National security and foreign direct investment (FDI) screening introduce another substantive dimension. The US Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), expanded by FIRRMA (2018)[1532], reviews not only control acquisitions but also non-controlling investments in "TID" businesses (critical technology, infrastructure, sensitive data). Mandatory filings apply for government-affiliated investors; unreviewed deals remain subject to perpetual call-in. Similar regimes exist in the EU (screening coordination), the UK, Australia (mandatory from 2026), and elsewhere. Substantive assessment weighs supply-chain resilience, IP leakage, and data sovereignty and factors beyond competition.

Additional substantive hurdles compound the picture. Tax regimes create structural complexity: US anti-inversion rules (Section 7874)[1533] and controlled foreign corporation (CFC)[1534] provisions can recharacterize foreign acquirors as US taxpayers or trigger immediate taxation on deferred income, distorting deal economics. Global minimum taxes (Pillar Two/OECD, US CAMT) overlay further. Securities laws impose extraterritorial antifraud liability (Rule 10b-5)[1535] and disclosure burdens for US-listed targets or foreign private issuers (FPIs), with Tier I/II exemptions for cross-border tenders offering only partial relief. Data protection, GDPR cross-border transfer restrictions[1536] versus lighter regimes elsewhere, raises sovereignty clashes in tech M&A. Labour and employment laws differ on worker protections, complicating integration.

Mitigation demands a proactive, multi-jurisdictional strategy. Early legal and economic modelling of substantive theories (market shares, innovation effects, national security nexus) is essential. Engaging local counsel, pre-filing consultations, and carve-out remedies can align outcomes. "Hold-separate" arrangements and arbitration clauses address post-closing disputes. Yet structural solutions remain elusive without deeper international cooperation, enhanced OECD/ICN convergence or bilateral protocols.

Looking to 2026, scrutiny persists amid AI/tech focus and potential US policy shifts, though some jurisdictions (UK CMA) signal greater remedial flexibility. Cross-border M&A success hinges on anticipating substantive divergences rather than assuming harmonisation. Parties ignoring jurisdictional realities risk not merely delay but outright failure, underscoring that in today's fragmented regulatory landscape, global deals demand sophisticated navigation of clashing sovereign priorities.

II. Jurisdictional Challenges Faced in Cross-Border Mergers

1. Legal Conflicts Across Jurisdictions

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions (M&A) inherently expose parties to a labyrinth of legal conflicts arising from the coexistence of multiple sovereign legal orders. Unlike domestic deals governed by a single framework, international transactions must navigate variations in ownership structures, fiduciary duties, shareholder rights, contractual principles, and dispute resolution mechanisms. These are compounded by government-imposed restrictions on foreign direct investment (FDI) in strategic sectors, driven by national security imperatives, and the fundamental clash between common law and civil law systems. The result is not merely procedural friction but substantive legal risk: incompatible obligations, unforeseen liabilities, prolonged negotiations, and potential deal collapse. In 2025-2026, amid heightened geopolitical tensions and regulatory tightening, these conflicts have intensified, with parties reporting average compliance costs exceeding $5 million per multi-jurisdictional transaction and heightened litigation exposure.

[1532] Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act of 2018 (FIRRMA), Pub. L. No. 115-232 (US).
[1533] Internal Revenue Code § 7874 (US).
[1534] Controlled Foreign Corporation (CFC) provisions (US).
[1535] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, Rule 10b-5 (US).
[1536] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation) [GDPR].

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

At the core of ownership and corporate governance conflicts lie divergent rules on how control is acquired and exercised. In the United States (a common law jurisdiction), ownership transfers typically involve share purchases under Delaware General Corporation Law, emphasising flexible, market-driven mechanics. Directors owe strict fiduciary duties of care, loyalty, and good faith exclusively to shareholders, as reinforced in landmark cases like ***Weinberger v. UOP, Inc.*** **(1983)**[1537], which imposed an "entire fairness" standard in conflicted transactions. Defensive measures against hostile bids must be scrutinised for fiduciary compliance, with courts applying the ***Unocal and Revlon doctrines*** **(1985)**[1538] to ensure shareholder primacy. In contrast, civil law jurisdictions such as Germany operate under the Aktiengesetz [1539](Stock Corporation Act), mandating co-determination: employee representatives occupy half the supervisory board seats in larger firms, diluting pure shareholder control. Ownership may require works council approval for post-merger integration, creating veto-like powers absent in US practice. These divergences manifest in cross-border deals as conflicting board oversight obligations. A US acquirer of a German target, for instance, may face US shareholder suits alleging breach of fiduciary duty for failing to maximise value, while simultaneously violating German stakeholder duties by ignoring employee consultation, leading to hybrid governance structures that satisfy neither regime fully.

Government restrictions on foreign investments in strategic sectors introduce a parallel, often overriding, layer of sovereign intervention. National security reviews, once peripheral, now dominate deal viability. In the US, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) expanded post-FIRRMA (2018) and under the 2025 "America First Investment Policy "dramatically." Mandatory filings apply to critical technologies (semiconductors, AI, quantum), critical infrastructure, and sensitive data; even non-controlling stakes trigger scrutiny for Chinese-linked investors. The Outbound Investment Security Program (effective January 2025) prohibits US persons from certain investments in China/Hong Kong/Macau in semiconductors, AI, and quantum, marking the first major "reverse CFIUS." High-profile blocks or mitigations in 2025-2026 included advanced microelectronics and aviation deals, with CFIUS adopting a broader "economic security is national security" lens. The EU mirrored this trajectory: a provisional political agreement in December 2025 revised the FDI Screening Regulation, mandating minimum-scope screening across all Member States for defence, semiconductors, AI, critical raw materials, energy, transport, and financial services. Foreign investments conferring control or significant influence face mandatory notification, with the Commission empowered to issue opinions on cross-border threats. Similar regimes in the UK (National Security and Investment Act[1540]), Australia, and Japan have proliferated, creating a "spaghetti bowl" of overlapping reviews.

These restrictions clash directly with commercial imperatives. A US acquirer targeting a European semiconductor firm must satisfy both CFIUS (inbound) and EU FDI rules[1541], plus any Member State overlays, often yielding incompatible mitigation demands (e.g., US divestiture of sensitive IP versus EU behavioural commitments). Geopolitical overlay amplifies risk: Chinese investors face near-automatic blocks in US/UK/EU strategic sectors, while even allied investors encounter heightened scrutiny under 2025-2026 policies. Non-notified transactions invite perpetual call-in powers and potential forced unwinding, deterring otherwise viable deals. Data from 2025 reviews show clearance rates declining for sensitive sectors, with mitigation agreements rising sharply.

[1537] Weinberger v. UOP, Inc., 457 A.2d 701 (Del. 1983).
[1538] Unocal Corp. v. Mesa Petroleum Co., 493 A.2d 946 (Del. 1985);Revlon, Inc. v. MacAndrews & Forbes Holdings, Inc., 506 A.2d 173 (Del. 1986).
[1539] Aktiengesetz (German Stock Corporation Act).
[1540] National Security and Investment Act (UK).
[1541] Regulation on the screening of foreign direct investments (EU FDI Screening Regulation, effective 2026).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

Ultimately, these jurisdictional legal conflicts transform cross-border M&A from a commercial exercise into a multi-sovereign negotiation. Variations in ownership, duties, and rights create governance paralysis; national security overlays impose political vetoes; and systemic contradictions demand constant reconciliation. Success hinges on proactive legal architecture rather than reactive compliance, recognising that in a fragmented global order, legal harmony is aspirational, not assured.

2. Compliance with Multiple Regulatory Regimes

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions demand simultaneous compliance with a fragmented mosaic of regulatory regimes across jurisdictions, far beyond simple antitrust filings. Parties must navigate overlapping obligations in competition law, foreign direct investment (FDI) screening, securities regulation, taxation, data protection, export controls, and sector-specific oversight. This multiplicity generates prohibitive complexity: divergent timelines, conflicting substantive requirements, duplicative disclosures, and the ever-present risk of incompatible remedies that can derail or reshape entire transactions. In 2026, with geopolitical tensions persisting and regimes tightening post-2025 reforms, compliance costs routinely exceed $4-7 million per deal involving three or more major jurisdictions, while regulatory uncertainty remains the leading cause of abandoned transactions.

Competition authorities bear the burden. A single deal may require mandatory notifications under the US Hart-Scott-Rodino Act (30-day waiting period), EU Merger Regulation (Phase I/II with up to 90+ days), China's Anti-Monopoly Law (SAMR review), UK DMCC Act, and numerous others (Brazil CADE, India CCI).

FDI and national-security regimes compound the challenge. US CFIUS (expanded under 2025 outbound rules) mandates filings for critical technology and data-sensitive deals, with perpetual call-in risk. The EU's revised FDI Screening Regulation (effective 2026 following the December 2025 agreement) imposes minimum standards across Member States for semiconductors, AI, energy, and defence, plus Commission opinions on cross-border threats. Parallel regimes in the UK (NSI Act), Australia, Canada, and Japan create a web of mandatory notifications, often with shorter timelines and broader "national interest" tests that override pure competition analysis. A US-European semiconductor transaction, for example, may face CFIUS mitigation (IP ring-fencing) directly contradicting EU behavioural commitments.

Securities, tax, and privacy layers add further friction. Public-company deals trigger US Williams Act disclosures[1542], UK Takeover Code strictures[1543], and EU Market Abuse Regulation obligations[1544], each with different timing and content. Tax compliance now includes global minimum tax calculations, US anti-inversion rules, and CFC provisions that can re-characterise deal economics overnight. Data-protection regimes (GDPR, China PIPL[1545], California CPRA[1546]) impose cross-border transfer restrictions and cybersecurity due diligence, particularly in tech and health M&A. Export-control rules (US EAR, EU dual-use lists) require licensing for sensitive technologies, often with extraterritorial reach.

The practical toll is severe. Parallel reviews extend timelines from 3-6 months to 12-18+ months, with "second requests" and information demands multiplying exponentially. Incompatible remedies force deal restructurings or carve-outs; non-compliance risks fines, forced divestitures, or criminal sanctions. Mitigation demands an early, coordinated regulatory strategy: pre-filing consultations, use of OECD/ICN convergence tools where available, appointment of a central regulatory counsel, and creative structuring

[1542] Williams Act (US)
[1543] UK Takeover Code.
[1544] Market Abuse Regulation (EU).
[1545] Personal Information Protection Law (PIPL) (China).
[1546] California Consumer Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.100–1798.199 (2018) (US) [CPRA].

(hold-separate arrangements, staged closings, regulatory conditionality). Sophisticated parties now model compliance risk quantitatively and price it into valuation.

In 2026, compliance with multiple regulatory regimes is no longer a back-office function but a core strategic imperative that frequently dictates whether a cross-border merger proceeds at all. Failure to anticipate overlapping mandates does not merely delay closing; it can render the transaction commercially unviable in today's hyper-fragmented global regulatory environment.

3. Taxation and Fiscal Challenges

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions are heavily distorted by taxation and fiscal challenges that arise when a single transaction collides with multiple sovereign tax systems. Unlike domestic deals, international M&A expose parties to overlapping anti-avoidance rules, extraterritorial taxation, new global minimum standards, and structural frictions that can erode deal value by 5-15% or force complete restructuring. In March 2026, with the OECD Pillar Two regime now live in over 140 jurisdictions and US rules tightened under the 2025 Inflation Reduction Act extensions, tax uncertainty ranks as the second-most frequent cause of aborted cross-border transactions after antitrust.

The cornerstone difficulty is the clash between residence-based and source-based taxation. US anti-inversion rules (IRC Section 7874) continue to treat foreign acquirers of US companies as domestic taxpayers if US shareholders retain 60%+ ownership, triggering immediate worldwide taxation. Parallel Controlled Foreign Corporation (CFC) and Global Intangible Low-Taxed Income (GILTI)[1547] regimes tax US shareholders on foreign earnings at effective rates above 10.5%, while the Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax (CAMT)[1548] imposes a 15% book-income minimum on large US-listed groups. EU and UK equivalents, via the EU Anti-Tax Avoidance Directive and UK diverted-profits tax, create symmetric traps for European buyers of US targets.

Deal structure choices are equally contentious. Share deals may qualify as tax-free reorganisations under US IRC §368 or EU cross-border merger directives, but asset purchases trigger immediate capital gains, VAT (up to 27% in Hungary), stamp duties (0.5% UK, variable in India/China), and withholding taxes on consideration. Post-deal integration faces transfer-pricing scrutiny under BEPS Action 13[1549] and the Multilateral Instrument[1550], with authorities challenging intra-group pricing of intangibles or financing. Exit taxes on migration of tax residency or asset transfers remain aggressive in the EU (Directive 2016/1164)[1551] and several Asian markets.

Mitigation requires early tax structuring: hybrid instruments, treaty shopping within BEPS limits, hold-separate tax entities, and indemnities for uncertain tax positions. Sophisticated parties now run Pillar Two scenario models before signing and seek multilateral advance pricing agreements. In 2026's environment, taxation is no longer a post-deal afterthought but a front-loaded strategic imperative that frequently dictates whether a cross-border merger is commercially viable at all.

4. Data Protection and Privacy Laws

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions encounter some of the most intractable substantive challenges in the domain of data protection and privacy laws. These regimes are extraterritorial, prescriptive, and carry draconian penalties, turning privacy compliance into a genuine deal-killer rather than a mere formality. In March 2026, with the EU AI Act's high-risk system rules now in force and international transfer mechanisms under renewed judicial pressure, data-related issues routinely extend deal timelines by 4-10 months, inflate costs by

[1547] Global Intangible Low-Taxed Income (GILTI) (US).
[1548] Corporate Alternative Minimum Tax (CAMT) (US)
[1549] OECD BEPS Action 13.
[1550] Multilateral Convention to Implement Tax Treaty Related Measures to Prevent Base Erosion and Profit Shifting.
[1551] EU Directive 2016/1164 (Anti-Tax Avoidance Directive).

$3-8 million, and force structural carve-outs or outright abandonment in tech, healthcare, consumer, and fintech transactions.[1552]

The core jurisdictional friction arises from fundamentally incompatible frameworks. The EU's GDPR (and its sister ePrivacy Directive[1553]) applies whenever EU residents' personal data is processed, regardless of company location. Cross-border transfers require an adequacy decision, Standard Contractual Clauses (SCCs) backed by a Transfer Impact Assessment (TIA), Binding Corporate Rules, or the EU-US Data Privacy Framework (DPF).

These divergences produce concrete substantive obstacles at every stage of a deal. During due diligence, even virtual data rooms trigger GDPR Article 28 processor obligations and risk unlawful processing if personal data is shared without safeguards.

National security and FDI regimes amplify the problem. CFIUS, the EU FDI Screening Regulation, and equivalent bodies now routinely scrutinise "sensitive personal data" (health, biometric, location) as critical technology or infrastructure, imposing mitigation conditions (data localisation, board veto rights) that conflict with pure privacy rules. High-profile examples in 2025-2026 include blocked or conditioned health-tech deals where GDPR erasure rights collided with CFIUS-mandated data-retention periods. Mitigation is complex and imperfect. Parties deploy privacy-by-design structuring, separate data entities, hold-separate arrangements, SCCs/DPF certification, and regulator pre-approvals, but these add high cost and delay. Full harmonisation remains elusive; the OECD's 2026 privacy guidelines have not produced binding convergence.[1554]

In today's environment, data protection and privacy laws are no longer peripheral compliance items. They constitute a core substantive jurisdictional barrier that can dictate deal structure, valuation, and ultimate feasibility in any data-rich cross-border merger.

5. Due Diligence in Multi-Jurisdictional Cross-Border M&A

Due diligence in multi-jurisdictional cross-border mergers and acquisitions is one of the most demanding substantive challenges, transforming what should be a disciplined risk-assessment process into a high-stakes exercise in reconciling incompatible legal, regulatory, and cultural frameworks. Unlike domestic deals, parties must simultaneously satisfy divergent disclosure standards, data-protection rules, corporate-governance obligations, and national-security restrictions across every jurisdiction touched by the target. In March 2026, with the EU AI Act, India's DPDP Act[1555], and tightened CFIUS/EU FDI regimes all fully operational, incomplete or mishandled due diligence is cited in over 40% of aborted or renegotiated cross-border transactions, routinely adding 3-9 months and $4 - 10 million in incremental costs.

Privacy and data-protection laws create the sharpest substantive barrier. GDPR, PIPL, DPDP Act, and US state laws prohibit uploading personal data to a central VDR without a lawful basis, processor agreements, Transfer Impact Assessments, or anonymisation. Sensitive categories (health, biometric, location) in AI/health-tech deals often require separate "clean rooms" accessible only by external counsel under strict protocols. Breaches during diligence can trigger immediate regulatory investigations and indemnity claims that exceed the purchase price. In 2025-2026 deals, privacy carve-outs have forced buyers to accept higher risk allocations or walk away entirely.

Competition and FDI reviews add parallel layers. Antitrust clean-team agreements are mandatory to prevent gun-jumping, yet information shared for merger-notification preparation must simultaneously satisfy CFIUS "sensitive personal data" restrictions and EU FDI

[1552] EU AI Act.
[1553] ePrivacy Directive (EU).
[1554] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD Privacy Guidelines (2026).
[1555] Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP Act) (India).

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

screening. National-security regimes increasingly demand that certain IP, supply-chain, or customer data never leave the target's jurisdiction, compelling physical or segmented diligence that defeats the purpose of comprehensive review.

Financial, tax, and accounting divergences compound the problem: IFRS vs US GAAP[1556] reconciliation, varying transfer-pricing documentation standards, and jurisdiction-specific tax-attribute warranties require parallel expert teams. Language barriers, time-zone coordination, and the need for 8-12 local counsel firms multiply complexity.

Mitigation demands sophisticated architecture: phased diligence (financial first, then legal/privacy), AI-assisted redaction tools compliant with the EU AI Act, multi-jurisdictional clean teams, and pre-signed clean-team and data-processing agreements. Yet no structure eliminates the core jurisdictional friction; parties must accept that perfect information symmetry is unattainable.

In the current regulatory environment, due diligence is no longer a preparatory step but a substantive jurisdictional battleground that frequently dictates deal viability, valuation adjustments, and ultimate success or failure in cross-border M&A.

6. Post-Merger Integration and Its Complexities

Post-merger integration (PMI) is the phase where cross-border M&A deals most visibly collide with jurisdictional realities. While pre-closing approvals create the legal pathway, actual integration exposes the irreconcilable differences in sovereign legal, regulatory, and cultural systems. In March 2026, with the EU AI Act's high-risk obligations, OECD Pillar Two tax filings, CFIUS/EU FDI mitigation monitoring, and GDPR/PIPL enforcement all at peak intensity, PMI failures account for 50-70% of value destruction in international transactions. Synergies projected at closing frequently evaporate, replaced by multi-year compliance drag, cultural friction, and regulatory sanctions that can exceed 10-15% of deal value.

Governance and employment laws create immediate structural conflict. A US acquirer integrating a German or French target must respect co-determination and works council veto rights over restructuring, headcount changes, or even IT system migration, rights absent under Delaware law. EU Acquired Rights Directives[1557] (and equivalents in the UK, India, and Brazil) mandate automatic transfer of employment terms and collective agreements, often prohibiting the rapid headcount rationalisation expected in US-style integration. Failure to consult triggers reinstatement orders, back-pay liabilities, and fines enforceable across borders.

Tax and transfer-pricing integration adds another layer of perpetual jurisdictional oversight. Post-deal, the combined group must instantly align intercompany pricing to satisfy BEPS Action 13, Pillar Two top-up tax calculations, and local CFC/GILTI rules. New financing structures or IP migrations can retroactively trigger withholding taxes, exit taxes, or denied treaty benefits, requiring fresh advance pricing agreements in multiple jurisdictions while tax authorities audit the very synergies the deal was meant to capture.

Data protection and privacy regimes turn database consolidation into a high-risk minefield. Merging customer, employee, or AI-training datasets demands fresh lawful bases, updated privacy notices, Transfer Impact Assessments, and data localisation compliance under GDPR, PIPL, DPDP Act, and US state laws. The EU AI Act further requires transparency and risk assessments for any high-risk system using integrated data, often forcing ring-fencing or partial divestiture of EU assets that defeats the commercial rationale.

[1556] International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) v. US Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

[1557] EU Acquired Rights Directive.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Competition and FDI remedies impose ongoing behavioural or structural straitjackets. Hold-separate obligations, firewalling of sensitive information, pricing commitments, or IP ring-fencing (imposed by CFIUS, the European Commission, SAMR, or CMA) can last 5-10 years and are actively monitored by multiple authorities. Breaches trigger severe penalties and forced unwinding. Accounting (IFRS vs US GAAP), currency hedging, and cultural integration multiply the complexity. Decision-making paralysis arises when a stakeholder-oriented board (civil-law) clashes with shareholder-primacy expectations (common-law).

7. Emerging Trends Affecting Cross-Border M&A

The fields of finance, mergers and acquisitions, and investment are rapidly evolving due to several major trends. First, technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), big data, and blockchain are increasingly being used in valuation, due diligence, and transaction processes. These technologies allow companies and investors to analyse large volumes of data quickly, identify risks more accurately, and improve transparency and efficiency in transactions. At the same time, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors are becoming more important in investment decisions and regulatory reviews. Investors and regulators now evaluate companies not only on financial performance but also on their environmental impact, social responsibility, and governance practices. Additionally, geopolitical tensions and national security concerns are leading governments to more closely examine foreign investments, especially in strategic sectors such as technology, energy, and infrastructure. As a result, cross-border deals are facing greater regulatory scrutiny and more complex approval processes.

8. Recommendations

To effectively mitigate the substantive jurisdictional challenges that plague cross-border mergers and acquisitions, ranging from conflicting competition assessments and overlapping regulatory reviews to incompatible due diligence standards, data privacy clashes, and geopolitical vetoes, policymakers and international organisations must pursue a coordinated reform agenda. First, harmonising competition laws and regulatory review procedures internationally would eliminate divergent substantive tests (such as the US SLC versus EU SIEC standards) and synchronise timelines, filing requirements, and remedy frameworks, thereby reducing parallel investigations that currently extend deal closures by 9-18 months and inflate costs by millions. Second, increasing transparency and predictability in regulatory processes, through mandatory pre-filing consultations, standardised information requests, and public guidance on emerging theories of harm, would minimise surprises and enable parties to model outcomes with greater certainty. Third, developing bilateral and multilateral agreements specifically focused on M&A, building on existing OECD/ICN soft-law instruments but with binding elements, would create mutual recognition of clearances in non-sensitive sectors and fast-track approvals for allied jurisdictions. Fourth, establishing an international advisory body, perhaps under the WTO[1558] or a new M&A Forum, would serve as a central clearing house to resolve conflicts, issue non-binding opinions on overlapping reviews, and facilitate information exchange among authorities like the FTC, European Commission, SAMR, and CFIUS. Fifth, standardising due diligence norms concerning legal, tax, and cybersecurity issues would impose uniform protocols for data-room access, privacy impact assessments, Pillar Two calculations, and clean-team agreements, directly addressing GDPR/PIPL/CFIUS frictions and cutting compliance expenditure. Finally, incorporating geopolitical risk frameworks and ESG considerations into the M&A process, via mandatory impact assessments and standardised mitigation templates, would

[1558] World Trade Organization, https://www.wto.org (last visited March 9, 2026).

embed national-security and sustainability factors early, preventing post-signing blocks and aligning deals with 2026 realities of supply-chain resilience and climate accountability. Collectively, these measures would transform cross-border M&A from a fragmented, high-risk endeavour into a more predictable, efficient engine of global growth, reducing deal failure rates and unlocking synergies that jurisdictional silos currently suppress.

Conclusion

Cross-border mergers and acquisitions remain indispensable engines of globalisation and economic integration, enabling companies to access new markets, technologies, and talent while fostering innovation and efficiency on a global scale. Yet they confront formidable substantive and jurisdictional challenges that transcend simple procedural hurdles: divergent antitrust standards (SLC versus SIEC), overlapping FDI and national-security reviews, conflicting tax regimes under OECD Pillar Two and anti-inversion rules, extraterritorial data-protection obligations (GDPR, PIPL, DPDP), incompatible due-diligence protocols across common-law and civil-law systems, and the protracted complexities of post-merger integration where governance, employment, and remedy obligations clash for years after closing. To navigate this fragmented landscape successfully, companies must proactively invest in rigorous multi-jurisdictional legal and financial due diligence, incorporating clean teams, privacy impact assessments, and Pillar Two modelling, alongside robust regulatory compliance strategies that anticipate parallel filings, incompatible remedies, and perpetual monitoring requirements. Equally critical are adaptive post-merger integration frameworks capable of reconciling co-determination rules, data-localisation mandates, and behavioural commitments imposed by authorities such as CFIUS, the European Commission, and SAMR. Ultimately, these transactional frictions can be meaningfully alleviated only through enhanced international cooperation: harmonised competition laws and review timelines, standardised due-diligence and cybersecurity norms, bilateral/multilateral M&A agreements, and the creation of an international advisory body to resolve conflicts in real time. Such reforms would not only reduce deal timelines and compliance costs but also unlock sustainable synergies, minimise value erosion, and reinforce cross-border M&A as a reliable catalyst for long-term global value creation and inclusive economic growth.