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For many years, partnership has been the oldest and the most basic entity choice which combines the efforts of more than one individual. As commerce progresses, partnership has to compete with other business entities, especially the company which gains much favour due to the advantage of limited liability. Being an unincorporated business association, partnership applies the principle of unlimited liability whereby partners are jointly and personally liable for partnership obligations to the extent they exceed the assets of the partnership.

The principle of unlimited liability in partnership is constantly criticized as it imposes heavy obligations and high business risks upon the partners. However, despite the disadvantages it carries, the principle of unlimited liability in partnership is neither replaced nor modified. Instead, the partnership laws are expanded to include alternatives, such as limited partnerships and limited liability partnerships, which
which provide the advantages of limited liability to the partners. The practice of limited partnerships and limited liability partnerships is already recognized and widely accepted in developed countries such as the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France and Germany. In Malaysia, the practice of partnership is still confined to general partnerships. There is neither development nor major amendment being made to the existing partnership laws. The latest development in Malaysian partnership laws was seen in Labuan when the Labuan Offshore Limited Partnership Act 1997 was passed to allow limited partnership to be practised in the Island.

With the development and expansion of partnership laws that allows limited liability to be practised in a partnership, it is high time for Malaysia to look at these alternatives as one of the means to expand business options and increase investments in this country. Nonetheless, in proposing the practice of limited liability in partnerships, there are many aspects which need to be clarified, such as the entity of the firm, the extent of limited liability which a partner has, the effect on partners’ and third parties’ rights and also the dividing line which differentiates a partnership with limited liability from a limited liability company.

With the above queries and concern in mind, it is the aim of this thesis to clarify the legal aspects of partnerships in the search of the application of limited liability in Malaysian partnerships.
Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

PENCARIAN SATU REGIM YANG MEMBENARKAN AHLI MENGHADKAN LIABILITI DALAM PERKONGSIAN DI MALAYSIA
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Buat masa yang lama, struktur perkongsian merupakan medium perdagangan yang tertua dan paling asas bagi pihak yang berniaga secara berkumpulan. Apabila ekonomi berkembang, perkongsian terpaksa bersaing dengan entiti perniagaan yang lain, terutama sekali syarikat, yang lebih disukai disebabkan kelebihan liabiliti berhadnya. Berbeza dengan struktur syarikat, ahli dalam perkongsian mengamalkan prinsip liabiliti tanpa had di mana ahli-ahli dan firma berkongsi bersama untuk membayar liabiliti perniagaan.

Prinsip liabiliti tanpa had adalah merupakan elemen utama struktur perkongsian yang sentiasa dikritik kerana ia menyebabkan ahli-ahli terpaksa menanggung liabiliti perniagaan yang tinggi dan secara tidak langsung menghalang perkembangan perniagaan dalam bentuk perkongsian. Walaupun prinsip ini dikritik berterusan, ia tidak dimansuhkan dan aplikasinya masih di teruskan sehingga hari ini.

Berdasarkan perkembangan terbaru dalam struktur perkongsian pada masa kini, telah sampai masanya untuk mengembangkan pilihan medium perniagaan dalam negara ini. Dengan memperkenalkan struktur perkongsian yang membenarkan ahli menghadkan liabiliti, bukan sahaja pilihan struktur perniagaan akan bertambah, malahan ia juga akan dapat menarik lebih pelaburan ke dalam negara ini.

Walau bagaimanapun, beberapa aspek penting perlu dikaji sebelum struktur perkongsian terhad dan perkongsian liabiliti berhad boleh diperkenalkan di negara ini. Di antaranya, entiti struktur perkongsian itu, had liabiliti yang dibenarkan, hak ahli dan pihak ketiga dalam struktur baru itu dan juga aspek-aspek penentu yang membezekan perkongsian liabiliti berhad dengan syarikat. Berlandaskan persoalan-persoalan ini, maka menjadi objektif utama kajian ini untuk menyelaraskan aspek-aspek undang-undang berkaitan struktur perkongsian liabiliti berhad untuk membolehkan ia dipraktikkan di Malaysia.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The importance of partnership as a business vehicle is irrefutable. Its establishment in the commercial world was very much earlier than corporations. In fact, in the early days, it was the only business vehicle which was available for two or more persons with a common objective to conduct business. Today, partnerships are still widely practiced particularly in the small and medium enterprises. In fact, for the professionals, partnership is the most opted structure as there are still professions which do not allow incorporation. As of 1997, in the United Kingdom, there are approximately 600 000 partnerships, whilst in Malaysia, there are more than 800 000 unincorporated business associations registered with the Registrar of Businesses.

Partnerships have a long history of establishment. The laws governing partnership were traced in the civilized European world when the Eastern Roman Emperor Justinian (A.D.527-565) resolved to codify the law. The Emperor Justinian entrusted his leading academic lawyers and civil servants to codify the laws and as a result, the "Institutes" and the "Digest" were published in A.D 533. Book III Title XXV of the Institutes gave an account of partnership (societas) which was fully recognized as the basis of modern partnership law.

Until the second half of the nineteenth century, partnership was recognized as an important business vehicle as it was the only business structure in which two or

---

1 Department of Trade and Industry Statistical Bulletin of SMES 1997 shows that there are approximately 600 000 partnerships in the UK.