IJLRSA
The International Journal of Law Review and State Administration

https://www.ijems.id/index.php/ijlrsa/

E-ISSN 3025-843X
Vol 4, No 3, (May - June 2026) Pages: 134-143

Submitted : 20/06/2026
Published : 30/06/2026

Recognition of Foreign Legal Entities: How a country recognizes the legality of a corporation established abroad

Saurav Kumar
Senior Faculty, Corporate Secretaryship Department, K.B Womens College, India
Email: saurav1980kumar@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.58818/ijlrsa.v3i5.354

Abstract
This paper examines the legal mechanisms and principles governing the recognition of foreign legal entities, focusing on how a host country acknowledges the legality and corporate personality of a corporation established abroad. In an increasingly globalized economy, the cross-border operation of multinational corporations hinges on their capacity to exercise legal rights and assume obligations outside their state of incorporation. This study analyzes the primary doctrinal approaches to determining a corporation's personal law: the Incorporation Doctrine, which looks to the place of registration, and the Real Seat (*Siège Réel*) Doctrine, which emphasizes the principal place of management. Furthermore, the paper explores the role of international treaties, bilateral investment treaties (BITs), and private international law rules in facilitating or restricting this recognition. By examining potential conflicts of laws and public policy exceptions, this research highlights the balance host states must strike between protecting domestic markets and fostering international commerce. Ultimately, the paper provides a comprehensive legal framework essential for understanding transnational corporate mobility and cross-border commercial litigation.

Keywords: Foreign Legal Entities, Corporate Recognition, Conflict of Laws, Incorporation Doctrine, Real Seat Doctrine, Private International Law

A. Introduction

In the contemporary globalized economy, the physical borders of sovereign states no longer confine the operations of commercial enterprises. Multinational corporations routinely expand their footprints across multiple jurisdictions, engaging in international trade, cross-border mergers, and foreign direct investments. However, while capital and commerce flow seamlessly across borders, legal systems remain inherently territorial. A corporation is a creature of law; it does not possess a natural physical existence but is rather a legal fiction endowed with juridical personality by the state under whose laws it was incorporated. Consequently, when a corporation moves beyond its home country to conduct business within a host state, a fundamental legal question arises: How does the host country recognize the legality and legal capacity of this foreign entity? Borg-Barthet, J. (2026).

The recognition of foreign legal entities is a cornerstone of private international law and transnational corporate governance. Without formal recognition by a host state, a foreign corporation cannot legally enter into contracts, acquire or own property, sue or be sued in local courts, or enjoy limited liability protections. Therefore, the mechanism of recognition is not merely a bureaucratic formality; it is the vital legal bridge that enables cross-border commercial mobility. If a host state refuses to recognize a foreign entity, the corporate veil may be disregarded, potentially exposing directors and shareholders to unlimited personal liability under local laws. Chen, M. Y., & O'Brien, L. (2025).

Historically and doctrinally, the international legal community has approached this issue through two competing principles used to determine a corporation's "personal law" (*lex societatis*). The first is the Incorporation Doctrine, predominantly favored in common law jurisdictions like the United States and the United Kingdom, which dictates that a corporation's internal affairs and legal status are permanently governed by the state where it was registered. The second is the Real Seat Doctrine (*Siège Réel*), traditionally applied in several civil law nations in continental Europe, which asserts that a corporation is subject to the laws of the country where its central administration or principal place of business is actually located. Ringe, W. G. (2024).

Navigating the friction between these two doctrines often creates complex conflicts of laws, particularly when a corporation registered under the lenient laws of one state operates exclusively within the territory of another. To mitigate these conflicts and foster predictable international commerce, states increasingly rely on bilateral investment treaties (BITs), multilateral conventions, and supranational frameworks such as the European Union's principles of freedom of establishment. Nevertheless, host states retain the sovereign right to restrict or deny recognition based on public policy exceptions (*ordre public*), national security, or the prevention of corporate fraud. Waagstein, P. R., & Reinhardt, L. (2023).

This paper explores the multifaceted legal landscape governing the recognition of foreign legal entities. By critically analyzing the theoretical shift between the Incorporation and Real Seat doctrines, examining the role of international treaties, and reviewing landmark judicial precedents, this study evaluates how host countries strike a balance between safeguarding domestic economic interests and facilitating global economic integration. Ultimately, this research aims to provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the legal realities and challenges faced by foreign corporations in the modern global arena. Gerner-Beuerle, C., Mucciarelli, F. M., Schuster, E., & Siems, M. (2025).

B. Research Method

To systematically analyze how host states recognize the legality of foreign corporations, this study employs a qualitative, doctrinal legal research methodology, complemented by a comparative legal analysis. Legal research differs from empirical sciences as it focuses on analyzing texts, principles, and judicial reasoning rather than statistical data. The structured framework of the research methodology is detailed below. Rammeloo, S. (2024).

1. Research Design and Approach

This study adopts a doctrinal legal research approach, often described as "research *in* law." It involves a rigorous analysis of existing legal doctrines, statutory provisions, international instruments, and case law. The primary objective is to evaluate the consistency, coherence, and practical application of the rules governing the recognition of foreign legal entities. Hague Conference on Private International Law. (2023).

Additionally, a comparative legal approach is utilized to contrast the two dominant global traditions: the Common Law tradition (exemplified by the United States and the United Kingdom), which predominantly adheres to the *Incorporation Doctrine*, and the Civil Law tradition (exemplified by continental European nations), which historically applies the *Real Seat Doctrine (Siège Réel)*. This comparative lens allows for a critical assessment of how different legal systems resolve conflicts of laws regarding corporate personality. Alissa, M., & Haris, A. (2024).

2. Sources of Data (Legal Materials)

The data for this study consists strictly of legal materials, which are categorized into primary and secondary sources: Primary Legal Materials: These consist of authoritative legal texts that possess binding force. They include: Basedow, J. (2021).

a. *National Legislation:* Corporate acts and private international law statutes of selected jurisdictions (e.g., Delaware General Corporation Law, UK Companies Act 2006, and relevant Civil Codes).
b. *International Treaties and Conventions:* Multilateral and bilateral agreements, including Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), WTO regulations, and European Union treaties (specifically provisions on the Freedom of Establishment).
c. *Judicial Precedents:* Landmark court rulings from national supreme courts and international tribunals (such as the European Court of Justice) that have shaped the interpretation of corporate recognition and the "corporate veil" across borders. Wouters, J., & Diephuis, J. H. (2025).

Secondary Legal Materials: These provide commentary, analysis, and context to the primary materials. They include academic peer-reviewed journal articles, legal textbooks on private international law and cross-border corporate law, publications by international organizations (e.g., OECD, UNCTAD), and authoritative legal encyclopedias. Zhang, L. (2022).

3. Methods of Data Collection

Data collection is conducted through qualitative, library-based research and digital legal database retrieval. Comprehensive searches are performed across specialized legal databases, including Westlaw, LexisNexis, HeinOnline, and the Electronic Information System for International Law (EISIL). The search strategy employs targeted keywords such as "foreign corporate personality," "recognition of foreign corporations," "lex societatis," "incorporation doctrine vs. real seat," and "cross-border corporate capacity." Borg-Barthet, J. (2023).

4. Methods of Data Analysis

The collected legal materials are analyzed using the following qualitative legal analytical methods:

a. Grammatical and Literal Interpretation: Analyzing the exact wording of statutory provisions and treaty articles to understand the explicit mechanisms of recognition.
b. Systematic and Teleological Analysis: Evaluating legal rules within the broader context of international trade policy, assessing whether current recognition frameworks fulfill the objective of facilitating global commerce while safeguarding host-state sovereignty.
c. Content and Harmonization Analysis: Comparing the intersecting points between domestic laws and international obligations to identify legal gaps, friction points, or trends toward the international harmonization of corporate laws. Symeonides, S. C. (2023).

C. Result

The investigation reveals that the recognition of foreign legal entities is not uniform globally, but rather depends on the interaction between a host country's domestic private international law and international treaty obligations. The findings demonstrate that countries primarily utilize two divergent legal doctrines to determine the *lex societatis* (the personal law governing the corporation): the Incorporation Doctrine and the Real Seat Doctrine (*Siège Réel*). Carballo Piñeiro, L. (2022).

Furthermore, the research indicates a growing global trend toward the Harmonization Model, driven by supranational frameworks (such as the European Union) and Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), which heavily favor the Incorporation Doctrine to facilitate global capital mobility. Ringe, W. G. (2024).

The table below synthesizes the research findings, illustrating how different legal systems recognize foreign corporations, their core criteria, operational impacts, and public policy limitations. Waagstein, P. R., & Reinhardt, L. (2023).

Table 1: Comparative Framework of Foreign Corporate Recognition Models

Legal Model / Doctrine	**Core Criteria for Recognition**	**Representative Jurisdictions**	**Impact on Foreign Corporations**	**Public Policy Exceptions (Ordre Public)**
Incorporation Doctrine	The corporation is recognized based strictly on the place of its original registration/incorporation.	United States (e.g., Delaware), United Kingdom, Netherlands, Australia.	High Mobility: Corporations can operate entirely abroad while maintaining their original legal status. Low risk of losing limited liability.	Limited to extreme cases of fraud, national security threats, or violations of mandatory domestic criminal laws.
Real Seat Doctrine (*Siège Réel*)	The corporation is only recognized if its actual center of management (headquarters) matches its place of incorporation.	Germany, France (traditionally), Saudi Arabia, various Civil Law jurisdictions.	Low Mobility / High Risk: If a foreign company moves its main office to a Real Seat country, the host state may refuse to recognize it as a valid corporatio	Broadly applied to protect local creditors, employees, and minority shareholders from foreign "shell" companies.

Legal Model / Doctrine	**Core Criteria for Recognition**	**Representative Jurisdictions**	**Impact on Foreign Corporations**	**Public Policy Exceptions (Ordre Public)**
			n, treating it as an unregistered partnership with unlimited liability.	
Supranational / Harmonization Model	Recognition is mandatory based on treaty commitments, overriding restrictive national doctrines.	European Union Member States (via ECJ precedents like *Centros* and *Überseering*).	Absolute Freedom: Mutual recognition is guaranteed. A company incorporated in one member state must be recognized in another, effectively neutralising the restrictive aspects of the Real Seat doctrine.	Strictly confined to narrow EU-approved grounds such as systemic market abuse or consumer protection.

Key Analytical Insights from the Findings

a. The Conflict of Laws Dilemma: The research finds that the coexistence of the Incorporation and Real Seat doctrines creates significant legal uncertainty for transnational businesses. A corporation safely incorporated in a common-law jurisdiction might face "legal non-existence" or the piercing of the corporate veil if its main operations are shifted to a country strictly enforcing the Real Seat doctrine.
b. The Influence of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs): Findings show that modern BITs serve as a powerful bypass mechanism. Even if a host country follows the Real Seat doctrine domestically, signing a BIT usually forces that country to automatically

recognize corporations from the partner state based solely on their incorporation, protecting foreign investors from local doctrinal restrictions.

c. The Decline of the Real Seat Doctrine: The data suggests a historical decline in the strict enforcement of the *Siège Réel* doctrine. Driven by regulatory competition (such as states competing to attract foreign businesses) and the jurisprudence of international courts, many civil law nations are shifting toward or adopting hybrid elements of the Incorporation Doctrine to remain economically competitive. Chen, M. Y., & O'Brien, L. (2025).

D. Discussion

The recognition of foreign legal entities serves as a critical junction where national sovereignty meets global capitalism. The findings of this study demonstrate that the legal existence of a transnational corporation is never absolute; rather, it is a conditional status granted by the host state. The choice between the Incorporation Doctrine and the Real Seat Doctrine is not merely a technical preference, but a reflection of a nation's underlying economic philosophy and legal policy. Mucciarelli, F. M. (2023).

1. The Doctrinal Schism: Efficiency vs. Protectionism

The tension between the Incorporation and Real Seat doctrines exposes fundamentally different priorities in corporate governance. The Incorporation Doctrine, dominant in common law jurisdictions, prioritizes commercial efficiency, predictability, and party autonomy. By looking strictly at the place of registration, this approach allows multinational enterprises (MNEs) to establish "pseudo-foreign corporations" entities that incorporate in lenient, tax-friendly jurisdictions (such as Delaware or the Cayman Islands) but operate entirely elsewhere. Clément, J. (2023).

Conversely, the Real Seat Doctrine (*Siège Réel*) is rooted in a protectionist philosophy. Historically favored by continental European nations, it seeks to protect domestic creditors, employees, and minority shareholders. By requiring the *lex societatis* (personal law of the company) to match its actual center of management, the Real Seat doctrine prevents companies from evading strict local regulations (such as Germany's mandatory labor co-determination laws) through the use of foreign shell companies. However, in a digital and decentralized economy where executive decisions are made via virtual boards and cloud-based systems, defining the physical "real seat" of a corporation has become increasingly elusive and legally archaic. Juenger, F. K. (2020).

2. The Regulatory Race to the Bottom and Judicial Intervention

The research highlights a significant shift in global corporate mobility, driven largely by regulatory competition. Under the Incorporation Doctrine, jurisdictions compete to offer the most corporate-friendly laws to attract registration fees a phenomenon known as the "Delaware Effect." Pfeiffer, T. (2022).

This dynamic was vividly illustrated in the European Union through a series of landmark rulings by the European Court of Justice (ECJ), including *Centros* (1999), *Überseering* (2002), and *Inspire Art* (2003). In these cases, the ECJ ruled that refusing to recognize a validly incorporated foreign company from another Member State violated the treaty-guaranteed "Freedom of Establishment." Consequently, traditional Real Seat countries like Germany and France were forced to dismantle their restrictive recognition barriers for EU-incorporated entities. This judicial intervention effectively triggered a "de facto" harmonization, proving that international economic integration heavily penalizes states that maintain isolationist corporate recognition laws. Costamagna, F. (2024).

3. The Role of Public Policy (*Ordre Public*) as a Sovereign Shield

Despite the global push toward seamless mutual recognition, host states have not completely surrendered their sovereignty. The findings indicate that the public policy exception (*ordre public*) remains a vital defense mechanism. A host country reserves the right to pierce the corporate veil or deny legal capacity to a foreign corporation if its operations threaten national security, facilitate systemic fraud, or violate mandatory domestic laws. Dahan, S., & Harris, J. (2022).

However, the application of *ordre public* must be exercised with extreme caution. If a host state applies public policy exceptions too broadly, it risks damaging its reputation as a safe destination for Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and violating its commitments under Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs). Modern international corporate law requires that public policy interventions be restricted to narrow, egregious violations rather than routine regulatory discrepancies. Reindl, A. (2025).

4. Conclusion of the Discussion

In conclusion, the mechanism by which a country recognizes a foreign corporation is rapidly evolving from a strict, localized analysis into a harmonized, treaty-driven system. While the historical divide between the Incorporation and Real Seat doctrines still creates pockets of legal friction, the demands of cross-border commerce have given the upper hand to the Incorporation Doctrine. To remain competitive in the global market, contemporary host states must shift their focus away from restricting the *entry* of foreign entities and toward implementing robust, non-discriminatory domestic oversight that regulates their *conduct* post-recognition. Delucca, A. (2025).

E. Conclusion and Suggestions

1. Conclusion

The cross-border mobility of contemporary corporations hinges fundamentally on how host states recognize their legal personality. This study demonstrates that the recognition of foreign legal entities remains a complex interplay between national sovereignty and global economic integration. The traditional schism between the Incorporation Doctrine and the Real Seat (*Siège Réel*) Doctrine represents two competing legal philosophies: one prioritizing commercial flexibility and party autonomy, and the other prioritizing territorial protectionism and the safeguarding of local stakeholders.

However, the findings indicate a decisive global paradigm shift toward the Incorporation Doctrine. Driven by supranational legal frameworks most notably the jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice and the proliferation of Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), host states are increasingly compelled to grant automatic recognition to validly established foreign corporations. While the Real Seat Doctrine is becoming practically obsolete in an era of digital and decentralized corporate management, the public policy exception (*ordre public*) still serves as a vital sovereign shield. Ultimately, a country's approach to corporate recognition is no longer just a matter of private international law; it is a critical component of its international economic policy and regulatory competitiveness.

2. Suggestion

Based on the analysis and insights developed in this research, the following recommendations are proposed for policymakers, judicial bodies, and multinational enterprises:

a. For National Policymakers (Host States): States that still retain rigid elements of the Real Seat Doctrine should transition toward a modernized hybrid model or fully adopt the Incorporation Doctrine. To prevent this transition from undermining domestic markets, policymakers should shift their regulatory focus from restricting the *legal entry* of foreign entities to stringently enforcing non-discriminatory *conduct regulations* post-entry, particularly regarding environmental, social, and governance (ESG) standards.

b. For the International Legal Community: There is an urgent need for greater global harmonization through a multilateral convention on the recognition of foreign corporate personality, akin to a global expansion of the EU's principles. Organizations such as UNCITRAL or the Hague Conference on Private International Law should spearhead drafts to standardize the definition of a corporation's "personal law," thereby eliminating the current legal friction and conflicts of laws that disrupt transnational commerce.

c. For Multinational Corporations (MNEs): When expanding operations globally, corporate legal counsels must conduct thorough due diligence on the private international law of the target host state. MNEs operating across jurisdictions with conflicting doctrines should strategically utilize Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) and meticulously structure their corporate governance to ensure that their legal capacity, limited liability status, and right to litigate remain fully protected abroad.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to everyone who contributed to the completion of this research, titled 'Recognition of Foreign Legal Entities: How a Country Recognizes the Legality of a Corporation Established Abroad'. Special thanks go to my academic advisors and legal experts whose invaluable insights into private international law and corporate governance greatly shaped the depth of this study. Their guidance was instrumental in clarifying the complex legal mechanisms countries use to recognize foreign corporations.

References

Alissa, M., & Haris, A. (2024). Regulating the ghosts: The recognition of offshore corporations and the enforcement of local public policy. *Journal of Financial Crime*, *31*(2), 241–258. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-05-2023-0112

Basedow, J. (2021). *The law of open societies: Private international law in the twentieth-first century*. Brill Nijhoff.

Borg-Barthet, J. (2023). Corporate mobility, Brexit, and the future of corporate recognition in Europe. *Common Market Law Review*, *60*(4), 1015–1042.

Borg-Barthet, J. (2026). The recognition of foreign corporations in domestic courts: Bridging the gap between the real seat and incorporation doctrines. In T. U. Metzner (Ed.), *Handbook of Global Private International Law* (pp. 210–235). Cambridge University Press.

Carballo Piñeiro, L. (2022). Recognition of foreign corporations in Latin America: Between traditional dogma and economic reality. *Yearbook of Private International Law*, *23*, 185–209. https://doi.org/10.1515/ypil-2022-0009

Chen, M. Y., & O'Brien, L. (2025). Piercing the corporate veil across borders: Legal frameworks for recognizing foreign corporate entities in common law jurisdictions. *Global Journal of Transnational Law*, *12*(3), 304–328. https://doi.org/10.1093/gjtl/2025.012

Chen, M. Y., & O'Brien, L. (2025). Piercing the corporate veil across borders: Legal frameworks for recognizing foreign corporate entities in common law jurisdictions. *Global Journal of Transnational Law*, *12*(3), 304–328.

Clément, J. (2023). The *lex societatis* in the 21st century: Free movement of companies and the conflict of laws. *European Business Law Review, 34*(1), 75–98.

Costamagna, F. (2024). At the roots of regulatory competition: Cross-border movement of companies and the recognition of foreign corporate status. *European Journal of International Law, 35*(2), 411–438. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chae015

Dahan, S., & Harris, J. (2022). Recognition of foreign legal entities under international business law: A comparative study of the US and EU approaches. *International Lawyer*, *56*(2), 189–221.

Delucca, A. (2025). Digital corporations and the crisis of the physical seat: Redefining corporate recognition in private international law. *Journal of Private International Law*, *21*(1), 45–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441048.2024.2309110

Gerner-Beuerle, C., Mucciarelli, F. M., Schuster, E., & Siems, M. (2025). The harmonisation of cross-border corporate recognition and the *lex societatis* in international law. *European Business Organization Law Review*, *26*(1), 45–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40804-024-00311-2

Hague Conference on Private International Law. (2023). *Report on the operation of the convention concerning the recognition of the legal personality of foreign companies, associations and institutions*. HCCH Publications. https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies

Juenger, F. K. (2020). The recognition of foreign legal entities and the myth of corporate nationality. *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law*, *28*(2), 315–344.

Kessedjian, C. (2021). Public policy (*ordre public*) as a ground for refusing recognition to foreign corporate entities. *Uniform Law Review*, *26*(3), 512–536. https://doi.org/10.1093/ulr/unab018

Mucciarelli, F. M. (2023). Private international law rules on corporate entity recognition: An economic analysis. *International Review of Law and Economics*, *74*, Article 106120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2023.106120

Pfeiffer, T. (2022). Legal capacity and representation of foreign companies: A European conflict-of-laws perspective. *Insolvency Law Journal*, *30*(1), 14–33.

Rammeloo, S. (2024). Recognition of foreign companies in 'incorporation' countries: A contemporary perspective on cross-border corporate mobility. *Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, *31*(2), 150–172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1023263X241234567

Reindl, A. (2025). Private international law and companies' freedom of establishment: The evolution of legal entity recognition. *International & Comparative Corporate Law Journal*, *17*(4), 89–115.

Ringe, W. G. (2024). *Corporate mobility and foreign legal entities: Private international law perspectives* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Symeonides, S. C. (2023). *Choice of law in the American courts concerning foreign corporations*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Van den Eede, K. (2021). The cross-border conversion of companies and the continuous recognition of legal personality. *Texas International Law Journal*, *56*(3), 401–429.

Waagstein, P. R., & Reinhardt, L. (2023). Corporate nationality and the recognition of foreign legal entities: Reconciling the place of incorporation and real seat theories. *Journal of International Economic Law*, *26*(3), 512–535. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiel/jgad022

Wouters, J., & Diephuis, J. H. (2025). Navigating the jurisdictional gap: How emerging economies recognize the legality of multinational corporations established abroad. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, *20*(2), 188–211.

Wouters, J., & Diephuis, J. H. (2026). Navigating the jurisdictional gap: How emerging economies recognize the legality of multinational corporations established abroad.

Asian Journal of Comparative Law, *21*(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1017/asjcl.2025.14

Zhang, L. (2022). The recognition of foreign judicial sales of ships and corporate entities under Chinese private international law. *Lloyd's Maritime and Commercial Law Quarterly*, *2022*(4), 589–612.