

**CHINA BEIDAHUANG INDUSTRY GROUP HOLDINGS LTD:  
FORMER EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SUES  
THE COMPANY THAT HE SERVED FOR THREE YEARS**

A former Executive Director of China Beidahuang Industry Group Holdings Ltd () (Code: 39, Main Board, The Stock Exchange of Hongkong Ltd) has sued the company in which he served in an executive capacity for about three years.

He is Mr Qu Shun Cai (), aged 52 years, who is the Plaintiff in Writ of Summons, Number 1867 of 2015 (Statement of Claim, attached), lodged in the High Court of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), the Defendant, being China Beidahuang Industry.

Mr Qu Shun Cai is suing China Beidahuang Industry for \$HK6,069,000, plus Interest and Costs of this Action.

Some people might be disposed into thinking that this is a relatively paltry sum of money for a person to launch an Action in the High Court of the HKSAR, but, clearly, as far as this Plaintiff is concerned, this is an important matter and, as such, he has engaged the services of a barrister to fight his cause in open Court.

(And, for the most part, barristers do not come cheaply in the HKSAR.)

A little of the background of Mr Qu Shun Cai is that he was appointed as an Executive Director of China Beidahuang Industry in June of 2012 and he was a director of certain subsidiaries of the company, being, inter alia, a director of the company's Development Division.

He, also, had been engaged in trading in wines and liquor, involved in nanotechnology development and the production and sales of automotive fine chemicals.

During his appointment as an Executive Director of China Beidahuang Industry, he had been receiving annual remuneration of \$HK100,000.

**Action Number 1867**

In HKSAR, High Court Action, Number 1867, Mr Qu Shun Cai alleges that China Beidahuang Industry, when it was named Sino Distillery Group Ltd (), granted '*options under its share option scheme to the Plaintiff (the "1st Option") ...*'.

The details of the purported share options are laid out in Paragraph Three of the Statement of Claim as follows:

'3. On or around 13 September 2010, the Defendant granted options under its share option scheme to the Plaintiff (the "**1st Option**"):-

Date of offer:	13 September 2010
Number of shares subject to the options granted:	4,500,000 shares
Subscription price:	\$0.83 per share
Method of payment of the	In cash or by cashier's order or by personal cheque

*subscription price:*

*Option exercisable:*

*The first 50% of the option exercisable after the first anniversary of the offer date*

*The second 50% of the option exercisable after the second anniversary of the offer date*

*Expiry date of the option:*

*The first 50% of the option would expire four years from the offer date*

*The second 50% of the option would expire five years from the offer date*

*Method of exercise of the option:*

*By the delivery of the exercise notice in the specified form, duly signed by the holder, with the relevant amount of the subscription price, payment of which shall be made in the method stated above*

*Other terms*

*N/A'*

It is alleged at Paragraph Four of the Statement of Claim that, on or about September 13, 2010, Sino Distillery Group Ltd 'issued an option certificate together with a prescribed exercise notice (the "***1st Exercise Notice***") evidencing the 1st Option to the Plaintiff'.

At ... [CLICK TO ORDER FULL ARTICLE](#)

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published, TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in **TARGET**, please feel free to e-mail your views to [editor@targetnewspapers.com](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com). **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*