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**ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS**

**Please note that all references to the “MLCBI” or “Model Law” in this assessment are references to the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.**

**QUESTION 1 (multiple-choice questions) [10 marks in total]**

Questions 1.1. – 1.10. are multiple-choice questions designed to assess your ability to think critically about the subject. Please read each question carefully before reading the answer options. Be aware that some questions may seem to have more than one right answer, but you are to look for the one that makes the most sense and is the most correct. When you have a clear idea of the question, find your answer and mark your selection on the answer sheet by highlighting the relevant paragraph **in yellow**. Select only **ONE** answer. Candidates who select more than one answer will receive no mark for that specific question.

**Question 1.1**

Which of the following statements **incorrectly** reflects the main purpose of the Model Law?

1. The Model Law provides effective mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvency so as to promote a number of objectives, including the protection and maximisation of trade and investment.
2. The Model Law provides effective mechanisms for dealing with cases of cross-border insolvency so as to promote a number of objectives, including the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects the interests of all creditors and other interested persons, not including the debtor.
3. The Model Law is a substantive unification of insolvency law so as to promote co-operation between courts of the enacting State and foreign States and facilitation of the rescue of financially troubled businesses.
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.2**

Which of the following statements is **unlikely** to be a reason for the development of the Model Law?

1. The existence of a statutory basis in national (insolvency) laws for co-operation and co-ordination of domestic courts with foreign courts or foreign representatives.
2. The difficulty of agreeing multilateral treaties dealing with insolvency law.
3. The practical problems caused by the disharmony among national laws governing cross-border insolvencies, despite the success of protocols in practice.
4. None of the above.

**Question 1.3**

Which of the following challenges to a recognition application under the Model Law **is most likely to be successful**?

1. The registered office of the debtor is not in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings were opened, but the debtor has an establishment in the jurisdiction of the enacting State.
2. The registered office of the debtor is in the jurisdiction of the enacting State, but the debtor has an establishment in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings were opened.
3. The debtor has neither its COMI nor an establishment in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings were opened.
4. The debtor has neither its COMI nor an establishment in the jurisdiction of the enacting State.

**Question 1.4**

“Cross-border insolvencies are inherently chaotic and value evaporates quickly with the passage of time”. Which of the following rules or concepts set forth in the Model Law **best addresses** this feature of cross-border insolvencies?

1. The *locus standi* access rules.
2. The public policy exception.
3. The safe conduct rule.
4. The “hotchpot” rule.

**Question 1.5**

For a debtor with its COMI in South Africa and an establishment in Brazil, foreign main proceedings are opened in South Africa and foreign non-main proceedings are opened in Brazil. Both the South African foreign representative and the Brazilian foreign representative have applied for recognition before the relevant court in the UK. Please note that South Africa has implemented the Model Law subject to the so-called principle of reciprocity (based on country designation), Brazil has not implemented the Model Law and the UK has implemented the Model Law without any so-called principle of reciprocity. In this scenario, **which of the following statements is the most correct one**?

1. The foreign main proceedings in South Africa will not be recognised in the UK because the UK is not a designated country under South Africa’s principle of reciprocity, but the foreign non-main proceedings in Brazil will be recognised in the UK despite Brazil not having implemented the Model Law.
2. Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Brazil will not be recognised in the UK because the UK has no principle of reciprocity and Brazil has not implemented the Model Law.
3. Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Brazil will be recognised in the UK.
4. None of the statements in (a), (b) or (c) are correct.

**Question 1.6**

Which of the following statements regarding concurrent proceedings under the Model Law **is true**?

1. No interim relief based on Article 19 of the Model Law is available if concurrent domestic insolvency proceedings and foreign proceedings exist at the time of the application of the foreign proceedings in the enacting State.
2. In the case of a foreign main proceeding, automatic relief under Article 20 of the Model Law applies if concurrent domestic insolvency proceedings and foreign proceedings exist at the time of the application of the foreign proceedings in the enacting State.
3. The commencement of domestic insolvency proceedings prevents or terminates the recognition of a foreign proceeding.
4. If only after recognition of the foreign proceedings, concurrent domestic insolvency proceedings are opened, then any post-recognition relief granted based on Article 21 of the Model Law will not be either adjusted or terminated if consistent with the domestic insolvency proceedings.

**Question 1.7**

When using its discretionary power to grant post-recognition relief pursuant to Article 21 of the Model Law, what should the court in the enacting State primarily consider?

1. The court must be satisfied that the interests of the creditors and other interested parties, excluding the debtor, are adequately protected.
2. The court should consider whether the relief requested is necessary for the protection of the assets of the debtor or the interests of the creditors and strike an appropriate balance between the relief that may be granted and the persons that may be affected.
3. The court should consider both (a) and (b).
4. Neither (a) nor (b) must be considered by the court.

**Question 1.8**

Which of the statements below regarding the Centre of Main Interest (or COMI) and the Model Law **is incorrect**?

1. COMI is a defined term in the Model Law.
2. For a corporate debtor, the Model Law does contain a rebuttable presumption that the debtor’s registered office is its COMI.
3. While (for purposes of the Model Law) the COMI of a debtor can move, the closer such COMI shift is to the commencement of foreign proceedings, the harder it will be to establish that the move was “ascertainable by third parties”.
4. None of the above.

**Question 1.9**

Which of the following types of relief have, prior to the adoption of the Model Law on Recognition and Enforcement of Insolvency-Related Judgments, been declared beyond the limits of the Model Law?

1. Enforcement of insolvency-related judgments.
2. An indefinite moratorium continuation.
3. Both (a) and (b).
4. Neither (a) nor (b).

**Question 1.10**

When for the interpretation of the Model Law “its original origin” is to be considered in accordance with article 8 of the Model Law, which of the following texts is likely to be of relevance?

1. The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Practice Guide.
2. The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Legislative Guide – Parts One, Two, Three and Four.
3. The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Judicial Perspective.
4. All of the above.

**QUESTION 2 (direct questions) [10 marks in total]**

**Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks**]

Under the MLCBI, explain what the appropriate date is for determining the COMI of a debtor, or whether an establishment exists.

The MLCBI does not define COMI nor does it indicate the appropriate date for determining the COMI of a debtor, or whether an establishment exists. The date of commencement of the foreign proceeding is generally considered to be the appropriate date, because of the evidence required for the application and the impact of the decision to commence the proceeding (this is also based off the interpretation of COMI under the European Regulation on Insolvency Proceedings). However, there is some inconsistency between how Courts in the US and the UK address this issue (see *Morning Mist Holdings v Krys (Matter of Fairfield Sentry Ltd)* (2nd Cir Appeals Apr. 16, 2013), with US courts deciding that the relevant date is the date of the filing of the application for recognition.

**Question 2.2 [maximum 3 marks]**

The following **three (3) statements** relate to particular provisions / concepts to be found in the Model Law. Indicate the name of the provision / concept (as well as the relevant Model Law article), addressed in each statement.

**Statement 1** “*This Article provides guidance in case of concurrence of two foreign non-main proceedings.*”

**Statement 2** *“The rule in this Article does not affect secured claims.*”

**Statement 3** “*This Article contains a rebuttable presumption in respect of an undefined key concept in the MLCBI.*”

Statement 1 refers to article 30 – coordination of more than one foreign proceeding. The key concept is to ensure there is coordination of proceedings and consistency of relief. Under article 30, where there are concurrent two foreign non-main proceedings, the Court shall shall grant, modify or terminate relief for the purpose of facilitating coordination of the proceedings.

Statement 2 refers to the hotchpot rule in Article 32 – rule of payment in concurrent proceedings. This rule tries to prevent unsecured creditors from taking advantage of concurrent proceedings to receive a proportionately greater payment than other creditors, by receiving payments in multiple proceedings.

Statement 3 refers to article 16 – presumptions concerning recognition, specifically regarding COMI. COMI is undefined in the MLCBI, but there is a rebuttable presumption that the debtor’s registered office is presumed to be the COMI of the debtor.

**Question 2.3 [2 marks]**

In the *IBA* case appeal, the English Court of Appeal upheld the decision that the court should not exercise its power to grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation. **Please explain**.

In the IBA case, the Court had to consider the Gibbs rule which provides that a debt governed by English law, cannot be discharged by a foreign insolvency proceeding (subject to some exceptions). In the IBA case, the foreign representative sought an indefinite moratorium continuation in order to prevent certain creditors from enforcing their claims in the UK, once the foreign proceeding and restructuring had concluded. The application was denied, as the Court considered that this would have circumvented the Gibbs rule.

**Question 2.4 [2 marks]**

In terms of relief, what should the court in an enacting State, where a domestic proceeding has already been opened in respect of the debtor, do after recognition of a foreign main proceeding? In your answer you should **mention the most relevant article of the MLCBI**. What (ongoing) duty of information does the foreign representative in the foreign main proceeding have towards the court in the enacting State? Here too you are required to **mention the most relevant article of the MLCBI**.

Under article 29(a) of the MLCBI, the Court shall seek cooperation and coordination under articles 25, 26 and 27. Under article 18, From the timing of filing the application for recognition of the foreign proceeding, the foreign representative needs to inform the court of substantial changes in the foreign proceeding or their appointment, and any other foreign proceeding concerning the debtor they become aware of.

**QUESTION 3 (essay-type questions) [15 marks in total]**

A foreign representative of a foreign proceeding opened in State B in respect of a corporate debtor (the Debtor) is considering whether or not to make a recognition application under the implemented Model Law of State A (which does not contain any reciprocity provision). In addition, the foreign representative is also considering what (if any) relief may be appropriate to request from the court in State A.

Write a brief essay in which you address the three questions below.

**Question 3.1** **[maximum 4 marks**]

Prior to making a recognition application in State A, explain how access and co­-ordination rights in State A can benefit the foreign representative?

In an insolvency context, an entity may have assets, interests, creditors, and/or obligations in more than one state, such that there is the potential that proceedings against the debtor may be commenced in more than one state and insolvency law from one state may have application to an entity in another state.

Where this is the case, the foreign representative may have a need to deal with assets, interests, creditors and/or obligations that sit outside the foreign jurisdiction. In these circumstances, the representative may need to utilise the courts of the enacting state to deal with any issues. By providing access rights, the foreign representative can seek the Court’s assistance in the enacting state including to examine witnesses, enable delivery of information or to provide other relief, including stays. The co-ordination of foreign proceedings assists with avoiding multiple concurrent proceedings whereby each jurisdiction focusses solely on generating the best outcome for local creditors, rather than all creditors.

**Question 3.2 [maximum 5 marks]**

For a recognition application in State A to be successful, the foreign proceeding opened in State B must qualify as a “foreign proceeding” within the meaning of article 2(a) of the MLCBI and the “foreign representative” must qualify as a foreign representative within the meaning of article 2(d) of the MLCBI. Assuming both qualify as such, list and briefly explain (with reference to the relevant MLCBI articles) any other evidence, restrictions, exclusions and limitations that must be considered, as well as the judicial scrutiny that must be overcome for a recognition application to be successful.

Article 15 sets out the recognition requirements. Any application needs to be accompanied by the following evidence in accordance with article 15:

(a) A certified copy of the decision commencing the foreign proceeding and appointing the foreign representative; or

(b) A certificate from the foreign court affirming the existence of the foreign proceeding and of the appointment of the foreign representative; or

(c) In the absence of evidence referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b), any other evidence acceptable to the court of the existence of the foreign proceeding and of the appointment of the foreign representative.

An application for recognition shall also be accompanied by a statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor that are known to the foreign representative.

There are restrictions as to when the enacting court may act. In particular, under article 6 the court may refuse to take any action where that action would be manifestly contrary to the public policy of the enacting state. However, as noted in the Digest of Case Law [[1]](#footnote-1), the use of this should be exceptional and has rarely been a basis for denying recognition.

The court may also refuse recognition where there is a perceived abuse of process. This could relate to the foreign representative failing to provide full and frank disclosure, or where there are inappropriate motives for the application.

In accordance with article 17, the recognition can be modified or terminated if the grounds for granting recognition were fully or partly lacking, or have ceased to exist. Accordingly, once the foreign proceeding ends, the recognition also terminates.

The foreign representative will also need to consider what the COMI is of the debtor. Article 16 sets out a rebuttable presumption as to the COMI, so the application for recognition should include evidence around the COMI of the debtor, to assist in determining whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main or foreign non-main proceeding.’

From the filing of the application, the foreign representative will need to keep the court informed in accordance with article 18.

**Question 3.3 [maximum 5 marks]**

As far as relief is concerned, briefly explain (with reference to the relevant MLCBI articles) what pre- and post-recognition relief can be considered in the context of the MLCBI, as well as any restrictions, limitations or conditions that should be considered in this context. For purposes of this question, it can be assumed that there is no concurrence of proceedings.

Interim relief is available under article 19, on filing of an application for recognition of a foreign proceeding. Under article 20, there is automatic mandatory relief where the foreign proceeding is a main proceeding. Article 21 contains a range of discretionary relief post-recognition of the foreign proceedings. The types of relief that is available include:

* Staying execution against the debtor’s assets;
* Staying the commencement or continuation of individual actions or individual proceedings concerning the debtor’s assets, rights, obligations or liabilities;
* Suspending the right to transfer, encumber or otherwise dispose of any assets of the debtor;
* Providing for examinations;
* Entrusting the administration or realization of all or part of the debtor’s assets located in the enacting State; and
* Granting any additional relief that may be available to a local representative under the laws of the enacting state.

When granting or denying relief, the Court must be satisfied the interests of creditors and other interested persons including the debtor are adequately protected. For interim relief, the Court may refuse to grant relief where that relief would interfere with the administration of a foreign main proceeding. For relief under article 21, the court needs to be satisfied the relief relates to assets that should be administered in the foreign proceeding or concerns information required for that proceeding.

**Question 3.4 [maximum 1 mark]**

Briefly explain why a worldwide freezing order granted as pre-recognition interim relief *ex* article 19 MLCBI, is unlikely to continue post-recognition *ex* article 21 MLCBI?

Under article 21, the Court would need to be satisfied that the relief relates to assets that should be administered in the foreign non-main proceeding which requires evidence to support an ongoing freezing order. Whereas under article 19, the Court can grant provisional relief where urgently needed to protect assets, with the relief lasting until the application is decided upon.

**QUESTION 4 (fact-based application-type question) [15 marks in total]**

**Read the following facts very carefully before answering the questions that follow.**

**(1) Background**

The Commercial Bank for Business Corporation (the Bank) has operated since 1991. The Bank’s registered office is situated in Country A, which **has not** adopted the MLCBI. As of 13 August 2015, the Bank’s majority ultimate beneficial owner was Mr Z, who held approximately 95% of the Bank’s shares through various corporate entities (including some registered in England).

The Bank entered provisional administration on 17 September 2015 and liquidation on 17 December 2015. Investigations into the Bank have revealed that it appears to have been potentially involved in a multi-million dollar fraud resulting in monies being sent to many overseas companies, including entities incorporated and registered in England.

Proceedings were issued in the High Court of England and Wales (Chancery Division) against various defendants on 11 February 2021 (the English Proceedings).

An affidavit (the Affidavit) sets out a detailed summary of the legislation of Country A’s specific insolvency procedure for Banks. The procedure involves initial input from the National Bank (the NB) and at the time that the Bank entered liquidation, followed a number of stages:

***Classification of the bank as troubled***

The NB may classify a bank as “troubled” if it meets at least one of the criteria set down by article 75 of the Law of Country A on Banks and Banking Activity (LBBA) or for any of the reasons specified in its regulations.

Once declared “troubled”, the relevant bank has 180 days within which to bring its activities in line with the NB’s requirements. At the end of that period, the NB must either recognise the Bank as compliant, or must classify it as insolvent.

***Classification of the bank as insolvent***

The NB is obliged to classify a bank as insolvent if it meets the criteria set out in article 76 of the LBBA, which includes:

1. the bank’s regulatory capital amount or standard capital ratios have reduced to one third of the minimum level specified by law;
2. within five consecutive working days, the bank has failed to meet 2% or more of its obligations to depositors or creditors; and
3. the bank, having been declared as troubled, then fails to comply with an order or decision of the NB and / or a request by the NB to remedy violations of the banking law.

The NB has the ability to classify a bank as insolvent without necessarily needing to first go through the troubled stage. Article 77 of the LBBA accordingly provides that a bank can be liquidated by the NB directly, revoking its licence.

***Provisional administration***

The Deposit Guarantee Fund (DGF) is a governmental body of Country A tasked principally with providing deposit insurance to bank depositors in Country A. However, the Affidavit explained that the DGF is also responsible for the process of withdrawing insolvent banks from the market and winding down their operations via liquidation. Its powers include those related to early detection and intervention, and the power to act in a bank’s interim or provisional administration and its ultimate liquidation.

Pursuant to article 34 of the DGF Law, once a bank has been classified as insolvent, the DGF will begin the process of removing it from the market. This is often achieved with an initial period of provisional administration. During this period:

1. the DGF (acting via an authorised officer) begins the process of directly administering the bank’s affairs. Articles 35(5) and 36(1) of the DGF Law provide that during provisional administration, the DGF shall have full and exclusive rights to manage the bank and all powers of the bank’s management.
2. Article 36(5) establishes a moratorium which prevents, *inter alia*: the claims of depositors or creditors being satisfied; execution or enforcement against the bank’s assets; encumbrances and restrictions being created over the bank’s property; and interest being charged.

***Liquidation***

Liquidation follows provisional administration. The DGF is obliged to commence liquidation proceedings against a bank on or before the next working day after the NB’s decision to revoke the bank’s licence.

Article 77 of the LBBA provides that the DGF automatically becomes liquidator of a bank on the date it receives confirmation of the NB’s decision to revoke the bank’s licence. At that point, the DGF acquires the full powers of a liquidator under the law of Country A.

When the bank enters liquidation, all powers of the bank’s management and control bodies are terminated (as are the provisional administrators’ powers if the bank is first in provisional administration); all banking activities are terminated; all money liabilities due to the bank are deemed to become due; and, among other things, the DGF alienates the bank’s property and funds. Public encumbrances and restrictions on disposal of bank property are terminated and offsetting of counter-claims is prohibited.

As liquidator, the DGF has extensive powers, including the power to investigate the bank’s history and bring claims against parties believed to have caused its downfall. Those powers include:

1. the power to exercise management powers and take over management of the property (including the money) of the bank;
2. the power to compile a register of creditor claims and to seek to satisfy those claims;
3. the power to take steps to find, identify and recover property belonging to the bank;
4. the power to dismiss employees and withdraw from/terminate contracts;
5. the power to dispose of the bank’s assets; and
6. the power to exercise “such other powers as are necessary to complete the liquidation of a bank”.

The DGF also has powers of sale, distribution and the power to bring claims for compensation against persons for harm inflicted on the insolvent bank.

However, article 48(3) of the DGF Law empowers the DGF to delegate its powers to an “authorised officer” or “authorised person”. The “Fund’s authorised person” is defined by article 2(1)(17) of the DGF Law as: *“an employee of the Fund, who on behalf of the Fund and within the powers provided for by this Law and / or delegated by the Fund, performs actions to ensure the bank’s withdrawal from the market during provisional administration of the insolvent bank and/or bank liquidation”*.

Article 35(1) of the DGF Law specifies that an authorised person, must have: “*…high professional and moral qualities, impeccable business reputation, complete higher education in the field of economics, finance or law…and professional experience necessary.*” An authorised person may not be a creditor of the relevant bank, have a criminal record, have any obligations to the relevant bank, or have any conflict of interest with the bank. Once appointed, the authorised officer is accountable to the DGF for their actions and may exercise the powers delegated to them by the DGF in pursuance of the bank’s liquidation.

The DGF’s independence is addressed at articles 3(3) and 3(7) of the DGF Law which confirm that it is an economically independent institution with separate balance sheet and accounts from the NB and that neither public authorities nor the NB have any right to interfere in the exercise of its functions and powers.

Article 37 establishes that the DGF (or its authorised person, insofar as such powers are delegated) has extensive powers, including powers to exercise managerial and supervisory powers, to enter into contracts, to restrict or terminate the bank’s transactions, and to file property and non-property claims with a court.

**(2) The Bank’s liquidation**

The Bank was formally classified by the NB as “troubled” on 19 January 2015. The translated NB resolution records:

“The statistical reports-based analysis of the Bank’s compliance with the banking law requirements has found that the Bank has been engaged in risky operations.”

Those operations included:

1. a breach, for eight consecutive reporting periods, of the NB’s minimum capital requirements;
2. 10 months of loss-making activities;
3. a reduction in its holding of highly liquid assets;
4. a critically low balance of funds held with the NB; and
5. 48% of the Bank’s liabilities being dependent on individuals and a significant increase in “adversely classified assets” which are understood to be loans, whose full repayment has become questionable.

Despite initially appearing to improve, by September 2015 the Bank’s financial position had deteriorated further with increased losses, a further reduction in regulatory capital and numerous complaints to the NB. On 17 September 2015, the NB classified the Bank as insolvent pursuant to article 76 of the LBBA. On the same day, the DGF passed a resolution commencing the process of withdrawing the Bank from the market and appointing Ms C as interim administrator.

Three months later, on 17 December 2015, the NB formally revoked the Bank’s banking licence and resolved that it be liquidated. The following day, the DGF initiated the liquidation procedure and appointed Ms C as the first of the DGF’s authorised persons to whom powers of the liquidator were delegated. Ms C was replaced as authorised officer with effect from 17 August 2020 by Ms G.

Ms G’s appointment was pursuant to a Decision of the Executive Board of the Directors of the DGF, No 1513 (Resolution 1513). Resolution 1513 notes that Ms G is a “leading bank liquidation professional”. It delegates to her all liquidation powers in respect of the Bank set out in the DGF Law and in particular articles 37, 38, 47-52, 521 and 53 of the DGF Law, including the authority to sign all agreements related to the sale of the bank’s assets in the manner prescribed by the DGF Law. Resolution 1513 expressly excludes from Ms G’s authority the power to claim damages from a related party of the Bank, the power to make a claim against a non-banking financial institution that raised money as loans or deposits from individuals, and the power to arrange for the sale of the Bank’s assets. Each of the excluded powers remains vested in the DGF as the Bank’s formally appointed liquidator.

On 14 December 2020, the Bank’s liquidation was extended to an indefinite date, described as arising when circumstances rendered the sale of the Bank’s assets and satisfaction of creditor’s claims, no longer possible.

On 7 September 2020, the DGF resolved to approve an amended list of creditors’ claims totalling approximately USD 1.113 billion. The Affidavit states that the Bank’s current, estimated deficiency exceeds USD 823 million.

**QUESTION 4.1 [maximum 15 marks]**

Prior to any determination made in the English Proceedings, Ms G, in her capacity as authorised officer of the Deposit Guarantee Fund (or DGF) of Country A in respect of the liquidation of the Commercial Bank for Business Corporation (the Bank), together with the DGF (the Applicants), applied for recognition of the liquidation of the Bank before the English court based on the Cross-Border Insolvency Regulations 2006 (CBIR), the English adopted version of the MLCBI.

Assuming you are the judge in the English court considering this recognition application, you are required to discuss:

4.1.1 whether the Bank’s liquidation comprises a “foreign proceeding” within the meaning of article 2(a) of the MLCBI **[maximum 10 marks]**; and

4.1.2 whether the Applicants fall within the description of “foreign representatives” as defined by article 2(d) of the MLCBI **[maximum 5 marks]**.

**While not all facts provided in the fact pattern for this question (Question 4) are immediately relevant for your answer, please do use, where appropriate, those relevant facts that directly support your answer.**

For the purpose of this question, you may further assume that the Bank is **not excluded** from the scope of the MLCBI by article 1(2) of the MLCBI.

Whether the liquidation is a foreign proceeding?

Foreign proceeding is defined under article 2 of the MLCBI as a “*collective judicial or administrative proceeding in a foreign State, including an interim proceeding, pursuant to a law relating to insolvency in which proceeding the assets and affairs of the debtor are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court, for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation*”. Each of these elements needs to met and should be considered together. These elements and their application to the Bank’s application are considered below.

*A proceeding:*

One Court stated that a key feature of a ‘proceeding’ was a “*statutory framework that constrains a company’s actions and that regulates the final distribution of a company’ assets*” (see *Irish Bank Resolution Corporation (IBRC) Limited,* 538 B.R. 629, 697 (D. Del 2015, CLOUT 1628)*.* In this regard, the Bank’s liquidation procedure is governed by a statutory framework under the DGF Law and the LBBA. On this basis, the liquidation can be considered a proceeding.

*Judicial or administrative:*

The liquidation process is governed by the DGF, which is a Governmental body of Country A and commenced by actions taken by the NB. Accordingly, the liquidation is considered to be judicial or administrative.

*Collective in nature:*

In determining whether the proceeding is a ‘collective proceeding’, a key factor is whether substantially all the assets and liabilities are dealt with in the proceeding, subject to local priorities and statutory exceptions, and to local exclusions relating to the rights of secured creditors.

Under the LBBA, the Bank’s property and funds are alienated to the Liquidator who can also sell or dispose of the assets. The Liquidator has powers to compile lists of creditors and satisfy those claims. Accordingly, the liquidation process deals with substantially all of the assets and liabilities and is, therefore, considered to be a collective proceeding.

*Is in a foreign state:*

The recognition application is in the English courts and relates to a liquidation process in Country A and, therefore, meets this requirement.

*Pursuant to a law relating to insolvency:*

This definition is intentionally wide, as in some jurisdictions, a liquidation or reoganisation might be conducted under law that is not labelled as insolvency law. The Liquidator was appointed under the LBBA, which contains laws relating to banking organisations that are ‘troubled’ or ‘insolvent’. On this basis, the Bank’s liquidation is pursuant to a law relating to insolvency.

*In which the affairs of the debtor are subject to control or supervision by a foreign Court:*

The MLCBI does not provide details regarding the level of control of supervision required to meet this test. However, the UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment and Interpretation[[2]](#footnote-2), notes the control or supervision may be potential rather than actual.

It is not clear from the facts whether the liquidation process of the Bank is subject to any control or supervision by the court. This would require a further examination of the Liquidation laws of Country A. There are some indications from the facts that the liquidation may not be subject to control or supervision in that, under the DGF Law, the DGF is an independent institution and public authorities and the NB do not have rights to interfere in the exercise of its functions and powers.

*For the purposes of reorganisation or liquidation:*

In this context, the Court in *In the matter of Sturgeon Central Asia Balance Fund Ltd* [2020] EWHC 123 (Ch) noted that insolvency or severe financial distress would meet these requirements. The liquidation of the Bank meets this requirement, as it was ‘troubled’ under the relevant law and failed to improve financially and was declared insolvent.

*Conclusion*:

On the basis of the facts outlined, the liquidation of the Bank meets nearly all of the requirements to be a foreign proceeding. However, in order to conclude on this, more information is required to understand to what extent the liquidation process is subject to any control or supervision by the court.

Whether the Applicants are a foreign representative?

Under article 2, a foreign representative is “*a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, authorised in a foreign proceeding to administer the reorganisation or the liquidation of the debtor’s assets or affairs or to act as a representative of the foreign proceeding*”.

In this instance, DGF has the full powers of a liquidator in the liquidation. The DGF’s powers include the powers to alienate the property and funds, powers of sale and disposal of assets. However, in this instance, DGF has delegated its liquidation powers to Ms G as an authorised person under article 48 of the DGF Law. In particular, all liquidation powers including the authority to sign agreements relating to sale of the Bank’s assets. Not all powers were delegated to Ms G, as the relevant resolution excluded the ability to take certain claims and the power to arrange for the sale of the Bank’s assets (these powers remained vested with the DGF).

The UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment and Interpretation[[3]](#footnote-3) notes that the foreign representative does not need to be authorised by the foreign court (as is the case here). A body can be an artificial person created by a legal authority and must have the relevant power at the time of the application[[4]](#footnote-4).

In this instance, the DGF could be considered a foreign representative as the liquidator with all powers. Ms G could be considered a ‘representative of the foreign proceeding’, and therefore be a foreign representative. However, there is also an argument that Ms G could not be a foreign representative on the basis that her powers are limited with respect to dealing with assets and creditors.

**\* End of Assessment \***

1. Digest of case Law on the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, paras 2 – 8, at pages 20 – 21. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment and Interpretation at paras 74 – 76, pages 41 – 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment and Interpretation at para 86, page 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Digest of Case Law on the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency, at paras 39 – 40, page 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)