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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 **does not** reflect the purpose of the Model Law?

1. The purpose of the Model Law is to provide greater legal certainly for trade and investment.
2. The purpose of the Model Law is to provide protection and maximization of the value of the debtor’s assets.
3. The purpose of the Model Law is to facilitate the rescue of a financially troubled business, by providing a substantive unification of insolvency law.
4. The purpose of the Model Law is to provide a fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects all creditors and the debtor

**Question 1.2**

Which of the following statements are reasons for the development of the Model Law?

1. The increased risk of fraud due to the interconnected world.
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. All 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**

Which of the following rules or concepts set forth in the Model Law ensures that fundamental principles of law are upheld?

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 Argentina, foreign main proceedings are opened in South Africa and foreign non-main proceedings are opened in Argentina. Both the South African foreign representative and the Argentinian 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), Argentina 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 Argentina will be recognised in the UK despite Argentina not having implemented the Model Law.
2. Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Argentina will not be recognised in the UK because the UK has no principle of reciprocity and Argentina has not implemented the Model Law.
3. Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Argentina 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 be satisfied that the foreign proceeding is a main proceeding.
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.8**

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

1. COMI is not 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. For an individual debtor, the Model Law does contain a rebuttable presumption that the debtor’s habitual residence is its COMI.
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.9**

An automatic stay of execution according to article 20 in the Model Law covers:

1. Court proceedings.
2. Arbitral Tribunals.
3. Both (a) and (b).
4. Neither (a) nor (b).

**Question 1.10**

Article 13 grants access to the creditors in a foreign proceeding. Which of the following statements correctly describes the protection granted in Article 13?

1. A foreign creditor has the same rights regarding the commencement of, and participation in, a proceeding as creditors in this State.
2. A foreign creditor has the same rights as it has in its home state.
3. All foreign creditors’ claims are, as a minimum, considered to be unsecured claims.
4. Article 13 contains a uniform ranking system to avoid discrimination.

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

**Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks]**

Under the MLCBI, **explain and discuss** what the appropriate date is for determining the COMI of a debtor?

COMI is not defined under the MLCBI however, historically, the appropriate date for determining COMI of a debtor was on the date of the commencement of the foreign proceedings.

However, following *Morning Mist Holdings Ltd v Krys (Matter of Fairfield Sentry Ltd)* the Second Circuit Appeals Court in the USA took into account factors which were present up to the time of the Chapter 15 petition is filed. Furthermore, the EIR and other international interpretations now indicate a practice of taking into consideration factors which were present in the lead up to the foreign recognition petition. Factors include the activities of the liquidators and any administrative functions occurring in the relevant jurisdiction. However manipulation of activities in bad faith will not support a COMI 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 lays down the requirements of notification of creditors.*”

**Statement 2** *“This Article is referred to as the ‘Safe Conduct Rule’”.*

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

Article 14 of the MLCBI sets out the requirements for notification of creditors including foreign creditors following the commencement of local insolvency proceedings. Amongst other things, notifications under Article 14 are required to:

* set out clear time frames within which claims are to be filed
* use simple language which can be easily translated to other languages
* provide any potential conflicts between local and foreign law, for example, to secured creditors filing claims who may unknowingly be surrender their security by submitting a claim.

Article 14 of the MLCBI also provides that the usual diplomatic channels are too slow, requiring more efficient means by which to transmit correspondence e.g. email.

Article 10 of the MLCBI sets out the “Safe Conduct Rule” which seeks to ensure that the Court in an enacting State does not automatically assume all assets of a foreign debtors assets upon obtaining foreign recognition. This supports fairness to the local jurisdiction and removes the “first to the Court” scenario might otherwise occur.

Article 31 of the MLCBI provides that the presumption of insolvency following the foreign recognition of an insolvency proceeding. Like all presumptions it can be rebutted, with the onus of proof on the debtor to demonstrate solvency (i.e. it can pay its debts as and when they fall due). The presumption does not apply where the foreign proceeding is a non-main proceeding.

**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 appeal, the English Court of Appeal’s decision not to exercise its power to grant an indefinite moratorium continuation reflects its support of Gibbs that English law-governed debt cannot be discharged under a foreign insolvency proceeding unless the creditors have voluntarily submitted to that proceeding. Specifically, it held that:

* Continuing the moratorium was not necessary to protect the interests of IBA’s other creditors as they had already received everything to which they were entitled under the Azeri restructuring proceeding (which had completed).
* There is nothing in Article 21 of the MLCBI to suggest that the procedural power to grant a stay could substantially circumvent the creditors’ English law rights. It was material that the IBA could have run a parallel scheme of arrangement, but chose not to.

**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 14 of the MLCBI, the Court in an enacting state will order the foreign representative to provide notice to all creditors in relation to the foreign proceedings. Furthermore, under Article 17 of the MLCBI, the Court in an enacting state is required to decide upon the recognition application at the earliest possible time.

Under Article 18 of the MLCBI, there is an ongoing duty of the foreign representative in the foreign main proceeding to keep the Court apprised of developments in the proceeding and any other foreign proceeding.

**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]**

The foreign representative is considering his options to secure the value of the debtor’s assets located in State A. With reference to the Model Law’s provisions on access and co-operation, explain how these rights in State A can benefit the foreign representative.

The foreign representative can benefit from applying for recognition of the foreign proceeding in State A to support:

* In providing standing to the foreign representative to access the Courts in State A under Article 9 and 11 of the MLCBI. Furthermore, Article 12 of the MLCBI provides that once foreign recognition is granted, the foreign representative will have access to the Court to make petitions, requests or submissions regarding the protection, realisation and distributions of the Debtor’s assets in State A.
* Also in support of co-operations between Courts and foreign representatives where many jurisdictions lack legislative frameworks in this regard under Articles 25 to 27 of the MLCBI.

In the absence of obtaining foreign recognition, the foreign representative’s standing to collect, protect and realise the assets in State A are non-existent. The assets may become subject to claims by other parties, creating significant uncertainty, duplication of effort and costs to resolve. The foreign representative’s ability to apply to the Court in State A may also support opportunities to obtain other powers to compel provision of information and to sue bad actors under the laws of State A.

**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 that 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.

* Exclusion: The debtor may operate in a sector which is excluded from the MLCBI such as banks, insurance and infrastructure companies which may operate under a special regime (Article 1 of the MLCBI)
* Exclusion: Supremacy of other international obligations under internal law such as the Cape Town Convention (impacting aircraft) and other marine law (impacting freight and cargo shipping) which take priority over the MLCBI (Article 3 of the MLCBI)
* Exclusion: The public policy exception provides an exception to granting foreign recognition if, to do so, would be manifestly contrary to the public policy of the State (Article 6 of the MLCBI)
* Limitation: The anti-discrimination principal provides that foreign creditors be afforded the same rights as creditors domiciled in the enacting State (Article 13 of the MLCBI)
* Evidence: The Court will require certified copies of the Court orders regarding the foreign proceeding and foreign representative’s appointment and identification of all foreign proceedings all translated to the enacting state’s language (Article 15 of the MLCBI).
* Evidence: The Court will also need to determine whether the foreign proceeding is a main or non-main proceeding. To do this, it applies the COMI test, the two key factors being the location where the central administration of the debtor takes place and the location at which creditors ascertain the debtor to be located. The weighting of these factors and others depending on the circumstances will be used to determine whether the proceedings are main or non-main and, in turn, the relief that should be afforded (Article 20 and 21 of the MLCBI).

**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. Also address which restrictions, limitations or conditions should be considered in this context. For the purposes of this question, it can be assumed that there is no concurrence of proceedings.

Article 19 of the MLCBI provides that interim relief can be granted prior to recognition of a foreign proceeding to protect assets or the interests of creditors. The Orders which may be granted include the following:

* Staying execution against a debtor’s assets
* Ordering the assets be made available to the foreign representative (particularly where those assets are perishable or may quickly diminish in value)
* Suspending the right to transfer assets
* Requiring information by way of public examination or provision of information be made available
* Any additional relief that may be available to the State.

Article 21 of the MLCBI provides details of the post-recognition relief which can be obtained. It is likely more extensive orders will be providing post-recognition in comparison to pre-recognition. These include:

* 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
* Requiring information by way of public examination or provision of information be made available
* Entrusting the administration or realization of all or part of the debtor’s assets located in the State to the foreign representative
* Extending any interim relief previously granted
* Any additional relief that may be available to the State.

**Question 3.4 [maximum 1 mark]**

Briefly explain – with reference to case law - 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?

The decision in *Igor Vitalievitch Protasov and Khadzi-Murat Derev* supports the position that an interim world wide freezing order is unlikely to be continued post-recognition under Article 21 of the MLCBI as the Court found that the foreign representative has alternative mechanisms under the domestic English law to achieve the objectives of the foreign representative using English procedures and processes. Absent some extraordinary reasoning, the Court held that the world wide freezing order come to an end putting the foreign representative in the same position it would be if the proceedings were domestic.

**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 commenced 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 by 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

A foreign proceeding under Article 2(a) of the MLCBI requires the following:

* A proceeding (can be interim);
* The proceeding is for the purpose of liquidation or re-organisation;
* In a foreign state;
* Takes place in a judicial or administrative setting;
* Conducted under a laws relating to insolvency;
* It must be collective in nature; and
* Assets and affairs of the debtor are or may become subject to control or supervision by a foreign court.

In relation to the Bank, there are a number of procedures and timeframes to consider:

* On 19 January 2015, the Bank was classified as “troubled”;
* On 17 September 2015, the provisional administration process; or
* On 17 December 2015, it was resolved that the Bank enter into liquidation.

**“Troubled” procedure**

The troubled classification on 19 January 2015 provides the Bank with a 180 day period to resolve certain criteria as set out by the NB. At the conclusion NB must recognise the Bank as compliant or insolvent. It would not appear to meet the definition of a foreign proceeding as it does not appear to be a proceeding for the purpose of liquidation or re-organisation nor is it collective in nature.

**Provisional administration**

The provisional administration proceeding commenced on 17 September 2015 following the classification of the Bank, by DGF, as being insolvent. This procedure encompasses withdrawing the insolvent bank from the market and winding down its operations via liquidation. This procedure would seem to meet the definition of a foreign proceeding whereby:

* Despite being an interim proceeding, it still meets the definition of a proceeding
* The proceedings commenced in England and the proceedings are in Country A
* Its purpose is for the purpose of liquidation
* Despite the appointment being commenced by the DGF under the DGF Law its conducted under laws *relating* to insolvency
* Ms C takes control of the Bank for the ultimate purpose of securing the Bank’s assets and affairs
* The procedure is collective for the benefit of the Bank’s depositors/creditors.

**Liquidation**

As detailed above, it is my assessment that the foreign proceeding commenced as of 17 September 2015. To confirm that the foreign proceeding remains ongoing, I note the following:

* The liquidation procedure is an ongoing proceeding;
* The proceedings commenced in England and the proceedings are in Country A;
* Its purpose continued to be for the purpose of liquidation;
* It was conducted under the DGF Law relating to insolvency;
* Ms C continues to maintain control of the Bank’s assets and affairs;
* The procedure is collective and for the benefit of the Bank’s depositors/creditors exceeding $1b.

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]**.

A foreign representative under article 2(d) of the MLCBI requires the following:

* A person or body (can be appointed on an interim basis);
* Authorised in the foreign proceeding;
* Charged with administering the reorganisation or liquidation of the debtor’s assets and affairs or to act as foreign representative of the foreign proceeding.

DGF are the Applicants and its necessary to consider whether they meet the description of foreign representatives at various points in the timeline:

* Upon the classification of the Bank as “troubled” on 19 January 2015, the Bank’s management remains in control. DGF is not appointed or charged with administering the reorganisation or liquidation of the Bank’s assets. Its role at that stage is to set the Bank with a set of criteria it is required to meet and review the Bank’s compliance with the criteria after 180 days.
* Upon the commencement of the provisional administration, Ms G is appointed from DGF as foreign representative in Country A. DGF is a body (even if appointed on an interim basis at that point) and authorised in the foreign proceeding to administer the assets and affairs of the Bank in its wind down and progress towards liquidation of the Bank.
* The commencement of the liquidation, being Ms G initially on 17 December 2015 and Ms G subsequently on 17 August 2020 (both from DGF) continues to meet the definition of a foreign representative in Country A being a body appointed on an ongoing basis, authorise in the foreign proceeding and charged with administering the liquidation of the Bank’s assets and affairs.

**While not all facts provided in the fact pattern given for this 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.

**\* End of Assessment \***