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6.1If you selected Module 2A as one of your **compulsory modules** (see the e-mail that was sent to you when your place on the course was confirmed), the final time and date for the submission of this assessment is **23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2024**. The assessment submission portal will close at 23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2024. No submissions can be made after the portal has closed and no further uploading of documents will be allowed, no matter the circumstances.

6.2 If you selected Module 2A as one of your **elective modules** (see the e-mail that was sent to you when your place on the course was confirmed), you have a **choice** as to when you may submit this assessment. You may either submit the assessment by **23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2024** or by **23:00 (11 pm) BST (GMT +1) on 31 July 2024**. If you elect to submit by 1 March 2024, you **may not** submit the assessment again by 31 July 2024 (for example, in order to achieve a higher mark).

**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 one of the following international organisations’ mandate is to further the **progressive harmonization of the law of international trade**?

1. World Trade Organization.
2. The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.
3. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

**Question 1.2**

Which trend(s) and process(es) served as a **proximate cause** for the development MLCBI?

1. Rise of corporations.
2. Internationalisation.
3. Globalization.
4. Universalism.
5. Territorialism.
6. Technological advances.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).
2. Options (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).
3. Options (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.3**

Which of the following statements **incorrectly** describe the MLCBI?

1. It is legislation that imposes a mandatory reciprocity on the participating members.
2. It is a legislative text that serves as a recommendation for incorporation in national laws.
3. It is intended to substantively unify the insolvency laws of the foreign nations.
4. It is a treaty that is binding on the participating members.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
2. Options (i), (ii) and (iv).
3. Options (i), (iii) and (iv).
4. All of the above are incorrect.

**Question 1.4**

Which of the below options reflect the **objectives** of the MLCBI?

1. To provide greater legal certainty for trade and investment.
2. To provide protection and maximization of value of the debtor’s assets.
3. To provide a fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects all creditors and the debtors.
4. To facilitate the rescue of financial troubled businesses.
5. To ensure substantive unification of insolvency laws of member-states.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).
2. Options (ii), (iii) and (v).
3. Options (ii), (iv) and (v).
4. None of the above.

**Question 1.5**

Which **two** of the below hypotheticals demonstrate a more likely **precursor to a “cross-border insolvency”**?

1. An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but a significant asset is located outside of jurisdiction A.
2. An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A and immediately transferred to a foreign jurisdiction B.
3. An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, in which a group of affiliated debtors has its COMI as well as all assets and liabilities.
4. An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but certain liabilities are governed by laws of a foreign jurisdiction B.
5. An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but all *de minimis* assets are located in foreign jurisdictions.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (i) and (ii).
2. Options (ii) and (iii).
3. Options (iii) and (v).
4. Options (i) and (v).

**Question 1.6**

A restructuring proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A by a corporation with COMI in jurisdiction A and an overleveraged balance sheet. The court in jurisdiction A, overseeing the restructuring, entered a final and non-appealable order, approving the compromise and restructuring of the debt. The entered order, by its express terms, has a universal effect. Based on these facts alone, what is the **effect** of such order’s terms in jurisdiction B if jurisdictions A and B do **not** have a bilateral agreement?

1. Binding within jurisdiction B.
2. Binding within jurisdiction B, but certain actions need to be taken.
3. No effect within jurisdiction B.
4. Likely no effect within jurisdiction B.
5. Not enough facts provided to arrive at a conclusion.

**Question 1.7**

Which of the following statements set out the reasons for the development of the Model Law?

1. The increased risk of fraud by concealing assets in foreign jurisdictions.
2. The difficulty of agreeing multilateral treaties dealing with insolvency law.
3. To eradicate the use of comity.
4. The practical problems caused by the disharmony among national laws governing cross-border insolvencies, despite the success of protocols in practice.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (i), (ii) and (iii).
2. Options (i), (ii) and (iv).
3. Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
4. All of the above.

**Question 1.8**

Which of the statements below are incorrect regarding COMI under the MLCBI?

1. COMI is a well-defined term in the MLCBI.
2. COMI stands for comity.
3. The debtor’s registered office is irrelevant for purposes of determining COMI.
4. COMI is being tested as of the date of the petition for recognition.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (i), (ii) and (iii).
2. Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
3. All of the above.
4. None of the above.

**Question 1.9**

In the event of the following concurrent proceedings, indicate the order of the proceedings in terms of their hierarchy / primacy:

1. Foreign main proceeding.
2. Foreign non-main proceeding.
3. Plenary domestic insolvency proceeding.

Choose the correct answer:

1. Options (ii), (i) and then (iii).
2. Options (i), (ii) and then (iii).
3. Options (iii), (i) and then (ii).
4. Options (iii), (ii) and then (i).

**Question 1.10**

Which of the statements below are correct under the MLCBI?

1. The foreign representative always has the powers to bring avoidance actions.
2. The hotchpot rule prioritises local creditors.
3. The recognition of a foreign main proceeding is an absolute proof that the debtor is insolvent.
4. None of the above are correct.

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

**Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks]**

What is the key distinction between the application of the MLCBI and the European Union (EU) Regulation on insolvency proceedings? Also describe one key benefit and disadvantage of each approach.

The EU Regulation on insolvency proceedings becomes directly part of the domestic laws of the EU member States. The MLCBI, however, is simply a recommendation which States can decide whether to adopt in whole or in part into the domestic legislation.

For the EU Regulation, one benefit would be the fact that it is a unified instrument across the States which it applies to. One disadvantage is the fact that States are not afforded the flexibility of adopting it in part.

On the contrary, for the MLCBI, the benefit would be the flexibility accorded to States in the adoption of it into domestic legislation, while the disadvantage would be the fact that there may still be discrepancies in the extent to which States incorporate the MLCBI.

**Question 2.2 [maximum 2 marks]**

Explain what the court should primarily consider using its discretionary power to grant post-recognition relief under Article 21 of the MLCBI.

According to the case of *Cosco Bulk Carrier Co Ltd v Armada Shipping SA and another* [2011] EWHC 216 (Ch), the court what is just, right and fair in the circumstances. The court will also consider the status of proceedings elsewhere, whether further steps could have been taken by the parties, and whether the interests of all creditors and other interested parties are adequately protected.

**Question 2.3 [2 marks]**

Explain the protections granted to creditors in a foreign proceeding under Article 13 of the MLCBI.

Under Article 13 of the MLCBI, foreign creditors are given the same rights as creditors domiciled in the enacting State without affecting the ranking of claims in the enacting State. In other words, foreign creditors will not be treated worse than local creditors. The principle of non-discrimination is preserved. The minimum rank which will be accorded to foreign creditors’ debts is that of general unsecured claims.

**Question 2.4 [maximum 3 marks]**

What is a key distinction with respect to the relief available in foreign main versus foreign non-main proceedings?

Foreign main proceedings, when recognised, come with mandatory relief, which includes a stay of commencement of actions or proceedings against the debtor, a stay of execution against the debtor’s assets and a suspension of the right to deal with the assets of the debtor.

Relief for a non-main proceeding will be more restrictive. The court will have the discretionary power to grant the appropriate relief, taking into account the relevant considerations stated above.

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

**Question 3.1 [maximum 4 marks]**

A debtor has its COMI in Germany and an establishment in Bermuda, and both foreign main and foreign non-main proceedings as well as the recognition proceedings in the US have been opened. In this scenario, explain where the foreign proceedings must have been filed, and the likely result.

Under Article 2 of the MLCBI, foreign main proceedings mean a foreign proceeding taking place in the State where the debtor has his COMI; a foreign non-main proceeding means a foreign proceeding taking place in the State where the debtor has an establishment (defined as any place of operations where the debtor carries out a non-transitory economic activity with human means and goods or services).

Here, the foreign main proceedings would be in Germany and the foreign non-main proceedings would be in Bermuda. As recognition proceedings have commenced in the US, that would be the enacting State. The likely outcome would be that automatic relief will apply with respect to the foreign proceedings in Germany and that discretionary relief will apply with respect to the foreign proceedings in both Germany and Bermuda.

**Question 3.2 [maximum 3 marks]**

Joint provisional liquidators commenced a recognition proceeding in the US and immediately were sued and served with discovery in connection with their alleged tortious interference with contract rights of the US-based vendors of the foreign debtor. Explain the likely outcome.

Here, we know that the debtor is foreign and the foreign representatives are seeking to recognise foreign proceedings in the US. Upon such recognition, the court has the discretion under Article 21 to stay the actions brought by the US-based vendors. This is likely to be granted to support the foreign proceedings.

**Question 3.3 [maximum 4 marks]**

A foreign representative who administers assets in a debtor-in-possession-like restructuring proceeding in the UK commences a recognition proceeding in the US, setting the recognition hearing 35 days after the petition date due to the availability of the court. There is no litigation pending or threatened against the foreign debtor, but US-governed leases and intellectual property licenses have *ipso facto* clauses (that is, bankruptcy-triggered terminations) that are not enforceable under the US Bankruptcy Code. Based on these facts, explain what steps, if any, should the foreign representative take to protect the assets and why?

The foreign representative would not need to request the court for a stay of the commencement of proceedings since there is no litigation pending or threatened against the foreign debtor. More importantly, based on *Fibria Celulose S/A v Pan Ocean Co Ltd*, service of notices to terminate leases or licences do not constitute the commencement or continuation of an action or proceedings.

However, the foreign representative could ask the court for the stay of execution against its assets. He/she could argue that under US law ipso facto clauses are unenforceable under the US Bankruptcy Code and thus ask for relief under Article 21(1)(g) of the MLCBI.

**Question 3.4 [maximum 4 marks]**

A foreign representative, who administers the assets of an insolvent debtor in an insolvency proceeding pending in Country A (where the foreign debtor has its registered office and not much more), commenced a proceeding in Country B to recognise the foreign proceeding as the foreign main proceeding in order to sell certain assets within the territorial jurisdiction of Country B, but unfortunately the insolvency court considering the petition for recognition denied the recognition of the foreign proceeding as a foreign main proceeding. Explain what may or should the foreign representative do next? What should the foreign representative have done at the outset?

At the outset, the foreign representative should have pointed to Article 16(3) which states that in the absence of proof to the contrary, the debtor’s registered office is presumed to be the centre of the debtor’s main interests. Accordingly, the proceedings could be recognised as foreign main proceedings.

The foreign representative could seek to have the foreign proceedings recognised as foreign non-main proceedings. He could then ask for the administration or realisation of the debtor’s assets in Country B to be entrusted to him under Article 21(1)(e) of the MLCBI.

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

**Assume you received a file for a new client of the firm. The file contains the facts described below. Based on these facts, analyse key filing strategy to ensure a successful restructuring – specifically, whether to apply for recognition of main or nonmain proceeding or both (in light of COMI / establishment analysis), what papers need to be submitted, and what relief should be requested on day one of the filing.**

The client is a Cayman Islands incorporated and registered entity. It is a financial service holding company for a number of direct and indirect subsidiaries that operate in the commercial automobile insurance sector in the United States. Globe Holdings was initially formed as a Canadian company in 2009, under the laws of Ontario, Canada. A year later, following certain reverse merger transactions, it filed a Certificate of Registration by Way of Continuation in the Cayman Islands to re-domesticate as a Cayman Islands company and changed its name to Globe Financial Holdings Inc. When it re-incorporated in the Cayman Islands in 2010 (from Canada), Globe Holdings provided various notices of its re-incorporation, including in the public filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Around that time, Globe Holdings retained its Cayman Islands counsel Cedar and Woods, which has regularly represented Globe Holdings for over a decade. Globe Holdings has a bank account (opened just a few days ago) in the Cayman Islands from which it pays certain of its operating expenses. Globe Holdings often holds its board meetings virtually, and not physically in the Cayman Islands, and, having obtained support for a bond restructuring, all its regular and special board meetings have been organized by its local Cayman counsel virtually. The client also maintains its books and records in the Cayman Islands. Its public filings with the SEC as well as the prospectus provided in connection with the issuance of the Notes disclosed that Globe Holdings is a Cayman Islands company and explained the related indemnification and tax consequences resulting from Globe Holdings’ place of reformation.

Globe Holdings has no business operations of its own. The business is carried out through its non-insurance company non-debtor subsidiaries that are all incorporated under the US laws and operating in the US. All employees are in the US. The headquarters are also in the US.

In April 2017, Globe Holdings offered and issued USD 25,000,000 in aggregate nominal principal amount of 6.625% senior unsecured notes due in 2023 (referenced above as the Notes) governed by New York law.

In 2019, Globe Holdings recorded on its consolidated balance sheet a significant increase in liabilities. As a result, Globe Holdings worked with external professional advisors to undertake a formal strategic evaluation of its subsidiaries’ businesses. In September 2020, Globe Holdings announced that it was informed its shares would be suspended from the NASDAQ Stock Market due to delinquencies in filing its 10-K. Thereafter, on November 6, 2020, its shares were delisted from the NASDAQ stock market.

An independent third party is actively marketing the sale of the corporate headquarters located in New York including the land, building, building improvements and contents including furniture and fixtures.

Despite these efforts to ease the financial stress, the culmination of incremental challenges consequently resulted in Globe Holdings being both cash flow and balance sheet insolvent.

Globe Holdings retained Cedar and Woods, its long-standing Cayman Islands counsel, to advise on restructuring alternatives. Upon consultations with Cayman counsel and its other professionals, Globe Holdings ultimately determined that the most value accretive path for the Noteholders was to commence a scheme under Cayman Islands law, followed by a chapter 15 recognition proceeding in the United States, most notably to extend the maturity of the Notes and obtain the flexibility to pay the quarterly interest “in kind”.

Globe Holdings expeditiously secured the support of the majority of the Noteholders of its decision to delay interest payments and restructure the Notes through a formal proceeding. Thereafter, on August 31, 2021, about 57% of the Noteholders acceded to the Restructuring Support Agreement (RSA) governed by the New York law. The RSA memorialized the agreed-upon terms of the Note Restructuring. When Globe Holdings approached its largest Noteholders regarding the contemplated restructuring, their expectations were that any such restructuring would take place in the Cayman Islands, which is reflected in the RSA.

On July 4, 2023, the client, in accordance with the terms of the RSA, applied to the Cayman Court for permission to convene a single scheme meeting on the basis that the Noteholders, as the only Scheme Creditors, should constitute a single class of creditors for the purpose of voting on the Scheme.

On July 26, 2023 the Cayman Court entered a convening order (the Convening Order) on the papers, among other things, authorizing the client to convene a single Scheme Meeting for the purpose of considering and, through a majority vote, approving, with or without modification, the Scheme. The Scheme Meeting was held in the Cayman Islands at the offices of Cedar and Woods.Given the Covid-19 pandemic, Scheme Creditors were also afforded the convenience of observing the Scheme Meeting via Zoom and in person via a satellite location in New York. Following the Scheme Meeting, the chairman of the Scheme Meeting (presiding over the meeting in person) reported to the Cayman Court that the Scheme was overwhelmingly supported by the Noteholders, with 91.83% in number and 99.34% in value voting in favor of the Scheme. The Sanction Hearing was held, and an order sanctioning the Scheme (the Sanction Order), which was filed with the Cayman Islands Registrar of Companies the same day.

During all of this time, a class action litigation was in the US was brewing but has been filed yet.

The representative of Globe Holdings can apply to recognise a foreign non-main proceeding in the Cayman Islands, ie, the scheme. This constitutes a foreign proceeding under Article 2 of the MLCBI as it is a collective administrative proceeding pursuant to insolvency laws for the purpose of the reorganization.

It is likely that this foreign proceeding will be deemed a non-main proceeding as although Globe Holdings has no business operations of its own, its business is carried out through its subsidiaries that are all incorporated under the US laws and operating in the US. All its employees are in the US and its headquarters are also in the US. This points to the fact that the COMI is in the US. Relevant factors in this analysis are where the central administration of the debtor takes place and whether this is readily ascertainable by the debtor’s creditors. However, it can be argued that Globe Holdings has an establishment in the Cayman Islands as it maintains its books and records in the Cayman Islands.

The application for recognition will need to be accompanied by the relevant documents set out in Article 15(2). This requirement can likely be fulfilled by adducing the application to the Cayman Court for permission to convene a single scheme meeting.

Specifically, the representative can also pray for the court’s discretionary relief under Article 21(1)(a) of the MLCBI to stay execution of actions or proceedings against the debtor. This will deal with the potential class action litigation in the US. It can also ask for a stay of execution against its assets under Article 21(1)(b) so as to prevent the third party from proceeding with the sale of its headquarters and its furniture and fixtures.

It is also noted that the representative can apply for interim relief from the date of filing of the recognition application under Article 19.

**\* End of Assessment \***