



SUMMATIVE (FORMAL) ASSESSMENT: MODULE 2A

THE UNCITRAL MODEL LAWS RELATING TO INSOLVENCY

This is the **summative (formal) assessment** for **Module 2A** of this course and is compulsory for all candidates who **selected this module as one of their compulsory modules from Module 2**. Please read instruction 6.1 on the next page very carefully.

If you selected this module as **one of your elective modules**, please read instruction 6.2 on the next page very carefully.

The mark awarded for this assessment will determine your final mark for Module 2A. In order to pass this module, you need to obtain a mark of 50% or more for this assessment.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION AND SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENT

Please read the following instructions very carefully before submitting / uploading your assessment on the Foundation Certificate web pages.

1. You must use this document for the answering of the assessment for this module. The answers to each question must be completed using this document with the answers populated under each question.
2. All assessments must be submitted electronically in MS Word format, using a standard A4 size page and a 11-point Arial font. This document has been set up with these parameters – **please do not change the document settings in any way. DO NOT** submit your assessment in PDF format as it will be returned to you unmarked.
3. No limit has been set for the length of your answers to the questions. However, please be guided by the mark allocation for each question. More often than not, one fact / statement will earn one mark (unless it is obvious from the question that this is not the case).
4. You must save this document using the following format: **[student ID.assessment2A]**. An example would be something along the following lines: 202122-336.assessment2A. **Please also include the filename as a footer to each page of the assessment** (this has been pre-populated for you, merely replace the words “studentID” with the student number allocated to you). Do not include your name or any other identifying words in your file name. **Assessments that do not comply with this instruction will be returned to candidates unmarked.**
5. Before you will be allowed to upload / submit your assessment via the portal on the Foundation Certificate web pages, you will be required to confirm / certify that you are the person who completed the assessment and that the work submitted is your own, original work. Please see the part of the Course Handbook that deals with plagiarism and dishonesty in the submission of assessments. **Please note that copying and pasting from the Guidance Text into your answer is prohibited and constitutes plagiarism. You must write the answers to the questions in your own words.**
- 6.1 If 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 2022**. The assessment submission portal will close at 23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2022. 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 2022** or by **23:00 (11 pm) BST (GMT +1) on 31 July 2022**. If you elect to submit by 1 March 2022, you **may not** submit the assessment again by 31 July 2022 (for example, in order to achieve a higher mark).
7. Prior to being populated with your answers, this assessment consists of **12 pages**.

ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS

Total: 21,5 out of 50

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?

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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.**
- (c) 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.
- (d) 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?

- (a) 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.
- (b) The difficulty of agreeing multilateral treaties dealing with insolvency law.
- (c) The practical problems caused by the disharmony among national laws governing cross-border insolvencies, despite the success of protocols in practice.**
- (d) 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?**

- (a) 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.
- (b) **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.**
- (c) **The debtor has neither its COMI nor an establishment in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings were opened.**
- (d) 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?

- (a) **The *locus standi* access rules.**
- (b) The public policy exception.
- (c) **The safe conduct rule.**
- (d) 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?**

- (a) **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.**
- (b) 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.

(c) Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Brazil will be recognised in the UK.

(d) 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**?

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) The commencement of domestic insolvency proceedings prevents or terminates the recognition of a foreign proceeding.

(d) 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?

(a) The court must be satisfied that the interests of the creditors and other interested parties, excluding the debtor, are adequately protected.

(b) 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.

(c) The court should consider both (a) and (b).

(d) 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**?

(a) COMI is a defined term in the Model Law.

(b) For a corporate debtor, the Model Law does contain a rebuttable presumption that the debtor's registered office is its COMI.

(c) 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".

(d) 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?

(a) Enforcement of insolvency-related judgments.

(b) An indefinite moratorium continuation.

(c) Both (a) and (b).

(d) 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?

(a) The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Practice Guide.

(b) The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Legislative Guide – Parts One, Two, Three and Four.

(c) The UNCITRAL Guide of Enactment and the Judicial Perspective.

(d) All of the above.

QUESTION 2 (direct questions) [10 marks in total] 9 marks

Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks] 3 marks

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

COMI or Centre of Main Interest is central to the operation of the Model Law. The determination of COMI is designed so as to ascertain and verify that the location of the foreign proceeding corresponds to the actual location of the debtor's Centre of Main Interest.

In the most basic sense, the Centre of Main Interest or (COMI) is the location where the debtor carries on its business and in fact is the place/country where its Registered Office or principal place of business is situated.

The appropriate date for determining the COMI, or whether an establishment exists, is the date of commencement of the foreign proceeding. It is sometimes difficult to establish the appropriate date for determination of COMI, if the proceedings in fact begin closer to the

commencement of the insolvency proceedings in another state since this could be a move by the debtor to take certain assets out of the reach of the creditors from one jurisdiction to another.

In *re Fairfield Sentry*¹, the United States Court of Appeal (Second Circuit) in its judgement dated 16.04.2013 took a slightly different approach and held that the courts should determine the foreign debtor's centre of main interest at the date of filing of Chapter 15 petition of the US Bankruptcy Code and not at the date of commencement of a foreign proceeding. Additionally, the Court further went on to say that the period between the filing of the Chapter 15 petition and the commencement of the foreign proceeding should also be looked at with impunity so as to satisfy itself that the debtor has not tried to manipulate the interest of its creditors in bad faith. It is also pertinent to mention here that a Chapter 15 petition is concerned with recognition of a foreign proceeding under the United States Bankruptcy law.

Question 2.2 [maximum 3 marks] 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: **Article 30(c)** of the UNCITRAL Model law on cross-border insolvency provides guidance in case of concurrence of two foreign non-main proceedings. For reference, Article 30 has been reproduced herein as follows:

"...Article 30. Coordination of more than one foreign proceeding-

In matters referred to in article 1, in respect of more than one foreign proceeding regarding the same debtor, the court shall seek cooperation and coordination under articles 25, 26 and 27, and the following shall apply:

(a) any relief granted under article 19 or 21 to a representative of a foreign non-main proceeding after recognition of a foreign main proceeding must be consistent with the foreign main proceeding;

(b) if a foreign main proceeding is recognized after recognition, or after the filing of an application for recognition, of a foreign non-main proceeding, any relief in effect under article 19 or 21 shall be reviewed by the court and shall be modified or terminated if inconsistent with the foreign main proceeding;

¹ 714 F.3d 127

(c) if, after recognition of a foreign non-main proceeding, another foreign non-main proceeding is recognized, the court shall grant, modify or terminate relief for the purpose of facilitating coordination of the proceedings...

Statement 2: Article 32 dealing with the “Hotchpot Rule” intends to protect the rights of the secured claimants. The rule does not affect that ranking of claims as established under the law of the enacting State.

Article 32 is reproduced herein as follows:

“...Without prejudice to the secured claims or rights in rem, a creditor who has received part payment in respect of its claim in a proceeding pursuant to a law relating to insolvency in a foreign state, may not receive a payment for the same claim in a [domestic proceeding in the enacting State] regarding the same debtor, so long as the payment to the other creditors of the same class is proportionally less than the payment the creditor has already received...”

Statement 3: Article 16 dealing with Presumptions in respect of Recognition. The same is reproduced herein for reference:

“...1. If the decision or certificate referred to in paragraph 2 of article 15 indicates that the foreign proceeding is a proceeding within the meaning of subparagraph (a) of article 2 and that the foreign representative is a person or body within the meaning of subparagraph (d) of article 2, the court is entitled to so presume.

2. The court is entitled to presume that documents submitted in support of the application for recognition are authentic, whether or not they have been legalized.

3. In the absence of proof to the contrary, the debtor’s registered office, or habitual residence in the case of an individual, is presumed to be the centre of the debtor’s main interests...”

Question 2.3 [2 marks] 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, Ms. Gunel Bakhshiyeva, who was the foreign representative for *IBA* restructuring process requested for relief in terms of the Article 21 of the Model Law in the form of an indefinite continuation of moratorium. This application was contested by the creditors of *OJSC International Bank of Azerbaijan (IBA)* that had unpaid claims with *IBA* under debt instruments governed by English Law and had not submitted to the foreign insolvency proceedings in Azerbaijan to which the *IBA* was subject.

The moratorium continuation application sought to address a major concern that after the restructuring procedure *IBA* ends, the challenging creditors would go to UK and enforce their

English law claims against IBA before an English Court on ground of the Gibbs Rule which states that a debt governed by English law cannot be discharged or compromised by a foreign insolvency proceeding. Mr. Justice Hildyard denied relief to the petitioners in the IBA case primarily on the ground that he did not have the appropriate jurisdiction to grant relief in terms of Article 21 of the Model Law due to the balancing of interest exercise he is required to take in terms of Article 22 of the Model Law. When the case went in Appeal, known as the IBA Case Appeal, the English Court of Appeal upheld the decision of the Court of First Instance and the order by Justice Hildyard on two grounds.

(a) on the question whether it could prevent the challenging creditors from enforcing their English law rights in accordance with the Gibbs Rule, the Court held that an English court could only properly grant the indefinite moratorium continuation if it was satisfied of two conditions:

(i) the stay to be granted would have to be necessary to protect the interests of IBA's creditors and,

(ii) the stay would have to be an appropriate way of achieving such protection.

In this case, neither of the two conditions were satisfied.

Further, on the issue whether moratorium could be extended even after the restructuring exercise had ended and the foreign representative no longer held office, there was no scope for further orders in support of the foreign proceedings and any relief previously granted under the Model Law should in fact terminate.

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**.

In terms of **Article 15** of the Model Law, one of the foremost things that is required to be done after recognition of a foreign main proceeding is to apply to the Court for recognition of the foreign proceeding to which the foreign representative has been appointed. This is known as the Application for Recognition and needs to be accompanied by:

1. a certified copy of the order indicating the commencement of the foreign proceeding and the foreign representative;
2. a certificate from the foreign court affirming the existence of the foreign proceeding and confirming the appointment of the foreign representative;
3. in case any evidence suggested in (1) and (2) above was not available, any other mode of evidence that was acceptable to the court.

Such an application is also required to be accompanied by a statement identifying all the foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor that are in fact known to the concerned foreign representative. A translation of the documents may also be provided in the official language of the enacting State.

The correct answer is art 29(a) on concurrent proceedings

Further, in terms of **Article 18** of the Model Law, there is an ongoing and continuing obligation on the foreign representative to promptly inform the Court in the enacting State of:

- (a) any substantial change in the status of the recognised foreign proceeding or on the status of the representative's appointment; and
- (b) any other proceeding that becomes known to the foreign representative must also be intimated to the court of the enacting state.

QUESTION 3 (essay-type questions) [15 marks in total] 3,5

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] 0

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

The benefits of recognition in the enacting State of a foreign proceeding are multi-fold.

The question deals with rights *prior* to recognition!

1. There is no need to open a separate proceeding in the enacting state. In certain respects, the foreign proceedings are treated in the enacting state similar to local proceedings without the actual need of opening such proceedings.
2. Recognition also enables and empowers the Foreign Representative to access certain tools and benefits available to a local insolvency representative without the actual requirement of commencement of local insolvency proceedings.
3. The foreign representative may also seek powers allowing for the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor's assets, liabilities and the general affairs of business.
4. Once the power of examination is granted, it can assist the foreign representative in gathering information to further ascertain whether avoidance or vulnerable

transactions were entered into by the promoters of the debtor entity and take appropriate steps for recovery of those transactions.

For full marks the answer should include:

- Legal standing (Article 9 MLCBI): The key access for the foreign representative is set forth in Article 9 MLCBI. In the capacity of foreign representative, the foreign representative has automatically standing before the courts in State A without having to meet any formal requirements such as a license or any consular action. In other words, the “status” in State B of the foreign representative is automatically recognised in State A for the purpose of granting the foreign representative standing before the courts in State A. This allows the foreign representative to safeguard and pursue assets of the debtor estate in State A before its courts.
- Opening domestic insolvency proceedings (Article 11 MLCBI): The foreign representative is further specifically entitled to apply for the opening of domestic insolvency proceedings in State A, as reflected in Article 11 of the MLCBI. Whether or not the foreign representative would wish to do this will depend on what the requirements are for opening such domestic proceedings. Can these requirements be met? On the other hand, it will depend on what the foreign representative believes he/she can get in terms of (interim) relief for the foreign proceedings in State B. In other words, are domestic insolvency proceedings really needed, or just additional time and costs that should be avoided?
- Cooperation: Similar to access rights, the cooperation provisions in the MLCBI (articles 25-27) also operate independently of recognition and it is not a prerequisite to the use of the cooperation provisions that recognition of the foreign proceedings is obtained in advance. Courts in State A can freely cooperate with the foreign representative without having to worry whether the status in State B of the foreign representative can be recognised in State A.
- Save Time & Costs: The key benefits of both the access provisions and the cooperation provisions are that they save time and therefore also costs, as a result of which value destruction can be avoided and value enhancement is being promoted.

Question 3.2 [maximum 5 marks] 1,5 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 of the Model Law deals with the requirements and documents that are required for a successful Recognition application. If those requirements are met, “Recognition” to the proceeding shall be granted pursuant to Article 17 of the Model Law. Further, such a decision is limited to the jurisdictional pre-conditions as set out in Section 2(a) of the Model Law which defines “foreign proceeding”. The court deciding such an issue is not required to consider whether the foreign proceeding for which recognition is requested was correctly commenced under the applicable law of the foreign state.

As far as the application is concerned, a “foreign representative” may apply to the court for recognition of the foreign proceeding to which the “foreign representative” has been appointed. The application needs to be accompanied by:

- a) a certified copy of the decision leading to the commencement of the proceeding and the appointment of the representative; or
- b) a certificate from the foreign court affirming the existence of the foreign proceeding and confirming the appointment of the representative; or
- c) in the absence of evidence referred to above, any other evidence acceptable to the court confirming the commencement of the proceeding and the appointment of the representative.

Such an application must also be accompanied by a statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor that are known to that foreign representative. The court can also ask for translation of the documents so submitted in the official language of the enacting state.

As far as Presumptions are concerned, Article 16 gives out certain presumptions concerning the Recognition application.

- a) if the decision or certification referred to in a) and b) above indicates that the “foreign proceeding” is a proceeding within the definition of Article 2(a) of the Model Law and also the fact that the foreign representative is a person or body within the meaning of Article 2(d) of the Model Law, the Court is entitled to presume so.
- b) Further, the court is entitled to presume that all such documents submitted are authentic, whether or not the same have been legalized.
- c) In case of absence of proof of the contrary, the debtor’s registered office or habitual residence is presumed to be the centre of the debtor’s main interest or COMI.

The following should be included for full marks

1. **Exclusions:** If the debtor is an entity that is subject to a special insolvency regime in State B, the foreign representative should first of all check if the foreign proceedings regarding that type of a debtor are excluded in State A based on Article 1(2) of the implemented Model Law in State A.
2. **Restrictions;- Existing international obligations of State A:** Based on Article 3 of the Model Law, the court in State A should also check if there are no existing international obligations of State A (under a treaty or otherwise) that may conflict with granting the recognition application under the implemented Model Law in State A.
3. **Judicial scrutiny:** While the court in State A is able to rely on the rebuttable presumptions set forth in Article 16 of the Model Law, in the context of Article 17 of the Model Law the court will have to assess whether either the COMI or at least an establishment of the debtor is located in State B where the foreign proceedings were opened. If the COMI of the debtor is in State B the foreign proceedings should be recognised as foreign main proceedings and if only an establishment of the debtor is in State B the foreign proceedings should be recognised as foreign non-main proceedings. Without a COMI or

at least an establishment of the debtor in State B, recognition cannot be granted by the court in State A.

4. Public policy exception: Finally, the court in State A should also ensure based on Article 6 of the Model Law that the recognition application is not manifestly contrary to public policy of State A.

Question 3.3 [maximum 5 marks] 2 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.

Article 19 of the Model Law deals with the Relief that may be granted upon application for recognition of a foreign proceeding.

1. From the time of filing an application for recognition until the application is decided upon, the court may, at the request of the foreign representative, where relief is urgently needed to protect the assets of the debtor or the interests of the creditors, grant relief of a provisional nature, including:

- (a) Staying execution against the debtor's assets;
- (b) Entrusting the administration or realization of all or part of the debtor's assets located in this State to the foreign representative or another person designated by the court, in order to protect and preserve the value of assets that, by their nature or because of other circumstances, are perishable, susceptible to devaluation or otherwise in jeopardy;
- (c) Any relief mentioned in paragraph 1 (c), (d) and (g) of article 21.

2. Unless extended under paragraph 1 (f) of article 21, the relief granted under this article terminates when the application for recognition is decided upon.

3. The court may refuse to grant relief under this article if such relief would interfere with the administration of a foreign main proceeding.

Article 21 of the Model Law deals with the Reliefs that may be granted post recognition of a foreign proceeding. These are as follows:

- a) Staying the commencement or continuation of individual actions or individual proceedings concerning the debtor's assets, rights, obligations or liabilities, to the extent they have not been stayed under paragraph 1 (a) of article 20;
- b) Staying execution against the debtor's assets to the extent it has not been stayed under paragraph 1 (b) of article 20;

- c) Suspending the right to transfer, encumber or otherwise dispose of any assets of the debtor to the extent this right has not been suspended under paragraph 1 (c) of article 20;
- d) Providing for the examination of witnesses, the taking of evidence or the delivery of information concerning the debtor's assets, affairs, rights, obligations or liabilities;
- e) Entrusting the administration or realization of all or part of the debtor's assets located in this State to the foreign representative or another person designated by the court;
- f) Extending relief granted under paragraph 1 of article 19;
- g) Granting any additional relief that may be available to under the laws of this State.

2. Upon recognition of a foreign proceeding, whether main or nonmain, the court may, at the request of the foreign representative, entrust the distribution of all or part of the debtor's assets located in this State to the foreign representative or another person designated by the court, provided that the court is satisfied that the interests of creditors in this State are adequately protected.

3. In granting relief under this article to a representative of a foreign non-main proceeding, the court must be satisfied that the relief relates to assets that, under the law of this State, should be administered in the foreign non-main proceeding or concerns information required in that proceeding.

Never just copy the text of the law. Also, for full marks, the following should be addressed:

1. **Adequate protection:** Pursuant to Article 22 of the Model Law any interim relief under Article 19 of the Model Law or any post-recognition relief under Article 21 of the Model Law require the court in State A to be satisfied that the interests of the creditors and the other interested persons, including the debtor, are adequately protected and any relief may be subject to conditions as the court considers appropriate.
2. **Existing international obligations of State A:** Based on Article 3 of the Model Law, the court in State A should again verify that there are no existing international obligations of State A (under a treaty or otherwise) that may conflict with granting the requested relief under the implemented Model Law in State A.
3. **Public policy exception:** The court in State A should, based on Article 6 of the Model Law, also again verify that the relief application is not manifestly contrary to public policy of State A.

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?

The court at every stage needs to satisfy that the interests of the creditors are adequately protected. Such a freezing order would hamper the interests of the creditors.

Here it should be mentioned that art. 21 provides for other forms for protection leaving the freezing order un-warranted.

QUESTION 4 (fact-based application-type question) [15 marks in total] 8 marks

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:

- (i) the bank's regulatory capital amount or standard capital ratios have reduced to one third of the minimum level specified by law;
- (ii) within five consecutive working days, the bank has failed to meet 2% or more of its obligations to depositors or creditors; and
- (iii) 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:

- (i) 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.
- (ii) 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:

- (i) the power to exercise management powers and take over management of the property (including the money) of the bank;
- (ii) the power to compile a register of creditor claims and to seek to satisfy those claims;
- (iii) the power to take steps to find, identify and recover property belonging to the bank;
- (iv) the power to dismiss employees and withdraw from/terminate contracts;

(v) the power to dispose of the bank's assets; and

(vi) 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:

- (i) a breach, for eight consecutive reporting periods, of the NB's minimum capital requirements;
- (ii) 10 months of loss-making activities;
- (iii) a reduction in its holding of highly liquid assets;
- (iv) a critically low balance of funds held with the NB; and

- (v) 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.

4.1.1. Article 2(a) of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency defines a “foreign proceeding” as

“...(a) “Foreign proceeding” means 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...”

Therefore, in order for a “foreign proceeding” to be eligible for recognition under the MLCBI, it must satisfy all of the elements of the definition in 2(a) as referred to above.

The courts have identified “collective proceedings” as having various characteristics including:

(a) Imposition of an orderly regime that affects the rights and obligations of all creditors and all of the assets of the debtor. A proceeding would affect all creditors if it realized assets for the general benefit of all creditors.

(b) All creditors need not receive a share of the distribution- by addressing potential distribution to other creditors, a foreign representative could acknowledge their overall duty to creditors in general.

(c) Creditor participation must be a reality. They should also have the power to appeal for their decision.

The MLCBI includes the requirement that the foreign proceeding be pursuant to a law relating to insolvency to acknowledge the fact that liquidation and re-organization might be conducted under a law that is not labelled as insolvency law, but nevertheless deals with or addresses insolvency or severe financial distress.

The courts have further indicated that the requirement for control and supervision can be met in a variety of situations in which the courts do not direct the day-to-day operations of the debtor, including where liquidators can proceed with their duties largely without court involvement, where the relevant law gives the court various control and supervisory roles with respect to liquidation proceedings.

As far as the facts are concerned, the proceedings satisfy the requirements as enshrined in Article 2(a) of the MLCBI.

“...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...'

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:

- (i) the power to exercise management powers and take over management of the property (including the money) of the bank;
- (ii) the power to compile a register of creditor claims and to seek to satisfy those claims;
- (iii) the power to take steps to find, identify and recover property belonging to the bank;
- (iv) the power to dismiss employees and withdraw from/terminate contracts;
- (v) the power to dispose of the bank's assets; and
- (vi) 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.

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..."

Therefore, the Bank's liquidation comprises a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of article 2(a) of the MLCBI.

It is difficult in this explanation to see which facts are relevant for each requirement. This answer should include the following for full marks:

This answer should have included a much more detailed explanation along the following lines:

Recognition of the Bank's liquidation under the CBIR

1. In order to be recognised, the Bank's liquidation must meet the definition of "*foreign proceeding*" set out in article 2(a) of the MLCBI.
2. Here reference can also be made to paragraphs 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 of the Guidance Text and in particular the *Agrokor* case discussed there.

"Collective proceeding"

3. UNCITRAL's guide for judiciary, "The Model Law on Insolvency: The Judicial Perspective" (2013) explains the requirement for proceedings to be "*collective*":

"The UNCITRAL Model Law was intended to apply only to particular types of insolvency proceedings. The Guide to Enactment and Interpretation indicates that the notion of a "*collective*" insolvency proceeding is based on the desirability of achieving a coordinated, global solution for all stakeholders of an insolvency proceeding. It is not intended that the Model Law be used merely as a collection device for a particular creditor or group of creditors who might have initiated a collection proceeding in another State, or as a tool for gathering up assets in a winding up or conservation proceeding that does not also include provision for addressing the claims of creditors. The Model Law may be an appropriate tool for certain kinds of actions that serve a regulatory purpose, such as receiverships for such publicly regulated entities as insurance companies or brokerage firms, provided the proceeding is collective as that term is used in the Model Law."

4. The Guide to Enactment and Interpretation of the UNCITRAL Model Law (2014) explains that when:

"evaluating whether a given proceeding is *collective* for the purpose of the Model Law, a key consideration is whether substantially all of the assets and liabilities of the debtor are dealt with in the proceeding, subject to local priorities and statutory exceptions, and to local exclusions relating to the rights of secured creditors. A proceeding should not be considered to fail the test of collectivity purely because a class of creditors' rights is unaffected by it."

5. Based on the facts provided the understanding is that *all* of the Bank's creditors are entitled to claim in the liquidation and that their claims are met from available assets, according to the statutory order of priorities. Consequently, the conclusion can be reached that the Bank's liquidation is a "*collective proceeding*".

"Judicial or administrative" and "subject to the control or supervision by a foreign court"

6. The collective proceeding, must be "*judicial or administrative*" where "*the assets and affairs or the debtor are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court*".
7. The term "*foreign court*" is defined at article 2(e) of the MLCBI and means: "*a judicial or other authority competent to control or supervise a foreign proceeding*".
8. The Guide to Enactment notes: "*87) A foreign proceeding that meets the requisites of article 2, subparagraph (a), should receive the same treatment irrespective of whether it has been commenced and supervised by a judicial body or an administrative body. Therefore, in order to obviate the need to refer to a foreign non-judicial authority whenever*

reference is made to a foreign court, the definition of “foreign court” in subparagraph (e) includes also non-judicial authorities.”

9. In ***Re Sanko Steamship Co Ltd*** [2015] EWHC 1031 (Ch) Simon Barker QC, noted that a foreign proceeding may be recognised where the control or supervision of the proceeding is undertaken by a non-judicial administrative body.
10. The Guide to Enactment states: “74) *The Model Law specifies neither the level of control or supervision required to satisfy this aspect of the definition nor the time at which that control or supervision should arise. Although it is intended that the control or supervision required under subparagraph (a) should be formal in nature, it may be potential rather than actual. As noted in paragraph 71, a proceeding in which the debtor retains some measure of control over its assets, albeit under court supervision, such as a debtor-in-possession would satisfy this requirement. Control or supervision may be exercised not only directly by the court but also by an insolvency representative where, for example, the insolvency representative is subject to control or supervision by the court. Mere supervision of an insolvency representative by a licensing authority would not be sufficient.*”
11. In this case the DGF has control of all of the Bank’s assets and overall control of the liquidation.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Taking these factors into account, the Bank’s liquidation is *administrative*. The assets and affairs of the Bank are subject to the control of the DGF, an official body which exercises its powers in the liquidation free from intervention by government or the NB and which should be considered, for the purposes of the definition set out in article 2(e) of the MLCBI, as a “*foreign court*”.

“Pursuant to a law relating to insolvency”

15. The Guide to Enactment provides at paragraph 48:

“Acknowledging that different jurisdictions might have different notions of what falls within the term “insolvency proceedings”, the Model Law does not define the term “insolvency”. However, as used in the Model Law, the word “insolvency” refers to various types of collective proceedings commenced with respect to debtors that are in severe financial distress or insolvent.”

- Further explanation is provided at paragraph 73:

“This formulation is used in the Model Law to acknowledge the fact that liquidation and reorganization might be conducted under law that is not labelled as insolvency law (e.g. company law), but which nevertheless deals with or addresses insolvency or severe financial distress. The purpose was to find a description that was sufficiently broad to encompass a range of insolvency rules irrespective of the type of statute or law in which they might be contained and irrespective of whether the law that contained the rules related exclusively to insolvency.”

16. Article 76 of the LBBA clearly set out Country A’s specific insolvency procedures for insolvent banks. The Bank’s liquidation was commenced pursuant to those provisions and

in my judgment should be considered by this Court as being “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 reorganisation or liquidation”

17. Having determined that the DGF falls within the definition of “foreign court”, I am satisfied, that by virtue of the legislative provisions set out above, it has control of all of the Bank’s assets and affairs for the purposes of administering the Bank’s liquidation.

4.1.2. Article 2(d) of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency defines a “foreign representative” as-

“...Foreign Representative means a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, authorized in a foreign proceeding to administer the re-organization or the liquidation of the debtor’s assets or affairs or to act as a representative of the foreign proceeding...”

The foreign representative may be a person authorised in the foreign proceedings either to administer those proceedings, which the GEI suggests would include seeking recognition, relief and cooperation in another jurisdiction, or for the purposes of representing those proceedings.

Since the MLCBI does not specify that the foreign representative must be authorized by the foreign court, the definition is thus sufficiently broad to include appointments that might be made by a special agency other than the court.

Courts have further indicated that the focus is upon the authorization being provided in the context of or in the course of the proceeding, rather than upon the body providing the authorization, which might include the court, the law, or even appointment by the debtor itself, such as an appointment made by the Board of Directors of the Debtor.

The Foreign Representative must also have the power to administer the re-organization or liquidation of the debtor’s assets or affairs at the time of the application for recognition.

Therefore, the liquidator appointed by DGF satisfies all conditions precedent and is therefore, covered under Article 2(d) of the Model Law.

This answer does not apply the fact to the requirements and is lacking a discussion on the effect of the split powers and is therefore inadequate.

*** End of Assessment ***