



SUMMATIVE (FORMAL) ASSESSMENT: MODULE 2A

THE UNCITRAL MODEL LAWS RELATING TO INSOLVENCY

Commented [SL1]: TOTAL = 27.5

55%

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: 202223-336.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 2023. The assessment submission portal will close at 23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2023. 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 2023 or by 23:00 (11 pm) BST (GMT +1) on 31 July 2023. If you elect to submit by 1 March 2023, you may not**

submit the assessment again by 31 July 2023 (for example, in order to achieve a higher mark).

- 7. Prior to being populated with your answers, this assessment consists of 14 pages.*

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]

Commented [SL2]: SUBTOTAL = 7 MARKS

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

Commented [SL3]: Correct answer is (c).

Which of the following statements does not reflect the purpose of the Model Law?

- (a) The purpose of the Model Law is to provide greater legal certainty for trade and investment.
- (b) The purpose of the Model Law is to provide protection and maximization of the value of the debtor's assets.**
- (c) The purpose of the Model Law is to facilitate the rescue of a financially troubled business, by providing a substantive unification of insolvency law.
- (d) 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

Commented [SL4]: Correct answer is (d).

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

- (a) The increased risk of fraud due to the interconnected world.
- (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) All of the above.

Question 1.3

Commented [SL5]: Correct answer is (c).

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

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

- (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 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?

(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 Argentina will be recognised in the UK despite Argentina not having implemented the Model Law.

(b) 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.

(c) Both the foreign main proceedings in South Africa and the foreign non-main proceedings in Argentina 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 be satisfied that the foreign proceeding is a main proceeding.

(d) 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?

(a) COMI is not 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) For an individual debtor, the Model Law does contain a rebuttable presumption that the debtor's habitual residence is its COMI.

(d) All of the above.

Question 1.9

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

(a) Court proceedings.

(b) Arbitral Tribunals.

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

(d) 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?

(a) A foreign creditor has the same rights regarding the commencement of, and participation in, a proceeding as creditors in this State.

(b) A foreign creditor has the same rights as it has in its home state.

(c) All foreign creditors' claims are, as a minimum, considered to be unsecured claims.

(d) 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?

[The Model Law has no precise definition of COMI therefore; it is difficult to determine the COMI of a Debtor in the absence of a definition of COMI. Thus, in order to determine the COMI of a Debtor recourse is made to the commencement date of the foreign proceeding. In other words, the appropriate date for determining the COMI of a debtor is the date of commencement of a foreign proceeding.]

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."

[Statement 1 the Statement relates to the "Timely Notice" provision under Article 14 of the Model Law. The Concept under Article 14 of the Model Law is that foreign creditors must be notified whenever notification is required for local creditors in the enacting state. Article 14 of the Model Law is premised on the equal treatment of the Creditors whether local or foreign in relation to timely notice.

Statement 2 The "Safe Conduct Rule" is provided for under Article 10 of the Model Law and the concept is that the Court in the enacting state is barred from assuming jurisdiction over the assets of the Debtor on the premise that the foreign representative has lodged an application for the recognition of a foreign proceeding.

Statement 3. This statement relates to Article 16 of the Model Law and deals with the concept of rebuttable presumption in relation to the Centre of Main interest ("COMI") of the Debtor in the absence of a precise definition of "COMI" in the Model Law.]

Commented [SL6]: SUBTOTAL = 6.5 MARKS

Commented [SL7]: 1 mark

Also, UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment explains (see paragraphs 159 and 160), art 17(2)(a) and position of US courts (*Morning Mist Holdings Ltd v. Kryz (Matter of Fairfield Sentry Ltd)*).

Commented [SL8]: 2.5 marks

Statement 3 = Art 16(3)

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.

[The substantive issue for determination in the IBA case appeal was whether as a matter of settled practice the court can be called upon to exercise its power to grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation where to do so would firstly prevent the English Creditors from enforcing their English law rights in accordance with the Gibbs Rule and secondly prolong the stay after the Azeri reconstruction has come to an end. In answering the preceding questions, the Court of Appeal authoritatively held, "an English court could only properly grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation if it were satisfied of two things; first, the stay would have to be necessary to protect the interest of IBA's creditors and secondly, the stay would have to be an appropriate way of achieving such protection." In light of the foregoing two requirements the Court of Appeal held that none of the two conditions were satisfied in the case. In other words, the Court can only grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation if it is best avenue of protecting the interest of the creditors and if that is the best way of achieving such protection.]

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.

[The Court in an enacting State is vested with discretionally power under Article 21 of the MLCBI where necessary to protect the assets or interest of the Debtor and at the request of the foreign representative to grant appropriate reliefs which may inter alia include stay of commencement or continuation of personal proceedings, stay of execution against the Debtor's assets etc. The foreign representative in the foreign main proceedings has the duty under Article 18 of the MLCBI to timely inform the court in the enacting state of any substantial change in the status of the recognized foreign proceeding or the status of his or her appointment. The foreign Representative is enjoined to inform the court of any other foreign proceeding pertaining to the same Debtor that he or she has knowledge of.]

Commented [SL9]: 1.5 marks

Art 18

Commented [SL10]: 1.5 mark

Art 29(a) and art 18

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] [2.5 marks out of 4]

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 fundamental benefit of recognition in the enacting State under the Model Law is that it eliminates the need of opening separate insolvency proceedings in the enacting state. On the other hand, it is a known fact that many countries lack legislative framework for cooperation between Judges in different countries or jurisdiction therefore, the Model Law fills a gap by empowering courts to offer cooperation in certain areas. The purpose of cooperation is to enable the Courts and insolvency representatives from two or more countries to be more efficient and achieve the best results as well as to promote consistency of treatment of the various stakeholders across the diverse jurisdictions. It is important to note that a foreign representative is a stakeholder in cross boarder insolvency, therefore stands to benefit upon being granted a recognition application and certain rights accrue to a foreign representative. In most cases, the rights that accrue to a foreign representative are access rights. Thus, Article 9 of the Model Law provides for the right of direct access by the foreign representative to courts of the enacting State. [1] This right is of great benefit to the foreign representative on the ground that the foreign representative has the right to access the courts in the enacting state. Article 11 provides for the right of audience to the foreign representative in the Courts of the enacting State without meeting the licencing requirements in that jurisdiction. [1] Articles 25 (1) of the Model Law enjoins the court to cooperate to the maximum extent possible with a foreign representative [½] whereas Article 25(2) of the Model Law provides for direct communication between the Court and the foreign representative. The preceding provisions of the Model Law are of great benefit to the foreign representative on the ground that the provisions make it easy for the foreign representative to discharge his duties in insolvency proceedings at the same footing with a local representative without any discrimination.]

Your answer should have included the following:

- **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] [3 out of 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.

[The application for recognition is granted pursuant to Article 17 of the Model Law. However, for the Court to grant the application for recognition the evidential requirements under Article 15 (2) of the Model Law must be satisfied and these are as follows; 1. The recognition application must be accompanied by a certified copy of the decision commencing the foreign proceedings and appointment of the foreign representative or 2. A certificate from the foreign Court speaking to the existence of the foreign proceeding and appointment of the foreign representative. [1] In the absence of any of the evidence above, the application must be accompanied by any other evidence acceptable to the court which must speak to the existence of the foreign proceeding and appointment of the foreign representative. It is important to note that Article 1 under paragraph 2 excludes certain proceedings from the application thus, proceedings pertaining to Banks and insurance companies are excluded on the ground that they require a special regulatory regime. [1] The other issue that must be considered is the public policy exception under Article 6 of the Model Law which is a safe net for the safeguard of the sovereignty of the enacting state which the Model Law respects. [1] Thus, the Court will give judicial scrutiny to the above issues if the recognition application is to be successful.]

With reference to the question, the following discussions should be included in your answer:

- 1. 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.**
- 2. 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.**

Question 3.3 [maximum 5 marks] [3 out of 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.

[In answering the question it is important to differentiate between Article 19 and Article 21 of the Model Law. Thus, Article 19 deals with pre recognition reliefs which the court is empowered to grant upon filing the application for recognition whereas Article 21 anchored on post recognition reliefs which the court is empowered to grant. The Court is empowered to grant the following pre recognition reliefs under Article 19, stay of execution against the debtor's assets, an order entrusting the administration or realization of the all or part of the debtor's assets located in the enacting state to the foreign representative or any other person designated by the court. It is worthy of note that Article 19 reliefs are mainly interim reliefs aimed to protect the assets of the debtor or interest of the creditors. On the other hand, Article 21 post recognition reliefs are discretionally in nature and include the following reliefs; Staying of commencement or continuation of individual proceedings pertaining to the debtor's assets, rights, obligations and liabilities, stay of execution against the debtor's assets if not automatically stayed pursuant to Article 20 (1), (b) of the Model Law, suspension of the right to transfer, encumber or otherwise dispose of any assets of the debtor if not automatically stayed under Article 20 (1), (c) of the Model Law, entrusting the administration of the assets of the Debtor in the enacting State to the foreign representative or any person appointed by the Court. The condition to be considered in granting the reliefs stated above are whether the court is satisfied that the interest of the local creditors in the enacting state are adequately protected. The limitations under Article 21 are

that the Court has no jurisdiction to grant an indefinite continuation of the automatic moratorium and enforcement of a Judgment in default is unattainable under the Model law]

Your answer must include a brief discussion on the following elements:

- 1. 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.
- 2. 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] [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?

*[In the case of Igor vitalievich Protasov and Khadzhi-Murat Derev [2021] EWHC 392 the question that confronted the Court was whether under Article 21 a worldwide freezing order that was granted as provisional relief under Article 19 could continue after recognition in the UK of a Russian bankruptcy as a foreign main proceeding. The Court held that "bankruptcy regime offers other forms of protection which mean that relief in the form of freezing order or similar injunctions are simply not warranted". On the basis of the above case, the reason why the worldwide freezing order is unlikely to continue is post recognition *ex article 21* of the Model Law is that the insolvency or bankruptcy regime has other adequate remedies which offer protection equal to the worldwide freezing order. For example the automatic stay under Article 20 of the Model Law is one such protection which renders the continuation of the freezing order unnecessary.]*

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:

- (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] [4.5 out of 15]

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 [3 out of 10]

[The starting point in this discussion is the definition of "foreign proceeding" under article 2 of the Model Law. Thus, the elements of the definition of foreign proceedings are as follows;

- 1. A proceeding (including an interim proceeding)**
- 2. That is either judicial or administration**
- 3. That is collective in nature**
- 4. That is in a foreign state**
- 5. That is authorised or conducted under a law relating to insolvency**
- 6. In which the assets and affairs of the debtor are subject to control or supervision by a foreign court and**
- 7. Which proceeding is for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation.**

In light of the above elements, it is clear that the elements when applied to the facts of the question fit in the definition of the "foreign proceedings" [for full marks your response must address each element in detail, provide guidance and source references, as appropriate, and actually apply the facts. Your

responses only lists the elements, which is insufficient - see below for an example of what we are looking for] however, due to the special procedure attendant to the liquidation of Banks as can be seen from the facts of the question Banks may be excluded from the definition of foreign proceedings [It is explicitly stipulated in the facts that this is not the case] under Article 2 (a) as the mainly require a special regulatory regime as the one given in the question. Therefore the Bank's liquidation does not comprises a "foreign proceeding" within the meaning of Article 2 (a) of the MLCBI.]

For example, for the "subject to the control or supervision by a foreign court" element we are looking for a response along the following lines:

1. 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".
2. 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."
3. 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.
4. 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."
5. In this case the DGF has control of all of the Bank's assets and overall control of the liquidation.
6. 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.
7. 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.

- 8. 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".**

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]. [1.5 out of 5]

[The elements of the definition of a "foreign representative" under Article 2 (d) of the MLCBI are as follows;

- 1. A person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis**
- 2. Authorised in a foreign proceeding**
- 3. To administer the reorganisation or liquidation of the debtor's assets or affairs or to act as representative of the foreign proceeding.**

On the basis of the above elements and the facts of the question it is very clear that there no assets of the Bank in England to be managed or administered by the foreign representative on behalf of the Bank. The proceedings instituted in England are against various Defendants arising out of the allegations of fraud and such proceedings do not meet the threshold of the definition of foreign proceedings as provided for under Article 2(a) of the MLCBI therefore, the Applicants do not fall within the description of foreign representatives.]

See the general comment above which also applies to your response to this question. For full marks we are looking for a response along the following lines:

- 1. Article 16(1) of the MLCBI provides:**

'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 sub-paragraph (i) of article 2 and that the foreign representative is a body or person within the meaning of sub-paragraph (j) of article 2, the court is entitled to so presume.'

- 2. This application is brought jointly by the DGF and Ms G. The DGF's role as liquidator arises under statute and article 77 of the LBBA provides that the DGF is automatically appointed as liquidator on the day it receives the NB's decision pursuant to article 77 revoking a bank's licence and commencing its liquidation.**
- 3. 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".**
- 4. 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.

- 5. 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.*
- 6. As a result of the sharing of some, but not all of the liquidator's powers and the division of responsibility between Ms G and the DGF, it seems likely that depending on the nature and timing of relief sought from this Court pursuant to the CBIR (if any), the appropriate applicant may, in the future, be either or both of Ms G and the DGF. I am satisfied that subject to the express limitations on Ms G's powers, they are both authorised to administer the liquidation and as such both meet the definition of "foreign representative". In our judgment they both had the necessary standing to apply in that capacity, for recognition of the Bank's liquidation.*

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 *