



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: 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

Commented [DDB1]: 34/50 = 68%

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 [BB2]: Sub-total = 8 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

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

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

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.

Commented [BB3]: The correct answer is (c)

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.

Commented [BB4]: The correct answer is (b)

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]

Commented [BB5]: Sub-total = 6 marks

Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks] [1]

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

Answer to 2.1:

The concept of COMI, although fundamental to the operation of the Model Law, contains no definition. There are two key factors for determining COMI under the Model Law which are

- i) the location where the central administration of the debtor takes place; and
- ii) which is readily ascertainable as such by creditors of the debtor.

There are a number of other factors a court can take into consideration when determining the debtor's COMI. The appropriate date determining the COMI, is the date of commencement of the foreign proceedings. Although the concept of COMI is similar in the EIR and Model Law, they serve different purposes. The determination of COMI in the EIR relates to the jurisdiction in which main proceedings should be commenced and in the Model Law it relates to the effect of recognition.

Suggested answer:

1. The MLCBI does not expressly indicate the relevant date for determining the COMI of the debtor. The same is true with respect to determining the existence of an establishment. However, the UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment suggests that the date of commencement of the foreign proceedings is the appropriate date for determining the existence of the COMI or an establishment of the debtor (see paragraph 143 of The Judicial Perspective).
2. The UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment explains (see paragraphs 159 and 160) that the date of commencement of the foreign proceeding is the appropriate date for determining the existence of the COMI of the debtor as well as an establishment of the debtor. Where the business activity of the debtor ceases after the commencement of the foreign proceeding, all that may exist at the time of the application for recognition to indicate the debtor's COMI or establishment is that foreign proceeding and the activity of the foreign representative in administering the insolvency estate. In such a case, determination of the COMI or an establishment by reference to the date of the commencement of those proceedings would produce a clear result. The same reasoning may also apply in the case of reorganisation where, under some laws, it is not the debtor that continues to have a COMI, but rather the reorganised entity. In such a case, the requirement for a foreign proceeding that is taking place in accordance with article 17(2)(a) is clearly satisfied and the foreign proceeding should be entitled to recognition. Moreover, taking the date of commencement to determine COMI provides

a test that can be applied with certainty to all insolvency proceedings. [see also pages 28/29 of the Guidance Text]

3. However, US courts may take a slightly different approach based on the *Morning Mist Holdings Ltd v. Krys (Matter of Fairfield Sentry Ltd)* (2nd Cir Appeals April 16, 2013) (which was recently followed in the UK in *Re Toisa Limited* - see footnote 94 on page 28 of the Guidance Text). The US court will most likely consider the date of the recognition application pursuant to the US Chapter 15 as the appropriate date for determining the COMI or the existence of an establishment.

Question 2.2 [maximum 3 marks] [2]

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."

Answer to 2.2:

Statement 1 Timely Notice – Article 14 of the Model Law. [1]

Statement 2 Safe conduct Rule – Article 10 [1]

Statement 3 Presumption of insolvency – Article 31 [0]

Correct answer: Article 16(3) MLCBI (key concept is COMI and this provision contains a rebuttable presumption that the registered office or habitual residence of the debtor is also its COMI).

Question 2.3 [2 marks] [2]

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 terms of the Court of Appeal the case at hand did not involve an issue of jurisdiction per say. The issue at hand was whether, as a matter of settled practice, the court should not exercise its power to grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation because, if the court decided to do so, it would

substantively prevent English creditors from enforcing their English law rights provided for in the Gibbs Rule, and prolong the stay unnecessarily. The Appeal Court held that it could only grant the indefinite Moratorium Continuation if it were satisfied that, the stay would have to be necessary to protect creditors; and the stay would be an appropriate way to achieve such protection.

Question 2.4 [2 marks] [1]

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 22 it is a matter of striking an appropriate balance between the relief granted by the court in the enacting State to a foreign representative and the effect of the relief. The court must in terms of article 22(1) be satisfied, at all times, that the interest of creditors, debtors and interested persons are adequately protected. The relief granted by the court in terms of article 19 or 21 may be subjected to conditions the court considers appropriate. [1]

In terms of article 22 (3) the court may, at the request of a foreign representative or an interested person affected by the relief granted under article 19 or 21, or on its own motion, modify or terminate such relief.

Suggested answer:

- Article 29(a) MLCBI (“(i) any relief granted under article 19 or 21 must be consistent with the domestic proceeding in the enacting State and (ii) if the foreign proceeding is recognised in the enacting State as a foreign main proceeding, article 20 does not apply”)
- Article 18 MLCBI (Subsequent Information) - The foreign representative has an ongoing information duty towards the court in the enacting State about (a) substantial changes to the status of the recognized foreign proceeding or the status of the foreign representative’s appointment and (ii) any other foreign proceeding regarding the same debtor that becomes known to the foreign representative.

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

Commented [BB6]: Sub-total = 10 marks

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] [3]

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.

Answer to 3.1:

Article 25 states that a foreign representative applying in the enacting State has the right to direct access to courts (article 9) [1]; to apply to commence a local proceeding in the enacting State on the conditions applicable in that State (article 11); [1] to apply to the court for recognition of the foreign proceedings in which the foreign representative has been appointed" Article 15, it also means that when recognised, a foreign representative can participate in insolvency-related proceedings in the enacting State under the law of that State (article12); to initiate action to avoid or otherwise render ineffective acts detrimental to creditors (article23) and also to intervene in any local proceedings in which the debtor is a party (article(24). [1] It is important to note that foreign creditors have the same rights as local creditors to commence and participate in proceedings in the enacting state (article 13)

Suggested answer

- **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] [3]

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.

In no particular order, the following list shows the additional issues relevant to recognizing foreign proceedings and granting forms of relief:

1. Article 6. provides that the Court may refuse recognise a foreign proceeding or grant certain forms of relief if to do so would offend public policy in the enabling State.
2. Article 7. provides that a court may use its powers to assist the foreign representative by granting relief permitting her to perform acts outside the forms of relief specifically mentioned in the MODEL LAW.
3. Article 10. protects the foreign representative by shielding her from being sued or brought to court in respect to matters unrelated to the application for recognition and forms of relief granted pursuant thereto.
4. Article 15. [1] Provides for the level of judicial scrutiny required when considering the application for recognition of a foreign proceeding brought by a foreign representative. In particular, the application must be accompanied by the following: a certified copy of the decision commencing the foreign proceeding and appointing the foreign representative; or a certificate from the foreign court affirming the existence of the foreign proceeding and of the appointment of the foreign representative; or In the absence of such evidence, any other evidence acceptable to the court proving the existence of the foreign proceeding and of the appointment of the foreign representative. Additionally, the application must be accompanied by a statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor

that are known to the foreign representative. Lastly, the court may require a translation of documents supplied in support of the application for recognition into an official language of the enabling State. [1]

Lastly, the provisions of articles 15, 16, 17 [1] and 18 do not prevent a Judge of the enabling State to amend or terminate if it is shown that the grounds for granting the application were not met in whole or in part or no longer exist.

Suggested answer:

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. Sufficient evidence: Article 15 of the Model Law sets forth in paragraph 2 what evidence in respect of the commencement of the foreign proceedings and the appointment of the foreign representative must accompany the recognition application. A statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor that are known to the foreign representative must also accompany the recognition application (Article 15(3) of the Model Law).
4. 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.
5. 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] [3]

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.

Answer to 3.3:

Pre-recognition relief is granted in terms of Article 19 and entails: [1]

1. automatic stay of individual actions and proceedings;
2. stay of execution against the debtor's assets;
3. entrusting the administration of all parts of debtor's assets to the foreign representative or person appointed by the Court;
4. any post-recognition relief available in terms of Article 21, being
 - a. suspending rights to transfer or encumber any assets of the debtor;
 - b. provide for the examination of witnesses;
 - c. grant any relief available to a domestic liquidator / officer bearer.
5. If granting interim relief will interfere with the administration of a foreign main proceeding, the Court may – based on Article (19)(4) refuse to grant such interim relief.
6. Interim relief is not without limits. For example, the UK Courts have refused certain forms of interim relief in the cases of *Rabin v Erofinance*; *Fibra Celulose S/A v Pan Ocean Co Ltd*; and the IBA case (concerning the "Gibbs rule")
7. Under Article 22, a Court is bound to balance the interests of the foreign representative with the interests of creditors, the debtor and interested parties when deciding whether and what interim relief to grant.

Post recognition relief is granted in terms of Article 21 [1]

1. Staying individual actions against assets of the debtor (if not automatically stayed under Article 20(1)(2));
2. Stay execution against the debtor's assets (to extent not already automatically stayed under Article 20(1)(b))
3. Suspend the right to transfer, encumber and dispose of the debtor's assets (unless already automatically stayed under Article 20(1) (c));
4. Examine witnesses;
5. Entrust administration of the assets to the foreign representative;
6. Extend any interim relief granted under Article 19 (1);
7. Grant additional relief available to domestic liquidators.

8. Under Article 22, a Court is bound to balance the interests of the foreign representative with the interests of creditors, the debtor and interested parties when deciding whether and what post-recognition relief to grant. [1]

Your answer should have also included a discussion on the following:

1. Post-recognition relief (automatic or discretionary): In case of a foreign main proceeding, there will be automatic relief as set forth in Article 20 of the Model Law. For both foreign main and non-main proceedings, article 21 of the Model Law set forth what post-recognition relief can be requested by the foreign representative. Appropriate relief under Article 21(1) of the Model Law must be necessary to protect the assets of the debtor or the interests of the creditors. The relief set forth in Article 21(2) of the Model Law requires the court to be satisfied that the interests of the creditors in State A are adequately protected. In case of a foreign non-main proceeding there is an additional requirement that needs to be met before relief can be granted. According to Article 21(3) of the Model Law the court in such a case must also be satisfied that the relief relates to assets that, under the law of State A, should be administered in the foreign non-main proceeding or concerns information required in that proceeding.
[In this context of relief, the foreign representative of State B could also think about the need to exercise any anti-avoidance powers in State A based on article 23 of the MLCBI]
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] [1]

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?

Answer to 3.4:

An underlying principle of the Model Law is to place a foreign representative in a cross-border insolvency in a similar position to that of a domestic liquidator by according her the same powers as far as possible and allowing the foreign representative access to all the powers and mechanisms afforded a domestic liquidator under the domestic insolvency regime.

When requested to extend a worldwide freezing order in the case of Igor Vitalievich Protasov and Khadz-Murat Derev, an English Judge declined. The Judge reasoned that, based on the considerations I have set out above, that the foreign representative should not be afforded greater powers and more extensive relief than that which is afforded a domestic liquidator. The Judge however left open the possibility that in exceptional circumstances a worldwide freezing order may be granted post-recognition. However, worldwide freezing order post recognition will not be granted as a matter of course.

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

Commented [DDB7]: 10/15

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]

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 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.

Answer to 4:

There are two issues to be determined, which will be considered separately below. Before doing so, I note that the facts in this matter are remarkably similar to those in the matter of Ms Svitlana Vasylivna Groshova (in her capacity as authorised officer of the Deposit Guarantee Fund of Ukraine in respect of the liquidation of PJSC Bank Finance and Credit which was heard by Judge C Burton in the English Chancery Division in April 2021. (1)

Answer to 4.1.1

The first is whether the proceedings in Country A are foreign proceedings as defined in the Model Law. Article 2 (a) provides that: (1)

- (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” (1)

There are several elements to this definition and these elements must be shown to be present in this application.

Under the Model Law, the proceedings in which NB and DGF have been involved must be “judicial or administrative proceedings in a foreign State. (1) It has been adequately shown that the proceedings are taking place “in a foreign State” and no more need be said of that. As to the requirement that the proceedings be “judicial or administrative”, on the facts, it appears that the proceedings are administrative in nature arising from the application of the provisions of a statute known as the LBBA and the DGF (which appointed the person purporting to be the foreign representative). It is not judicial proceedings as no mention is made in the facts a

court assisted process or that a judicial body oversees the liquidation proceedings. Nonetheless, the existence of administrative proceedings suffice. (1)

As to the proceeding being collective in nature, the English courts have held that “collective” should be given a wide meaning. The facts establish that the proceedings apply to the debtor and all its creditors given that the appointed liquidator is afforded the right to create a list of all creditors and realise the assets of the insolvent Bank. Thus, the proceedings are collective as it concerns the debtor and all creditors having claims. See too paragraphs 69 – 70 of the UNCITRAL Guide to Enactment. (1)

As to requirement that the proceedings be pursuant to a law relating to insolvency, the facts show that the LBBA and the DGF process is a law relating to insolvency, under which the NB declared the Bank insolvent following which the DGF appointed the liquidator who is tasked with winding up the affairs of the Bank.

As to the requirement that the assets and affairs of the debtor are to be subject to control or supervision by a foreign court, the English courts have followed paragraphs 74 to 76 of the UNCITRAL Guide To Enactment which notes that the level or timing of the control or supervision by a foreign court is not specified. I find that this requirement has not been met as nowhere in the facts is it stated that a Court shall at any time play a role – controlling or supervisory in the liquidation process. (1)

As to the requirement that the proceedings be for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation, the facts establish that this is the case, not least the fact that the process is designed to remove “troubled” banks from the banking sector and create stability and confidence in Country A’s banking system. As a result, the LBBA allows such banks to be removed through a process of winding up, thus clearly an insolvency law.

Answer to 4.1.2

Article 2 (d) states that a foreign representative (“f/r”) means “a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, authorized in a foreign proceeding to administer the reorganization or the liquidation of the debtor’s assets or affairs or to act as a representative of the foreign proceeding”. (1) Article 16(1)?

As to these requirements, Mrs G meets those requirements in that she was “a person” appointed or “authorised in a foreign proceeding” to “administer the reorganization or the liquidation of the debtor’s (i.e. the Bank’s) assets or affairs” (1)

Mrs G replaced Mrs C, who had been appointed as liquidator on an interim basis, with effect from 17 August 2020. Her appointment was pursuant to a Decision of the Executive Board of the Directors of the DGF, No 1513 (Resolution 1513). Ms G is described as a “leading bank liquidation professional”. The Decision delegates to Mrs G 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. (1)

Mrs G as the authorised officer of the Deposit Guarantee Fund (or DGF) of Country A therefore meets this requirement and is a foreign representative as defined in Article 2 (d) of the Model Law on CBI. (1)

*** End of Assessment ***

Full correct answer:

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 MCBI.
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” [max 3 marks]

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"
[max 3 marks]

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" [max 2 marks]

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" [max 1 mark]

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.

The Applicants’ standing as a “foreign representative” [max 5 marks]

18. “Foreign representative” is defined by article 2(d) of the MLCBI to mean:

‘a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, authorised in a foreign proceeding to administer the reorganisation or the liquidation of the debtor’s assets or affairs or to act as a representative of the foreign proceeding’

19. 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.’

20. 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.

21. 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”.

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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 my judgment they both had the necessary standing to apply in that capacity, for recognition of the Bank's liquidation.