



**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 2024**. The assessment submission portal will close at 23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2024. No submissions can be made after the portal has closed and no further uploading of documents will be allowed, no matter the circumstances.
- 6.2 If you selected Module 2A as one of your **elective modules** (see the e-mail that was sent to you when your place on the course was confirmed), you have a **choice** as to when you may submit this assessment. You may either submit the assessment by **23:00 (11 pm) GMT on 1 March 2024** or by **23:00 (11 pm) BST (GMT +1) on 31 July 2024**. If you elect to submit by 1 March 2024, you **may not** submit the assessment again by 31 July 2024 (for example, in order to achieve a higher mark).

## ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS

Please note that all references to the “MLCBI” or “Model Law” in this assessment are references to the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.

### QUESTION 1 (multiple-choice questions) [10 marks in total] 6 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 one of the following international organisations' mandate is to further the progressive harmonization of the law of international trade?

- (a) World Trade Organization.
- (b) The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.**
- (c) The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

#### Question 1.2

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

- (i) Rise of corporations.
- (ii) Internationalization.
- (iii) Globalization.
- (iv) Universalism.
- (v) Territorialism.
- (vi) Technological advances.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).
- (b) Options (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).**
- (c) Options (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).
- (d) All of the above.

### Question 1.3

Which of the following statements incorrectly describe the MLCBI?

- (i) It is legislation that imposes a mandatory reciprocity on the participating members.
- (ii) It is a legislative text that serves as a recommendation for incorporation in national laws.
- (iii) It is intended to substantively unify the insolvency laws of the foreign nations.
- (iv) It is a treaty that is binding on the participating members.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
- (b) Options (i), (ii) and (iv).
- (c) Options (i), (iii) and (iv).
- (d) All of the above are incorrect.

### Question 1.4

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

- (i) To provide greater legal certainty for trade and investment.
- (ii) To provide protection and maximization of value of the debtor's assets.
- (iii) To provide a fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies that protects all creditors and the debtors.
- (iv) To facilitate the rescue of financial troubled businesses.
- (v) To ensure substantive unification of insolvency laws of member-states.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).
- (b) Options (ii), (iii) and (v).
- (c) Options (ii), (iv) and (v).
- (d) None of the above.

### Question 1.5

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

- (i) An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but a significant asset is located outside of jurisdiction A.
- (ii) An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A and immediately transferred to a foreign jurisdiction B.
- (iii) An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, in which a group of affiliated debtors has its COMI as well as all assets and liabilities.
- (iv) An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but certain liabilities are governed by laws of a foreign jurisdiction B.
- (v) An insolvency proceeding is commenced in jurisdiction A, but all *de minimis* assets are located in foreign jurisdictions.

Choose the correct answer:

(a) Options (i) and (ii).

(b) Options (ii) and (iii).

(c) Options (iii) and (v).

(d) Options (i) and (v).

#### Question 1.6

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

(a) Binding within jurisdiction B.

(b) Binding within jurisdiction B, but certain actions need to be taken.

(c) No effect within jurisdiction B.

(d) Likely no effect within jurisdiction B.

(e) Not enough facts provided to arrive at a conclusion.

#### Question 1.7

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

(i) The increased risk of fraud by concealing assets in foreign jurisdictions.

(ii) The difficulty of agreeing multilateral treaties dealing with insolvency law.

- (iii) To eradicate the use of comity.
- (iv) The practical problems caused by the disharmony among national laws governing cross-border insolvencies, despite the success of protocols in practice.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (i), (ii) and (iii).
- (b) Options (i), (ii) and (iv).**
- (c) Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
- (d) All of the above.

#### Question 1.8

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

- (i) COMI is a well-defined term in the MLCBI.
- (ii) COMI stands for comity.
- (iii) The debtor's registered office is irrelevant for purposes of determining COMI.
- (iv) COMI is being tested as of the date of the petition for recognition.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (i), (ii) and (iii).**
- (b) Options (ii), (iii) and (iv).
- (c) All of the above.**
- (d) None of the above.

#### Question 1.9

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

- (i) Foreign main proceeding.
- (ii) Foreign non-main proceeding.
- (iii) Plenary domestic insolvency proceeding.

Choose the correct answer:

- (a) Options (ii), (i) and then (iii).
- (b) Options (i), (ii) and then (iii).

(c) Options (iii), (i) and then (ii).

(d) Options (iii), (ii) and then (i).

#### Question 1.10

Which of the statements below are correct under the MLCBI?

- (a) The foreign representative always has the powers to bring avoidance actions.
- (b) The hotchpot rule prioritises local creditors.
- (c) The recognition of a foreign main proceeding is an absolute proof that the debtor is insolvent.

(d) None of the above are correct.

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

##### Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks] 3 marks

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

The key distinction is that the MLCBI is a soft law which provides recommendations for enacting states to unify their domestic insolvency law. It does not contain any requirement of reciprocity, whereas the ERI is part of each member state's domestic law.

MLCBI is suitable for adoption, in whole or in part, into the domestic laws of a State. However, it leaves it to each jurisdiction to determine by application of their own domestic laws and practices. It does not substantively unify the insolvency laws of the States.

Under the ERI, insolvency proceedings taking place in any EU Member State could be recognized and enforced throughout the rest of the EU. However, ERI, though not a treaty but an EU Regulation, took a long time (40 years) for all member states to agree.

##### Question 2.2 [maximum 2 marks] 2 marks

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

The court in the enacting state should consider and must be satisfied that the interests of the debtor's creditors and other interested parties are adequately protected. Also, such relief should not interfere with the administration of another insolvency proceeding, in particular the main proceeding.

##### Question 2.3 [2 marks] 2 marks

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

Under Article 13 of the MLCBI, creditors in the foreign proceedings are given the same access rights as those creditors domiciled in the enacting state, regarding the commencement of or participation in the local insolvency proceedings, without affecting ranking of claims. A claim of the foreign creditors cannot be given a low priority than that of general claims solely because the holder of the claim is foreign creditor.

**Question 2.4 [maximum 3 marks] 3 marks**

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

Article 20 of MLCBI provides for automatic mandatory relief in case the recognised foreign proceeding qualifies as a foreign main proceeding (which is, the COMI of the debtor is in the jurisdiction where the foreign insolvency proceeding is opened). Such automatic relief does not exist for foreign non-main proceedings and only discretionary relief is available subject to the judge's decision.

**QUESTION 3 (essay-type questions) [15 marks in total] 4 marks**

**Question 3.1 [maximum 4 marks] 2 marks**

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

The foreign main proceeding must have been filed in Germany as it is where the debtor has its COMI.

The foreign non main proceeding must have been filed in Bermuda as it is where the debtor has an establishment.

The likely result is the US court will recognise both foreign proceedings, but the German proceedings as the main foreign proceeding will be given primacy over the Bermuda proceeding in the recognition proceedings in the US.

**Requires references to definitional and procedural provisions of MLCBI to substantiate answer eg. Art. 2, 15, 17, 6..**

**Question 3.2 [maximum 3 marks] 0 mark**

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

Under article 14(f) of MLCBI, the likely outcome would be that the US court will refuse recognition if it is convinced that the interests of the US-based creditors of the foreign debtor were not taken into consideration and were not adequately protected in the proceeding giving rise to the judgement to be recognised and enforced in the U.S.

**Requires discussion based on Art.10 MLCBI**



**Question 3.3 [maximum 4 marks] 0 mark**

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

The leases and IP licenses are valuable assets of the debtor-in-possession for its restructuring. The foreign representative should file an application to declare that the *ipso facto* clauses are null and void under US law so as to prevent the lessor and the IP licensor from exercising the *ipso facto* clauses in the contracts. This is because under the Pan Ocean case, service of notice of termination is not commencement or continuation of individual action or proceedings, which means the rule of automatic stay does not apply. As such, the foreign representative needs to pre-empt and prevent the termination of these valuable contracts so that it can carry out the restructuring for the debtor.

Requires discussion based on relief under Art.19 MLCBI and its definitions, as well as references to the provisions of Art 20 and/or 21 MLCBI as applicable.

**Question 3.4 [maximum 4 marks] 2 marks**

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

The fact that the debtor has its registered office in Country A does not mean that it has its COMI or an establishment in Country A. As a next step, the foreign representative should check if the debtor has an establishment in Country A. If the answer is positive, the foreign representative may amend or file a new petition to recognise the foreign proceeding as a foreign non-main proceeding and seek relief in Country B again. On the other hand, if the answer is negative, the foreign representative may open a domestic insolvency proceeding in Country B where the foreign debtor has assets under article 11 of MLCBI which gives the foreign representative standing to open domestic insolvency proceedings in the enacting state.

At the outset, the foreign representative should have considered carefully where the debtor's COMI is and whether the foreign proceeding is a foreign main or non-main proceeding. If it is neither, then it does not qualify as foreign proceeding and will not be recognised by the receiving court in the enacting state under MLCBI.

Art.16 MLCBI is the main reference for “rebuttable COMI presumption” to discuss weak COMI. References to Art.17, 21, 6 are also required for full marks.

**QUESTION 4 (fact-based application-type question) [15 marks in total] 5 marks**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The key strategy is to secure a successful restructuring plan to discharge Globe Holdings debt which can be recognized in the US so that the debt governed by US law can be discharged.

First, we need to consider where the COMI is for Globe Holdings. The two key factors for determining COMI are: (1) the location where the central administration of the debtor takes place; and (2) which is readily ascertainable as such by creditors of the debtor. In addition, the court may consider the following factors as well: the location of the debtor’s books and records, the location where financing was organized or authorized, location of the debtor’s primary bank, the location from which reorganization of the debtor was being conducted.

In the present case, most of the above factors point us to Cayman Islands as the COMI for Globe Holdings. It is the place where it has its bank account, keeps its books and records and also where the scheme of arrangements was sanctioned by the local court. More importantly, its public filings with the SEC as well as the prospectus provided in connection with the issuance of the Notes disclosed that Globe Holdings is a Cayman Islands company so that its creditors can ascertain its location.

It is of note that Globe Holdings' business is carried out through its non-insurance company non-debtor subsidiaries that are all incorporated under the US laws and operating in the US. All employees are in the US. The headquarters are also in the US. However, these factors do not mean that US is the COMI for Globe Holdings as these characteristics are not of Globe Holdings itself but of its non-debtor subsidiaries.

Secondly, we need to consider the discharge of the debt for Global Holdings which is the unsecured notes issued and governed by New York law. Under the Gibbs Rule, an obligation can only be discharged under the law governing the obligation. Therefore, to discharge the debt, Globe Holdings need to petition for recognition of the Cayman insolvency proceedings as foreign main proceedings in the US under chapter 15 of the US Bankruptcy Code. In Modern Land, the US court held that a Cayman Islands scheme of arrangement recognized as a main proceeding under chapter 15 of the US Bankruptcy Code would constitute a substantive discharge of New York law governed debt. As such, the client should consider filing petition to recognize the Cayman proceeding as a foreign main proceeding in the US under chapter 15 of the US Bankruptcy Code.

In terms of the papers to be filed for recognition under chapter 15, it should include the following documents:

- (1) a certified copy of the decision commencing the Cayman proceeding and appointing the Cayman representative;
- (2) a certificate from the Cayman court affirming the existence of the Cayman proceedings and of the appointment of the Cayman representative;
- (3) any other evidence acceptable to the US court of the existence of the Cayman proceedings and the appointment;
- (4) a statement identifying all foreign proceedings in respect of the debtor that are known to the foreign representative.

On day one of the filing, the following reliefs should be requested:

- (1) Staying the commencement or continuation of individual actions or individual proceedings concerning Globe Holdings' assets, rights, obligations or liabilities to the extent they have not (automatically) stayed;
- (2) Staying execution against the debtor's assets to the extent it has not been (automatically) stayed;
- (3) Suspending the right to transfer, encumber or otherwise dispose of any assets of the debtor to the extent this right has not been (automatically) suspended;
- (4) Entrusting the administration or realization of all or part of the debtor's assets in the US to the Cayman representative or another person designated by the court.

The answer should contain as a minimum:

1. Definitions (COMI, establishment, foreign main/non-main proceedings etc.) with respective references to (if any) MLCBI provisions
2. A discussion on the rebuttable presumption of the COMI per Article 16(3) MLCBI and alternative courses of action
3. The necessary papers to be submitted to the US Court per Article 15 MLCBI
4. Conclusive remarks with reference to Articles 19 through 22 MLCBI and 6 MLCBI

**\* End of Assessment \***

**Marks awarded: 25 out of 50**