



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] 5 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) Internationalisation.
- (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] 8 marks

Question 2.1 [maximum 3 marks] 2 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 between the MLCBI and the EIR Recast is the scope of its application, which is explained on the grounds of its different legal basis and nature. On the one hand, there are no limitations on terms of which States the MLCBI is intended to influence (global framework) and it's a soft law recommendation. On the other hand, the EIR Recast has a more limited scope as it only concerns the EU Member States. Moreover, the EIR Recast is not a recommendation, but is mandatory, direct, and compulsory for the EU member countries without the need for individual adoption into national law. One key advantage of the MLCBI is its suitability for adoption, in whole or in part, into the domestic legislation of a State. However, one relevant disadvantage is that the effectiveness of the MLCBI depends on the States adopting and implementing it.

Requires key (dis)advantages of the EIR

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.

According to Article 22 of the MLCBI, in granting or denying relief based on either Article 19 or Article 21, the court in the enacting state must be satisfied that the interest of the debtor's creditors and other interested parties are adequately protected. For that purpose, the court is granted the power to subject relief to conditions it considers appropriate and at the request of the foreign representative or an affected person the court may further modify or terminate the relief.

Question 2.3 [2 marks] 2 marks

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

Article 13 of the MLCBI gives foreign creditors the same rights as creditors domiciled in the enacting State (regarding the commencement of, and participation in, local proceedings regarding the debtor under the insolvency law of the enacting State) without affecting the ranking of claims in the enacting State. However, a claim of a foreign creditor cannot be given a lower priority than that of general unsecured claims solely because the holder of such claim is a foreign creditor. This is known as the anti-discrimination principle.

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?

Under the MLCBI, the COMI of the debtor determines the consequences of the recognition in terms of relief. If the COMI is in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings have been opened, the proceedings are main insolvency proceedings with automatic mandatory relief. If the debtor has an establishment in the jurisdiction where the foreign proceedings are opened, the proceedings are non-main proceedings without automatic relief, but only discretionary post-recognition relief granted by the court. There is no reciprocity requirement and there is an ongoing duty to keep the court updated on developments.

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 proceedings should have been filed in Germany where the debtor has its COMI, and the secondary proceedings should have been filed in Bermuda where the debtor has an establishment. The debtor might seek to obtain both proceedings recognized in U.S. The likely result would be that the proceedings filed in Germany would be recognized as a foreign main proceeding whereas the proceedings filed in Bermuda would be recognized as a foreign non-main proceedings.

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

Question 3.2 [maximum 3 marks] 1 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.

I believe that the joint provisional liquidators should not be liable for having commenced a recognition proceeding in the US. In fact, they have recourse to the legal mechanism that would eventually allow them to fulfil their objective. Moreover, the joint provisional liquidators request has to be analysed by a local Court in the US, so this prevents the joint

provisional liquidators from illegally interfering with contract rights of the US-based vendors of the foreign debtor. In this respect, If the recognition request is rejected, then the US-based vendor would have not suffered any interference and, therefore, there would be no liability with respect to the joint provisional liquidators. Conversely, if the request of recognition is accepted, then the US-based vendor would suffer an interference with contract rights of the US-based vendors of the foreign debtor but this would be grounded in a legal provision so they will not be entitled to bring a damage claim against the joint provisional liquidators.

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 foreign representative should take immediate measure to prevent the US counterparties from terminating the US-governed leases and intellectual property licenses. In this light, I believe that the foreign representative should inform this situation to the US court handling the recognition proceedings to seek: (i) the hearing to take place before schedule set; or (ii) an interim relief that prevents the debtor's US counterparties from terminating the contracts until there is a final decision with respect to the recognition of the foreign insolvency proceedings. The foreign representative might also notify the debtor's US counterparties about the commencement of the recognition proceedings and its procedural estate. Moreover, in such communication, the foreign representative could also address the *ipso facto clauses* and qualify them as unenforceable under the US Bankruptcy Code. If the recognition is accepted, then the foreign representative could use the provisions related to the executory contracts.

Requires discussion based upon 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] 1 mark

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 foreign representative should: (i) file a motion for reconsideration, trying to furnish new evidence, arguments and case law to demonstrate that the foreign proceedings shall be recognized as it was opened in the place of COMI; (ii) appeal the decision; (iii) try to

obtain recognition of the foreign proceedings as a secondary proceeding and not as a main proceeding.

However, if the main assets were situated in Country B, the foreign representative should have commenced main proceedings in that jurisdiction and then seek recognition of that proceedings in Country A.

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

QUESTION 4 (fact-based application-type question) [15 marks in total] 4 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 facts of this case are particularly complicated as they refer to a company whose principal administrative activities are based in the Cayman Islands, but its main commercial activities take place in the United States. These facts are relevant because they cast a doubt on the interpretation of the COMI. In this regard, there are reasonable arguments to consider that the company could bring main proceedings before the competent Cayman Islands' court. However, there are also reasonable arguments to conclude that the company's COMI is located in the United States and, therefore, any proceedings brought in other jurisdiction shall be considered to be secondary in nature (foreign non-main proceeding).

In this light, for a successful restructuring I would request in the United States a recognition of foreign main proceedings brought before the competent Cayman Island court. From my perspective, this would be the perfect scenario for the debtor, as it has made several agreements before the Cayman Island court and because the determination of a foreign proceeding as a main proceeding may affect the nature of the relief accorded to the foreign representative under Articles 20 and 21 of the Model Law. To ground this position, I would quote relevant jurisprudence related to the interpretation of COMI under the European Insolvency Regulation and the so-called Virgos-Schmit Report.

However, for the hypothetical scenario that the competent United States's court considers the proceedings brought in Cayman Island to be a foreign non-main proceeding, I would also apply for a recognition of that proceeding as a foreign non-main proceeding.

Together with the petition before the competent United States court the company should file any document that demonstrate the appointment of the Cayman Island insolvency representative. Moreover, I would file the following documents:

- Those related to the company incorporation as a Canadian company in 2009.
- The 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.
- The notices of its re-incorporation that the company provided when it re-incorporated in the Cayman Islands in 2010 (from Canada), including in the public filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).
- Documents related to the services provided by the Cayman Islands counsel Cedar and Woods, that has regularly represented Globe Holdings for over a decade.
- the bank account that the company has in the Cayman Islands from which it pays certain of its operating expenses.
- Proof that the company 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.
- All the relevant decisions taken by the Cayman Island competent court.

Finally, the company should request relief from the senior unsecured notes offered and issued in 2017 and due in 2023 which are governed by the New York law as well as the class action that have already been filed against the company.

The answer should contain

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: 21 out of 50