Insolvency Litigation and Related Strategic Concerns – US, European and Asian Considerations
Overview of Today’s Program

• Litigation in a cross-border insolvency context
• How insolvency can affect the jurisdiction in which the litigation occurs
• Aspects of insolvency law which will be of strategic relevance to insolvency litigation parties
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An English Perspective

• Enforcement in England of foreign insolvency judgments
  – The ‘usual’ enforcement rule applying to non-insolvency judgments— is there a different rule for insolvency?
  – Within the EU
    • Insolvency Regulation Article 25: Judgments that derive directly from the insolvency proceedings and are closely linked with them
  – Outside of the EU
    • The Supreme Court’s decision in Rubin v Eurofinance; New Cap v Grant
An English Perspective

Some other factors relevant to jurisdiction strategy

- Substantive differences
  - e.g. Preferences in England: influenced by a desire to prefer

- Procedural differences
  - e.g. Availability of litigation funding in England
• National proceedings and proceedings outside the EU
  – Claims of the insolvency administrator
    • Ordinary rules of Code of Civil Procedure on local/international jurisdiction apply (also true for annex claims such as actions for avoidance and rescission)
  – Claims of creditors against the insolvency administrator
    • Pending litigation is stayed
    • Insolvency claims to be filed exclusively at the venue of the insolvency court
Within the EU

- ECJ: Does the action derive directly from the bankruptcy and is it closely connected?

  - If no: Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 (Brussels Regulation) applicable
  - If yes: Council Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000 (Insolvency Regulation) applicable
A German Perspective: Enforcement of Foreign Insolvency Judgments

• Within the EU
  – Recognition of insolvency proceedings
    • Council Regulation (EC) No 1346/2000 (Insolvency Regulation)
  – Recognition and enforcement of annex decisions
    • Insolvency Regulation in connection with Council Regulation (EC) No 44/2001 (Brussels Regulation)
A German Perspective: Enforcement of Foreign Insolvency Judgments

• Outside the EU
  – Recognition of insolvency proceedings
    • International Jurisdiction?
    • Public policy?
  – Recognition and Enforcement of annex decisions: German executory title required
    • Annex decision final?
    • International Jurisdiction?
    • Due process?
    • Contradicting decisions?
    • Public policy?
    • Reciprocity?
A US Perspective

- Substantive Consolidation and International Insolvency
  - The application of substantive consolidation in US bankruptcy courts
  - Complications arising from the substantive consolidation of Multinational Enterprise Groups
• Three Tests Used to Evaluate Consolidation
  
  **Auto-Train** (D.C. Cir. 1987)
  
  • The proponent must show substantial identity exists between the entities to be consolidated and that consolidation is necessary to avoid some harm or realize some benefit.
  
  • A creditor may object to consolidation if it can show that it relied on the separateness of one of the entities in extending credit.
  
  • If that showing is made, a court only orders consolidation if benefits outweigh harm.

  **Augie/Restivo** (2d Cir. 1988)
  
  • A court considers whether creditors dealt with entities as single economic unit and did not rely on separate identity in extending credit (Separateness); OR
  
  • whether the affairs of entities are so entangled that consolidation will benefit all creditors (Entanglement).

  **Owens Corning** (3d Cir. 2005)
  
  • A court considers whether creditors in fact relied on unity of entities in extending credit and
  
  • Whether separating entities would hurt all creditors.
A US Perspective

- Substantive Consolidation in United States Bankruptcy Courts: Fluid Courts Applying Fluid Standards
  - Different courts apply different tests
  - Bankruptcy courts are equitable in nature
A US Perspective

• Complications Arising from Substantive Consolidation and Multinational Enterprise Groups
  
  – Predicting the application of substantive consolidation is extremely difficult
  
  – No international or regional legal regimes exist to coordinate the conduct of insolvency proceedings across jurisdictions
    • Choice of law questions arise
    • Legal disputes may be prolonged
    • Creditors may receive suboptimal prices
Because of the uncertainty surrounding substantive consolidation, Counsel should carefully weigh the potential consequences of substantive consolidation when drafting loan documents and formulating cross-border negotiation strategies. Consider creative solutions, such as:

- Cross-border protocols in case of insolvency
- Centralization of insolvency proceedings
- Conferring with counsel in relevant countries
An Asian Perspective

• Three factors which might have an impact on deciding whether to institute court proceedings in an insolvency scenario
  – Non-recognition of foreign insolvency appointees
  – Administration not available
  – Access to litigation funding
An Asian Perspective

• Non-Recognition of Foreign Insolvency Appointees
  
  – HK has no equivalent to UK s.426/Cross Border Insolvency Regulations or US Chapter 15.
  
  – To exercise the powers of a liquidator in HK, office-holder must be a liquidator appointed by the HK court.
  
  – Can present difficulties in establishing HK nexus
• Administration Not Available

  – No equivalent to UK administration/US Chapter 11

  – To restructure, resort is had to provisional liquidation to obtain the moratorium which is otherwise unavailable

  – But, *Legend Intl. Resorts Ltd*—PL is not available if the sole reason for PL is to restructure—traditional "jeopardy to assets" must still be shown

  – Has led to some innovative arguments on jeopardy to assets...
An Asian Perspective

• Access to litigation funding
  – Maintenance and Champerty still rule the day—liquidation exception to these principles now applied by the Court taking a liberal approach
  – Funding is lawful in insolvency context and funders are available
Thank You.
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