

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Theoretical Basis for International Cross-Border Insolvency Laws	1
2	Development of the Model Law	5
2.1	Background	5
2.2	Model Law	9
2.3	Summary	13
3	Manner of Introduction of the Model Law	15
3.1	Australia	15
3.2	Canada	16
3.3	New Zealand	18
3.4	United Kingdom	19
3.5	USA	20
3.6	Summary	21
4	How Does the Model Law Affect Existing Principles of Recognition?	23
4.1	Australia	23
4.1.1	Statutory Provisions	24
4.1.2	Common Law	25
4.2	Canada	28
4.3	New Zealand	29
4.4	United Kingdom	31
4.5	USA	38
4.6	Summary	40
5	Concepts of Centre of Main Interest and Establishment	43
5.1	Recognition	43
5.2	Factors Determining COMI	43

5.3	Factors Considered When Determining Establishment	48
5.3.1	Australia	49
5.3.2	Canada	49
5.3.3	New Zealand	49
5.3.4	United Kingdom	50
5.3.5	USA	52
5.3.6	Establishment Generally	53
5.4	Time of Recognition of COMI and Establishment	53
5.4.1	Difficulties with Present Proposed Dates	55
5.4.2	Suggested Reform	56
6	Comparative Analysis of the Enactment and Interpretation of the Preamble and Chapter I of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency—General Provisions	59
6.1	Preamble.	59
6.2	Article 1	60
6.3	Article 2	63
6.3.1	Foreign Proceedings	65
6.3.2	Centre of Main Interest (COMI)	66
6.3.3	Collective Proceedings.	67
6.3.4	Foreign Main Proceeding	70
6.3.5	Foreign Non-main Proceeding	70
6.3.6	Foreign Representative	71
6.3.7	Foreign Court	72
6.3.8	Establishment	72
6.3.9	Other Definitions	72
6.3.10	Practical Implications of the Definitional Section	75
6.4	Article 3	76
6.5	Article 4	77
6.6	Article 5	79
6.7	Article 6	80
6.7.1	USA Legal System	83
6.7.2	Practical Issues	84
6.8	Article 7	85
6.9	Article 8	87
6.10	Summary	90
7	Comparative Analysis of the Enactment and Interpretation of the Chapter II of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency—Access of Foreign Representatives and Creditors to Courts in This State	91
7.1	Article 9	91
7.2	Article 10	93
7.3	Article 11	94

7.4	Article 12	95
7.5	Article 13	96
7.6	Article 14	98
7.7	Summary	99
8	Comparative Analysis of the Enactment and Interpretation of Chapter III of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency— Recognition of Foreign Proceeding and Relief.	101
8.1	Article 15	101
8.2	Article 16	102
	8.2.1 Rebuttable Presumptions	104
8.3	Article 17	111
	8.3.1 Australia	113
	8.3.2 Canada	114
	8.3.3 New Zealand	116
	8.3.4 United Kingdom	117
	8.3.5 USA	118
8.4	Article 18	122
8.5	Article 19	124
	8.5.1 Australia	125
	8.5.2 New Zealand	126
	8.5.3 USA	126
8.6	Article 20	127
	8.6.1 Exceptions to Stay	128
8.7	Article 21	129
	8.7.1 Australia	130
	8.7.2 Canada	132
	8.7.3 New Zealand	133
	8.7.4 United Kingdom	133
	8.7.5 USA	135
	8.7.6 Generally	138
8.8	Article 22	138
	8.8.1 Australia	139
	8.8.2 Canada	140
	8.8.3 New Zealand	140
	8.8.4 United Kingdom	140
	8.8.5 USA	141
8.9	Article 23	142
	8.9.1 Australia	142
	8.9.2 Canada	142
	8.9.3 New Zealand	143
	8.9.4 United Kingdom	143
	8.9.5 USA	143
	8.9.6 Generally	144

8.10	Article 24	145
8.11	Summary	146
9	Comparative Analysis of the Enactment and Interpretation of Chapter IV of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency—Operation with Foreign Courts and Foreign Representatives	147
9.1	Article 25	147
9.1.1	Australia	149
9.1.2	Canada	150
9.1.3	United Kingdom	151
9.1.4	USA	151
9.1.5	Canada and USA	151
9.2	Article 26	155
9.3	Article 27	156
9.4	Summary	157
10	Comparative Analysis of the Enactment and Interpretation of Chapter V of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency—Concurrent Proceedings	159
10.1	Article 28	159
10.2	Article 29	161
10.3	Article 30	162
10.4	Article 31	163
10.5	Article 32	165
10.6	Summary	166
11	Conflict of Laws	167
11.1	Introduction	167
11.2	Common Law	168
11.2.1	Australia	168
11.2.2	Canada	169
11.2.3	New Zealand	169
11.2.4	United Kingdom	170
11.2.5	USA	171
11.3	Model Law	172
11.3.1	Concurrent Administrations	172
11.3.2	Excluded Entities	173
11.3.3	Exempt Property	175
11.3.4	Conflict of Laws Provision in Different States	179
11.3.5	Nature of Stay Under Article 20	185
11.3.6	Worldwide Effect of Some States' Insolvency Regimes	190
11.3.7	Priority of Domestic Laws in Administrations	195
11.3.8	Effect of Discharge Under Domestic Law	197
11.3.9	Inconsistency with Other International Laws Treaties and Conventions	198

11.3.10	Protection of Creditors Interests.	202
11.4	Summary	204
12	Present Issues with Concepts of Centre of Main Interest and Establishment	207
12.1	Courts Obligation to Review Decisions in Relation to COMI and Establishment.	207
12.2	Inappropriate Recognition of Centre of Main Interest (COMI)	208
12.3	Inconsistency of Court Decisions	209
12.4	Summary	211
13	Applicability of Rules of Private International Law	213
13.1	Private International Law	213
13.1.1	Choice of Forum	213
13.1.2	Recognition and Choice of Law	214
13.2	Model Law	215
13.3	Private International Law in Interpretation of Model Law	219
13.3.1	Extrinsic Material	220
13.3.2	Vienna Convention	222
13.3.3	Model Law Provisions.	223
13.4	Uniform Choice of Law Rules	224
13.5	ALI and IIL Guidelines	224
13.6	Summary	224
14	Interrelationship Between the Model Law and the EC Regulation	227
14.1	Interrelationship	227
14.1.1	COMI	229
14.1.2	Establishment	230
14.1.3	Date of Recognition of COMI.	231
14.1.4	EC Regulation	231
14.1.5	Predilection of Insolvency Laws	232
14.1.6	Changes to EC Regulation Since Model Law	233
14.1.7	Other Comments	234
14.2	Reconciliation—ALI and LLI Guidelines	235
14.3	Summary	235
15	Current Proposals Which May Affect the Model Law	237
15.1	Model Law Concepts	238
15.2	Directors' Obligations.	239
15.3	Enterprise Groups.	240
15.4	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises	242
15.5	Financial Institutions.	242

15.6	Recognition of Foreign Insolvency Judgments	244
15.7	Conclusion	244
16	Conclusions	245
16.1	Present Status of Model Law	245
16.2	Does the Model Law Achieve Its Objectives?	247
16.3	Factors Giving Rise to Inconsistencies	250
	Bibliography	253

Cross-Border Insolvency

The Enactment and Interpretation of the UNCITRAL
Model Law

Hannan, N.

2017, XII, 270 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-5875-2