

International Corporate Rescue



Published by:

Chase Cambria Company (Publishing) Ltd
4 Winifred Close
Barnet, Arkley
Hertfordshire EN5 3LR
United Kingdom

www.chasecambria.com

Annual Subscriptions:

Subscription prices 2017 (6 issues)

Print or electronic access:

EUR 730.00 / USD 890.00 / GBP 520.00

VAT will be charged on online subscriptions.

For 'electronic and print' prices or prices for single issues, please contact our sales department at:
+ 44 (0) 207 014 3061 / +44 (0) 7977 003627 or sales@chasecambria.com

International Corporate Rescue is published bimonthly.

ISSN: 1572-4638

© 2019 Chase Cambria Company (Publishing) Ltd

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publishers.

Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner.
Please apply to: permissions@chasecambria.com

The information and opinions provided on the contents of the journal was prepared by the author/s and not necessarily represent those of the members of the Editorial Board or of Chase Cambria Company (Publishing) Ltd. Any error or omission is exclusively attributable to the author/s. The content provided is for general purposes only and should neither be considered legal, financial and/or economic advice or opinion nor an offer to sell, or a solicitation of an offer to buy the securities or instruments mentioned or described herein. Neither the Editorial Board nor Chase Cambria Company (Publishing) Ltd are responsible for investment decisions made on the basis of any such published information. The Editorial Board and Chase Cambria Company (Publishing) Ltd specifically disclaims any liability as to information contained in the journal.

The New Swiss International Insolvency Law

Sabina Schellenberg, Partner, and Yannik Hässig, Associate, FRORIEP, Zurich, Switzerland

Synopsis

On 1 January 2019, the revised chapter of the Swiss Private International Law Act (hereinafter 'PILA') regarding cross-border insolvencies entered into force. The revision became necessary as the previous regulation was criticised in particular for its protectionist elements, which also were a recurring topic in discussions with foreign colleagues and insolvency practitioners.

The major points for discussion in recent years were:

- How can insolvency practitioners of foreign main proceedings access the debtor's assets in Switzerland and transfer them to the estate of foreign main proceedings?
- How can they pursue claims against third party debtors in Switzerland?

Both was difficult and costly until end of 2018, namely for the following reasons:

Contrary to the rules of the European Insolvency Regulation¹, Swiss law did not provide that foreign insolvency proceedings and the powers of foreign insolvency practitioners are automatically recognised in Switzerland. Foreign insolvency practitioners could therefore not access assets in Switzerland and enforce claims against Swiss third party debtors without recognition of the foreign insolvency opening order. Even after such recognition, the insolvency practitioner could not access the assets in Switzerland or pursue claims against Swiss debtors on its own. Instead, an ancillary insolvency proceeding was opened and conducted by a Swiss bankruptcy office (a state authority). Only a potential surplus of the ancillary insolvency proceeding could be transferred to the foreign estate. This cumbersome process led to criticism – in Switzerland as well as abroad.

A further point of discussion was that foreign decisions on claw back claims and other creditor-damaging acts could not be recognised in Switzerland. Instead, such claims had to be pursued in Switzerland in the course of the ancillary insolvency proceedings and the claims were governed by Swiss law.

With the revised PILA, the Swiss legislator has responded to these criticisms. This article outlines the fundamentals of the new Swiss cross border insolvency law and analyses to which extent above issues have been addressed.

As a preliminary, the innovations of the revised act are limited in scope. It is still necessary to have the foreign insolvency decision recognised in Switzerland in a first step, although the recognition requirements have been slightly loosened (see section I below). In principle, an ancillary insolvency procedure remains necessary (see section II below). Consequently, accessing assets located in Switzerland and transferring them to a foreign estate will continue to be difficult and costly for foreign insolvency practitioners. Besides, a provision was introduced as part of the revision which, in principle, allows the recognition of foreign decisions on claw back claims and other insolvency related claims (see section III below). However, this only applies if the respondent was not domiciled in Switzerland at the time of the judgment. As a result of this restriction, foreign decisions on such insolvency related claims will often still not be recognisable in Switzerland in the future.

I. Recognition requirements

Under the revised PILA, a foreign insolvency decision is recognised in Switzerland upon request of the foreign insolvency practitioner, the debtor or one of its creditors if:

- the decision was issued in the state of the debtor's place of registered seat or the state in which the debtor's centre of main interest (hereinafter 'COMI') is situated, provided the debtor was not domiciled in Switzerland at the time the foreign proceedings were opened;
- the decision is enforceable in the state in which it has been issued and
- there are no grounds for refusal (in particular infringement of the Swiss *ordre public*).

Notes

1 Regulation (EU) 2015/848 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 May 2015 on insolvency proceedings.

These new recognition requirements entail two simplifications compared to the old regime: First, an insolvency decision issued in the state in which the debtor's COMI is situated can now be recognised in Switzerland, too, if the debtor had no registered seat in Switzerland at the time the foreign proceedings were opened. Second, the previously applicable, strongly criticised requirement of reciprocity was waived, according to which it had to be demonstrated in the request for recognition that the state in which the insolvency decision was issued recognised Swiss insolvency decisions under equivalent conditions. This waiver of the reciprocity requirement leads to lower costs for the recognition procedure, since legal opinions on foreign law had to be filed so far in order to prove that the foreign state grants reciprocity.

II. Recognition and ancillary insolvency proceedings

Foreign insolvency decisions are still not automatically recognised in Switzerland under the revised PILA. Hence, if a foreign insolvency practitioner wants to move assets from Switzerland to the foreign estate or pursue a claim against a debtor in Switzerland, the first step is to request recognition of the foreign insolvency decision.

The recognition proceeding is set out as a single-party court procedure. In the recognition proceeding, the recognition requirements must be proven. Furthermore, it must be demonstrated that there are assets located in Switzerland belonging to the foreign insolvency estate. In case the recognition requirements are fulfilled, the court will recognise the foreign insolvency decision.

The further procedure depends whether there are any Swiss creditors and if so, what kind of creditors: If there are no claims secured by a pledge and no preferential claims of creditors domiciled in Switzerland, the foreign insolvency practitioner may file an application to waive the ancillary insolvency proceedings. If there are Swiss domiciled creditors of other claims, the court can waive the conduct of ancillary insolvency proceedings on request, if the claims of these creditors are adequately taken into account in the foreign proceedings. This has to be proven by the foreign insolvency practitioner.

However, it is uncertain how it can be proven in the recognition procedure that there are no pledge-secured or preferential creditors domiciled in Switzerland. It is discussed that the application for recognition may also include a request for the execution of a call for creditors. However, the result of this call for creditors is already decisive for the reasoning of the application for recognition, if the request for a waiver for ancillary insolvency proceedings is included in the application for recognition. This makes this approach appear rather impractical. Another solution could be to not initially apply for a waiver of the ancillary insolvency

proceedings in the application for recognition of the foreign insolvency decision. Together with the recognition of the foreign insolvency decision, the court opens ancillary insolvency proceedings in Switzerland. The competent bankruptcy office then issues a call for creditors. If no claims are filed by Swiss creditors, it should then be possible to apply for a waiver of the continuation of the ancillary insolvency proceedings at this stage in our opinion. However, until now there are barely any published decision regarding this question. Therefore, there are still uncertainties with regard to the concrete procedure.

If an application for waving the ancillary insolvency procedure is approved, the foreign insolvency practitioner may carry out all actions to which it is authorised pursuant to the foreign law. He or she may in particular pursue claims and transfer assets abroad without further authorisation or further legal proceedings. He or she must, however, comply with all applicable Swiss laws and must not perform any official acts, use any means of coercion or decide disputes.

In all other cases, where no application to waive the ancillary insolvency proceedings is filed, or if such a request is rejected, the procedure remains unchanged. Ancillary insolvency proceedings are opened by the court that decides on the recognition of the foreign insolvency decision. These proceedings are conducted by a state authority, the bankruptcy office, and are limited to the debtor's assets located in Switzerland. With certain adjustments the rules of Swiss insolvency law are applied. The bankruptcy officer will set up a list of assets located in Switzerland belonging to the debtor's estate, publish a call for creditors and draw up the schedule of claims.

The debtor's assets located in Switzerland are drawn into the insolvency estate and liquidated in the course of these proceedings. This also includes the enforcement of claims against third party debtors domiciled in Switzerland. The proceeds of the liquidation fall into the Swiss ancillary insolvency estate. After deduction of the costs for the proceedings, secured and preferential creditors domiciled in Switzerland are satisfied first. If there is a surplus, the funds will be handed over to the foreign insolvency practitioner, provided judicial recognition of the foreign list of creditors is granted. For this recognition, a second court proceeding is required. In this second court proceeding, the same court that decided on the recognition of the foreign insolvency decision examines whether the claims of non-preferential creditors domiciled in Switzerland have been adequately taken into account in the foreign list of creditors.

III. Recognition of foreign decisions which are closely related to insolvency proceedings

In connection with the recognition of insolvency proceedings, the question of the recognition of individual

proceedings which are materially closely related to insolvency proceedings arises. The main cases of application are claw back claims and director liability claims.

According to a new provision that was introduced with the revision, foreign rulings on claw back claims or other claims regarding creditor damaging actions which are closely related to the foreign insolvency proceeding shall be recognisable in Switzerland.

However, this only applies if:

- the foreign insolvency opening decision was recognised in Switzerland;
- such judgment was issued in the state of origin of the main insolvency proceedings or is recognised in that state and
- the respondent was not domiciled in Switzerland at the time of the judgement.

In cases in which the respondent was domiciled in Switzerland at the time of judgment, however, a foreign ruling on claw back claims or liability claims against organs cannot be recognised in Switzerland. In this case, a claw back claim according to Swiss law must be filed within the framework of the ancillary insolvency proceedings. Thus, the scope of this new provision is very limited.

Critical appraisal of the revision

The revised PILA entails some simplification – particularly the loosening of the recognition requirements is to be welcomed. However, the Swiss legislator has not succeeded in making a big step forward with this revision, and the opening-up to foreign jurisdictions has not taken place to the extent that many foreign insolvency practitioners had hoped for.

There is still no automatic recognition of the foreign insolvency decision. If a foreign insolvency practitioner wants to move assets from Switzerland to the foreign estate or pursue a claim against a third party debtor in Switzerland, the recognition of the foreign insolvency decision in a court proceeding continues to be necessary. With regard to the new possibility of applying for a waiver of ancillary insolvency proceedings, a number of procedural issues are unresolved. Even after resolving these issues, it seems questionable whether waving the ancillary insolvency proceedings can actually save much time. Such a waiver is only possible, if there are no creditors in Switzerland or there are solely

unsecured and non-preferential creditors, which are taken into account adequately in the foreign insolvency proceedings.

Until now, in such constellations an ancillary insolvency proceeding had to be conducted – nonsensically indeed –, but due to the lack of Swiss creditors it was very lean and did not take up much time. The recognition of the foreign insolvency decision as well as the recognition of the foreign list of creditors before assets could be transferred abroad were the time consuming and costly factors. As mentioned, no separate procedure is required for the recognition of the foreign list of creditors when waiving the conduct of ancillary insolvency proceedings. Instead, however, the absence of pledge-secured creditors or preferential creditors domiciled in Switzerland and the appropriate consideration of any other Swiss creditors in the foreign proceedings must now already be proven in the proceedings for recognition of the foreign insolvency decision. This procedure therefore becomes more complex.

This can be problematic, as it often only became apparent after recognition of the foreign insolvency decision during the ancillary insolvency proceedings whether sufficient assets were available and whether claims could actually be enforced. In these cases, the foreign insolvency practitioner was able to save the expense of the second court proceeding for the recognition of the foreign list of creditors, as it had already been established before that there were not sufficient assets. The proof that there are no Swiss creditors or that certain kinds of creditors are appropriately taken into account in the foreign proceedings has now, however, already to be provided during the proceedings for recognition of the foreign insolvency decision and thus irrespective of whether it later turns out that, for instance, a claim against a third party debtor cannot be enforced. In this respect, the new regulation may even prove to be disadvantageous in cases where the enforceability of claims is uncertain. It is obvious that under the new law, it is still only worthwhile for foreign insolvency practitioners to initiate proceedings in Switzerland if there is sufficient security that there are enough assets in Switzerland.

It is regrettable that the protectionist character of the Swiss international insolvency law in favour of Swiss creditors has not been abolished. In our opinion, Switzerland's revised international insolvency law still does not comply with modern standards and will continue to cause a lack of understanding abroad.

International Corporate Rescue

International Corporate Rescue addresses the most relevant issues in the topical area of insolvency and corporate rescue law and practice. The journal encompasses within its scope banking and financial services, company and insolvency law from an international perspective. It is broad enough to cover industry perspectives, yet specialized enough to provide in-depth analysis to practitioners facing these issues on a day-to-day basis. The coverage and analysis published in the journal is truly international and reaches the key jurisdictions where there is corporate rescue activity within core regions of North and South America, UK, Europe Austral Asia and Asia.

Alongside its regular features – Editorial, US Corner, Economists' Outlook and Case Review Section – each issue of *International Corporate Rescue* brings superbly authoritative articles on the most pertinent international business issues written by the leading experts in the field.

International Corporate Rescue has been relied on by practitioners and lawyers throughout the world and is designed to help:

- Better understanding of the practical implications of insolvency and business failure – and the risk of operating in certain markets.
- Keeping the reader up to date with relevant developments in international business and trade, legislation, regulation and litigation.
- Identify and assess potential problems and avoid costly mistakes.

Editor-in-Chief: Mark Fennessy, Proskauer Rose LLP, London

Emanuella Agostinelli, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP, Milan; Scott Atkins, Norton Rose Fulbright, Sydney; James Bennett, KPMG, London; Prof. Ashley Braganza, Brunel University London, Uxbridge; Dan Butters, Deloitte, London; Geoff Carton-Kelly, FRP Advisory, London; Gillian Carty, Shepherd and Wedderburn, Edinburgh; Charlotte Cooke, South Square, London; Sandie Corbett, Walkers, British Virgin Islands; Katharina Crinson, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, London; Hon. Robert D. Drain, United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of New York; Matthew Kersey, Russell McVeagh, Auckland; Prof. Ioannis Kokkoris, Queen Mary, University of London; Professor John Lowry, University College London, London; Neil Lupton, Walkers, Cayman Islands; Ian McDonald, Mayer Brown International LLP, London; Nigel Meeson QC, Conyers Dill Pearson, Hong Kong; Professor Riz Mokhal, South Square, London; Mathew Newman, Ogier, Guernsey; Karen O'Flynn, Clayton Utz, Sydney; Professor Rodrigo Olivares-Caminal, Queen Mary, University of London; Christian Pilkington, White & Case LLP, London; Susan Prevezer QC, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges LLP, London; Sandy Purcell, Houlihan Lokey Howard & Zukin, Chicago; Professor Arad Reisberg, Brunel University, London; Daniel Schwarzmann, PricewaterhouseCoopers, London; The Hon. Mr Justice Richard Snowden, Royal Courts of Justice, London; Anker Sørensen, De Gaulle Fleurance & Associés, Paris; Kathleen Stephansen, New York; Dr Artur Swierczok, CMS Hasche Sigle, Frankfurt; Meiyen Tan, Oon & Bazul, Singapore; Stephen Taylor, Isonomy Limited, London; Richard Tett, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, London; The Hon. Mr Justice William Trower QC, Royal Courts of Justice, London; Mahesh Uttamchandani, The World Bank, Washington, DC; Robert van Galen, NautaDutilh, Amsterdam; Miguel Virgós, Uría & Menéndez, Madrid; Prof. em. Bob Wessels, University of Leiden, Leiden, the Netherlands; Maja Zerjal, Proskauer Rose, New York; Dr Haizheng Zhang, Beijing Foreign Studies University, Beijing.

For more information about *International Corporate Rescue*, please visit www.chasecambria.com