

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

OCTOBER 2022

EDITOR'S NOTE: SECTION 363

Victoria Prussen Spears

A ROAD MAP FOR POTENTIAL SECTION 363 BUYERS OF DISTRESSED BUSINESSES IN THE UNITED STATES

Frank Grese, Debra A. Dandeneau, Michael Nowina, William J. Rowe, Derek Liu, Matthew Grant and Barry Chang

SECTION 363(m) CIRCUIT SPLIT HEADED FOR U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW

David S. Meyer, William L. Wallander, Steven M. Abramowitz, Steven Zundell and Elias M. Medina

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION SETTLES WITH BANKRUPT MASSACHUSETTS GENERATOR, WHILE INVESTIGATION INTO ISO-NEW ENGLAND REMAINS ONGOING

Norman C. Bay, Paul J. Pantano, Jr., and Alexandra K. Calabro

FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS VACATES FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION ORDERS, REAFFIRMING CONTRACT REJECTION POWERS IN BANKRUPTCY

Ben Hoch and Marsha Sukach

THIRD-PARTY RELEASES IN MAHWAH BERGEN'S CHAPTER 11 PLAN HELD TO BE UNENFORCEABLE

Tyler R. Ferguson, Aaron Gavant, Sean T. Scott and Samuel R. Rabuck

CREDITOR FILES U.S. LAWSUIT AGAINST SRI LANKA IN CONNECTION WITH ITS SOVEREIGN DEBT DEFAULT, ASSERTING BREACH OF CONTRACT AND PARI PASSU CLAIMS

Richard J. Cooper, Carmine D. Boccuzzi, Jr., Jorge U. Juantorena, Boaz S. Morag, Juan G. Giráldez, Sui-Jim Ho, and Rathna J. Ramamurthi

LOMBARD V. SKYJETS: KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR LENDERS AND RESTRUCTURING PROFESSIONALS

Bevis Metcalfe, Matthew Smith, William Sugden and Matthew Mazenier

HONG KONG COURT BREATHES NEW LIFE INTO RULE IN *GIBBS*

Bruce Bell, Howard K.H. Lam, Adam J. Goldberg, Flora F. W. Innes and Tim Bennett



LexisNexis

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 7

October 2022

Editor's Note: Section 363 Victoria Prussen Spears	303
A Road Map for Potential Section 363 Buyers of Distressed Businesses in the United States Frank Grese, Debra A. Dandeneau, Michael Nowina, William J. Rowe, Derek Liu, Matthew Grant and Barry Chang	306
Section 363(m) Circuit Split Headed for U.S. Supreme Court Review David S. Meyer, William L. Wallander, Steven M. Abramowitz, Steven Zundell and Elias M. Medina	317
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Settles with Bankrupt Massachusetts Generator, While Investigation into ISO-New England Remains Ongoing Norman C. Bay, Paul J. Pantano, Jr., and Alexandra K. Calabro	322
Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals Vacates Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Orders, Reaffirming Contract Rejection Powers in Bankruptcy Ben Hoch and Marsha Sukach	332
Third-Party Releases in Mahwah Bergen's Chapter 11 Plan Held to Be Unenforceable Tyler R. Ferguson, Aaron Gavant, Sean T. Scott and Samuel R. Rabuck	335
Creditor Files U.S. Lawsuit Against Sri Lanka in Connection with Its Sovereign Debt Default, Asserting Breach of Contract and Pari Passu Claims Richard J. Cooper, Carmine D. Boccuzzi, Jr., Jorge U. Juantorena, Boaz S. Morag, Juan G. Giráldez, Sui-Jim Ho, and Rathna J. Ramamurthi	340
<i>Lombard v. Skyjets</i>: Key Takeaways for Lenders and Restructuring Professionals Bevis Metcalfe, Matthew Smith, William Sugden and Matthew Mazenier	343
Hong Kong Court Breathes New Life into Rule in <i>Gibbs</i> Bruce Bell, Howard K.H. Lam, Adam J. Goldberg, Flora F. W. Innes and Tim Bennett	347

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at 513.257.9021
Email: ryan.kearns@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call
Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780
ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)
ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)
ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

Example: Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2022)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SCOTT L. BAENA

Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP

ANDREW P. BROZMAN

Clifford Chance US LLP

MICHAEL L. COOK

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

MARK G. DOUGLAS

Jones Day

MARK J. FRIEDMAN

DLA Piper

STUART I. GORDON

Rivkin Radler LLP

PATRICK E. MEARS

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

Hong Kong Court Breathes New Life into Rule in *Gibbs*

By **Bruce Bell, Howard K.H. Lam, Adam J. Goldberg, Flora F. W. Innes and Tim Bennett***

Judicial comments cast doubt on the ability to compromise U.S. law-governed debt effectively based on Chapter 15 recognition alone. The authors of this article explain a recent first instance decision in Hong Kong that has cast doubt on the ability of an offshore scheme of arrangement to compromise debt governed by a foreign law.

A recent first instance decision in Hong Kong has relied upon the so-called rule in *Gibbs* to cast doubt on the ability of an offshore scheme of arrangement to compromise debt governed by a foreign law. In *Re Rare Earth*,¹ a case that on its facts did not seem to require consideration of the issue, Mr. Justice Harris voluntarily joined the fray. In so doing, he highlighted an important conflict of laws issue that will inform debtor groups with a Hong Kong presence on where to promote a restructuring.

The rule in *Gibbs* is derived from a 19th century English case,² which decided that, as a matter of English law, only the governing law of a contract may validly discharge or amend it. Therefore, absent the agreement of the creditor (by its submission to the jurisdiction in question or by otherwise participating in the foreign proceedings), only an English law process may validly amend or discharge English law-governed debts.

* Bruce Bell (bruce.bell@lw.com) is a partner in the Finance Department of the London office of Latham & Watkins and global vice chair of the firm's Restructuring & Special Situations Practice. Howard K. H. Lam (howard.lam@lw.com), a partner in the firm's Hong Kong office, advises corporates, banks, and investors on complex financing transactions across Asia, with a strong focus on Greater China. Adam J. Goldberg (adam.goldberg@lw.com) is a partner in the firm's New York office, advising creditors, secured creditors, acquirers, financing sources, and companies in all facets of the restructuring and reorganization process, with a particular focus on complex cross-border matters. Flora F.W. Innes (flora.innes@lw.com) is an associate in the firm's office in Hong Kong. Tim Bennett (tim.bennett@lw.com) is knowledge management counsel in the firm's London office.

¹ *Re Rare Earth Magnesium Technology Group Holdings Ltd* [2022] HKCFI 1686; HCCW 81/2021.

² *Antony Gibbs & Sons v. La Société Industrielle et Commerciale des Métaux* (1890) 25 QBD 399 (English Court of Appeal).

OFFSHORE BORROWERS AND COMPROMISES OF FOREIGN LAW-GOVERNED DEBT

In *Rare Earth*, a Bermuda-incorporated borrower listed in Hong Kong and with operations in mainland China proposed a Hong Kong scheme of arrangement to compromise its largely Hong Kong law-governed debt. In sanctioning the scheme, the court was satisfied that the effect of the scheme would be recognized in Bermuda (the jurisdiction of incorporation) and the Cayman Islands (the jurisdiction of the scheme company's ultimate parent).

As the Hong Kong scheme compromised Hong Kong law-governed debt, the relevance to the case of the rule in *Gibbs* was not readily apparent. However, in obiter comments, the judge considered the effect of an offshore scheme of arrangement (for example, one proposed in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands) on Hong Kong law-governed debt. The judge found that, unless a creditor had submitted to the jurisdiction of the offshore scheme jurisdiction, the creditor would not be prevented from suing for its debt in Hong Kong because, under *Gibbs*, Hong Kong law-governed debt could only be compromised by a Hong Kong law process. That statement was helpful insofar as it removed any lingering doubt that the Hong Kong court would apply the rule in *Gibbs* in determining the effect of a foreign law compromise on Hong Kong law-governed debt.

However, the court extended its analysis still further to a hypothetical (but common) structure, under which an offshore-incorporated borrower with assets in Hong Kong has issued U.S. dollar denominated debt under an instrument governed by New York law. How would the Hong Kong court treat the New York law debt if the borrower successfully proposed a scheme of arrangement in the offshore jurisdiction and obtained recognition in the United States under Chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Code?

The judge held that a Hong Kong court would not necessarily recognize the scheme as compromising the New York law debt. This was because Mr. Justice Harris considered that any relief granted under Chapter 15 would not of itself compromise New York law debt as a matter of U.S. law, but would be limited to ancillary relief to prevent a creditor taking action against the company (or its assets) in the United States. In order to compromise the New York law debt substantively, Mr. Justice Harris was of the view that a Chapter 11 plan would be required. His Honor commented that:

[T]here is a distinction between a court treating a compromise as having the substantive legal effect of altering the legal rights of the parties to an agreement (the issue with which *Gibbs* is concerned) and a court within its jurisdiction recognizing, pursuant to a process such

as Chapter 15, the purported legal consequence of a foreign insolvency procedure.

The result of this would be that a creditor with New York law-governed debt would be at liberty to seek recovery for its uncompromised claim in the Hong Kong court, and by extension petition to wind up the company in Hong Kong based on it notwithstanding any Chapter 15 recognition that had been obtained.

THE EXTENT OF CHAPTER 15 RELIEF AND THE INTRUSION OF *GIBBS*

At first blush, this decision is surprising. Chapter 15 has been commonly used as a way of recognizing compromises of New York law-governed debt by a foreign court (whether by way of scheme of arrangement or otherwise), and it has become common practice to obtain expert New York law advice confirming their effectiveness as part of a scheme of arrangement. Other affected jurisdictions tend to follow the lead of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court insofar as matters of New York law-governed debt are concerned. The Hong Kong court's approach appears to raise uncertainty where, at least under the governing law of the debt (being New York law), no such uncertainty exists.

Mr. Justice Harris cited in support of his view Judge Glenn's judgment in the Southern District of New York in the *Agrokor* case, granting Chapter 15 relief.³ In *Agrokor*, a Croatian restructuring plan sought to compromise predominantly English law-governed debt. The U.S. bankruptcy court granted Chapter 15 relief, notwithstanding that the rule in *Gibbs* might undermine the plan's effectiveness as a matter of English law. In short, the U.S. court was prepared to overlook the territorialism of the *Gibbs* approach in favor of the direct application of Chapter 15 recognition and U.S. case law, which is based on principles of international comity to respect the decisions of foreign courts and the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross Border Insolvency. That would be the case even if the substantive result of the compromise is different from what might be available under U.S. law.

Whereas the Hong Kong court in *Rare Earth* is correct to characterize Chapter 15 as a limited proceeding to "import" relief within the territorial boundaries of the United States, it is unlikely that Chapter 15 imposes any limitation along the lines of the rule in *Gibbs* with respect to debt governed by U.S. or any other law. On the facts in *Agrokor*, there would therefore likely have been no limitation from the U.S. perspective on the impact of a Croatian law

³ *In re Agrokor d.d.*, Case No. 18-12104 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2018) (MG).

restructuring plan on New York law-governed debt before the courts of New York, England, Hong Kong, or elsewhere. Moreover, there is no equivalent to the *Gibbs* rule in the United States, and U.S. courts have readily acknowledged the discharge of New York law-governed debts in non-U.S. judicial proceedings. For example, in *Canada Southern Railway Co. v. Gebhard*⁴ it was held that:

Unless all parties in interest, wherever they reside, can be bound by the arrangement which it is sought to have legalized, the scheme may fail. All home creditors can be bound. What is needed is to bind those who are abroad. Under these circumstances, the true spirit of international comity requires that schemes of this character, legalized at home, should be recognized in other countries. The fact that the bonds made in Canada were payable in New York is unimportant

Whether or not the Hong Kong court's comments on the effect of Chapter 15 recognition are consistent with the U.S. law analysis,⁵ the decision will likely prompt Hong Kong debtors incorporated offshore with New York law-governed debt to consider carefully whether to propose a creditor compromise under the laws of that offshore jurisdiction.

⁴ 109 U.S. 527, 539 (1883).

⁵ In the recent bankruptcy court decision, *In re Modern Land (China) Co., Ltd.*, Case No. 22-10707 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 18, 2022) (MG), Judge Glenn held that a Cayman Islands scheme of arrangement of a Cayman debtor, recognized as a main proceeding under Chapter 15, would indeed constitute a substantive discharge of New York law-governed debt.