



# Corporate Turnaround and Insolvency

## Stay summary judgment to allow scheme of arrangement proposal

The recent decision of *Re Bluecrest Mercantile BV* saw the High Court stay proceedings for summary judgment in respect of contract debts to allow the formulation of proposals for a scheme of arrangement - is this likely to become common practice, or is it a one-off?

### The background

Schemes of arrangement (SofAs) are another mechanism (aside from CVAs) by which companies can compromise their liabilities. Although the process involves court sanction, as with CVAs the proposition of a SofA will not cause a moratorium to arise which protects the company from further action until the SofA is either approved or discharged. As such, they are rarely used in isolation in insolvency situations due to the potential for "rogue" creditors to disrupt the process with court action.

In *Re Bluecrest Mercantile BV* ([2013] EWCH (Comm) 22/04/2013), Credit Suisse, together with other lenders, had lent \$600 million to the Vietnam Shipbuilding Industry Group (VSI), a state owned entity which built and repaired ships.

VSI later ran into financial difficulties and opened negotiations for a debt restructuring with several of its lenders. Those negotiations lasted some two years from 2010. Two of the lenders later started court proceedings to recover the money owing to them, and applied for summary judgment for payment of the debts. As so much progress had been made with the negotiations, VSI applied to the court under Civil Procedure Rule 3.1(2)(f) to stay the legal proceedings until some specified future event. Their argument was that - although there was no defence to the debt - the action would subvert the attempted restructuring, and that VSI believed it had a sufficient body of support to vote through a SofA. A court hearing for the SofA had been scheduled for June 2013, which would allow approval by August 2013.

### The issues

The major issue for the court was whether it could use its jurisdiction to allow a SofA to be proposed. Several authorities were cited by the bank which contended that the court had no authority to allow hearings to be delayed pending resolution of other issues. One analogy used was the inability of a court to stay winding up petition under Section 126 of the Insolvency Act 1986 pending a meeting of creditors.

### What did the court decide?

Referring to other authorities under the old Rules of the Supreme Court (the "White Book") under which stays of judgments had been allowed specifically to allow consideration of SofAs, the High Court allowed the application and stayed the summary judgment proceedings. Given that the SofA had a reasonable prospect of being approved, this constituted "special circumstances" which justified a stay under CPR 3.1(2)(f). If the stay was not granted, there was a risk that not all creditors would be treated equally and a "free for all" would ensue in which the supportive lenders would no doubt back out of a restructuring.

### What does this mean for practitioners?

This decision is to be welcomed, especially in those marginal cases where a consensual restructuring is sought outside the protection of administration or a formal insolvency process. No doubt many practitioners have experienced the frustration of having proceedings disrupted by the precipitous actions of a rogue disgruntled creditor. This provides confirmation of the court's jurisdiction to stay action where a SofA or other restructuring appears to be a viable option. The case also serves as a valuable reminder of when the court will sanction SofA in respect of overseas companies (the primary test being whether they are able to be wound up by the English courts). It also represents a cautionary tale for junior lenders and may affect their enthusiasm to participate in clubs or syndicates.

### Contacts

For more information on this subject please contact:



#### Patrick Cook

Partner

+44 (0)117 307 6807

patrick.cook@burgess-salmon.com



#### Richard Clark

Senior Associate

+44 (0)117 902 6626

richard.clark@burgess-salmon.com

Burgess Salmon LLP, One Glass Wharf, Bristol BS2 0ZX Tel: +44 (0) 117 939 2000 Fax: +44 (0) 117 902 4400  
6 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BF Tel: +44 (0) 20 7685 1200 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7980 4966

[www.burgess-salmon.com](http://www.burgess-salmon.com)

Burgess Salmon LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales (LLP number OC307212) and is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. A list of members, all of whom are solicitors, may be inspected at our registered office: One Glass Wharf, Bristol BS2 0ZX.

© Burgess Salmon LLP 2013. All rights reserved. Extracts may be reproduced with our prior consent, provided that the source is acknowledged. Disclaimer: This briefing gives general information only and is not intended to be an exhaustive statement of the law. Although we have taken care over the information, you should not rely on it as legal advice. We do not accept any liability to anyone who does rely on its content.

Data Protection: Your details are processed and kept securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. We may use your personal information to send information to you about our products and services, newsletters and legal updates; to invite you to our training seminars and other events; and for analysis including generation of marketing reports. To help us keep our database up to date, please let us know if your contact details change or if you do not want to receive any further marketing material by contacting [marketing@burgess-salmon.com](mailto:marketing@burgess-salmon.com).