1 Monday, 24 July 2017 1 they do what the reserves are for the creditors, will be 2 2 (10.00 am) able to reserve fully and know what the surplus is. 3 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Ms Toube. 3 Now, there may be more surplus in relation to further 4 MS TOUBE: Yes. 4 distributions, but they will know what the surplus is at 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I have read as promised the 5 6 transcripts and gone through your submissions, including 6 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, but this is a point in the 7 the additional material supplied by Mr Beswetherick. 7 8 There is one issue on which I would just like some 8 MS TOUBE: Not very far in the future. 9 9 comfort from you, with apologies that this is now the MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, but it is in the future. 10 third or fourth time of asking -- not of you but just of 10 MS TOUBE: Yes, but probably in the next week or so. 11 trying to get my mind round it. 11 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. 12 Really, it is a single point but in two parts. The 12 MS TOUBE: The directors will put together the interim 13 13 problem I have had, and to some extent have always had, accounts -- the director, sorry, will put together the 14 is that all this is to operate in the future when the 14 interim accounts. The director will be provided with 15 surplus is ultimately revealed, subject to any reserves 15 information by the administrators to do that. So that, 16 which may enable further surplus to be made available 16 those figures will all be set in stone at that point. 17 according to whatever contingencies arise. 17 The director will pass the resolutions, the 18 At whatever point or points that is, the directors 18 shareholders will approve the resolutions and the 19 on your model in option 1 will then have the surplus, 19 distribution can be made. In point of fact, the monies 20 such as by then established, released to them in order 20 are not going to be handed over by the administrators to 21 for them to exercise their powers as directors under the 21 the director, the director will direct the 22 Companies Act, the mode envisaged for the exercise of 22 administrators to make the distribution. 23 23 those powers being to apply to the court for a reduction So the point that your Lordship is concerned about, 24 of capital to enable the sum to be released. 24 one of the points your Lordship is concerned about, 25 MS TOUBE: As your Lordship will understand, I don't need to 25 which is that it will go into the director's hands Page 1 Page 3 1 apply to the court. 1 subject to a conditional undertaking, that will not 2 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, I'm sorry, you are quite right; 2 happen because the monies are not going to actually pass 3 3 for them to exercise their powers as a private company. from the administrators to the director. The point your 4 The difficulty I had previously and to some extent 4 Lordship is worried about, which is doesn't that look 5 still have is this: that the directors cannot state in 5 like the administrators are doing what they can't 6 otherwise do, is in a way amplified because it is the 6 advance, can they, how they will exercise their powers 7 7 in advance, they must judge it at the time? administrators making the payment, but they are always 8 8 Furthermore, for it to be a real choice they have to making the payment on behalf of the director because g have dominion over the funds to determine what they 9 they have no power to do it otherwise. 10 think is in the best interests of the company, adopting 10 So we go back to the point which I made to your your test. If you release the money to them subject to 11 Lordship no doubt ad nauseam that the question is, is 11 12 a conditional undertaking, which I envisage you would 12 the fact that the Insolvency Act doesn't let the 13 have to do, does that not show the element of 13 administrators make the distribution themselves by using 14 artificiality in the whole thing, that the 14 something in the Insolvency Act, is that the no entry 15 administrators, albeit they are envisaging that 15 sign or is there something which allows the director and 16 directors will exercise their powers under the Companies 16 the shareholders to do what they would otherwise be 17 Act in a certain way, are in fact controlling the entire 17 entitled to under the Companies Act. If the answer to 18 18 thing, so it is, in point of substance and possibly in that is yes, then it doesn't matter how the mechanics of 19 point of form, doing that which Mr Justice Briggs as he 19 that happen. If the decisions that are taken under the 20 then was says they couldn't do. 20 Companies Act are taken under the Companies Act and if Submissions by MR TOUBE 21 2.1 the distribution that is made is made by the director, 22 MS TOUBE: Well, the first thing is to deal with the 22 in accordance with the Companies Act, even if the money 23 futurity point. What is anticipated and will happen in 23 is passed from the hands of the administrators to the fairly short order, if we get an order from your 24 24 hands of the shareholder, that doesn't matter any more 25 Lordship, is that the administrators of LBEL, knowing as 25 than giving a direction to a bank doesn't mean the bank Page 2 Page 4

1	is making the payment, it means the person giving	1	factually LBH is supportive of this, for all the reasons
2	direction is making the payment.	2	we have identified before.
3	But I think your Lordship said to me at an earlier	3	So that is why we say we know that the powers in the
4	hearing, "Doesn't this look like a construct". And	4	Companies Act do survive insolvency, and there is no
5	I said, well, in a way it is, because if there was	5	reason why these powers should not survive insolvency.
6	something in the Act which said the administrators could	6	And then the only question is, is this an appropriate
7	make the distributions, the administrators would make	7	case in which they should be exercised? And we say yes,
8	the distributions, but that is not the question. The	8	for all the reasons we have debated at length.
9	question is, does the thing that we have come up with	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Put another way, you say this power,
10	work or not? And that really depends on the two points	10	and all powers relating to surplus, properly so-called,
11	that your Lordship put to me at the last hearing: one is	11	ie monies returnable to shareholders, remain in the
12	it no entry and, two, if it is not no entry, is this	12	directors to be exercised in the interests of the only
13	the proper case?	13	constituency in which they are interested, which is the
14	And your Lordship knows that in circumstances where	14	shareholders?
15	the Companies Act provides the statutory architecture,	15	MS TOUBE: Yes, as long as it is in support of the purposes
16	where the Insolvency Act does not provide a no entry	16	of the administration for the administrators to
17	sign, and we are in this very unusual circumstance where	17	facilitate, and we say it is.
18	a distribution is to be made by a director to	18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
19	a shareholder for the purposes of benefiting the	19	Now
20	creditors, it is difficult to imagine many other	20	MS TOUBE: Mr Trower is adding a point I made to your
21	circumstances, if any, in which that would be the case	21	Lordship on an earlier occasion, which is that also it
22	but this is one of those circumstances.	22	is the administrators not only facilitating but
23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But another way of putting the point	23	consenting to the directors using those powers.
24	in general, and this was the second part, is does the	24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
25	Companies Act provision for reduction of capital survive	25	MS TOUBE: So it is not that the director just goes off on
23	Companies Net provision for reduction of capital survive	23	NIS TOOBE. SO It is not that the director just goes on on
	Page 5		Page 7
			e i ea : li a ai wa i
1	administration?	1	a frolic of their own doing these things. We know they
2	MC TOUTE MAIN AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN		
	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. And we say there is nothing to say	2	cannot just say "I am going to distribute a surplus"
3	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there	3	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it.
3 4	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not	3 4	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No.
3 4 5	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent.	3 4 5	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages,
3 4 5 6	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does	3 4 5 6	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process,
3 4 5 6 7	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be	3 4 5 6 7	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what
3 4 5 6 7 8	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have	3 4 5 6 7 8	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes. We have gone through that process, because that is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then all the director has to do is look at the members	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes. We have gone through that process, because that is the process of working out what the debts are and who
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then all the director has to do is look at the members because by very definition the creditor's interests are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes. We have gone through that process, because that is the process of working out what the debts are and who—MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is a matter for calculation?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then all the director has to do is look at the members because by very definition the creditor's interests are being met by the administrators. So all the director	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes. We have gone through that process, because that is the process of working out what the debts are and who MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is a matter for calculation? MS TOUBE: Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it doesn't for two reasons. First of all, because there is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not exercised except for when the company is solvent. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be solvent because otherwise you would not have distributable profits, but there is nothing that says there is a bar. The other point is we know that the powers of the directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can be used whether for the benefit of the company and also because of this overlay of being in administration where it is the administrators are facilitating this for the purposes of the administration. So you get it is facilitated for the purposes of the administration because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then all the director has to do is look at the members because by very definition the creditor's interests are being met by the administrators. So all the director has to do is say, is this in the interest of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because apart from anything else they wouldn't have it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, you have to have gone through the proving process, working out who your creditors are, working out what your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, and then those powers which the director and shareholder indubitably do still have, we say, those can be exercised. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been asking you and now recognising that the funds will be retained by the administrators, you say that funds so retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital may, as it were, be reduced? MS TOUBE: Yes. We have gone through that process, because that is the process of working out what the debts are and who MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is a matter for calculation? MS TOUBE: Yes.

1	payment out of the surplus so identified, which is not	1	MR BESWETHERICK: If I might turn around for a minute.
2	under the control of the directors?	2	Yes, my Lord, that would suit us. We are perfectly
3	MS TOUBE: So the capital will be reduced, and then there	3	happy and we would welcome an order that provided
4	will be distributable profits and then they will be	4	clarity as to how the option is going to work.
5	distributed.	5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Have you got something to add?
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And those are subject to the control	6	MS TOUBE: I am just
7	of the directors exclusively?	7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you looking at the reduction of
8	MS TOUBE: If they are surplus to the administration, yes.	8	capital provision?
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	9	MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am not. (Pause).
10	Do you think, in the light of our discussions, were	10	I was just seeing if Mr Trower had an additional
11	I to approve it, you would need a more focused order	11	point that I might press your Lordship with, but it is
12	than the rather general wand which the application	12	simply the point that we have been dealing with about
13	notice envisages?	13	the management powers of the directors surviving, and
14	MS TOUBE: We are certainly content to have any wording that	14	that is why I say that the Insolvency Act makes it clear
15	would allow us to do what we need to do, so that if it	15	that there are those powers in the director which
16	said that the administrators can permit the director and	16	survive. But your Lordship knows that that is
17	the shareholder to reduce capital and make distribution	17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think my question was more confined
18	to LBH, in circumstances where that would be for the	18	than that.
19	purposes of the administration	19	MS TOUBE: I understand, my Lord.
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not drafting but I think when	20	The question you have is, why this power?
21	I looked at the application notice, which was after all	21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Why this power is it right that
22	crafted back in May or whenever it is, water having	22	that power to reduce capital, which isn't a power one
23	passed under the bridge and more focus having been	23	would associate with a company administration, as it
24	brought to the various issues there could be, I wonder	24	appears unlikely in all ordinary circumstances to arise
25	whether a more targeted approval, which is effectively	25	in that context, is that one which is legitimately said
	Tr,		
	Page 9		Page 11
1	what the application seeks, would be appropriate	1	to curviva?
1	what the application seeks, would be appropriate.	1	to survive? MS TOURE: My Lord was Lundarstand that And Lthink in
2	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up	2	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in
2 3	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full	2 3	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your
2 3 4	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something	2 3 4	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has
2 3 4 5	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits	2 3 4 5	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill.	2 3 4 5 6	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your purposes if a targeted order and a revised application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on this. On the one hand, Lord Neuberger says that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your purposes if a targeted order and a revised application were, as it were, approved, you having added your name	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on this. On the one hand, Lord Neuberger says that the Insolvency Act is not a complete and exclusive code, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your purposes if a targeted order and a revised application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on this. On the one hand, Lord Neuberger says that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS TOUBE: We would be content with that. We can come up with a full MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something out over the course of time to make sure that that fits the bill. MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. I will get back to you in a second. Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them late last night; I was travelling. MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in favour of all this, and can for your part not see any startling objection to it. MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led us to the conclusion that we support option 1. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your purposes if a targeted order and a revised application were, as it were, approved, you having added your name	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes, I understand that. And I think in a way, this brings together the two concerns that your Lordship has MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MS TOUBE: which is, first of all, you are worried about setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this may be the only case in which it does happen. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly bad precedent. MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the power to determine the question of whether this gap can be filled or not. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on this. On the one hand, Lord Neuberger says that the Insolvency Act is not a complete and exclusive code, and

1	decision, the decision was ultimately based, at least in	1	constituency to whom he owes duty?
2	part, on the thesis that administrators are not given	2	MS TOUBE: Yes.
3	certain powers, including the power they do not have	3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a matter of fact, he will also
4	the power to make cause. So on the one hand you have	4	have the administrator's bossy blessing.
5	a let's plug the gap if it is necessary, and on the	5	MS TOUBE: Facilitating blessing, yes.
6	other hand not that gap.	6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Facilitating blessing, yes.
7	The question is, are we on the left or the right	7	Well, Ms Toube I have indicated that I found this
8	side in this particular case?	8	an awkward question. I don't think that this has arisen
9	MS TOUBE: Yes, my Lord. I understand that.	9	before. My assistant and I have combed, as you have, to
10	It is true to say that sometimes navigating these	10	see whether there are provisions which might fortify one
11	waters is rather difficult, but in this case, what we	11	in supposing that a coordinate power resided in the
12	say is that in circumstances where it is for the purpose	12	directors which could be exercised irrespective of any
13	of the administration, and these powers do still exist,	13	prospect of returning to going concern, but there seems
14	that there is no reason at all why one should not	14	to be a complete blank. It may have happened but there
15	continue to use them. Filling the gap where there is	15	is no record of it.
16	nothing anywhere we can see might cause more difficulty,	16	I think that this is a novel point and I think it is
17	but the Companies Act is the statutory furniture for	17	a difficult point, but in all the circumstances, I am
18	doing this.	18	proposing to permit you to adopt this point for reasons
19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Can you just read me the provision for	19	which I will set out in a reasoned judgment in due
20	reduction of capital. I have not got the Companies Act	20	course.
21	with me.	21	If there were need for this judgment earlier rather
22	MS TOUBE: This is section 6(4)(i) of the Companies Act:	22	than later, which I wouldn't imagine there is within
23	"A limited company having a share capital may reduce	23	reasonable time I would still hope to get it out
24	its share capital (a), in the case of a private company	24	by September if not before, while I remember things, and
25	limited by shares, by special resolution supported by	25	probably this week you must let me know. But as it
	Page 13		Page 15
1	a solvency statement."	1	is in essence ex parte or agreed by all parties,
2	That is really what it says.	2	I should imagine it is not one of those occasions where
3	Then if you look at section 6(4)(ii), reduction of	3	someone is thirsting to see what the judge said in order
4	capital supported by solvency statement:	4 5	to show him wrong.
5	"A resolution for reducing share capital of	6	MS TOUBE: My Lord, no. Not at all. In fact, everyone
6	a private company limited by shares is supported by	7	wished to see it to see your Lordship is correct. But
7	a solvency statement if the directors of the company		I think we do need to have a go at the wording of the
8	make a statement of the solvency of the company in	8	order.
9	accordance with 6(4)(iii) not more than 15 days before	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: My anxiety is to ensure that the evils
10	the date on which the resolution is passed and the	10	of commitment before of fettering your discretion,
11	resolution and solvency statement are registered in	11	I am bothered about fettering discretion, and partly
12	accordance with section 6(4)(iv)."	12	because of that and partly because of my anxiety as to
13	And then $6(4)(iii)$ is the provisions for the	13	only using this in very confined circumstances, the
14	solvency statement, and then 6(4)(iv) is the	14	precise mechanics need to be adumbrated, and I think the
15	registration and simply says within 15 days, et cetera.	15	director I would propose to give in essence beyond my
16	So it is not limited in any way, it just simply says	16	powers to do so, the director power to apply if he were
17	one can do this if you have a solvency statement, and	17	concerned at any stage.
18	the solvency statement says as long as they cannot say	18	MS TOUBE: I think the best thing to do, my Lord, may simply
19	it is solvent, and your Lordship knows those can be	19	be to replicate the steps which it is intended to take
20	interim accounts.	20	and say that the administrators have the power to cause
21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Finally, I hope, what protection does	21	a transaction to be entered into in which the following
22	the single director have? The administrators can always	22	steps will happen.
23	come for momentous blessing.	23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, to approve that that happens and
24	MS TOUBE: The director has the shareholders' resolutions.	24 25	the directors say that they have considered it and
25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So he has been blessed by the only	23	presently, on present circumstances, that is what they
	Page 14		Page 16

1	think is right. But if they at any stage regarded his	1	court's approval for it and its administrators to enter
2	duty as in conflict with that, notwithstanding the	2	into the relevant transaction documents, it also seeks
3	approval of the shareholders, I think he should resort	3	the court's approval for it to take the steps required
4	to court unless you say I can't do that. He is not	4	to put into effect option 1.
5	an officer, but I should have thought that bearing in	5	My Lord, there are two entities which are parties to
6	mind he is down to take this special task directed by	6	Backstop 2 who are not represented today: there is LBHI,
7	the administrators, he should have at least	7	which acts as plan administrator in modified joint
8	theoretically that ability.	8	chapter 11 plan of LBHI and its affiliates, and it is
9	MS TOUBE: My Lord, if we give the director and	9	the largest subordinated creditor and the largest
10	administrators liberty to apply, that should deal with	10	unsubordinated creditor of LBHI2.
11	that.	11	My Lord, LBHI has inevitably been closely involved
12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am very grateful to you.	12	in the negotiations and the drafting of the documents
13	I am sorry again to have made heavy weather of it.	13	and it is present by its solicitors in court today, but
14	I think it is a curious position, but let us do that.	14	it has also conveyed its support for Backstop 2 in some
15	The question as to whether it is beneficial is much,	15	detail by a letter sent by its solicitors Weil Gotshal
16	much easier than whether it is available.	16	to those instructing me on 19 July. My Lord, that
17	MS TOUBE: I understand that, my Lord.	17	letter has been exhibited to Ms Bruce's fifth witness
18	We are all very grateful and I think that will	18	statement, and the letter itself can be found in the
19	enable us to go forward with option 1.	19	bundles. I won't take your Lordship to it but for your
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Good. All right. That means I have	20	Lordship's reference, it is bundle 2, tab 13, page 143.
21	eaten eight minutes into your respective times.	21	My Lord, there are also the Wentworth parties, and
22	I think I should also admit that I have read the	22	your Lordship will see that they are the assignees of
23	skeleton arguments. I have not lavished the care and	23	LBHI2's senior debt and subordinated debt originally
24	intention which I would ordinarily wish to do on the	24	owed by LBIE to LBHI2, and your Lordship will have seen
25	three witness statements which you directed me to and	25	they are also an integral part of the deal and they have
	Page 17		Page 19
1	therefore between you I will need your special help in	1	also participated in its negotiation and drafting of
2	this respect.	2	documents, and your Lordship can take it they support
3	Mr Trower, are you compère as ever?	3	the deal.
4	MR TROWER: On this occasion we thought Mr Arden might	4	My Lord, in the usual way details of the deal and
5	start, but I am very happy to do whatever is required.	5	details of this hearing have been advertised on the
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would like to follow what you have	6	website of LBIE, LBHI2 and LBL and there are details of
7	prescribed.	7	those given in the witness statements. So, for example,
8	Submissions by MR ARDEN	8	Ms Bruce deals with it at paragraph 7 of her witness
9	MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am grateful. As your Lordship knows,	9	statement and that is volume 1, tab 7.3.
10	there are now four applications before your Lordship	10	My Lord, importantly, as far as the contribution
11	relating to the Backstop deal. All of them seek the	11	element of all of this is concerned, your Lordship will
12	court's approval for the administrators ask for the	12	have seen that the LBIE administrators in particular
13	administrators to be at liberty to enter into the	13	have had discussions with their creditor groups and, in
14	various transactions which are the components of what	14	particular, with the representatives of the SCG and
15	has been described as the Backstop 2 deal.	15	York, who, as your Lordship knows, have been active
16	•	16	participants in the Waterfall proceedings.
17	My client, LBHI2 and LBL also ask that the court direct the administrators be at liberty to make	17	My Lord, as we understand, the position taken by
18	distributions without reserves in respect of any	18	those creditors or creditor groups is that they do not
19	liability to contribute under section 74 of the 1986	19	oppose Backstop deal or the relief being sought by the
20		20	applications and, again, this is dealt with in
	Act, and their ability to do so is, as your Lordship	21	particular in Mr Downs' 11th witness statement between
21	will have appreciated, an integral part of the Backstop	22	paragraphs 61 and 71 and your Lordship will find that in
22	deal.	23	bundle 1, pages 19 to 21.
23	LBH, I think following discussions on Friday, LBH	24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Shall we have a quick look at that?
24	has also issued its application; that is the fourth.	25	MR ARDEN: Yes. It is volume 1, tab 9, Mr Downs' 11th
25	In the case of LBH, as well as asking for the	23	Tes. 1 is volume 1, the 7, 141 Downs 11th
	Page 18		Page 20
	5		\cup

1	statement. Page 19, section H, headed "Engagement with	1	this application and have nothing to contribute to it.
2	LBIE creditors".	2	So that just completes the notification picture, if
3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	3	I can put it that way, and there is nothing in this
4	MR ARDEN: It is the whole section running through to 71;	4	correspondence which indicates anything other than
5	paragraph 71, I should say.	5	contentment or non-opposition to the proposal.
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I will just read it quickly. (Pause).	6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Your obligations to the FCA, are they
7	Yes.	7	individual or are they by statute or other provision?
8	MR ARDEN: My Lord, just while we are on this, Mr Trower has	8	MR TROWER: They are by statute. Under FSMA we are required
9	just indicated to me that there has been a little bit	9	to notify the FSA of any application made in the
10	more correspondence and it might be best if he updates	10	administration. So your Lordship will see there is
11	you on that now, while we are on this and before I move	11	a response from the relevant FCA individual there,
12	on, if that seems	12	Mr Gareth Reed.
13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Is this for the single creditor?	13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That applies to all persons before me?
14	MR TROWER: It is just we have had a couple of emails back	14	MR TROWER: No, it only applies to us. I think we are the
15	and they all make exactly the same point, which is	15	only authorised person.
16	a point in relation to our creditor constituency hoping	16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is in light of that?
17	we are not going to allow LBIE to go into liquidation at	17	MR TROWER: It is in light of that that we are required to
18	this stage. There was just a concern about the way	18	notify them.
19	a point was expressed on the website.	19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
20	If I can just briefly indicate the point or develop	20	MR TROWER: So that is really just to give your Lordship the
21	the point just a tiny little bit, it is simply this:	21	complete picture of the response that we have had to the
22	that it is obvious one of the reasons why we cannot do	22	notifications that have gone on our website, and they
23	anything by way of asserting our contribution claim at	23	are responses from at least one member of the senior
24	this stage is because LBIE is not in liquidation and the	24	creditor group, another individual creditor which is
25	position of those of our stakeholders who have responded	25	also an affiliate, the FCA, and that in essence is it.
	•		
	Page 21		Page 23
1	to this deal is that they very much hope that we will	1	As your Lordship will see, the response is only on this
2	not go into liquidation at this stage. The reason they	2	one issue; there is no response to the substance of the
3	don't want to us go into liquidation at this stage is	3	deal.
4	because of the lacuna point on statutory interest.	4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I mean it highlights, on the one
5	So in a sense this correspondence actually fortifies	5	hand, liquidation would enable the contribution claim;
6	the nature of the submissions that we are making as to	6	on the other hand, the statutory interest goes down the
7	why this is a sensible deal overall.	7	drain.
Q Q	But I can hand up what I have just so your	8	MR ARDEN: Yes.
9	Lordship has a complete picture, it is a little file of	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That central tension is presumably the
10	the responses that we have had.	10	one you have had to grapple with in achieving a proposed
11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you. (Handed).	11	resolution?
12	Is there anything I should particularly look at?	12	MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think the damage that liquidation
13	MR TROWER: The responses I think what I realise, I think	13	causes the statutory interests and lacuna point is
14	I've got mine possibly in a slightly different order.	14	well, it is one of a number of reasons why LBIE is not
15	I don't think your Lordship probably needs to know	15	going to go into liquidation.
16	very much, apart from the fact that all of these	16	That in turn feeds into the assessment there are
17	responses are concerned to simply ensure that it remains	17	other factors that are relevant to this as well that
18	the LBIE administrator's position that LBIE will not go	18	the possibility of a contribution claim at all or of any
19	into liquidation at this stage, so I don't think we need	19	substance is extremely remote, and that is a combination
20	to look at anything specific.	20	of factors, in part the size of the surplus in the LBIE
21	The only other thing I should say, and it is not	20 21	estate, but as your Lordship knows, in part also as
22	dealt with in the evidence, there is some correspondence	21 22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23	there with the Financial Conduct Authority, who we are	23	a result of the way in which the Supreme Court dealt with Waterfall I and what one extracts from the Supreme
24	required to notify of any application in the	23	Court's decision. So your Lordship is right about the
25	administration, under the Act, and they are aware of	25	tension and that is a relevant part of the parties'
23	and the rect and the same and aware or	23	cusion and mai is a relevant part of the parties
	Daga 22		Page 24
	Page 22		1 age 24

1	assessment, the assessment the parties have made about	1	a theoretical possibility of a contribution claim.
2	the contribution, but there are other factors, important	2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I mean, Mr Trower will probably
3	factors as well which are identified in evidence and in	3	explain this in greater detail but I am rather ignorant
4	the skeletons.	4	of the arithmetics. I mean, supposing my judgment in
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But the other factors come down to:	5	Waterfall IIC were reversed and the gate were opened to
6	best to get the money out earlier rather than later.	6	costs of funding claims, potentially infinite, ie not
7	The only way is if you clear out litigation, which could	7	capped by any known interest rate
8	go up to the Supreme Court and last for years.	8	MR ARDEN: Yes.
9	MR ARDEN: My Lord, the factors in favour of making the	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: would that affect things?
10	distributions are the need or the desire to distribute	10	MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think probably Mr Trower is best able
11	cash reserves that we have been sitting on for a very	11	to deal with the figures.
12	long time now.	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I will leave that. It is something
13	The question, or a question, one of the questions is	13	dealt with in his skeleton, along with the Sempra Metals
14	whether there needs to be a reserve and the parties'	14	issue, which I will need some assistance on. But there
15	assessment, as I said, in part based upon the lack of	15	are certain imponderables. They can be pondered but
16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: A reserve against a respective	16	they cannot be assessed with absolute accuracy.
17	contribution claim itself dependent on liquidation which	17	MR ARDEN: Yes, there are a number of claims against LBIE's
18	no one wants?	18	estate which are yet to be resolved and so there is the
19	MR ARDEN: Yes, exactly.	19	Bower v Marris point that will not affect the
20	So if one at the moment there is no claim and no	20	contribution claim, but as we accept and point out in
21	creditor. What the parties, what all parties have	21	our evidence, in the skeleton, there are on that appeal
22	sought to do is to address the question, well, is	22	still being run arguments to the effect that there are
23	a claim of any substance likely? For various reasons	23	non-provable claims by way of an alternative to Bower v
24	all of the parties have concluded that it is not. One	24	Marris and so that is yet to be determined, and your
25	of the reasons, or one of the reasons that underpins	25	Lordship has identified a further point. I think I am
	Page 25		Page 27
	8		- 100 - 1
1	that conclusion, is that LBIE for a number of reasons,	1	right in saying that Mr Trower can deal with this, but
2	but including the very important one relating to	2	I think I am right in saying that it is thought that,
3	statutory interest, will not go into liquidation,	3	even if one factors in the imponderables, there is
4	because that will damage the interests of the creditors.	4	a likelihood that the surplus will be sufficient to
5	But my Lord, as I said, on top of that, there are other	5	cover all elements of LBIE's liabilities above the
6	reasons why it is thought that the contribution claim is	6	subordinated debt and it could get down as far as the
7	unlikely. Those are the sort of economic factors and	7	subordinated debt itself. I am not sure anybody would
8	they relate to the size of LBIE's estate and the loss of	8	go as far as to say that is a certain outcome, there are
9	the foreign currency conversion claims and the fact	9	imponderables, but that is the way it is looking at the
10	that, as we now know, the members cannot the	10	moment.
11	liability to contribute does not extend to statutory	11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: As far as creditors are concerned, the
12	interests, and so one is now looking at a contribution	12	position is this, isn't it, from what you have shown me,
13	claim only if, which seems unlikely, LBIE's surplus is	13	that they were notified of the first version and its
14	insufficient to pay statutory interest, plus what now	14	abandonment in light of the Supreme Court's decision.
15	looks to be a fairly theoretical possibility of	15	They were on the 12th and 13th told of the revised
16	a species of unprovable claims. That is the	16	proposal. They were told of the date of this hearing.
17	Waterfall II point.	17	They were not told it may well be impossible to tell
18	So what the parties have done, as I said, what the	18	them for all I know that it is now or never and to
19	parties have done is to assess the likelihood of	19	put up or shut up. One or two of them have put up but
20	a contribution claim arising by reference to various	20	only in terms of noises against liquidation, which is in
21	factors and concluded that the claim is unlikely or	21	effect in favour of the proposals, and that is where the
22	highly unlikely and that the advantages to all estates,	22	matter lies.
		23	MR ARDEN: Yes. But nobody if one were trying to
23	not just the affiliates but also to LBIE, the advantages		
23 24	not just the affiliates but also to LBIE, the advantages to all estates outweigh whatever objection could be made	24	identify creditor groups most likely to oppose, they
		24 25	
24	to all estates outweigh whatever objection could be made		identify creditor groups most likely to oppose, they

1	affiliates.	1	agreement. I have not read those.
2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2	MR ARDEN: No.
3	MR ARDEN: And the two most active, or what I understand to	3	Your Lordship, they are, as one would expect them to
4	be the two most active groups, the SCG and York, are the	4	be, not light reading.
5	ones with whom there has been a direct engagement, so	5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No.
6	not just solely reliant on what appears on the website,	6	MR ARDEN: My Lord, as far as background is concerned, as
7	and they do not object. And obviously your Lordship	7	I just told your Lordship and I think your Lordship
8	will appreciate no one else has objected in response to	8	knows, the affiliates, by which I mean the four other of
9	what has appeared on the website on any website.	9	us other than LBIE, currently hold something in the
10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That doesn't strike one as surprising	10	order of £1.4 billion in cash reserves. My Lord, the
11	given the lie of the land, ie the lie of the land is	11	position in relation to each affiliate is summarised in
12	likely that they are benefitted by these	12	Mr Downs' 11th witness statement at paragraph 20, so
13	MR ARDEN: My Lord, certainly a deal which results in	13	that is volume 1, tab 9 and I think page 5.
14	distributions being made from the affiliates' estates is	14	At the bottom your Lordship will see it starts with
15	undoubtedly for their creditors a significant	15	LBL sitting on 390 million, LBHI2 704 million, LBH
16	improvement on the current position where distributions	16	63 million and LBEL 270 million.
17	simply have been frozen now for a considerable period of	17	My Lord, in the same paragraph and for each company,
18	time and, indeed, none have been made in LBHI2's	18	your Lordship will see what distributions have been made
19	administration at all, as your Lordship knows.	19	to date from each estate. So LBL has paid 1.8 million.
20	So your Lordship is right, one would not expect	20	That is a small dividend on account of preferential
21	I think objections from the affiliates' status; the	21	creditors. LBHI2 has paid no dividend. That is 20.2.
22	objections, if they were to come, would come from LBIE's	22	LBH has paid in aggregate 63 million, and LBEL has paid
23	estate, but your Lordship knows what has happened there.	23	its unsecured 100p in the pound, but nothing on account
24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Mr Trower will elaborate on the	24	of statutory interest.
25	various potential, additional factors which might impel	25	My Lord, the reason why no dividends have been paid
	Page 29		Page 31
1	liquidation, but beyond that and I also have to	1	or why payments or distributions once made have been
2	remember I suppose that my function is, as you have all	2	suspended very slightly, according to which company one
3	explained to me, relatively limited. I must simply test	3	looks at, but essentially it is this, and your Lordship
4	to see whether there is any conceivable argument of	4	will see the detail of what I am about to say from
5	irrationality or whether there is an argument of	5	paragraphs 21 and 28 of Mr Downs' statement and also at
6	conflict of interest such as to undermine the structure.	6	appendix 4 to that statement where he summarises the
7	MR ARDEN: Yes.	7	claims that are being made amongst or between LBIE and
8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Beyond that it is not for me to wonder	8	the affiliate. That is not numbered, but it is 6 or 7
9	whether some other deal might have been preferable, even	9	or 8 pages in from the back of the witness statement,
10	if I could. Those are the tests. They are almost sort	10	same tab. It is appendix 4 claims among LBIE and the
11	of Wednesbury tests.	11	affiliates, if your Lordship has that.
12	MR ARDEN: That is right, it is a limited function.	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
13	My Lord, what I was going to do was to just give	13	MR ARDEN: My Lord, the position is this, that as far as the
14	your Lordship the background and some references to the	14	members were concerned, LBHI2 and LBL, as your Lordship
15	evidence.	15	knows, proofs were submitted by LBIE in those estates on
16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, thank you.	16	the basis of the contributory liability.
17	MR ARDEN: And once I have done that, I will tell your	17	My Lord, again as your Lordship knows, the amount of
18	Lordship where in the evidence and the skeletons the	18	the proofs was calculated on the basis that the law was
19	various parties have assessed the merits or otherwise of	19	as stated by the Court of Appeal in Waterfall I and on
20	the deal and expressed a view and then, my Lord, I think	20	a worst case basis.
21	it is right that I should take your Lordship, and I will	21	Against each estate LBIE claimed 100 per cent of the
22	try to do this briefly, to the transaction documents, so	22	shortfall calculated on that basis, which resulted in
23	you can see how the package is put together.	23	a claim against a contributory claim against each in the
24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, because I mean I can't remember	24	order of about £10 billion, and that for all practical
25	how many there were, six or eight, under the framework	25	purposes had the effect of preventing or freezing
	D 20		D 22
	Page 30		Page 32

g

distributions from those two estates. My Lord, that is a point which is made by Mr Downs at paragraph 21, which I have already referred your Lordship to but without reading it. It is also made by Ms Bruce in her statement at paragraph 10, dealing with the position of LBHI2. My Lord, separate from the contribution claim, then, LBL has asserted initially principally against LBIE and q LBEL a right to recharge various items, and those are the bad debt claims and the administration costs claims,

My Lord, again, your Lordship may recall that the amount of those claims, even as originally formulated ran to many hundreds of millions of pounds. My Lord, that obviously creates an issue for LBIE because it is something that LBIE has to deal with, but also it has frozen the further distributions that would otherwise have been made by LBEL on account of its statutory interests and hence Ms Toube's submissions to your Lordship about how LBEL was particularly concerned to get on with Waterfall III.

but as your Lordship knows, possibly extending beyond

My Lord, in addition to that recharge claim -- and I am using "recharge" not in any defined way but as a convenient way of dealing with it, of describing it --

been the two forms have been the subject of negotiation, starting from about the end of last year. The objective of the Backstop deals in both forms was to try to find a solution to the problem that I have just identified and to permit the affiliates to commence or recommence the process of distribution.

My Lord, Backstop 1 was negotiated before the Supreme Court decision and the proposal there, as your Lordship probably recalls, was to create a fund which would be available to meet shortfalls, a shortfall in the LBIE estates, and that fund would effectively take the place of the contributory's liability, leaving the contributories free to distribute.

The background and broad outline of Backstop 1 in the evidence is dealt with, firstly by Ms Bruce at paragraphs 40 to 42 and it is touched upon by Mr Downs at paragraph 22.

My Lord, Backstop 2 has been overtaken. It was premised upon the Court of Appeal's decision in material respects being upheld and the Supreme Court decision overtook it and, as your Lordship knows, changed the legal landscape. But my Lord, it is worth bearing Backstop 1 in mind because if one takes both Backstops what one can see is that Backstop 2 is the product of a very long period of negotiation. It is not something

Page 33

in addition to the recharge claim as originally formulated and confined to the two items I have mentioned, LBL has asserted a wider right of recharge, which in its widest form extends to LBHI2 and LBH and includes its liabilities as a contributory. Your Lordship will recall all of this in Waterfall III. It is simply an attempt to pass on in one form or another whatever liability LBL has as a contributory and that wider alleged right of recharge obviously creates, or it compounds the effect that the existing claims already have on the estates and their ability to distribute. It is a further impediment to the distribution of the cash reserves.

My Lord, that obviously operates to the detriment of the third party creditors of each of the estates but it also has an effect on the estates themselves because many of the debts are intercompany debts, intercompany balances and the like. So, for example, a significant asset in LBHI2's estate is a claim of around 277 million against LBL, which is an intercompany claim, which essentially cannot be admitted and won't be paid for as long as the rights of recharge coming the other way remain.

Now, my Lord, the objectives, Backstop, as your

Lordship knows, has been around in two forms and it has

Page 34

Page 35

which has simply started with the Supreme Court; it
extends for some five months beyond that. So now for
some seven-odd months the parties have been trying to
find a solution and Backstop 2 represents what they
believe to be the right one, so the product of a long
negotiation.

As far as Backstop 2 is concerned, the immediate background was the Supreme Court judgment and, my Lord, there are various summaries both of the effect and impact of the Supreme Court judgment and its consequences, various summaries which all pretty much say the same thing but sometimes with different angles and they appear both in the witness statements and in the skeletons. So, for example, Ms Bruce summarises the position at paragraphs 33, 38 to 39 and 56 of her witness statement; Mr Downs at paragraphs 32 to 34 and 54 to 59 of his statement.

That analysis is then repeated and sometimes expanded upon in the skeletons. So, for example, if one takes the LBIE skeleton, your Lordship will find the impact dealt with -- I have lost it for the moment.

My Lord, the analysis is in the part of the skeleton which deals with the LBIE administrators' view and it is dealt with particularly in section, I think, C, paragraphs 32 and onwards.

Page 36

1 2

q

those items.

1 My Lord, in our skeleton, it is dealt with 1 then 10 refers to a share transfer. LBL is to transfer 2 particularly at paragraph 19, where we deal particularly 2 its shares in LBIE to LBHI2. with the position of the contributories and the 3 3 My Lord, as far as then the transaction documents 4 contributory liability. 4 are concerned, there is a master framework agreement, 5 So my Lord, that is the immediate background to 5 which I will take your Lordship to first, not the first 6 Backstop 2, and Backstop 2 reflects the Supreme Court's in the bundle but your Lordship will see that between 67 6 decision about the nature of the contributories' 7 and 98. 8 liability or is intended to reflect it. 8 My Lord, if I can just pick up the recitals. They q As far as the deal itself is concerned, the overall 9 start on page 70 and your Lordship will see that, from H 10 effect of Backstop 2 is summarised by Ms Bruce at 10 onwards, it describes, the recitals describe both what 11 paragraph 43. She then identifies the transaction 11 this deed is intended to do and also the other documents at paragraph 44. My Lord, there is a longer 12 12 agreements that the parties are to execute, which are 13 13 summary in Mr Downs' witness statement, paragraphs 48 to the other component parts of Backstop 2. Then the 14 14 significant provisions are to be found at clause 3. 15 15 My Lord, the transaction documents, which is what That is an obligation to execute the other documents. 16 I was going to take your Lordship to now, are in 16 And 4 is the execution of a consent order disposing of 17 17 volume 4 of the bundles. Waterfall III. 18 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Volume 4? 18 So that is a framework deed, which then provides 19 19 MR ARDEN: It is a ring binder. also for dismissal of Waterfall III, and then the next 20 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 20 document is the deed of settlement. 21 MR ARDEN: My Lord, page 1 and 2, this is the heads of 21 My Lord, I am taking your Lordship through this at 22 terms, so not itself a transaction document. But your 22 fairly high level because, as your Lordship will have 23 Lordship may find this a useful summary of the principal 23 picked up from the skeletons, there is an application 24 terms of the whole of Backstop 2. 24 that the court file be sealed in respect of these 25 So, for example, you will see at paragraph 1, this 25 documents, which are confidential. My Lord, what I am Page 37 Page 39 trying to do is to point your Lordship to the clauses, 1 is Wentworth's agreement to limit its recourse in 1 2 2 the relevant clauses, without going into them in too respect of the subordinated debt to the assets, to 3 3 much detail. I need to do that, but if I do not descend LBIE's assets, so doing away with the need to make a contribution claim in respect of the subordinated 4 4 into detail --5 debt, which was a point which might otherwise have 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: When do you wish to deal with the arisen in Waterfall III. 6 6 issue of confidentiality? 7 7 Paragraph 2 deals with the position between LBL and MR ARDEN: Because it relates to the court file, it is not 8 proposed that your Lordship deals with this or sit in 8 LBIE and paragraph 3 deals with notice of intention to g distribute. Paragraph 4, liquidation. At paragraph 5 9 private. Because it simply relates to the court file I was going to deal with it at the end. 10 there is a reference to the interaffiliate settlement, 10 11 which is the way in which distributions -- or the 11 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So you must help me from my ignorance, 12 agreement which governs distributions between the 12 ordinarily any document referred to in open court is 13 13 affiliates, and it would be based on values which we available generally. 14 calculated according to a financial model and, my Lord, 14 MR ARDEN: For inspection, my Lord, yes, but then the court 15 I will come on to that in due course. 15 can restrict the right of inspection. 16 Paragraph 6, my Lord, LBL is dropping its recharge 16 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Without its permission? 17 and indemnity claims and withdrawing claims made against 17 MR ARDEN: Yes. 18 the parties identified. Paragraph 7, LBHI will give 18 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Presumably that is an agreed 19 LBIE an uncollateralised indemnity to cover any 19 application? 20 shortfall for LBIE's senior creditors and capped at 20 MR ARDEN: My Lord, every party supports it, yes. 62 million. 2.1 21 Obviously when one starts digging down into the 22 Then 8, Waterfall III. Over the page, Waterfall III 22 figures, those can become obviously more confidential, 23 will be terminated by dismissal by consent, no order as 23 but I am not proposing -- I will show you where the 24 24 figures are but I am not proposing to go through them. 25 9 relates to a LBIE claim, a LBIE/LBH claim. And 25 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Anyway, you say I don't have to make Page 38 Page 40

1			
1	a direction at this stage?	1	I just want to know whether any further protection
2	MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think, as I said, it relates to the	2	is required, having given the warning that I can quite
3	parties only want a restriction on the right of	3	understand seeing in the court files, saying it should
4	inspection, so I don't think your Lordship needs to deal	4	be monitored, but I am not quite sure what the answer
5	with it now, it can be dealt with at the end of my	5	would be to an application. There may be answers, I am
6	submissions.	6	not dealing with that, I just want to I am asking to
7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: What would be the objection to	7	you pause and think whether this is sufficient for your
8	inspection if it has already been referred to in open	8	purposes and, if it is, whether it is any good.
9	court?	9	MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, as I said, it gives us some
10	MR ARDEN: The objection is it is in the detail, my Lord.	10	protection in the sense that we can then, in response to
11	It is the	11	an application, we will be able to identify the interest
12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is good for people to know the	12	sought to be promoted by inspection, and to oppose if we
13	generality but not to test it by reference to the	13	think it is right or perhaps to oppose in part. "Well,
14	particular?	14	if you want to see this, that is fine, but not this",
15	MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, yes, your Lordship needs to know,	15	something like that.
16	as I said, your Lordship needs to know what the relevant	16	It is not perfect, but my Lord, I think the
17	clauses are and what	17	alternative would be for this hearing to be dealt with
18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: If I need to know, surely other people	18	in private, which seems, and I think seemed to all of
19	should be entitled to know what I need to know?	19	us, to be perhaps going too far the other way.
20	MR ARDEN: My Lord, if they have a good reason for needing	20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think you are right that it would be
21	to know	21	very difficult to have these sorts of applications in
22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Curiosity.	22	private. The question is whether there is anything
23	MR ARDEN: My Lord, that would not be, in my submission,	23	between that and this.
24	a good reason.	24	Now, it is a matter for all of you. I can't
25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Wishing to be satisfied that justice	25	personally assess whether it will be worthy of further
	Page 41		Page 43
	1 age 11		1 450 10
1	was done and seen to be done.	1	protection. I agree with you that these hearings need
2	MR ARDEN: My Lord, then an application it is open to	2	to be public hearings, but if you are content with this
3	an interested party, a party that can demonstrate	3	and it can be dealt with in effect at the end of the
4	a legitimate interest, which may be the one that your	4	day, simply by my directing that the file is not to be
5	Lordship has identified, it would be open to that party	5	released without permission of the court, well and good,
6	to apply for permission and then for the court to deal		
7		6	but I am just querying this. Are you all right with
	with it. But what the protection that the party seeks	6 7	but I am just querying this. Are you all right with this?
8	with it. But what the protection that the party seeks simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad,		
	* * *	7	this?
8	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad,	7 8	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone
8 9	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the	7 8 9	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to
8 9 10	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive.	7 8 9 10	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection
8 9 10 11	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own	7 8 9 10 11	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content?
8 9 10 11 12	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection.	7 8 9 10 11 12	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy
8 9 10 11 12 13	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?"	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail in the way in which	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail in the way in which I am covering it, I am hoping to give your Lordship	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the way I have just suggested.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail in the way in which I am covering it, I am hoping to give your Lordship sufficient detail to enable	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the way I have just suggested. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is fine.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail in the way in which I am covering it, I am hoping to give your Lordship sufficient detail to enable MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You and I can nod and wink at each	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the way I have just suggested. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is fine. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I was going to take your Lordship to the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, turning up and trying to inspect documents that the parties agree are commercially sensitive. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own protection. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when someone says "I would like to have a look at those documents, please" and they say they have been referred to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail in the way in which I am covering it, I am hoping to give your Lordship sufficient detail to enable MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You and I can nod and wink at each other as much as we like, but other people may be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone else wants to whether any other party wishes to pursue a more stringent form of protection MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy for the matter to be dealt with in that way. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? All right. MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the way I have just suggested. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is fine. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I was going to take your Lordship to the deed of settlement. I have touched on the framework.

1 happy with that, to some extent you must take me to 1 the requirement that is reflected or contained in the 2 2 those points quite openly which you say are relevant to order that your Lordship made. 3 3 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That was for their protection, and the adjudication application. 4 MR ARDEN: Yes. 4 they no longer seek it? 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 5 MR ARDEN: That's right. 6 Can I just ask this while it is on my mind. Apart MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not sure they ever did but 6 7 from wondering why it was all called "Backstop", which 7 I landed them with it. 8 no doubt you will let me know, but there is provision 8 MR ARDEN: My Lord, as your Lordship will recall, in the 9 g for waiver by Wentworth, is that in the document? course of that hearing, one was trying to sort of identify, in relation to any contributory liability, who 10 MR ARDEN: Yes. That is the limited recourse -- it is in 10 11 the limited recourse. 11 would be the right person or party to object, and by 12 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is all within the limited 12 default I think one alit upon LBIE and its 13 13 recourse? administrators because there really is no one else who 14 MR ARDEN: Yes. 14 could sensibly object. 15 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It caps it, of course, but also --15 The idea of giving them four weeks' notice was to 16 I see. Thank you. 16 enable them to turn up to object if they thought they 17 MR ARDEN: My Lord, as for "Backstop", I think it was 17 should, and note it is before we pulled the distribution 18 an expression which probably worked for the first one 18 trigger which leads you into the structure and the 19 19 but doesn't for the second. It is just easy to keep process stipulated by the rules. So under 7.1, the 20 using the same term and just adding a number afterwards. 20 notice period is waived, or they agreed to waive it. 21 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am still being stupid about why it 21 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 22 was called Backstop, but my assistant will tell me. 22 MR ARDEN: Then 7.2, your Lordship will see that there is 23 23 MR ARDEN: I think backstop was the idea of the provision of a confirmation that LBIE and its administrators do not object to the LBHI2, LBL and LBEL and LBH 24 the fund in Backstop 1 which would take place, which 24 25 would respond to a shortfall, so that was the backstop. 25 administrators. And then it is: Page 45 Page 47 1 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I see, thank you. 1 "Making or deeming to make distributions or paying 2 2 statutory interest in accordance with the distribution MR ARDEN: But it is a sort of backstop. There is the 62 or 3 3 63 million, it is a rather less significant part of the model, pursuant to clause 6 of the interaffiliate 4 4 transaction. settlement deed ' 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 5 And, my Lord, I will come to that in a moment. 6 6 MR ARDEN: My Lord, the deed of settlement then is between "... paying relevant actual net payment amounts, 7 pages 3 and 26 of volume 4. What this deals with is it 7 making distributions to other unsecured creditors ..." 8 settles the claims as between LBIE on the one hand and 8 I'm taking that fairly quickly. g LBL, LBHI2 and LBH on the other hand, and you see that 9 "... in each case without provisions or reserve in 10 between clauses 3 to -- well, it is 3 to 5 and 10 connection with any actual or potential claims from 11 essentially it is a series of releases and discharges as 11 LBIE, LBIE administrators and/or any liquidator 12 between the various estates, and one of the advantages 12 appointed to LBIE or any contributory claim." 13 seen by all estates, one of the advantages of Backstop 2 13 So that is the confirmation that your Lordship will 14 is that it is intended to settle the position as 14 have seen addressed in all of the skeletons and it is 15 between, as far as possible, the various estates either 15 a confirmation, as I said, that in making the 16 by eliminating claims in their entirety or agreeing the distributions that are governed by the -- in making 16 17 value of claims for distribution purposes, and this 17 distributions, no reserve need be made. 18 agreement is one of the documents intended to achieve 18 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And does that take account of the fact 19 that. 19 that it is proposed that distributions be made by 20 My Lord, the other clause I should draw your 20 directors? 2.1 Lordship's attention to is then clause 7. This is LBIE 21 MR ARDEN: My Lord, I don't think, as far as the 22 and LBIE's administrators' waiver of the notice period 22 distribution -- my Lord, LBEL is not I think on 23 required to be given by them before the LBHI2 23 anybody's argument a contributory, and so it is administrators serve a distribution notice or a notice 24 24 difficult to see how --25 of intention to distribute in LBHI2. My Lord, that is 25 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It wouldn't arise; is that right? Page 46 Page 48

1	MD ADDEN. It simply describ orige. The only entities in	1	three clauses in the decoment
1 2	MR ARDEN: It simply doesn't arise. The only entities in respect of which it could arise, LBL no, LBHI2 and	$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	three clauses in the document. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But I am not asked to consider or
3	arguably LBH, but that would depend on whether LBL is	3	approve the modelling, nor the amounts which follow from
4	right about rectification.	4	the model?
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Anyway, I do not have to worry	5	MR ARDEN: No, it is really so your Lordship understands the
6	about the position of Mr	6	way the components work and then that perhaps just gives
7	MR ARDEN: No.	7	you a bit more detail and machinery.
8	My Lord, that is the deed of settlement. Then there	8	·
9	is the interaffiliate deed and this governs the	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is to see what is happening rather
10	distributions that have been made amongst the	10	than approve the details? MR ARDEN: Absolutely, otherwise one is in a sort of dull
11	affiliates. Essentially this proceeds on the basis that	11	drafting session, and it is probably not a very
12	it is possible to identify all the claims as between the	12	
13	various estates and all the estates' other liabilities	13	productive one at that. MP IJSTICE HIJ DVAPD: Bight
14	and their assets, and then, on the basis of that	14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right.
15		15	Well, let's pause there. You have had a quite
16	information, to agree net amounts which will then be	16	a time. How long would you like?
17	paid by a relevant affiliate to a relevant affiliate.	17	(11.45 am)
	My Lord, this is at page 27 onwards. If I could		(A short adjournment)
18	just draw your Lordship's attention to recitals J and K,	18	(11.50 am)
19	and if your Lordship would read that. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Where is recitals J and K?	19	MR ARDEN: My Lord, we were in the interaffiliate settlement
20		20	deed and, I think I explained to your Lordship, as far
21	MR ARDEN: Bundle-page 31, the last two recitals on that	21	as distributions are concerned, they will be calculated
22	page, and going over to 32. (Pause).	22 23	and then modelled so that one arrives at single figures
23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So there is a sort of rolled-up single	24	or single sums going from one estate to the other and
24	dividend, distribution?	25	the modelling in the calculation take place at a number
25	MR ARDEN: That's right.	23	of different stages until you get to the sort of final
	Page 49		Page 51
1	What it is possible to do, what will appear as	1	effective date or the final date where the last
1 2	What it is possible to do, what will appear as a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but		effective date or the final date where the last calculation is made which takes into account everything
	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but	1 2 3	calculation is made which takes into account everything
2		2	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the
2 3	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series,	2 3	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures.
2 3 4	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to	2 3 4	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done
2 3 4 5	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply	2 3 4 5	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the
2 3 4 5 6	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences	2 3 4 5 6	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done
2 3 4 5 6 7	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than	2 3 4 5 6 7	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your Lordship to I can do this fairly briefly, but one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your Lordship to I can do this fairly briefly, but one of the matters that is governed by the interaffiliate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are concerned, there are only going to be two payers, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your Lordship to I can do this fairly briefly, but one of the matters that is governed by the interaffiliate settlement deed is the LBEL distribution and I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are concerned, there are only going to be two payers, which is LBL and LBEL, and that is why the obligations, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your Lordship to I can do this fairly briefly, but one of the matters that is governed by the interaffiliate settlement deed is the LBEL distribution and I think your Lordship should see that clause as well, as well as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are concerned, there are only going to be two payers, which is LBL and LBEL, and that is why the obligations, the payment obligations, in clause 6 extend only to those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to financially model so that rather than have a series, a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than have the money just keep going round over and over, you just simply have, as I said, you financially model it and then you can arrive at net payments. My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be a convenient moment for the shorthand writers MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement deed? MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the transaction works and I think I do need to take your Lordship to I can do this fairly briefly, but one of the matters that is governed by the interaffiliate settlement deed is the LBEL distribution and I think your Lordship should see that clause as well, as well as the other clauses which provide for distributions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	calculation is made which takes into account everything that has happened up to that date and then produces the net figures. My Lord, there is an order in which things are done and the first in terms of first significant step or the first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is required to procure that the director does, and then LBH is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting into effect the LBEL option 1. And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the mechanism which deals with and then leads to the payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of distribution to its members but also as between the various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are concerned, there are only going to be two payers, which is LBL and LBEL, and that is why the obligations, the payment obligations, in clause 6 extend only to those two companies. The rest, the other affiliates are net

2

14

15

17

So what this does, what clause 6 does with effect, particularly 6.4, with effect from the final effective time, there are a series of admissions to proof. And then 6.5 is a release of claims other than those that are to be dealt with. That is 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8. And then the payments are dealt with at 6.14 and 6.15. 6.14 is statutory interest, the payment by LBEL of statutory interest. And then 6.15, the opening words of 6.15 give effect to -- there are deeming provisions and the intention of that is you deem payments to be made rather than to require them to be made, and that is to give effect to the 10 notional distributions leading to a net amount due or to be paid at the end of that process.

Then the payment obligations. 6.15.1, LBL is to pay

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

8

Then the payment obligations. 6.15.1, LBL is to pay what it is required to pay, and then 6.15.2, it is back to LBEL. You see reference to the accounts at (i), broad resolution at (ii) and then (iii) is the obligation to pay.

My Lord, that deals with the position as far as the affiliates are concerned and then distributions to other creditors is dealt with by clause 7. So the complicated ones are the affiliates because they are the payments of the product of a settlement of balances and letting off and so on.

parties are entering into this upon assumptions as to

what the likely outcome will be.

3 It is unlikely that that will change but it is 4 possible and so over the course of the working out of

5 the agreement, a fairly short period of time, statements

6 will be produced, and if the statements disclose

7 a position which is materially different and materially

8 worse than the figures that the parties are working on

9 in entering into the agreement, there is a right to

10 terminate. And, my Lord, the final effective date is

defined by reference to the final point at which

12 a parties can terminate for a material adverse effect

and so it relates back to 6.1 and that is the last of

the certificates that I have mentioned to your Lordship.

So once the last of the certificates is produced,

which is after the capital reduction takes place, there

is a short period of time to terminate. Once that is

18 over, that is the final effective date and then

19 everything rolls on from there.

20 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And any business day is right, 9.00 am

21 on any business day after the certification?

22 MR ARDEN: My Lord, when I looked at it I thought it was

23 right but ...

24 So under 6.1 you have to produce --

25 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 6.1 you have the certificates and then

Page 55

Page 53

- The distributions to other creditors will be made on the same basis, in other words at the same rate and in
- accordance with paragraph 7, so there will be
- 4 a distribution to all creditors, including affiliates.
- My Lord, I was next going to take your Lordship to
 the limited recourse deed. This is the Wentworth deed.
- 7 That is at page 99 of the bundle through to 118.
 - MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am just trying to get my head
- 9 round -- I apologise because it is drafting -- the final 10 effective term.
- 11 MR ARDEN: My Lord, that is defined, in the deed it is 12 defined by reference to --
- 13 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Any business day after the 14 certifications required by clause 6.1 provided I suppose 15 no certification has occurred. Is that right?
- MR ARDEN: My Lord, final effective time is --
- 17 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is 6.3 but it clocks back to 6.1,
- is that right?
- 19 MR ARDEN: My Lord, that is right.
 - At various points, as I indicated but took it fairly quickly, at various points in the process, so at the
- beginning and then as it starts and then at this point, the parties are required to essentially sort of produce
- statements which will convey to the other parties where
 things stand as far as their estates are concerned. The
 - things stand as far as their estates are concerned. The $Page\ 54$

- 1 you have 6.2, which is changes of mind; then you have to
- 2 wait 14 hours --
- 3 MR ARDEN: Yes.
- 4 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: -- to make sure there are not further
- 5 changes in mind.
- 6 MR ARDEN: Yes.
- 7 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Is it the business day or a business
- 8 day?
- 9 MR ARDEN: Well, it sounds to me like it should be "the",
- 10 I would have thought, rather than ...
- 11 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Any business day carries on ad
- 12 infinitum.

18

23

- 13 MR ARDEN: Your Lordship is right.
- 14 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Do you want to have a think about that
- 15 over the short adjournment -- there will be other
- drafting minutiae, I am sure, but I noticed that this
- 17 "final effective time" carries through the other
 - documents without further definition. So it just struck
- me as one where we might as well try and get it right.
- 20 MR ARDEN: Yes.
- 21 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Just have a think about that.
- 22 MR ARDEN: My Lord, it is right to say, your Lordship is
 - looking at documents that are still in a draft form,
- 24 albeit reasonably advanced, and there are matters which
- are incomplete, schedules, for example, which need to be

Page 56

20

2.1

1		١,	The material I defined in desired will be desired from
	dealt with, and this, and probably other drafting	1	Its nature I think is derived, will be derived from
2	issues, or corrections, will probably arise in the	2	the wording of clause 5. What is required is that the
3	course of the next few days.	3 4	joint administrators it is confirmation that in the joint administrators' reasonable opinion there is no
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Well, I hope I would not be as ambitious or even pretentious as to try to look at the	5	prospect of a distribution.
6	drafting, but just as we were on that	6	My Lord, I think that probably puts it in the
7	MR ARDEN: My Lord, it is helpful because it is easily	7	category of perhaps I would challenge for irrationality,
8	missed.	8	no reasonable administrator could have formed that
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Okay, well have a think about it and	9	opinion, but beyond that I don't see that there would be
10	let me know.	10	scope for challenge. I can't say I have really thought
11	MR ARDEN: My Lord, yes.	11	it through in any detail but that would be my immediate
12	My Lord, subject to your Lordship, I was just going	12	reaction to clause 5, 5.1.
13	to take your Lordship to the limited recourse deed,	13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That may very well not have got the
14	which was the Wentworth, page 99.	14	full glory of it but the shortfall certificate is really
15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	15	sort of the nub of it, isn't it, the nub of the
16	MR ARDEN: The relevant clause there is clause 3 and so it	16	agreement, really? And again it is a draft. The
17	is a limited recourse for release and release.	17	question sometimes is what the power of the certificate
18	My Lord, I don't think I need to go to the	18	should be.
19	definitions. I think the point will be fairly clear and	19	MR ARDEN: Yes, well, I mean it is something that vexed your
20	it has been discussed in the context of Waterfall III.	20	Lordship in Waterfall IIIC.
21	But you will see that it is a claim limited to assets	21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It did, yes.
22	and no contribution claim in respect of a shortfall.	22	MR ARDEN: Yes.
23	My Lord, the other thing that this document does at	23	Well, my Lord, I think my instant and probably not
24	5 and 6 is just to settle on the quantum of the two	24	particularly well thought out reaction was that it would
25	claims, the relatively small senior claim and then the	25	be challengeable on the basis of irrationality only but
	·		
	Page 57		Page 59
1	much larger subordination claim; that is clauses 5 and	1	not beyond that, but I can't, as I said to your
2	6.	2	Lordship, I can't say I have thought it through but it
3	Then the other document I was going to take your	3	may be that, it may be something that the two parties to
4	Lordship to is the indemnity agreement. This is the	4	that agreement
5	62 million fund not fund, it is an agreement to	5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Can have a think about.
6	indemnify LBIE against a shortfall provided by LBHI.	6	MP ADDEN. That the LDHI might want to have a think about
7	Commercial in manage 110 americands of the boundle and the		MR ARDEN: That the LBHI might want to have a think about.
	Sorry, this is pages 119 onwards of the bundle and the	7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the
8	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just		_
8 9		7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the
_	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just	7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could
9	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the	7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see
9 10 11 12	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers	7 8 9 10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you.
9 10 11 12 13	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable.
9 10 11 12 13 14	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and the important terms and that was the purpose of taking
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is intended, subject to the constraints of reasonableness	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and the important terms and that was the purpose of taking you to those.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is intended, subject to the constraints of reasonableness and good faith, to be definitive, is it?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and the important terms and that was the purpose of taking you to those. My Lord, as far as the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is intended, subject to the constraints of reasonableness	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and the important terms and that was the purpose of taking you to those.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	indemnity is at clause 3 and it is fairly it is just the lower of on certification, LBHI, has to pay the shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in which the definitions work mean I think that this covers very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities derived from senior claims, and one gets that they are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, senior claims, including statutory interest and, if applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated debt and not just the first. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is intended, subject to the constraints of reasonableness and good faith, to be definitive, is it?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was it a case called Socimer in the Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that with you. MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see whether that point can be clarified if it is thought desirable. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary for your Lordship to get into the detail because otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, which is not very helpful, but I thought it was important that your Lordship just see the structure and the important terms and that was the purpose of taking you to those. My Lord, as far as the

,	mith Partick installation already Theore have smith	,	describing the second s
1	with English jurisdiction clauses? I have been trying	1	that objective, a speedy distribution or as speedy as
2	to spot as we go through but I think they are, aren't	2	possible a distribution, as being consistent with their
3	they?	3	statutory duties, which is, even in a case as
4	MR ARDEN: I think Mr Marshall has pointed out that the	4	complicated as this, to get on with things and reach
5	indemnity at 134 is	5	a point where they could distribute as soon as
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: New York?	6	reasonably possible.
7	MR ARDEN: New York. (Pause).	7	My Lord, all of those matters are matters that we
8	My Lord, Mr Trower points out that it is both so	8	advance in support of our application. As I say, they
9	jurisdiction is both here and New York, and New York is	9	are shared by many. We have, as your Lordship knows,
10	the governing law. That is for indemnity.	10	separately dealt with the question of the contributory
11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Is there any reason I should bother	11	liability and as to whether or not there should be
12	myself with as to why it is the odd man out as to the	12	a reserve. My Lord, in our submission, the short answer
13	choice of law?	13	to that is no, there is no claim against which we can
14	MR ARDEN: My Lord, I would assume I think that this would	14	currently reserve and there is no prospect of that claim
15	be it is a familiar candidate for a choice of law.	15	vesting in anybody in the near to medium future, if at
16	This court does retain jurisdiction. And, my Lord,	16	all.
17	I would assume that that would have been the subject of	17	Those were all points I covered with your Lordship
18	a negotiation between those parties and that the LBIE	18	earlier and then, on top of that, and this is something
19	administrators, who will need to enforce it if	19	all of the evidence in the skeletons suggests, on top of
20	necessary, were satisfied with that outcome. There is	20	that, the ability to distribute or a distribution
21	nothing, certainly in my submission, nothing that leaps	21	without a reserve is, as I have described it, it is
22	out of that choice of law and makes one think, "Well,	22	an integral part of Backstop 2 and the financial
23	why on earth are you doing that?"	23	modelling is based upon it and if it doesn't happen,
24 25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	24 25	Backstop 2 will collapse. All of the parties identify
25	MR ARDEN: My Lord, those are the documents. In terms of	25	benefits to Backstop 2 which, in the opinion of the
	Page 61		Page 63
1	this application, your Lordship summarised the	1	various office-holders, outweigh any possible prejudice
2	principles that are applicable and I agree with	2	which might be said to arise as a consequence of the
3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I read Nortel and its summary of the	3	distribution taking place without any reserve being
4	trust jurisdiction and Mr Justice David Richards'	4	made, even if it were possible to make one.
5	analysis in MF, I think it was. Was it MF Global?	5	So even if it were a relevant factor, nevertheless,
6	MR ARDEN: MF Global.	6	particularly the LBIE administrators expressed the view
7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. You are not surrendering your	7	that that would not be something which would dissuade
8	discretion, you are simply putting it forward as	8	them from entering into Backstop 2 because of the other
9	a momentous decision, as obviously it is. Nevertheless,	9	benefits it secures, in particular for LBIE and its
10	however momentous my role, the court's role is limited	10	estate.
11	to determining whether there is any blot in terms of	11	My Lord
12	irrationality or of this conflict of interest which	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: This is not really a re Danka case, is
13	could give rise to difficulties. That is the end of it,	13	it?
14	isn't it?	14	MR ARDEN: I think you can use re Danka, you could get
15	MR ARDEN: My Lord, that is right and it can be very shortly	15	something out of re Danka, but it is not the same
16	stated, and I think in most of the skeletons it is	16	because there was a claim which could be there
17	stated exactly as your Lordship has said.	17	was a provable claim, the liquidators has initiated the
18	My Lord, as far as LBHI2 is concerned, each party	18	distribution process, and the Court of Appeal's decision
19		1 40	was to the effect that they were entitled to do that and
20	looks at this from a perspective of their own estate,	19	was to the effect that they were entitled to do that and
	looks at this from a perspective of their own estate, but in many respects the estates identify the same	20	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was
21	• •	1	·
	but in many respects the estates identify the same	20	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was
21	but in many respects the estates identify the same benefits in terms of settlement of claims, disposal of	20 21	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was a valuation of contingent claims and payments on the
21 22	but in many respects the estates identify the same benefits in terms of settlement of claims, disposal of the Waterfall III proceedings, and all of the affiliates	20 21 22	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was a valuation of contingent claims and payments on the value of those claims as estimated, and the argument in
21 22 23	but in many respects the estates identify the same benefits in terms of settlement of claims, disposal of the Waterfall III proceedings, and all of the affiliates identify the ability now to move to distribute the cash	20 21 22 23	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was a valuation of contingent claims and payments on the value of those claims as estimated, and the argument in that case by the creditor that a reserve should be made
21 22 23 24	but in many respects the estates identify the same benefits in terms of settlement of claims, disposal of the Waterfall III proceedings, and all of the affiliates identify the ability now to move to distribute the cash that they are holding on to as being a positive and	20 21 22 23 24	what followed from that under the statutory scheme was a valuation of contingent claims and payments on the value of those claims as estimated, and the argument in that case by the creditor that a reserve should be made was simply inconsistent with that scheme and the way in

1	my Lord, I think what one can draw from that is this.	1	a liquidator being appointed, so your Lordship doesn't
2	Firstly, there is the point made and it is the	2	have to grapple with what might
3	submission I have already made about the duty to get on	3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I know, but at present it seems that
4	with this, the duty to just you start a liquidation	4	even if there were, too bad, it is an administration and
5	process or you are in a distributing administration and	5	there we are. But, you know, that is beyond my level.
6	then really you just get on with it and you cannot wait	6	MR ARDEN: Well, as has been pointed out on various
7	forever and a day to see if a claim pops up.	7	occasions here, it seems that that consequence was
8	Shall I take your Lordship is your Lordship	8	something which Lord Neuberger contemplated at
9	looking for	9	paragraph 165 of the judgment.
10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I mean, I need to remind myself	10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He said it didn't put him off his
11	I thought Danka was really a case on valuation of	11	decision.
12	contingent claims and the duty to strike a valuation	12	MR ARDEN: He said it didn't put him off, despite the
13	figure and then get on with it, whereas this is not that	13	consequences. It just was one of those things that
14	case, is it? This is a case where you are told by the	14	happened. It just happens, it follows from the
15	Supreme Court that there is none that you can take	15	analysis, which follows from the way in which the
16	a view about, there is just no incoming claim.	16	statute has approached all of this.
17	Now, of course, one doesn't know what the position	17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Hmm.
18	is, if the administrators already have the view that	18	MR ARDEN: So my Lord, it is stronger than Danka. The
19	actually the exit is going to be liquidation. I am not	19	reason I think one gets some assistance from Danka, it
20	sure Lord Neuberger explains exactly what is going to	20	is more to do with the expression principle or the way
21	happen in those circumstances, but ours is not to reason	21	in which the Court of Appeal rejects the notion that
22	why and I am told that there isn't that exit in	22	somehow it is all right to hang on and wait and one
23	contemplation.	23	should be reserving against future possible claims. The
24	It is a you cannot reserve case, isn't it? It is	24	Court of Appeal simply flatly rejects that as
25	not a take a view and live with it, it is a: look, in	25	an appropriate way or an appropriate approach to the
			are affective and as an affective affective as
	Page 65		Page 67
1	case you have got any idea about that being an incoming	1	legislation. It is simply not what one does when one is
2		1 1	legislation. It is simply not what one does when one is
2		1 2	dealing with proofs and distributing. It is not a wait
3	reservable claim, you are wrong. MP APDEN: Vac. My Lord, it is stronger than Donka because	2	dealing with proofs and distributing. It is not a wait
3	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because,	3	and see structure.
4	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was	3 4	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep
4 5	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing	3 4 5	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with
4 5 6	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and	3 4 5 6	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be
4 5 6 7	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will	3 4 5 6 7	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit
4 5 6 7 8	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and	3 4 5 6 7 8	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route.
4 5 6 7 8 9	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL?
4 5 6 7 8 9	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and there is no claim.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have covered it over rather a long time, both matters more
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and there is no claim. MR ARDEN: No, and I think your Lordship this case is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have covered it over rather a long time, both matters more than once, but if there is anything I can assist your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and there is no claim. MR ARDEN: No, and I think your Lordship this case is a case where there is no imminent prospect, and nothing	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have covered it over rather a long time, both matters more than once, but if there is anything I can assist your Lordship on, I would be happy to do so, but if not,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and there is no claim. MR ARDEN: No, and I think your Lordship this case is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have covered it over rather a long time, both matters more than once, but if there is anything I can assist your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR ARDEN: Yes. My Lord, it is stronger than Danka because, as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was a creditor and then the choice was between just doing what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the Court of Appeal said no MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here there cannot be a valuation or a MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat that sounds rude the apparent decision is when you are in the administration world, you must shut your eyes to others and even if it is not impossible, that the administration will move into liquidation. For as long as it is an administration, there is no creditor and there is no claim. MR ARDEN: No, and I think your Lordship this case is a case where there is no imminent prospect, and nothing	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and see structure. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep forgetting which company is involved with it, and with Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit route. MR ARDEN: For LBEL? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose that is by the by in terms of this particular context. MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they are so concerned. But their main concern about this application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, which it will not. My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on benefits generally and the distributing without a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have covered it over rather a long time, both matters more than once, but if there is anything I can assist your Lordship on, I would be happy to do so, but if not,

1	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, I think that is very helpful.	1	had already arisen in the context of Waterfall III and
2	I mean, the court is in a slightly difficult	2	so a separate unconnected PWC representative was
3	position in capturing all the nuances of even the	3	appointed, an additional administrator, and separate
4	framework. Descending into the details of the other	4	legal advice was taken from Lovells. As it applied to
5	agreements, though I don't criticise you at all, it was	5	water it was a way of managing the possible conflict
6	necessary for me to see them, is I think beyond really	6	between LBH and LBHI2 in the Waterfall III proceedings,
7	any reasonable proportionate assessment. But I take it,	7	but similarly, in my submission, manages the potential
8	really, that my job is to see that the pros and cons	8	conflict of the crossover of administrators in this case
9	have been sensibly adumbrated and that a decision in	9	as well. As your Lordship will have seen from the most
10	favour of the proposal is not barmy.	10	recent application from LBH, they have now separately
11	MR ARDEN: My Lord, yes, my Lord, neatly put.	11	considered Backstop 2 and taken advice and now seek your
12	My Lord, that is right, and I wouldn't for my part,	12	approval, but on the basis of a separate consideration
13	and I don't think anyone would, encourage you to descend	13	independently of Ms Bruce. And although I am not sure
14	to the level of detail that I descended to this morning,	14	I can tell you that is the conflict
15	that is just simply to give you some idea of the	15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The evidence as to the separate
16	mechanics. All of the skeletons and the witness	16	consideration by isolated individuals is sparse.
17	statements in their own way summarise what the	17	I don't quite know what it is, do I?
18	Backstop 2 is intended to achieve. As I say, there are	18	MR ARDEN: Well, I think in terms of for LBHI2, Ms Bruce
19	sort of slight nuances depending on which estate you are	19	did deal with it she dealt with it in her witness
20	looking at, but they do that at the level of detail	20	statement and then, you know, from the content of
21	which I think is probably sufficient for your Lordship.	21	Mr Lewis' statement
22	If your Lordship is satisfied that the transaction	22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, the weekend one explains that
23	documents look like they are trying to achieve that,	23	there has been in effect a delegation.
24	then probably you can take the more general descriptions	24	MR ARDEN: Yes, and I think Ms Bruce dealt with it "As
25	from, as I said, the witness statements and the	25	administrator I do think it is in the interests of LBH
23	from, as I said, the witness statements and the	23	administrator I do tillik it is ili die interests of LBH
	Page 69		Page 71
		1	
1	skeletons.	1	but there is somebody else acting", and then Mr Lewis
1 2	skeletons. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that	1 2	but there is somebody else acting", and then Mr Lewis does flesh that out.
2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that	2	does flesh that out.
2 3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it	2 3	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am
2 3 4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any	2 3 4	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry.
2 3 4 5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored.	2 3 4 5	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it
2 3 4 5 6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just	2 3 4 5 6 7	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been addressed in I suppose what is the usual way, by which I mean this: one of my administrators, Ms Bruce, is also an LBH administrator.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further comfort of notification and no creditor turning up and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been addressed in I suppose what is the usual way, by which I mean this: one of my administrators, Ms Bruce, is also an LBH administrator. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further comfort of notification and no creditor turning up and saying "Actually, this is absolutely wrong by my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been addressed in I suppose what is the usual way, by which I mean this: one of my administrators, Ms Bruce, is also an LBH administrator.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further comfort of notification and no creditor turning up and saying "Actually, this is absolutely wrong by my lights".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any material considerations which have simply been ignored. MR ARDEN: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the apple cart. The other is that conflict of interest is much easier to assess in the trust context or in the single proposal context than where you have a great many interrelating arrangements with, I think, some cross-administrators acting for the companies. But I think what is really meant there is no personal or disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable balance between conflicting concerns. MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been addressed in I suppose what is the usual way, by which I mean this: one of my administrators, Ms Bruce, is also an LBH administrator. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	does flesh that out. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am sorry. MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then at 54, what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: "Safeguard independent interests, separately Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, they have been informed of the overall architecture of Backstop 2". MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that is helpful. Thank you. MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of the separate consideration, when one looks at the weekend statement. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further comfort of notification and no creditor turning up and saying "Actually, this is absolutely wrong by my lights". MR ARDEN: No one is saying it plainly benefits, for

1	MD HISTORIUM DVADD. Vermedianden de la Colonia de	,	and the latine of this decrease the assumption of the
1	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, equating them to beneficiaries if	1	are looking at this through the perspective of the
2	you like.	2	individual estates, although of course inevitably it is
3	MR ARDEN: Yes.	3	against the background of thinking about the group as
4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	4	a whole, but it is because of the benefit to the group
5	Mr Arden, thank you very much.	5	as a whole and the knock-on benefit to the individual
6	MR ARDEN: Thank you very much.	6	estates that one has in some respects the best of both
7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Mr Trower, are you next?	7	worlds in a structure of administrations in this way.
8	Submissions by MR TROWER	8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It may be I am wrong about this, but
9	MR TROWER: My Lord, I am going to go next, if that is all	9	I suppose in that way it differs from the trust model
10	right. Mr Arden has covered a lot of the ground so	10	MR TROWER: It does.
11	hopefully I can be reasonably short. If your Lordship	11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: because the trustees have to act
12	will turn up our skeleton at paragraph 16, just so I can	12	together, as it were, when I suppose under the
13	just quickly start with that. In paragraph 16 to 25, we	13	administrator it is really a question of whether that is
14	provide what we hope is a helpful summary of the test	14	a permissible not delegation, but sort of segregation
15	your Lordship was applying.	15	of function.
16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	16	MR TROWER: One way of thinking about it really is this. In
17	MR TROWER: If your Lordship has any questions on that,	17	the ultimate analysis it is in relation to each specific
18	I would be happy to discuss them with your Lordship, but	18	estate; of that there is no doubt. But as part of the
19	otherwise, having heard the debate between your Lordship	19	process of satisfying themselves that it is in the
20	and Mr Arden, it has been encapsulated, the tests that	20	interests of a particular estate, they are able to look
21	my Lord has to apply.	21	at it through the spectacles of the group as a whole
22	Now, the one issue that I perhaps should briefly	22	because there will inevitably be knock-on benefits.
23	dwell on is the one that you have just been discussing	23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. But there is no problem, in the
24	with Mr Arden, which is the position of each separate	24	context of administration, of making the ultimate
25	estate.	25	decision, as it were, so far as it is a focused decision
	Daga 72		Daga 75
	Page 73		Page 75
1	Now, we know there are five separate office-holders	1	on behalf of the particular entity, for providing for
2	who have a primary duty to look at this from the	2	that to be ultimately taken by a single one of the
3	perspective of each of the five estates. In LBIE's case	3	various joint administrators.
4	it is Mr Downs, who is the maker of the witness	4	MR TROWER: No, on two bases. First of all, it may be in
5	statement, and he deals with the issue in relation to	5	the interests of the estate as a whole for that to be
6	separate consideration at paragraph 60 of his witness	6	agreed. And secondly, the legislation anyway
7	statement, where he summarises his conclusion and deals	7	contemplates that the administrators can act jointly and
8	with the conflict issue towards the second part of that	8	severally and a declaration to that effect is made at
9	paragraph.	9	the beginning of an insolvency.
10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I remember that, and in these cases it
11	MR TROWER: There obviously are a number of individual	11	was.
12	administrators who act for more than one estate in the	12	MR TROWER: Yes.
13	Lehman insolvencies, but a very careful structure has	13	So, my Lord, that is the starting bit and then
14	been adopted in relation to these proceedings to ensure	14	I thought I would just simply take my Lord, against that
15	that there is one lead administrator who is the person	15	background, to the settlement from LBIE's perspective,
16	and the only person with responsibility: it is Mr Downs	16	which is dealt with in the evidence in Mr Downs' witness
17	for LBIE, it is Ms Bruce for LBHI2, it is Mr Jervis for	17	statement from paragraph 48 onwards.
18	LBL, it is Mr Lewis for LBH and it is Mr Schwarzmann for	18	It is in our skeleton from paragraph 32 onwards.
19	LBEL.	19	· · ·
			Can I summarise
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you give me those again, sorry.	20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Downs 48?
21	MR TROWER: Not at all.	21	MR TROWER: Downs 48 onwards, skeleton 32 onwards.
22	Mr Downs for LBIE, Ms Bruce for LBHI2, Mr Jervis for	22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
23	LBL, Mr Lewis for LBH and Mr Schwarzmann for LBEL.	23	MR TROWER: What I was going to do was just summarise the
24	Each of them in their own ways is conscious of or	24	benefits and then just address what might be perhaps
25	says in their evidence that they are conscious that they	25	most accurately characterised as the quid pro quo for
		1	

1 the benefits, which is we are giving up a "right", in 1 a New York voluntary case or a US law voluntary case. 2 inverted commas, to object to a distribution by LBHI2 2 So we respectfully suggest it is not that surprising 3 and LBL. 3 that one finds it being governed by New York law. But 4 As far as the benefits are concerned, the first one 4 at the end of the day, it was one of the terms of the 5 is that Wentworth waives its right to be paid the 5 agreement that was negotiated, and at the end of the subdebt from anything other than LBIE's free assets, 6 day, conceptually it might, one supposes, affect the 6 7 which reduces or limits LBIE's exposure under the 7 extent of the obligation, but it is what it is and it is 8 subdebt, removes the possibility of a subdebt 8 New York law and it is maybe rather different as 9 contribution claim and --9 a result from some other legal systems that the parties 10 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: This is 29 of your skeleton? 10 might in a case such as this irrationally have chosen. 11 MR TROWER: That's right. And it means that a number of the 11 We respectfully submit that your Lordship need not 12 3A issues do not require determination at all. 12 be concerned about that point. 13 That is the first benefit. 13 The final benefit is a relatively small one but it 14 The second is it settles the interaffiliate dispute 14 goes in the mix all together in any event, which is that 15 with LBL at zero, and it removes the possibility, from 15 LBIE has a claim against LBH and it will free up money 16 LBIE's point of view, of any recharge claims, which 16 to pay a dividend to LBIE in respect of that. 17 amount to just in excess of 900 million, excluding the 17 Now, probably the more important aspect is the quid 18 contribution claim element. 18 pro quo, what are we giving up? 19 19 There is an indemnity which you were looking at with The crucial point here is that we have no present 20 Mr Arden from LBHI up to the amount, and just so your 20 right to make a contribution claim in any form and no 21 Lordship knows about the figure, the limited figure of 21 right to prove. We do not have standing. And that is 22 62 million is the amount that LBIE thinks it is owed by 22 clear from the passages in the decision of the Supreme 23 LBL. Can I just, as you touched on it, can I just 23 Court that we have identified in our skeleton argument. 24 briefly make two submissions in relation to the deed of 24 We only acquire standing if LBIE goes into liquidation, 25 indemnity, because you asked Mr Arden about it. 25 but it cannot go into liquidation for two reasons Page 77 Page 79 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 1 actually, and we have concentrated on the first one, 1 2 MR TROWER: If we turn up -- I think the first one related 2 which is obviously a very important one. The first one 3 to, well, not so much what is this shortfall certificate 3 is it would bring the entitlement to statutory interest 4 4 but what does it do. to an end in respect of the administration period, the 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 5 lacuna point. So we need to pay first the interest 6 MR TROWER: We think it is all right really for this reason, 6 before going into liquidation, and we cannot do that 7 that the shortfall certificate is linked into the 7 until all the arguments going right through to whatever 8 concept of the shortfall amount, and the shortfall 8 level of appeal is appropriate have been resolved. So q 9 amount is defined on page 124: Bower v Marris, cost of funding and so on, through the 10 10 "To an amount equal to the amount by which the joint Court of Appeal up to the Supreme Court, as doubtless 11 administrators anticipate in acting reasonably and in 11 they would otherwise go. 12 good faith the administration state(?) surplus is 12 The second one is there are some adverse tax 13 insufficient." 13 consequences of going into liquidation in any event, 14 Your Lordship gets from that the concept that the 14 which although not of themselves as significant, one 15 draftsmen had in mind when thinking about the 15 suspects, they go into the melting pot, they are 16 certificate. This is a reasonable good faith 16 described in Mr Downs in paragraph 57.2, and they were 17 certificate, is the words that have been used. 17 a factor that went into the mix when the administrators 18 18 That, we respectfully submit, is what provides the of LBIE were considering the position. 19 parameters of the certification exercise that is going 19 Now, even if, against all that, LBIE were to go into 20 20 liquidation, the value of any contribution claim is very 2.1 The second point in relation to the deed of 21 doubtful, because it would necessarily -- there is one 22 indemnity is the use of New York law. My Lord, this is 22 point I just need to correct on the evidence in relation 23 a New York law document and the circumstances are that 23 to this. It is referred to in our skeleton, but if your 24 the payer, the paying party under the indemnity is LBHI, 24 Lordship turns up paragraph 36 of Mr Downs' witness 25 which is a New York institution, subject to I think 25 statement. It describes the significance of the Page 78 Page 80

1 Waterfall II application, and would your Lordship just 1 like a right that is not a particularly problematical 2 2 read that. (Pause). right to give up, and it is the reason why Mr Arden's 3 3 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. clients are content that it is appropriate for no 4 MR TROWER: Now, the 36.2.1 is no longer quite right in the 4 reserve to be made in respect of it. 5 light of the way the SCG have put their case before the 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: What is the present state of things with respect to Waterfall II? I mean, I had heard 6 Court of Appeal, the point being, they now argue the 6 7 point in relation to compounding of interest as a matter 7 through the grapevine that that was being argued in the 8 of construction of rule 2.88, not as giving rise to 8 Court of Appeal further to the Supreme Court decision. 9 q a non-provable claim. This week? 10 10 MR TROWER: Yes, there is a hearing tomorrow at which Now, that was a change in the way they put their 11 case in a document that went into the Court of Appeal at 11 submissions are being made on the impact of the Supreme the end of June and it was missed when this was being 12 Court decision, and it was in the context of those 12 submissions that we heard about the change that I have 13 13 put together. It actually strengthens though, if I can 14 14 referred to in 36.2.1. It was in that context, because put it this way, the unlikelihood of a non-provable 15 the Court of Appeal directed further written 15 claim being made, because the only non-provable claim 16 that is now asserted is a Sempra Metals argument, which 16 submissions 17 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That goes to 2A and B? 17 is the point made in 36.2.2. 18 Now, the relevance of that is that a contributory 18 MR TROWER: It goes to 2A and B. And that then conceptually 19 19 claim under section 74 can only be made against our own could go on up to the --20 members in respect of the non-provable element. It 20 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is Bower v Marris as well? 21 cannot be made in respect of any shortfall in statutory 21 MR TROWER: Yes. 22 interest. That was one of the decisions of the Supreme 22 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And then costs of funds, which is 23 23 other uncertainty, that is not until next year? 24 So it is only if a Sempra Metals claim is made and 24 MR TROWER: I think so. Can I just take instructions. 25 July next year in the Court of Appeal, and then we 25 there is a shortfall in our surplus, such that the Page 81 Page 83 1 have the obvious problem that there is potential for the 1 Sempra Metals claim cannot be paid, that a contribution 2 2 Supreme Court after that. claim could even get off the ground against our own 3 3 members. So the exercise your Lordship has to think about, 4 4 with respect, and the exercise of thinking that we have So there are two elements here. First of all, you 5 have got to get to a stage where there is a shortfall in 5 been through is we are thinking, well, if we were 6 6 the surplus in respect of any non-provable claim, and imminently going to go into liquidation, maybe the court 7 7 that will only arise if there is success on Bower v would find a way of ensuring that a reserve was kept for 8 8 Marris in the Court of Appeal or the success on the cost a period of time; or might -- query even that because of q 9 of funding in the Court of Appeal so as to increase the the way Lord Neuberger expresses himself. But we are so 10 10 amount of statutory interest payable, then you might get far removed from that in this case, both in timing terms 11 to a stage where there wasn't enough in our existing 11 and in terms of the likelihood of the issue arising, 12 surplus to pay non-provable claims and you then have to 12 that it is an application that it would be very 13 13 get to the stage where the Sempra Metal argument difficult to make. 14 succeeds. 14 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But would the -- I think, was it 15 So that is why not only do we not have standing at 15 Goldman Sachs put it? No, it was SCG were arguing for 16 the moment in relation to stopping a distribution, there costs of funds not being limited by any commercial 16 17 are real question marks. It is very doubtful -- it is 17 interest rate. Or have I got it wrong? 18 put in different ways in the evidence by various 18 MR TROWER: I can't remember who was arguing for that. 19 people -- that one will ever get to a stage where 19 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Mr Dicker was appearing for the SCG 20 a claim economically can ever be made. We cannot rule 20 and Mr Zacaroli for --21 it out, but the economics do not look promising at the 21 MR TROWER: For Wentworth. 22 22 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And Wentworth succeeded on that point 23 So when you set that against the fact that we have 23 and SCG lost on that point, before me at any rate. 24 no standing to make a claim, the right that we are 24 MR TROWER: That's correct. 25 actually giving up to object to a distribution seems 25 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: If Mr Dicker or whoever were to

Page 84

Page 82

1	prevail at whatever level, would his claim be snookered?	1	anyone was going to think that the balance came down in
2	MR TROWER: Well, his claim in respect of costs of funding,	2	favour of not going along with this, one would think it
3	no, because that just goes to increase the interest. It	3	would be them.
4	is not a non-provable claim.	4	So that, if you like, gives you the interested
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: If the surplus is distributed?	5	parties' comfort, which is an aspect to the process
6	MR TROWER: Well, no, because we are not concerned here	6	which my Lord is going through.
7	about the distribution of our surplus. That is not	7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
8	before your Lordship.	8	MR TROWER: Does that sort of give the shape of it?
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Only the	9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does, but I am ashamed to say it
10	MR TROWER: The only issue before your Lordship as far as we	10	goes in and out of my mind as to what the threats are,
11	are concerned is whether or not we should say we cannot	11	if you like, and this difference between the provable
12	stop our own members making a distribution because we	12	and non-provable claims, but your only interest, the
13	have a future contribution claim.	13	only thing you are giving up is the right to stop
14	That is the only question.	14	a distribution without provision for your claim in
15	And the reason	15	respect of a non-provable claim which would only be
16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So the only person who would be	16	provable in the event of liquidation?
17	snookered is you?	17	MR TROWER: Your Lordship has summarised it, if I may say
18	MR TROWER: The only person who might at some stage in the	18	so, very concisely and clearly and that is right.
19	future suffer as a consequence of this is in	19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is what it comes to, yes.
20	circumstances where let's assume, on your Lordship's	20	Yes.
21	hypothesis, the cost of funding works as an argument	21	MR TROWER: But having understood the commercial context and
22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	22	the sort of people put it differently the extent
23	MR TROWER: ie Dicker is successful in the Court of	23	of the unlikelihood, it may be that your Lordship's most
24	Appeal. There is then, as a consequence of that, there	24	sort of absolute comfort comes from the fact that we
25	is a shortfall within our surplus.	25	simply don't have standing to stop it anyway.
	Page 85		Page 87
		1	
1	MR ILISTICE HII DVARD: Vas	1	MP ILISTICE HII DVAPD: Because you must live in the
1 2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: The only person who could then concentrally have	1 2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Because you must live in the
2	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have	2	administrative world, the administration world?
2 3	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim	2 3	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration.
2 3 4	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had	2 3 4	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has
2 3 4 5	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is	2 3 4 5	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't
2 3 4 5 6	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we	2 3 4 5 6	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory	2 3 4 5 6 7	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we have got to get into liquidation as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we have got to get into liquidation as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what Mr Arden said about Danka on this point. One has to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we have got to get into liquidation as well. That is why the notification point becomes of further relevance to my Lord because your Lordship can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what Mr Arden said about Danka on this point. One has to bear this in mind throughout this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we have got to get into liquidation as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what Mr Arden said about Danka on this point. One has to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR TROWER: The only person who could then conceptually have a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim which was not going to be paid because the surplus had all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make a contribution claim in respect of that because the Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is any non-provable claim. We now know that the only non-provable claim that might be out there is the Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG winning across the line in respect of all their arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we have got to get into liquidation as well. That is why the notification point becomes of further relevance to my Lord because your Lordship can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	administrative world, the administration world? MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has told me that, in the land of administration, I don't have a claim. So, whatever one may feel about that MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of uncomfortable MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what was to happen. MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said there might be some circumstances where something imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult to see how that could be done in a case such as this where we are some considerable period of time away from ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what Mr Arden said about Danka on this point. One has to bear this in mind throughout this

1	line than even Danka. Danka was obviously a valuation	1	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You might not get an educated response
2	case but Danka, set against the duty to get on with	2	from me.
3	making a distribution, is a case where you did at least	3	MS TOUBE: I understand that, my Lord, but I think it will
4	have a claim. This is case where I don't even have	4	at least give you the parameters of how we are thinking
5	a claim.	5	the order might look.
6	So that really is the shape of it.	6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is very kind.
7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The nub of it, yes.	7	Mr Beswetherick, you will just remind me of your
8	MR TROWER: And it is, you know, a consequence of what the	8	application and that shouldn't take too long.
9	Supreme Court has decided where, although instinctively	9	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, I anticipate being very brief.
10	of course one can see that there is a bit of an oddity	10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So we should be all right. Thanks
11	about it on one level, but the logic is, we would	11	very much. 2.00.
12	respectfully submit, pretty inexorable and, taking into	12	(1.00 pm)
13	account all those factors, it is plain we say against	13	(The Luncheon Adjournment)
14	that background that the administrators' decision to do	14	(2.00 pm)
15	this deal is rational, which is what your Lordship is	15	MR TROWER: So, my Lord, I finished by drawing your
16	primarily concerned with.	16	Lordship's attention to parts of the Downs witness
17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For the acceptance or at least if we	17	statement and the correspondence dealing with
18	are not objecting, what is the best thing to look at	18	notification.
19	from the point of view of the SCG?	19	You will have seen from that that there has been
20	MR TROWER: Of the SCG? Let me take you through that,	20	a mixed series of notifications, part notification on
21	actually, quickly.	21	the website and part email correspondence with specific
22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I can read it over the short	22	people.
23	adjournment, if that would help?	23	Just one little extra bit in relation to the
24	MR TROWER: Of course. There is an is that little file	24	website, just so your Lordship knows this, what happens
25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: This one? Should I read that?	25	when something goes up on the website is an email goes
			D 01
	Page 89		Page 91
1	MR TROWER: If you wouldn't mind, that would be fine, and	1	out to everyone who has registered and they get told
2	then if I could just give you the bit in the evidence is	2	there is a new little notification gone on to the
3	in Downs' paragraph 68, I think, of my note.	3	website.
4	Yes, it is 61 to 71 of Downs. 61 to 71.	4	So what is disclosed in that little clip of
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right.	5	correspondence is the only issue that has been raised by
6	How are we doing on time? I didn't realise you were	6	anybody in relation to the notifications and that is why
7	in the Court of Appeal tomorrow.	7	we respectfully submit that you can be satisfied that
8	MR TROWER: I am not.	8	those with an interest who might be expected to say
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You are not?	9	something have either had an adequate opportunity to do
10	MR TROWER: I am not. Others are doing that. I don't think	10	so or have actually done so in a way that doesn't give
11	anyone else is, either? No.	11	rise to a difficulty with what it is that we are asking
12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Okay. You have nearly done?	12	the court to do.
13		13	
	MR TROWER: Lam nearly done. I was just going to address		50 my Lord
	MR TROWER: I am nearly done. I was just going to address vou on notification and then I was going to sit down.		So, my Lord MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you
14	you on notification and then I was going to sit down.	14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you
14 15	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework	14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG?
14 15 16	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time.	14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG
14 15 16 17	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall?	14 15 16 17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not
14 15 16 17 18	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long.	14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it
14 15 16 17 18 19	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right.	14 15 16 17 18 19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz."
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer? MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man. But in a way we don't really rely in a way that
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer? MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my instructing solicitor about maybe we have actually	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man. But in a way we don't really rely in a way that is sort of put in there just to show your Lordship what
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer? MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my instructing solicitor about maybe we have actually started drafting on the order. So I might be able to	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man. But in a way we don't really rely in a way that is sort of put in there just to show your Lordship what has come back. What I really rely on is what has not
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer? MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my instructing solicitor about maybe we have actually	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man. But in a way we don't really rely in a way that is sort of put in there just to show your Lordship what
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you on notification and then I was going to sit down. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework and then we should be able to complete within the time. Mr Marshall? MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested observer? MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my instructing solicitor about maybe we have actually started drafting on the order. So I might be able to	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG is the gentleman from DK, which is sorry, I do not have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, Gabriel Schwartz." So he is the SCG man. But in a way we don't really rely in a way that is sort of put in there just to show your Lordship what has come back. What I really rely on is what has not

1 that is really rather more important because this 1 Sempra Metals. 2 2 particular point doesn't in any way undermine what we MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. 3 3 all want to do; in fact, if anything, it gives a bit of MR TROWER: One and two are not now, or indeed are not at 4 support to it. 4 all, non-provable claim issues per se. They are 5 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: What, the "All we mind about is no 5 statutory interest issues. So although they will, if 6 liquidation"? 6 the decision goes the other way at an appellate level, 7 MR TROWER: Indeed, and that just serves to fortify that we 7 that will increase the amount of the claim on the 8 cannot get ourselves into a position of having standing. 8 existing surplus, it has no effect on the contribution 9 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. q claim because we cannot make a contribution claim in 10 There was a bit in Mr Downs' witness statement which 10 respect of statutory interest. 11 I possibly haven't quite got the hang of, in 11 So the Bower v Marris point and the cost of funding 12 paragraph 12. 12 point are both arguments that go to increase the amount 13 MR TROWER: Yes. That is a completely different point, and 13 of the inbound claims, which might reduce the surplus, 14 actually has now been resolved. It relates to a claim 14 but they don't permit a contribution claim to be made, 15 15 that emerged at the last minute as a potential claim and in respect of them. 16 the parties are simply agreed in principle how that is 16 The non-provable Sempra Metals claim does 17 going to be dealt with. It doesn't have any effect on 17 conceptually operate as it says it is, as a non-provable 18 the substance of the deal per se, but Mr Downs felt it 18 claim, and a contribution claim can be made in theory in 19 19 was appropriate just to mention it because, had the respect of that, if there is a need to do so. 20 parties not agreed how to deal with it, there might have 20 But the evidence is that a non-provable claim under 21 been more difficulty in relation to how these things are 21 Sempra Metals will only or could only, even if it had 22 going to work out. 22 any legs to it, give rise to a contribution claim by us 23 23 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He puts it in quite high terms, that against our own members in circumstances in which there 24 is to say in order to proceed with the settlement, it 24 was also success on Bower v Marris or cost of funding, 25 25 will need to be resolved satisfactorily. because the effect of there being success on Bower v Page 93 Page 95 1 MR TROWER: It has been resolved satisfactorily in that the Marris or cost of funding is to reduce the surplus that 1 2 burden of the claim, if it were to be established, and 2 would otherwise be available to us without making 3 3 there are big question marks over whether or not it a contribution claim. So that is the sort of -- can I say straight away, 4 would be established, is going to be shared between the 4 5 parties in a manner which is acceptable to them. 5 my Lord, it takes a little bit to get one's head round 6 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I see, right. 6 the way they work together, these points, and we quite 7 MR TROWER: If you like it is another point that simply 7 understand that, but the critical point, ultimately, is 8 goes to figures, which, as Mr Arden said, is not 8 that they have all got to work in a way that we q something your Lordship is in a position to reach 9 presently don't anticipate they will, in order for there 10 10 a concluded view on. to be even the prospect of a contribution claim made by 11 My Lord, that I think --11 a liquidator of LBIE in due course. 12 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Was there any more you wanted to say 12 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. 13 about the Waterfall IIC cost of funds issue? 13 MR TROWER: The reason, one of the reasons we cannot give 14 MR TROWER: I don't think so, unless there was any 14 any sensible assessment of the figures in relation to 15 particular aspect of it that was troubling your 15 this is because the Sempra Metals claim has never been Lordship. The cost of funding issue simply goes to the 16 16 quantified and --MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: This is interest on --17 quantum of the statutory interest claim. 17 18 So all I wanted just -- it is just worth stressing 18 MR TROWER: This is interest for delay in paying interest. 19 19 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the resolution of that at first that there are really, for present purposes, three --20 and this may be one helpful way of thinking about it --20 instance was? 21 three outstanding issues: one is Bower v Marris and two 21 MR TROWER: Was in favour of LBIE. So in other words, there 22 is cost of funding. Those two don't directly affect 22 isn't a claim. 23 what we want to do in this sense --23 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 24 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which is the third? 24 MR TROWER: That is why, in a sense -- of course at the end 25 25 MR TROWER: The third is non-provable claim based on of the day, the standing issue is what gives rise to Page 96 Page 94

q

1	a pretty insuperable problem, but in a sense one feels
2	one's instinctive feeling, we submit, in a case such as
3	this is that on the facts it doesn't give rise to the
4	sort of extreme consequences that in some factual
5	situations one might be more concerned about; even if
6	one could do anything about it, which one cannot because
7	of what Lord Neuberger said.
8	So, my Lord, that was really pretty much it, and
9	unless there is anything else you would like me to deal
10	with?
11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, Mr Trower. You are quite right in
12	perceiving that the problem with these sorts of cases,
13	rather like schemes of arrangement, is that one sees the
14	tip of the iceberg which has been carefully fashioned,
15	if that is not to mix metaphors, over the course of
16	time, the intricacies of which are all beneath the
17	surface. It doesn't mean they have been obscured in any
18	way, simply that they are not evident to the 24-hour
19	observer.
20	MR TROWER: Yes.
21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So I am very grateful to you for your
22	help. If I get muddled again I shall call on any of you
23	to rescue me, but thank you very much.
24	Yes, Mr Marshall.
25	

an intention to make a distribution, and then in December 2014, there was a first interim dividend of 1.66p in the pound to ordinary unsecured creditors with proved claims. And that has really remained the position ever since. Your Lordship will see the table, the different categories of creditor, in paragraph 29, quite a substantial amount is third party suppliers, debt traders to some extent employees, HM Revenue and Customs, and then also Lehman affiliates, but quite a large body of third party suppliers and ordinary creditors of that kind who have remained in the position since December 2014 of only having received 1.66p in the pound.

My Lord, in terms of the view of the proposed transactions and their benefit from LBL's point of view, Mr Jervis has addressed that in paragraph 32 to 35 of his witness statement, beginning at page 8. Your Lordship will see in particular at paragraph 33 that the LBL administrators have concluded that the terms of the proposed settlement would result in a payment of 100p in the pound to the LBL creditors, plus 7.4 per cent of accrued statutory interest to ordinary unsecured creditors, with it being anticipated the dividend could be declared in September 2017.

Then he goes on in paragraph 34 to outline

Page 97

- 18-71

Submissions by MR MARSHALL

MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I will be quite short, just a couple of points to clarify the position in connection with LBL. First of all, in terms of possible conflict, we respectfully submit that is certainly not the position in relation to LBL. Mr Jervis and Mr Hussein are the administrators, the joint administrators of LBL and they are only administrators of that company, not of any of the others. And Mr Jervis confirms in his witness statement in paragraph 32 that they have sought advice from Dechert, who are representing LBL alone, and as far as Mr Jervis is concerned, he has not been affected by any conflict of interest in coming to his conclusions.

My Lord, in terms of the creditor position regarding LBL, if I could just take your Lordship to Mr Jervis'

Your Lordship will be kind enough to go to page 7, paragraph 26. There your Lordship will see that LBL's administrators have paid a dividend of 100p in the pound to former employees with preferential unsecured claims, comprising claims of unpaid wages and holiday pay. It doesn't have any secure creditors.

witness statement; that is in bundle 1 at tab 8.

In addition to that, paragraph 28, your Lordship will see reference to the fact that on 8 July 2014, there was notice given to all known creditors of

Page 98

Page 99

particular aspects of the proposed settlement which are of importance from the LBL perspective. There is a withdrawal of proof which is described in paragraph 34.1 by LBL and that is in connection with proofs related to the contribution claim and pension debt, which is a matter which was the subject of a proof in the LBL's estate by LBIE. There is a reciprocal withdrawal by LBIE of its proof in LBL's estate. And then in 34.2 and 34.3, there is a reference to the agreement of intercompany balances. Then in 34.4, the fact that the LBL administrators and LBIE administrators will withdraw their respective proof of debts so far as those proofs relate to an intercompany balance, which was another important aspect of the proof received in LBL's estate from LBIE, so there will be an agreed zero balance between the two.

Then also perhaps specific to LBL, paragraph 34.5, the LBL administrators will withdraw their proofs of debt in LBIE and LBEL's estate as far as those proofs relate to bad debts. The LBL administrators have concluded that that is an appropriate concession to make. It will facilitate the distribution from the estate of LBH of some £475 million in respect of an admitted claim and that would then have a reduction of the bad debt balance in LBL's estate.

Page 100

2.1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In relation to that particular aspect, which is rather special to LBL, Mr Jervis provides some further observations a little bit later in the witness statement at page 12, paragraph 40. He refers to the withdrawal of claims against other parties on the basis of recharge arrangements and concludes that that is considered to be balanced as against the matters set out earlier in paragraph 34.5 above and the benefits inherent in the settlement, including the avoidance of delay, further legal and professional costs and associated litigation risk.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So fundamentally the administrators of LBL have concluded that it is worth giving up the recharge claims, in particular that for bad debts, in return for the withdrawal of proofs on the part of LBIE and the avoidance of delay and greater certainty and avoidance of further costs which will thereby result. The net outcome will be, as described in paragraph 33, a payment of 100p in the pound, plus a significant amount of accrued statutory interest to unsecured creditors.

My Lord, we have had no objections from creditors, notwithstanding having given quite extensive notice of what is proposed, and your Lordship will see the details of that in paragraphs 41 through to 50 of Mr Jervis' statement at pages 13 to 14.

Page 101

Mr Jervis draws attention to the first notice having been posted on the website in March of this year. There was then a seventh progress report referring to the potential settlement of these proceedings, in paragraph 43. He refers to that.

Then there was a meeting with the creditors' committee of LBL on 9 June, which he draws attention to in paragraph 44, with progress update being given. And then in paragraph 45, 10 July, a further notice posted on behalf of LBL administrators on the PWC website concerning the transaction documents that are proposed to be entered into. And then a further notification to the creditors' committee attaching a copy of the heads of terms was sent on 11 July, and there was also a conference call with the creditors' committee on 13 July, which is referred to in paragraph 47 and in which no objections were raised by any members of the creditors' committee. Then there was notification of the hearing, as your Lordship sees, on the previous note of notices, as is described in paragraph 48. And in fact, there was also a further notification given on 14 July, which is described in paragraph 49.

So extensive notification given of what was proposed and of this application and no objection has been raised by any creditor to what is proposed. That is having had

Page 102

quite extensive discussions with the creditors' committee along the way.

My Lord, in terms of the critical features of the proposal from LBL's point of view, I think it is summarised in the skeleton argument, which I hope your Lordship received, at paragraph 9. We have set out in I think seven subparagraphs particular aspects of the transaction which are important from LBL's point of view. Important and key amongst those is the release and withdrawal of any proof of debt on the part of LBIE and the LBIE administrators, which we refer to in paragraph 9.3, and also the transfer of a share from LBIE to LBHI2, which is referred to in paragraph 9.6, which in our submission really removes the -- well, virtually removes the possibility of any contribution claim coming LBL's way.

So, my Lord, bearing those factors in mind, we would respectfully submit to your Lordship that we certainly pass the rationality test and there is no conflict and there is no reason therefore why, applying the appropriate analysis in the authorities, that your Lordship shouldn't be able to provide the relevant approval which we seek to the procedure that the parties are wishing to engage in.

MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The uncollaterallised indemnity

Page 103

referred to in paragraph 9.2 covers shortfall in LBIE's estate. It is probably an unfair question to you, but

3 how is that dealt with in terms of its ranking or

4 treatment in the administration of LBHI? Who appears

5 for LBHI?

6 MR MARSHALL: That's Mr -- well, actually I'm not sure --

7 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Mr Arden is LBHI2, isn't that right?

8 MR MARSHALL: I am not sure, my Lord.

9 MR TROWER: They are subject to proceedings in the

10 United States. It is not an English issue.

11 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am so sorry. They are in chapter

12 11, are they?

13

20

25

MR TROWER: Yes, they are the New York entity.

14 MR MARSHALL: This, of course, is the New York --

15 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Do we know how that --

MR TROWER: I can't tell you off the top of my head but

17 I think the prospects of LBHI, through its relevant

organs, if I can put it that way, doing anything which

exposed the decision-makers to a situation where they

were committing to do something which they could not

21 honour is very slim, to put it at its ...

22 I don't know the short answer. Plainly if the

23 entity was in insolvency proceedings over here, it would

24 be an expense of that insolvency because it would be

undertaken by the relevant office-holder in accordance

Page 104

1			
1	with his duties as part of the conduct of the	1	commercial factors, and I understand in picking
2	insolvency. Therefore applying ordinary principles,	2	paragraph 40 out I am only taking one string from what
3	that would constitute an expense.	3	is obviously a complex cat's cradle of engagements.
4	I can't tell you what the position is here and now,	4	I understand all that.
5	but I will see if anyone who is sitting behind me can	5	MR MARSHALL: Yes.
6	help. I can't tell you here and now in relation to	6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I was just trying to work out what,
7	LBHI.	7	just reflecting on my function, and just getting
8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: LBHI is under the direction of its	8	a little bit anxious about the trust side of the
9	directors, it is? It is a debt in possession, is it?	9	analogy, which does seem to me to involve a somewhat
10	MR TROWER: It is subject to a voluntary case. I am not	10	more confidential in-depth approach to the various
11	quite sure what its status is. Can I find out and	11	possible legal claims as distinct from what really is
12	I will see what I can help you with?	12	the focus of process. In the corporate or insolvency
13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. (Pause).	13	field, I just wondered for your response really, it
14	MR TROWER: Can we come back to you, my Lord, on that?	14	seems more process really. Have the relevant
15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course.	15	office-holders approached their task diligently, free of
16	Yes. Again, this may be unfair to load you with	16	a disqualifying conflict of interest, taking account of
17	this, Mr Marshall, but others can have a go at it if	17	considerations worthy of being taken into account, not
18	they want	18	failing to take into account considerations which should
19	MR MARSHALL: Okay.	19	have been taken into account and not taking into account
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I was just wondering over the short	20	irrelevant considerations.
21	adjournment about the equivalence drawn, particularly in	21	MR MARSHALL: Yes, rather a Wednesbury-like
22	Nortel, between the customary application by	22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Ie it is processed, really.
23	office-holders, including administrators, for directions	23	MR MARSHALL: Yes.
24	to the court, on the one hand, and the trustee position	24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which do you say is the proper
25	where there is no surrender of discretion on the other	25	approach?
	Page 105		Page 107
	1 agc 103		1 agc 107
1	hand.	1	On reflection I just wondered whether Nortel was in
2	MR MARSHALL: Yes.	2	line with MF Global, really?
3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: In the latter case, however, often the	3	MR MARSHALL: Yes, I mean in some contexts of course, in
4	advisability or commercial wisdom is reviewed but it is	4	a trust situation, one might have something equivalent
5	reviewed with the benefit of quite often separate	5	to a Beddoe summons or something of that nature which
6	applications and the production of, for example,	6	
7	opinions from counsel assessing the merits taken in the		results with the court being provided with opinions and
		7	results with the court being provided with opinions and having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but
8	round, including of any adverse litigation sought to be		
8 9	round, including of any adverse litigation sought to be compromised. In this case there is no such thing.	7	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but
		7 8	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is
9	compromised. In this case there is no such thing.	7 8 9	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in
9 10	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of	7 8 9 10	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily
9 10 11	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good	7 8 9 10 11	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material
9 10 11 12	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the	7 8 9 10 11 12	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether
9 10 11 12 13	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is
9 10 11 12 13 14	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other elements of these transactions whereby there is full	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other elements of these transactions whereby there is full proof of the ability to transfer the share across. The	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare for discretions to be landed with the court. Normally
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other elements of these transactions whereby there is full proof of the ability to transfer the share across. The reduction in the length of delay which may result, which	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare for discretions to be landed with the court. Normally MR MARSHALL: Of course, yes.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other elements of these transactions whereby there is full proof of the ability to transfer the share across. The reduction in the length of delay which may result, which may come about through the appellate process continuing,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare for discretions to be landed with the court. Normally
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	compromised. In this case there is no such thing. For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good example which appears to involve an assessment of the strength or not of the recharge claims. MR MARSHALL: Yes. Well, there is an element of that, but there is also quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is a matter of balancing against one type of claim other commercial benefits that would come in the other direction, and among those, of course, are all the other elements of these transactions whereby there is full proof of the ability to transfer the share across. The reduction in the length of delay which may result, which may come about through the appellate process continuing, for example.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but I think the line of authority which we are following is one which is a process, a different type of process in the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily having the benefit of opinions or confidential material because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is check whether there is any conflict, check whether anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is a rational outcome and, having done those things, the court is not taking on the job of actually exercising the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given the importance of the decisions being made, but that is the limit of it. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare for discretions to be landed with the court. Normally MR MARSHALL: Of course, yes.

1	accepts a surrender discretion but nevertheless it gets	1	MR BESWETHERICK: It should be in a separate bundle,
2	into much more of the detail on a confidential basis.	2	my Lord, that you probably only received this morning.
3	But your answer is, if it does, it really is	3	I am told it will be blue.
4	a process matter. It is seeing to it that the decision	4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It will be blue?
5	it made after addressing the relevant factors,	5	And you are Hogan?
6	addressing to those factors the weight that the	6	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, Hogan Lovells.
7	ministers in their judgment consider is appropriate.	7	By way of reminding you, my Lord
8	MR MARSHALL: Plus what your Lordship has got is a situation	8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Somewhere I've got your skeleton
9	where obviously the parties have all got legal advice	9	argument which was sent to me over the weekend, so
10	and have taken it before proposing these transactions.	10	I haven't got this marked up unfortunately.
11	They have all been looked at in considerable detail.	11	MR BESWETHERICK: It ought to be at tab 5 of this bundle.
12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is a great comfort, but it is not	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I see that.
13	for me to second guess or even to verify its process, is	13	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, essentially, what we are seeking
14	it?	14	is liberty and it was put in the application
15	MR MARSHALL: I would submit to your Lordship it is. It is	15	notice to support and take such further steps as may
16	checking that the parameters have not been exceeded and	16	be considered desirable and appropriate to give effect
17	factors like conflict don't arise, and once we have got	17	to option 1, and liberty to enter into and perform the
18	past that point, that is largely the objectives	18	proposed settlement agreement.
19	achieved.	19	My Lord, in light of the discussion you had with
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	20	Ms Toube this morning in relation to the application and
21	MR MARSHALL: My Lord, unless you have some particular	21	your judgment that option 1 is available and you will
22	questions with regard to LBL's position, that was all	22	sanction it, and also the discussion you had with me
23	I was proposing to say.	23	this morning, what we propose is this: Ms Toube is going
24	From our point of view	24	to be producing an order which sets out the specific
25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are there any responses from any of	25	steps for which you are going to be granting sanction,
	Page 109		Page 111
1	the constituency that you want me to consider?	1	and what we had in mind is once we have seen what those
2	MR MARSHALL: Not at all, my Lord. They are all very happy,	2	specific steps are, that we would identify those which
3	it would seem, from the discussions we have had. There	3	require our input, and we have in mind in particular the
4	is no one to raise any objection.	4	passing of the resolution for the reduction of capital,
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	5	and then we would have, if your Lordship is happy,
6	MR MARSHALL: In a sense we are if LBHI2 is a happy case,	6	a mirror-image order on our application which provides
7	we are a fortiori a happy case because we in fact	7	that we have sanction to take those particular steps.
8	achieve a complete withdrawal of the possibility of	8	I have just been handed a draft of the order, which
9	a contribution claim by the transfer of the share and	9	I understand is going to be handed to you as well, in
10	withdrawal of the (Inaudible), which occurs in our	10	relation to Ms Toube's application. I haven't had
11	estate, so it is even more obviously for our benefit	11	an opportunity to look at it but I will do so.
12	than perhaps in the case of some of the others.	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And your second paragraph?
13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, thank you very much.	13	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, what we are seeking there, it flows
14	Submissions by MR BESWETHERICK	14	in fact from the first, is liberty to enter into the
15	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, I hope to be very brief. You	15	proposed settlement documents. In our case, those will
16	will have seen we have issued an application. That came	16	be the final versions of the deed of settlement, the
17	out of the discussion before your Lordship on Friday in	17	interaffiliate settlement deed and the master framework
18	the context of LBEL's application.	18	deed.
19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	19	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: To some extent, by giving you or not
20	MR BESWETHERICK: I sought to explain to your Lordship the	20	preventing you, as it were, from doing anything in terms
21	reasons why LBH are supporting option 1, and those	21	of performing the relevant settlement deed, which do
22	reasons have been fleshed out in the evidence of	22	cater for option 1, you may have what you want, mayn't
23	Mr Lewis and are addressed in my skeleton argument,	23	you?
24	which I hope you have received.	24	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, yes, that is right. The edges
25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am just trying to find your	25	between them are not hard edges. Because we were
	D 442		D 445
	Page 110		Page 112

1 specifically discussing with your Lordship the rationale 1 she refers to the advantages she has already outlined. 2 2 for why we were adopting option 1 and explaining our She gives some detail about those, which is further 3 3 expanded upon by Mr Lewis, and I will take you to his reasons for it, we would seek, if your Lordship was 4 minded to give it, specific liberty to adopt the 4 evidence in a moment. And then in paragraph 54, 5 position that we indicated we wished to adopt. 5 Ms Bruce addresses Mr Lewis' role. Perhaps I could ask 6 6 In relation to the actual settlement agreements your Lordship to read that. 7 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, read that. 7 themselves, it is in our case in fact only really the 8 option 1 issue that is the important issue, because we 8 MR BESWETHERICK: If I can now ask your Lordship to turn to 9 Mr Lewis' witness statement, which is at tab 3 of the q are going to be receiving sums of money, we are going to 10 10 blue bundle. be -- as presently projected, we anticipate receiving MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. 11 a significant sum from LBHI2, because we are 11 12 12 MR BESWETHERICK: Thank you. He explains that which I have an unsecured creditor in LBHI2, and also, as your 13 13 just said to you in paragraph 8, how he became involved Lordship is aware, a significant distribution from LBEL. 14 14 in October 2016. Those monies, there is going to be a flowing around. 15 15 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. We are not giving up any existing rights, other than 16 settling certain intercompany positions, but if we are 16 MR BESWETHERICK: And then he explains in paragraph 9 --17 17 MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. giving up anything that is possibly tangible, we are not MR BESWETHERICK: -- that he has not had responsibility for 18 going to seek to run an argument that seeks to put LBEL 18 19 19 all aspects, but he is familiar with the general into liquidation against the wishes of its office-holder 20 in order to try and crystallise and bring about the 20 position. 21 21 effect of the statutory lacuna, and you have seen, and Then if I could ask your Lordship to skip forward to 22 you understand our reasons for that, that it is 22 paragraph 26. He then goes on to identify the various 23 23 aspects of the proposed settlement which are of clear a combination of us seeing that as a very difficult 24 application to make, but also one which, for wider 24 benefit to LBH Plc and its creditors. I do not propose to take your Lordship through all of those; they are 25 25 commercial considerations, it is not one we wish to Page 113 Page 115 1 make. I will address your Lordship on that and 1 familiar to you because they are the same sorts of 2 2 I address it in my skeleton argument again. factors that your Lordship has seen are relied upon by 3 3 But because we are here, if I can put it that way, the other estates. He does give details of the specific 4 4 what we are seeking then is permission to enter into the monetary sums which come to this estate, which I have 5 specific transaction documents in the same way as the 5 mentioned to you. They are in subparagraphs D and E, other parties are seeking as well. Our evidence in 6 6 the references to the sums anticipate to flow through 7 7 relation to that is put forward by Mr Lewis. from LBHI2; and E is the distribution expected from 8 8 LBEL. Now, Mr Lewis is not one of the joint administrators g of LBH and, as your Lordship knows and you have seen and 9 He then says in paragraph 28 that: 10 Mr Arden took you to it, Mr Bruce's evidence --10 "It will be appreciated from the foregoing summary 11 Ms Bruce, who is an administrator of LBH and LBHI2, she 11 that the LBH administrators consider the proposed 12 explains -- it is probably useful if I just show you it. 12 settlement to be in the best interests of LBH and its 13 It is in volume 1, tab 7 and if we could pick it up 13 creditors." 14 page 17 and it is paragraph 52. 14 He cross-refers there to Ms Bruce's statement. 15 15 I should explain, Mr Lewis has been tasked with the Finally, my Lord, if I could ask you to turn to 16 responsibility for dealing with the Waterfall III 16 paragraph 33, just over the page, this is when he 17 application, and he has not been involved in the 17 specifically addresses the option 1 issue. 18 18 day-to-day negotiation of the settlement agreements, but You will see that he says that: 19 he has been kept informed about them and he has filed 19 "[He] and the LBH administrators consider that the 20 the evidence in support of our application. As Ms Bruce 20 interests of LBH Plc and its creditors are best served 2.1 explains in paragraph 52, she has participated in 21 by seeking support and give effect to option 1." 22 negotiations in her capacity as a joint administrator of 22 Those are the reasons given and those are the 23 LBH, as well as joint administrator of LBHI2, and she 23 reasons that you have heard. 24 confirms that she considers the proposed arrangements to 24 So what we say, my Lord, as you see, steps have been 25 be in the best interests of LBH, as well as LBHI2, and 25 taken to manage the possibility of a conflict and the

Page 116

Page 114

		١.	
1	view has been reached, and you see the reasons here,	1	to interest would go down the plug opened up by the
2	which, in my submission, are perfectly sensible reasons,	2	liquidation and therefore there would be a straight
3	for why it is considered this settlement is in the	3	fight between creditors' interests and the
4	interests of LBH's creditors as a whole.	4	contributories' interest. At that point the court would
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Well, first of all, I mean it is very	5	say well, it might well say "I am not going to open
6	useful for me to see this from your own particular	6	that". But that's the point, isn't it? I was not quite
7	perspective, your client's perspective.	7	sure that the
8	In saying that option 1 is available, I will go	8	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, it is slightly more nuanced than
9	further than I will go in any of the applications, that	9	that, if I may say so. Because what will happen is
10	is to say it is available and its adoption is not	10	explained I address it in my skeleton. But if LBEL
11	unreasonable or the product of any conflict of interest,	11	were to enter liquidation now, with no settlement of the
12	lest(?) it would go too far.	12	Waterfall III proceedings
13	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes.	13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes?
14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The third is I am not this may be	14	MR BESWETHERICK: then a liquidator of LBEL is not going
15	my ignorance entirely convinced by 33A, because I am	15	to be making a distribution to the shareholders of LBEL
16	not quite sure how realistic it is. I mean, what we are	16	because a liquidator of LBEL is going to have to wait to
17	looking at in the context of option 1 is the position	17	find out what the outcome is of the Waterfall III
18	that funds to which ex hypothesi creditors are not	18	litigation to establish whether or not there are prior
19	entitled, proposed to be released by option 1 to	19	claims and LBL has made claims into the estate for bad
20	shareholders, contributories.	20	debts, the expense of the administration and to pass on
21	At that point, prospectively, only the shareholders	21	any contribution liability.
22	are interested. If they say they would rather	22	So a liquidator of LBEL is not going to be in
23	liquidation, what is to stop them?	23	a position where suddenly the monies get paid out, so
24	MR BESWETHERICK: So the position we are in at the moment is	24	one would then be into the scenario that is discussed in
25	that LBEL is in administration. The effect of	25	the evidence, where the settlement would be off the
	Page 117		Page 119
1	paragraph 42	1	table because I DEL's participation in the cattlement is
1	paragraph 42	1	table because LBEL's participation in the settlement is
2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during	2	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then
2 3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding	2 3	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless
2 3 4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be	2 3 4	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would
2 3 4 5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well,	2 3 4 5	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five
2 3 4 5 6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the	2 3 4 5 6	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that?	2 3 4 5 6 7	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and make them do otherwise would be to make an application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and make them do otherwise would have to seek to establish	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all of these ingredients together. Your Lordship's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and make them do otherwise would be to make an application to court, where we would have to seek to establish essentially that our interests as shareholders are being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all of these ingredients together. Your Lordship's expression is this is a cat's cradle. There are various
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and make them do otherwise would be to make an application to court, where we would have to seek to establish essentially that our interests as shareholders are being unfairly harmed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all of these ingredients together. Your Lordship's expression is this is a cat's cradle. There are various different factors which are weighed up here, and overall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand the statute says during the course of administration you cannot have a winding up, but somehow the administration process has to be brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the administrators say against that? MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their hands monies which could be available to pay statutory interest, which are monies that would be payable to creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the forefront of the administration regime. We are shareholders. And if the administrators of LBL wished to continue administration similar to the stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that they would not move into liquidation where the result of that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to continue, the only way that we could seek to try and make them do otherwise would be to make an application to court, where we would have to seek to establish essentially that our interests as shareholders are being unfairly harmed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The problem is that a liquidation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	an important aspect of it, and we would be having then Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we think it would be something of a difficult application to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into liquidation where it would damage the interests of creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see that as being something that in the wider commercial setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a whole. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all of these ingredients together. Your Lordship's expression is this is a cat's cradle. There are various different factors which are weighed up here, and overall that is a view we have reached is in the best interests

1	It leads in the case of LBH to the release of	1	I haven't got the material and I don't think it is my
2	significant sums, anticipated release into our estate of	2	proper remit to do so. So what I want to do is make
3	significant sums which we can then distribute to our own	3	sure that I wanted you to be well, I left it to
4	creditors in the relatively near future, which is not	4	you, but I can see the reasons why you would wish to be
5	the world that we would otherwise be in. It also	5	included within the steps of option 1 as a proper
6	removes all the other risks around that as to whether or	6	participating party and I am not sure I can do more than
7	not there could be significant reductions in what might	7	that. Do you see what I mean?
8	be available at some unspecified time in the future.	8	MR BESWETHERICK: I do, my Lord.
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But beyond committing to the	9	What we are not seeking, of course and it
10	settlement agreements, which envisage and provide for	10	wouldn't be for us anyway is some order from you that
11	option 1, amongst other things, but really from your	11	blesses the steps that the director would take. The
12	point of view provide for option 1, what other things do	12	step we would be taking is voting in favour of the
13	you have to do in achieving option 1 or in facilitating	13	resolution to make a reduction in capital. What we are
14	option 1? You would have to pass a resolution	14	inviting your Lordship to do is to confirm that that is
15	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, the steps that would be taken are	15	a step that we have liberty to take.
16	addressed in Mr Schwartzmann's sixth witness statement	16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You are at liberty to take?
17	in support of LBL's application. But it might be useful	17	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes.
18	if I may briefly look at the draft order that the	18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Yes.
19	Ms Toube's prepared because this probably is	19	MR BESWETHERICK: Is that what we have
20	MS TOUBE: Would it be helpful for your Lordship to have	20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
21	a copy?	21	MR BESWETHERICK: If your Lordship is happy with that, that
22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. (Handed).	22	is essentially what we are seeking.
23	Thank you.	23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The wisdom of taking it is something
24	MS TOUBE: Your Lordship will see it is the passing of the	24	for you. Yes.
25	resolution in 1.3. That is really all LBH has to do for	25	That is what I want. I simply want to by my
	Page 121		Page 123
	C		O
1	option 1. Everything else is done by the director and	1	judgment explain how I've got to the conclusion that
2	subsequently the administrators causing the company to	2	option 1 is, in the exceptional circumstances of this
3	make the payment and LBH will receive it.	3	case, an available means of dealing with surplus
4	MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, that appears to be right, and	4	arising, as to whether that is the right and best way to
5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would like to meditate on this	5	do that for you?
6	order, but it is all you need, isn't it? You don't need	6	MR BESWETHERICK: One moment, my Lord, if I may.
7	any separate order, do you? You, being included in the	7	My Lord, that is good for us. I have mentioned
8	hearing recitation, you could add your application if	8	several times obviously we are acting in the interests
9	you wanted, yes?	9	of the creditors and I ought to probably show you what
10	MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, my Lord. I think as drafted,	10	we say about creditors. If I could ask you to turn up
11	paragraph 1, which then sets out the steps that could be	11	Mr Lewis' witness statement again.
12	taken by the administrators, I suppose the question	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
13	arises whether that covers my clients as well.	13	MR BESWETHERICK: It is paragraph 14, where the creditors
14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right.	14	are dealt with.
15	MR BESWETHERICK: But subject to just making clarifications	15	As he explains, there our unsecured,
16	on that, and perhaps even just having a new paragraph 2	16	non-preferential unsubordinated creditors total just
17	within this order that provides that the administrators	17	over a billion pounds. LBL is the largest creditor.
18	of LBH may have liberty to take the step identified in	18	Its admitted unsecured claim of 709 million, so over
19	paragraph	19	50 per cent. That, of course, does not include that
20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: What I can see myself to be approving	20	is the admitted claim, that is not any of the
21	is the availability of option 1. And the purpose of	21	recharge-type claims that are the subject of
22	this order is to identify what option 1 comprises. I am	22	Waterfall III litigation.
23	not blessing the decision to adopt option 1, nor the	23	Our other unsecured, unsubordinated creditors
24	directors' assessment as to what that director thinks	24	include LBIE, LBHI and various other Lehman Brothers
25	about the solvency or otherwise or anything else because	25	group companies which are subsidiaries of LBHI and thus
23			
23	Page 122		Page 124

1	under its control and influence. By value, all of those	1	to amend that and send that into your Lordship.
2	entities taken together, control, influence, over	2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: If you could send that through, if
3	95 per cent of our unsecured, unsubordinated creditors	3	I have anything, I will let you know.
4	by value. And of the remainder, although we don't have	4	Does anyone want to say anything, including "No, you
5	the breakdown here, some of the others are also Lehman	5	are wrong about that, judge", on the question as to
6	Brothers entities in one form or another.	6	whether the assimilation of the sort of trust approval
7	In terms of the steps we are proposing to take,	7	route with the office-holder green light does anyone
8	there is a large constituency here seeking sanction,	8	want to say anything about that?
9	mirror-image sanction.	9	MR TROWER: Only this I think, my Lord, that we set out in
10	My Lord, that was all I proposed to say, unless	10	our skeleton two passages, one from the MF Global case,
11	there is anything I can assist you with?	11	I think
12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, that is very helpful.	12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And one from Nortel?
13	MR BESWETHERICK: Thank you, my Lord.	13	MR TROWER: I was not thinking of the Nortel one. Sorry,
14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you very much for doing this.	14	I will just turn up my skeleton, just a moment. It is
15	Yes.	15	paragraphs 22 and 23, the two citations I was thinking
16	Further submissions by MS TOUBE	16	of.
17	MS TOUBE: Your Lordship, we are certainly not seeking	17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Hold on, I've got myself in the usual
18	an order that we shall do these things, we have	18	muddle. 22 and 23?
19	deliberately used the word "may". We don't have	19	MR TROWER: Yes.
20	an issue at all with adding this, so that it covers	20	The important point is that there is a what has
21	LBH's application as well.	21	happened is Mr Justice David Richards in 21 has looked
22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is the neatest way I think.	22	at what you do with administrators generally, and then
23	MS TOUBE: I am quite happy to do that. And again, as your	23	we go on in 22 to say the approach is similar and then
24	Lordship says, we don't need the wording to this to be	24	refer to those two passages. And the similarity of the
25	nailed down now but we wanted your Lordship to see the	25	approach is the point that was made by
	Page 125		Page 127
1	sort of way in which we are thinking about it, so that	1	Mr Justice Snowden in Nortel, but I think we would
2	if you had any objection to this sort of order, you	2	certainly agree with my Lord that it is not an identical
3	would let us know now. But obviously if you have any	3	approach, but you get some help from it. And what is
4	objection to any of the particular wording, you can let	4	interesting about both of those two passages, they
5	us know as appropriate.	5	don't it is not a sort of necessary prerequisite,
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, I will meditate on it, but as it	6	even to the trustee approach, for the court to see
7	seems to me, it adumbrates those things which option 1	7	confidential legal advice in relation to deals. It is
8	comprises and says that option 1 would be a lawful thing	8	something that is very often done when you are settling
9	to adopt.	9	legal proceedings or seeking a Beddoe order, but it is
10	MS TOUBE: My Lord, that is very helpful.	10	not it does depend on all the circumstances. And it
11	What we will do is we will amend it to add the LBH	11	would be slightly odd in this rather usual case, where
12	application and email that to your clerk so you have the	12	we have got five separate estates all separately legally
13	latest version of it.	13	advised, if we all presented our legal advice to you,
14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Both of you will have the further	14	particularly as you were going to hear the trial. That
15	comfort you are not actually a party to any of	15	is obviously not a complete answer because one might in
16	the but certainly Mr Beswetherick's clients would	16	an appropriate case have to go off to another judge.
17	have the further comfort that their participation as	17	But the jurisdiction is slightly different and I think
18	parties will, to the like extent as the others, assuming	18	all Mr Justice Snowden was really saying in Nortel at
19	I give the requisite green light, as they do.	19	the end of the day was you get a bit of help when you
20	MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes.	20	are thinking about the nature of the jurisdiction on the
21	Obviously we have not participated in this because	21	point about the court not actually deciding itself that
22	we had our own we have troubled your Lordship enough	22	it is the right thing to do but looking at the process.
23	with our particular question.	23	Does that help at all?
24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
25	MS TOUBE: So unless you had anything else, we just propose	25	MR TROWER: The only other thing I wanted to say while I am
	Page 126		Page 128

1	on my feet, when my Lord has finished, the only other	1	we should keep the hearing on Friday for the moment
2	thing I thought I would just mention is in relation to	2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is at 10.30?
3	the indemnity you asked about the position of LBHI.	3	MR TROWER: Yes, I think so, yes. All anticipating that we
4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	4	will be able to come to your Lordship on Friday,
5	MR TROWER: We gave a bit of a lead into this in the	5	possibly in very short order or even through the usual
6	indemnity deed, paragraph 4.3.	6	channels, if that is appropriate, to invite by consent
7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Is this 127?	7	your Lordship to adjourn the hearing in September
8	MR TROWER: 127, yes.	8	I shouldn't say sine die, should I, but anyway adjourn
9	"All sums payable"	9	it generally, the point being that the actual dismissal
10	My Lord can read that.	10	of that application is the last thing that happens when
11	Now, what has happened with LBHI is in December 2011	11	all the points, the things have been worked you through.
12	a plan was approved by the US court and that plan is	12	So we cannot invite your Lordship to dismiss it, but it
13	still working through, claims are being paid under it	13	would be sensible, we respectfully suggest, as long as
14	and assets are being got in order to satisfy claims.	14	there hasn't been a blockage which nobody anticipated
15	What this does is provide for the obligation under the	15	and as long as we are where we need to be for the thing
16	indemnity to be a cost of carrying out the provisions of	16	to be adjourned on Friday.
17	the plan.	17	So that is what we would suggest happens: we keep
18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I see. So the costs, as you said, it	18	the hearing for the moment, hoping we just come back and
19	is the analogue to our expenses and the administration.	19	ask you to adjourn it on Friday.
20	MR TROWER: Indeed. And so I am afraid we haven't got the	20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: When do you need the permission
21	plan itself, but that is what section 1.5 of the	21	letter, let's call it that, and what sort of judgment
22	chapter 11 plan does.	22	are you envisaging in terms of sort of detail given the
23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That was my interest. It was just to	23	constituencies to whom you answer?
24	see at what level they came	24	MR TROWER: As far as we are concerned there may be two
25	MR TROWER: I understand. You wanted to know whether or not	25	separate questions there: one is the decision and the
	Page 129		Page 131
1	this was an indemnity that was worth the paper it was	1	second is the reasoning.
1 2	this was an indemnity that was worth the paper it was written on.	1 2	second is the reasoning. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
			MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
2	written on.	2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective,
2 3	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that.	2 3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision.
2 3 4	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2 3 4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much
2 3 4 5	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial	2 3 4 5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can
2 3 4 5 6	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are	2 3 4 5 6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much
2 3 4 5 6 7	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get — I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission — MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think we would be content with something relatively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but not everybody what we for our part will suggest is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think we would be content with something relatively abbreviated, if that helps.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but not everybody what we for our part will suggest is that there are the documents themselves to execute and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think we would be content with something relatively abbreviated, if that helps. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are there any other places, either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but not everybody what we for our part will suggest is that there are the documents themselves to execute and there are one or two Ts to cross and Is to dot, and with a fair wind that will all be done very immediately, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think we would be content with something relatively abbreviated, if that helps. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are there any other places, either jurisdictions or otherwise, in which you would have to make good the course that has been taken?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	written on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial decision as well for the administrators and they are satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being satisfied when called on. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the Waterfall III this coming Friday. MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get I am not sure what to call it; it is not sort of permission MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" because permission doesn't imply anything other than you can do it if you want to. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest and we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but not everybody what we for our part will suggest is that there are the documents themselves to execute and there are one or two Ts to cross and Is to dot, and with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, that we would need the reasoning before the decision. If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, I don't think for our part we require or expect anything elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for your Lordship to MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting point of principle as to whether administrators could deal with expenses claims. Is that right? MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot of these estates had potential conflicts within them and were not separately represented in the same way. It was a different case from this one. For our part, I think we would be content with something relatively abbreviated, if that helps. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are there any other places, either jurisdictions or otherwise, in which you would have to

	A TO THE OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OW		
1	MR TROWER: No, because	1	transcript and go through the witness statements once
2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is all internal.	2	more before giving you my answer. I would hope then to
3	MR TROWER: Yes, and I can be straightforward about this in	3	give a short judgment, possibly on Friday. I would hope
4	this sense, that it was a fairly finely balanced	4	to get you the answer before then.
5	question for the LBIE administrators as to whether or	5	I think, without wishing to bind myself and make
6	not to seek permission at all. We decided it was the	6	redundant the homework which I have set myself, I have
7	appropriate thing to do, but it is not as momentous for	7	seen nothing which militates against granting the
8	the LBIE administration as it is for some of the others.	8	permission, if that is the proper word for it, to the
9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No.	9	intricate arrangements reflecting a pretty intricate set
10	Does anyone wish to add to that or does that broadly	10	of balances, which seem to be the best way of assuring
11	encapsulate your positions?	11	for creditors of all the relevant entities the most
12	MR MARSHALL: It encapsulates our position, my Lord, yes.	12	expeditious resolution of matters which may affect them
13	MR ARDEN: And ours.	13	and, ultimately, shareholders in the event of
14	MR BESWETHERICK: And ours.	14	a continuing surplus, presently estimated I think, what,
15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: One other clarification, and this is	15	at 7 or 8 billion in respect of LBIE, is that right?
16	the most self-interested question that I have for you.	16	MR TROWER: Yes.
17	MR TROWER: Yes?	17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes.
18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The January hearings were adjourned,	18	So what I am saying to you is proceed as you have
19	as I recall.	19	proceeded, upon the footing that the matter will receive
20	MR TROWER: Yes.	20	the permission. If a sudden electric bolt descended on
21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Pending the decisions of the Supreme	21	me, I would let you know, but I wanted to give you
22	Court.	22	a sort of provisional estimate, so that you are not
23	MR TROWER: Yes.	23	wasting your time or wondering whether it is worth it.
24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: In the event, that was probably not	24	MR TROWER: Yes.
25	a wrong thing to have occurred.	25	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Obviously, part of my reasoning is
	Page 133		Page 135
1	MR TROWER: Onite	1	that I can see that a very great deal of thought has
1 2	MR TROWER: Quite. MR ILISTICE HIL DYARD: They were very much affected by it	1 2	that I can see that a very great deal of thought has
2	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it.	2	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to
2 3	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes.	2 3	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended
2 3 4	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in	2 3 4	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to
2 3 4 5	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it	2 3 4 5	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event,
2 3 4 5 6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required?	2 3 4 5 6	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in	2 3 4 5 6 7	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss — or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss — or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is worth reserving and asking the court for its decision at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is worth reserving and asking the court for its decision at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know I have done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is worth reserving and asking the court for its decision at all, it is also to be expected that the court does its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know I have done. MR TROWER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They were very much affected by it. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it will no longer be required? MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss or will be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not to give a judgment. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, I had adjourned it for further argument. MR TROWER: You had. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise in January. Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had a limited time to read this. I think that if it is worth reserving and asking the court for its decision at all, it is also to be expected that the court does its proper homework, having heard from you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	gone into this, a thought which I will never be able to replicate in the time available. It is to be commended that so much sort of constructive work has been done to resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. MR TROWER: Yes. The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, I think there were one or two things that were going to happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs not to carry on with that exercise? MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know I have done. MR TROWER: Yes. MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But I haven't seen anything which

		1	
1	you, and I am very grateful to you.	1	INDEX
2	Was there anything else?	2	
3	I will let you know tomorrow or Wednesday what the	3	Submissions by MR TOUBE2
4	decision is if you proceed upon the footing it will	4	Submissions by MR ARDEN18
5	be approved and let us keep the fixture for Friday	5	Submissions by MR TROWER73
6	for the purposes of signing off on all the has to be	6	Submissions by MR MARSHALL98
7	signed off, which is I think is what you proposed,	7	Submissions by MR BESWETHERICK110
8	Mr Trower, is that right?	8	Further submissions by MS TOUBE125
9	MR TROWER: Indeed.	9	
10	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would anticipate that would be	10	
11	a short event. I will tell Listing of the likelihood	11	
12	that September will be released but I will maintain it	12	
13	in the books against eventuality.	13	
14	MR TROWER: And, hopefully, we can then dispose of it on	14	
15	Friday.	15	
16	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And we can then dispose of it.	16	
17	MR TROWER: Yes.	17	
18	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Anything else?	18	
19	Your order you will get on Friday, if not before.	19	
20	MS TOUBE: My Lord, thank you very much.	20	
21	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Do you need it before then?	21	
22	MS TOUBE: Well, we only need it at the same time as the	22	
23	permission, because we are the first to go.	23	
24	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You are the first to go, yes.	24	
25	Are there any steps between now and Friday beyond	25	
	The more any steps seemed now and Thanky seyond	23	
	Page 137		Page 139
1	litigation steps that are being taken?		
2	MS TOUBE: No, my Lord.		
3	MR TROWER: There are obviously the documents to be		
4	finalised and executed but we will		
5	Yes.		
6	MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Very good.		
7	Thank you all very much indeed.		
8	(3.18 pm)		
9	(The hearing adjourned)		
10	(augumes)		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
L	Page 138		

	actual 12:25 48:6	59:8 70:23 71:3	advanced 56:24	allows 4:15
A	48:10 50:5 113:6	71:25 74:15 75:13	advantages 26:22	alternative 27:23
abandonment	131:9	114:11,22,23	26:23 46:12,13	43:17
28:14	ad 4:11 56:11	administrator's	115:1	ambit 108:15
abbreviated 132:22	add 11:5 122:8	15:4 22:18	adverse 55:12	ambitious 57:5
ability 17:8 18:20	126:11 133:10	administrators	80:12 106:8	amend 126:11
34:11 62:23 63:20	added 10:24			127:1
106:21		2:15,25 3:15,20	advertised 20:5	
able 3:2 27:10	adding 7:20 45:20 125:20	3:22 4:3,5,7,13,23	advice 71:4,11	amount 32:17
43:11 70:8 75:20		5:6,7 6:17,23 7:16	98:10 109:9 128:7	33:14 53:13 58:10
90:16,24 103:22	addition 33:23 34:1	7:22 8:16 9:16	128:13	58:16,17 77:17,20
131:4 136:2	98:23	13:2 14:22 16:20	advisability 106:4	77:22 78:8,9,10
absolute 27:16	additional 1:7	17:7,10 18:12,13	advised 128:13	78:10 82:10 86:8
87:24	11:10 29:25 71:3	18:17 19:1 20:12	advocacy 68:6	95:7,12 99:7
absolutely 51:10	address 25:22	46:24 47:13,23,25	affect 27:9,19 79:6	101:19
72:22	70:25 76:24 90:13	48:11 59:3 61:19	94:22 135:12	amounts 48:6
accept 27:20	114:1,2 119:10	64:6 65:18 70:22	affiliate 23:25	49:15 51:3
acceptable 94:5	addressed 48:14	71:8 74:12 76:3,7	31:11 32:8 49:16	amplified 4:6
acceptance 89:17	70:21 88:12 99:16	78:11 80:17 98:7	49:16 50:16	analogue 129:19
accepts 88:17	110:23 121:16	98:7,8,19 99:19	affiliates 19:8	analogy 107:9
109:1	addresses 115:5	100:11,11,18,20	26:23 29:1 31:8	analysis 36:18,22
account 31:20,23	116:17	101:12 102:10	32:11 35:5 38:13	62:5 67:15 75:17
33:19 48:18 52:2	addressing 109:5,6	103:11 105:23	49:11 52:24 53:21	103:21
89:13 107:16,17	adequate 92:9	114:8 116:11,19	53:23 54:4 62:22	and/or 48:11
107:18,19,19	adjourn 131:7,8,19	118:7,8,13,15,18	99:9	angles 36:12
accounts 3:13,14	adjourned 131:16	120:12 122:2,12	affiliates' 29:14,21	answer 4:17 6:25
14:20 53:17	133:18 134:14,15	122:17 127:22	afraid 129:20	12:7,13 43:4
accrued 99:22	138:9	130:6 132:14	aggregate 31:22	63:12 104:22
101:20	adjournment 51:17	133:5	agree 42:10 44:1	109:3 128:15
accuracy 27:16	56:15 89:23 91:13	administrators'	49:15 62:2 88:22	131:23 135:2,4
accurately 76:25	105:21	36:23 46:22 59:4	128:2	answers 43:5
achieve 46:18	adjudication 45:3	89:14	agreed 16:1 40:18	anticipate 78:11
69:18,23 110:8	administration 6:1	admissions 53:3	47:20 76:6 93:16	91:9 96:9 113:10
achieved 109:19	6:16,18,19 7:16	admit 17:22	93:20 100:15	116:6 137:10
achieving 24:10	9:8,19 11:23	admitted 34:21	agreeing 46:16	anticipated 2:23
121:13	13:13 22:25 23:10	100:24 124:18,20	agreement 31:1	99:23 121:2
acquire 79:24	29:19 33:10 65:5	adopt 15:18 113:4	38:1,12 39:4	131:14
act 1:22 2:17 4:12	66:18,20,21 67:4	113:5 122:23	46:18 55:5,9 58:4	anticipating 131:3
4:14,17,20,20,22	75:24 78:12 80:4	126:9	58:5 59:16 60:4	anxiety 16:9,12
5:6,15,16,25 6:4	88:2,3,5 104:4	adopted 74:14	79:5 100:10	anxious 107:8
7:4 11:14 12:15	117:25 118:3,4,12	118:15	111:18 120:4	anybody 28:7
12:24 13:17,20,22	118:14 119:20	adopting 2:10	agreements 39:12	63:15 92:6
18:20 22:25 74:12	129:19 133:8	108:12 113:2	69:5 113:6 114:18	anybody's 48:23
75:11 76:7	administrations	adoption 117:10	121:10	anyway 40:25 49:5
acting 70:15 72:1	75:7	adumbrated 16:14	albeit 2:15 56:24	60:9 76:6 87:25
78:11 124:8	administrative	69:9	alit 47:12	123:10 131:8
active 20:15 29:3,4	88:2	adumbrates 126:7	alleged 34:9	apart 8:3 22:16
acts 19:7	administrator 19:7	advance 2:6,7 63:8	allow 9:15 21:17	45:6
acts 17.7		,		

	1	54 10 55 22 56 2	1 150 15 51 2	1 4 4 22 22
apologies 1:9	applying 73:15	54:19 55:22 56:3	asked 50:15 51:2	authority 22:23
apologise 54:9	103:20 105:2	56:6,9,13,20,22	77:25 129:3	108:8
apparent 66:16,17	appointed 48:12	57:7,11,16 58:25	asking 1:10 8:15	availability 122:21
appeal 27:21 32:19	67:1 71:3	59:19,22 60:6,11	18:25 43:6 92:11	available 1:16
60:8 66:10 67:21	appreciate 29:8	60:15 61:4,7,14	134:8,22	17:16 35:10 40:13
67:24 80:8,10	appreciated 18:21	61:25 62:6,15	aspect 79:17 87:5	96:2 111:21 117:8
81:6,11 82:8,9	116:10	64:14 66:3,12,14	94:15 100:14	117:10 118:9
83:8,15,25 85:24	approach 67:25	66:23 67:6,12,18	101:1 120:2	121:8 124:3 136:3
90:7	107:10,25 108:13	68:9,12 69:11	aspects 100:1 103:7	avoid 68:17
Appeal's 35:19	127:23,25 128:3,6	70:6,20,25 71:18	115:19,23	avoidance 101:9,16
64:18	approached 67:16	71:24 72:5,8,17	asserted 33:8 34:3	101:16
appear 36:13 50:1	107:15	72:24 73:3,5,6,10	81:16	aware 22:25 113:13
50:3	appropriate 7:6	73:20,24 77:20,25	asserting 21:23	awful 106:25
appeared 29:9	10:1 67:25,25	88:23 94:8 104:7	assess 26:19 43:25	awkward 15:8
appearing 84:19	80:8 83:3 93:19	114:10 133:13	70:12	B
appears 11:24 29:6	100:21 103:21	139:4	assessed 27:16	
104:4 106:12	109:7 111:16	Arden's 83:2	30:19	B 83:17,18
122:4	126:5 128:16	arguably 49:3	assessing 106:7	back 4:10 9:22 10:9
appellate 95:6	131:6 133:7	argue 81:6	assessment 10:16	21:14 32:9 53:16
106:23	approval 9:25 17:3	argued 83:7	24:16 25:1,1,15	54:17 55:13 92:24
appendix 32:6,10	18:12 19:1,3	arguing 84:15,18	69:7 96:14 106:12	92:25 105:14
apple 70:10	71:12 103:23	argument 30:4,5	122:24	131:18
applicable 58:19	108:18 127:6	48:23 64:22 79:23	asset 34:19	background 30:14
62:2	approve 3:18 9:11	81:16 82:13 85:21	assets 38:2,3 49:14	31:6 35:14 36:8
application 9:12,21	16:23 51:3,9	86:16 103:5	57:21 77:6 129:14	37:5 75:3 76:15
10:1,23,25 18:24	136:19	110:23 111:9	assignees 19:22	89:14
22:24 23:1,9	approved 10:24	113:18 114:2	assimilation 127:6	backstop 18:11,15
39:23 40:19 42:2	129:12 137:5	134:10,15	assist 68:23 125:11	18:21 19:6,14
43:5,11 45:3 62:1	approving 122:20	arguments 17:23	assistance 27:14	20:19 34:24 35:3
63:8 68:17 71:10	architecture 5:15	27:22 80:7 86:21	67:19	35:7,14,18,23,24
81:1 84:12 91:8	72:13	95:12	assistant 15:9	36:4,7 37:6,6,10
102:24 105:22	Arden 18:4,8,9	arisen 15:8 38:6	45:22	37:24 39:13 45:7
110:16,18 111:14	20:25 21:4,8 24:8	71:1	associate 11:23	45:17,22,23,24,25
111:20 112:6,10	24:12 25:9,19	arises 70:25 86:21	associated 101:10	46:2,13 63:22,24
113:24 114:17,20	27:8,10,17 28:23	122:13	assume 61:14,17	63:25 64:8 69:18
118:20 120:9,15	29:3,13 30:7,12	arising 26:20 84:11	85:20	71:11 72:14
121:17 122:8	30:17 31:2,6	124:4	assuming 126:18	Backstops 35:23
125:21 126:12	32:13 37:19,21	arithmetics 27:4	130:13,18	bad 12:12 33:10
131:10	40:7,14,17,20	arrangement 97:13	assumptions 55:1	42:8 67:4 100:20
applications 18:10	41:2,10,15,20,23	arrangements	assuring 135:10	100:25 101:14
20:20 43:21 106:6	42:2,13,20 43:9	70:14 101:6	attaching 102:13	119:19
117:9	44:8,18,20,23	114:24 135:9	attempt 34:7	balance 70:19 87:1
applied 71:4	45:4,10,14,17,23	arrive 50:7,11	attention 46:21	100:13,16,25
applies 23:13,14	46:2,6 47:5,8,22	arrives 51:22	49:18 91:16 102:1	balanced 101:7
apply 1:23 2:1	48:21 49:1,7,21	artificiality 2:14	102:7	133:4
16:16 17:10 42:6	49:25 50:18 51:5	ashamed 87:9	authorised 23:15	balances 34:18
73:21	51:10,19 54:11,16	aside 120:8	authorities 103:21	53:24 100:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

105.10	110 20 111 1 6 11	1 05 24 25	7 0.10	1 , 1240
135:10	110:20 111:1,6,11	95:24,25	cap 58:10	central 24:9
balancing 106:17	111:13 112:13,24	breakdown 125:5	capacity 114:22	certain 2:17 13:3
bank 4:25,25	115:8,12,16,18	bridge 9:23	capital 1:24 5:25	27:15 28:8 42:18
bar 6:10	117:13,24 118:8	brief 91:9 110:15	8:17 9:3,17 11:8	113:16
barmy 69:10	119:8,14 120:20	130:21	11:22 13:20,23,24	certainly 9:14
based 13:1 25:15	121:15 122:4,10	briefly 21:20 30:22	14:4,5 52:7,9	29:13 44:12 61:21
38:13 63:23 94:25	122:15 123:8,17	50:20 73:22 77:24	55:16 112:4	98:5 103:18
bases 76:4	123:19,21 124:6	121:18	123:13	125:17 126:16
basis 26:25 32:16	124:13 125:13	Briggs 2:19	capitalists 8:25	128:2 132:11
32:18,20,22 42:25	133:14 139:7	bring 80:3 113:20	capped 27:7 38:20	certainty 101:16
49:11,14 54:2	Beswetherick's	brings 12:3	caps 45:15	120:6
59:25 71:12 101:5	126:16	broad 35:14 53:18	capturing 69:3	certificate 58:22
109:2	better 130:15	broadly 133:10	care 17:23	59:14,17 78:3,7
bear 88:24	beyond 16:15 30:1	Brothers 124:24	careful 74:13	78:16,17
bearing 17:5 35:22	30:8 33:11 36:2	125:6	carefully 97:14	certificates 55:14
103:17	59:9 60:1 67:5	brought 9:24 118:5	carries 56:11,17	55:15,25
Beddoe 108:5	69:6 121:9 137:25	Bruce 20:8 33:4	carry 136:13	certification 54:15
128:9	big 94:3	35:15 36:14 37:10	carrying 129:16	55:21 58:9 78:19
beginning 54:22	bill 10:6	70:22 71:13,18,24	cart 70:10	certifications 54:14
76:9 99:17	billion 31:10 32:24	72:5 74:17,22	case 5:13,21 7:7	cetera 14:15
behalf 4:8 76:1	124:17 135:15	114:11,20 115:5	12:9 13:8,11,24	challenge 59:7,10
102:10	bind 135:5	Bruce's 19:17	18:25 32:20 48:9	challengeable
believe 36:5	binder 37:19	114:10 116:14	60:7 63:3 64:12	59:25
beneath 97:16	bit 21:9,21 51:7	build 60:9	64:23 65:11,14,14	change 55:3 81:10
beneficial 17:15	76:13 89:10 90:2	bundle 19:20 20:23	65:24 66:1,23,24	83:13 88:15
beneficiaries 73:1	91:23 93:3,10	39:6 54:7 58:7	71:8 74:3 79:1,1	changed 35:21
benefit 6:15,20	96:5 101:3 107:8	98:16 111:1,11	79:10 81:5,11	changes 56:1,5
8:10 10:16 62:25	128:19 129:5	115:10	84:10 88:20 89:2	channels 131:6
75:4,5 77:13	blank 15:14	Bundle-page 49:21	89:3,4 97:2	chapter 19:8
79:13 99:15 106:5	blessed 14:25	bundles 19:19	105:10 106:3,9	104:11 129:22
108:11 110:11	blesses 123:11	37:17	110:6,7,12 112:15	characterised
115:24	blessing 14:23 15:4	burden 94:2	113:7 121:1 124:3	76:25
benefiting 5:19	15:5,6 122:23	business 54:13	127:10 128:11,16	check 44:18 108:14
benefits 62:21	blockage 131:14	55:20,21 56:7,7	132:20	108:14
63:25 64:9 68:20	blot 62:11	56:11	cases 76:10 97:12	checking 109:16
72:24 75:22 76:24	blue 111:3,4 115:10		cash 25:11 31:10	choice 2:8 61:13,15
77:1,4 101:8	body 99:10		34:12 62:23	61:22 66:5
106:18	bolt 135:20	C 36:24	cat's 107:3 120:22	chosen 79:10
benefitted 29:12	books 137:13	calculated 32:18,22	categories 99:6	circumstance 5:17
best 2:10 16:18	bossy 15:4	38:14 51:21	category 59:7	circumstances 5:14
21:10 25:6 27:10	bother 61:11	calculation 8:22	cater 112:22	5:21,22 9:18
75:6 89:18 114:25	bothered 16:11	51:24 52:2	cause 13:4,16 16:20	11:24 13:12 15:17
116:12,20 120:24	bottom 31:14	call 97:22 102:15	causes 24:13	16:13,25 65:21
124:4 135:10	bounce 120:10	130:14 131:21	134:20 136:25	78:23 85:20 86:18
Beswetherick 1:7	Bower 27:19,23	called 45:7,22 60:7	causing 122:2	88:18 95:23
10:10,13,19 11:1	80:9 82:7 83:20	130:8	cent 32:21 99:21	120:13 124:2
91:7,9 110:14,15	86:9 94:21 95:11	candidate 61:15	124:19 125:3	128:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

citations 127:15	clarify 98:3	107:1 113:25	21:18 68:16	109:17 116:25
claim 21:23 24:5,18	clarity 11:4	120:16 130:5	136:25	117:11
25:17,20,23 26:6	clarity 11.4 clause 39:14 46:20	commercially	concerned 3:23,24	conflicting 70:19
26:13,20,21 27:1	46:21 48:3 50:23	42:10	16:17 20:11 22:17	conflicts 70:20
27:20 32:23,23	52:8,8,9,10,16,23	commitment 16:10	28:11 31:6 32:14	132:18
· ·		committee 102:7	33:21 36:7 37:9	connection 48:10
33:7,23 34:1,19	53:1,22 54:14		39:4 51:21 52:21	98:3 100:4
34:20 38:4,25,25 48:12 57:21,22,25	57:16,16 58:8	102:13,15,18 103:2	53:21 54:25 62:18	cons 69:8
58:1 63:13,14	59:2,12 clauses 40:1,2		68:16 77:4 79:12	
64:16,17 65:7,16	41:17 46:10 50:24	committing 104:20 121:9	85:6,11 89:16	conscious 74:24,25 consent 38:23
· · ·	51:1 58:1 61:1		97:5 98:12 131:24	39:16 131:6
66:2,6,8,22 77:9		companies 1:22		
77:18 79:15,20	clear 11:14 12:14	2:16 4:17,20,20	134:7 136:21	consenting 7:23
80:20 81:9,15,15	25:7 57:19 79:22 115:23	4:22 5:15,25 6:4	concerning 102:11	consequence 64:2
81:19,24 82:1,2,6		7:4 12:15 13:17	concerns 12:3	67:7 85:19,24
82:20,24 85:1,2,4	clearly 87:18	13:20,22 52:24	70:19	89:8
85:13 86:3,6,7,11	clerk 126:12	70:15 124:25	concession 100:21	consequences
86:13,14,15 87:14	client 18:16	company 2:3,10	concisely 87:18	36:11 67:13 80:13
87:15 88:6 89:4,5	client's 117:7 132:3	6:5,15 11:23	concluded 25:24	97:4
93:14,15 94:2,17	clients 83:3 122:13	13:23,24 14:6,7,8	26:21 94:10 99:19	consider 51:2
94:25 95:4,7,9,9	126:16 134:7	31:17 32:2 68:5	100:21 101:13	109:7 110:1
95:14,16,18,18,20	clip 92:4	98:8 122:2	concludes 101:6	116:11,19
95:22 96:3,10,15	clocks 54:17	compère 18:3	conclusion 10:21	considerable 29:17
96:22 100:5,24	closely 19:11	complete 12:24	26:1 74:7 124:1	88:21 109:11
103:16 106:17	cocktail 10:20	15:14 22:9 23:21	conclusions 98:13	consideration
110:9 118:25	code 12:24	90:16 110:8	conditional 2:12	71:12,16 72:18
124:18,20	collapse 63:24	128:15 134:10	4:1	74:6
claimed 32:21	combed 15:9	completely 93:13	conduct 22:23	considerations
claims 26:9,16 27:6	combination 24:19	completes 23:2	105:1	70:5 107:17,18,20
27:17,23 32:7,10	113:23	complex 107:3	conference 102:15	113:25
33:10,10,14 34:10	come 5:9 10:2,15	complicated 53:22	confidential 39:25	considered 16:24
38:17,17 46:8,16	14:23 25:5 29:22	63:4	40:22 107:10	71:11 101:6
46:17 48:10 49:12	29:22 38:15 48:5	component 39:13	108:7,11 109:2	111:16 117:3
53:4 57:25 58:13	92:24,25 105:14	components 18:14	128:7	considering 80:18
58:14,15,18 62:21	106:18,23 116:4	51:6	confidentiality	considers 114:24
64:21,22 65:12	131:4,18	compounding 81:7	40:6	consistent 63:2
67:23 77:16 82:12	comes 87:19,24	compounds 34:10	confined 11:17	constituencies
87:12 95:13 98:20	comfort 1:9 72:21	comprises 122:22	16:13 34:2	131:23
98:21 99:4 101:5	87:5,24 109:12	126:8	confirm 123:14	constituency 7:13
101:14 106:13	126:15,17	comprising 98:21	confirmation 47:23	15:1 21:16 110:1
107:11 119:19,19	coming 34:22	compromised	48:13,15 59:3	125:8
124:21 129:13,14	98:13 103:16	106:9	confirms 98:9	constitute 105:3
132:15	130:11	conceivable 30:4	114:24	constraints 58:23
clarification	commas 77:2	concentrated 80:1	conflict 17:2 30:6	construct 5:4
133:15	commence 35:5	concept 78:8,14	62:12 70:11,17,25	construction 81:8
clarifications	commended 136:3	conceptually 79:6	71:5,8,14 74:8	constructive 136:4
122:15	commercial 84:16	83:18 86:2 95:17	98:4,13 103:19	contained 47:1
clarified 60:12	87:21 106:4,16,18	concern 15:13	107:16 108:14	contemplated 67:8
			<u> </u>	

contemplates 76:7	35:12	36:10 39:24 40:7	98:25 99:3,11,21	day-to-day 72:12
contemplates 70.7	control 9:2,6 125:1	40:9,12,14 41:9	99:23 101:20,21	114:18
contemplating 00.7	125:2	42:6,17 43:3 44:5	115:24 116:13,20	days 14:9,15 57:3
65:23	controlling 2:17	60:8 61:16 64:18	117:4,18 118:11	deal 2:22 17:10
content 9:14 10:2	convenient 33:25	65:15 66:10 67:21	118:11,18 120:12	18:11,15,22 19:25
44:2,11,20 71:20	50:14	67:24 69:2 79:23	120:17,25 121:4	20:3,4,19 22:1,7
83:3 132:21	conversion 26:9	80:10,10 81:6,11	124:9,10,13,16,23	24:3 27:11 28:1
contentment 23:5	convey 54:24	81:23 82:8,9 83:8	125:3 135:11	29:13 30:9,20
context 11:25	conveyed 19:14	83:8,12,15,25	creditors' 102:6,13	33:17 37:2,9 40:5
57:20 68:11 70:12	conveyed 19.14 convinced 117:15	84:2,6 85:23	102:15,18 103:1	40:10 41:4 42:6
70:13 71:1 75:24	coordinate 15:11	86:12 88:4 89:9	119:3	70:18 71:19 89:15
83:12,14 87:21	copy 102:13 121:21	90:7 92:12 105:24	critical 96:7 103:3	93:18,20 97:9
110:18 117:17	corporate 107:12	108:6,10,17,22,25	criticise 69:5	132:15 136:1
contexts 108:3	correct 16:6 80:22	118:21 119:4	cross 130:24	dealing 11:12 33:5
	84:24	120:10 128:6,21	cross-administra	33:25 43:6 68:2
contingencies 1:17 86:17	corrections 57:2	120.10 128.0,21 129:12 133:22	70:15	91:17 114:16
			cross-refers 116:14	124:3 136:6
contingent 64:21 64:25 65:12 66:6	correspondence 21:10 22:5,22	134:22,23 court's 18:12 19:1	crossover 71:8	deals 20:8 35:3
	23:4 86:25 91:17	19:3 24:24 28:14	crucial 79:19	36:23 38:7,8 40:8
continue 12:15,16				46:7 52:9,17
13:15 118:14,19	91:21 92:5	37:6 62:10	crystallise 113:20	/
continuing 106:23	cost 80:9 82:8	cover 28:5 38:19	curiosities 70:2	53:20 72:8 74:5,7
120:3 135:14	85:21 86:10 94:13	covered 63:17	Curiosity 41:22	128:7
contractual 66:9	94:16,22 95:11,24	68:22 73:10	curious 17:14	dealt 20:20 22:22
contribute 18:19	96:1 129:16	covering 42:21	currency 26:9	24:22 27:13 35:15
23:1 26:11	costs 27:6 33:10	covers 58:12,19	current 29:16 50:2	36:21,24 37:1
contribution 20:10	38:24 83:22 84:16	104:1 122:13	currently 31:9	41:5 43:17 44:3
21:23 24:5,18	85:2 101:10,17	125:20	63:14	44:13 52:7,12,14
25:2,17 26:6,12	129:18 136:12	cradle 107:3	customary 105:22	53:5,6,22 57:1
26:20 27:1,20	counsel 106:7	120:22	Customs 99:9	63:10 64:25 71:19
33:7 38:4 57:22	couple 21:14 98:2	crafted 9:22	D	71:24 76:16 93:17
77:9,18 79:20	course 10:5 15:20	create 35:9	$\frac{\bf D}{\bf D}$ 116:5	104:3 124:14
80:20 82:1 85:13	38:15 44:19 45:15	creates 33:16 34:9	damage 24:12 26:4	debate 73:19
86:7,11,13 95:8,9	47:9 55:4 57:3	creditor 19:9,10	118:17 120:11	debated 6:14 7:8
95:14,18,22 96:3	65:17 68:4,10	20:13,18 21:13,16	Danka 64:12,14,15	debt 19:23,23 28:6
96:10 100:5	75:2 88:11 89:10	23:24,24 25:21	65:11 66:3,4	28:7 33:10 38:2,5
103:15 110:9	89:24 96:11,24	28:24,25 64:23	67:18,19 88:23	58:21 99:8 100:6
119:21	97:15 104:14	66:5,7,21 72:21	89:1,1,2	100:19,25 103:10
contributories	105:15 106:19	98:14 99:6 102:25	date 14:10 28:16	105:9
35:13 37:3 117:20	108:3,24 118:3	113:12 124:17	31:19 52:1,1,3	debts 8:21 34:17,17
118:5	120:20 123:9	creditor's 6:22	55:10,18	64:25 100:12,20
contributories'	124:19 132:25	creditors 3:1 5:20	David 62:4 127:21	101:14 119:20
37:7 119:4	134:4,9 136:10	6:20 8:7,8,10	day 44:4 54:13	December 99:2,12
contributory 32:16	court 1:23 2:1	20:18 21:2 26:4	•	129:11
32:23 34:5,8 37:4	12:17,20 17:4	28:11 29:15 31:21	55:20,21 56:7,8	Dechert 98:11
47:10 48:12,23	18:16 19:13 24:22	34:15 38:20 48:7	56:11 65:7 79:4,6	decided 89:9 133:6
63:10 81:18	25:8 32:19 35:8	53:22 54:1,4	96:25 128:19	deciding 128:21
contributory's	35:19,20 36:1,8	62:25 68:14 98:22	130:5	decision 13:1,1
	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	
24:24 28:14 35:8	derived 58:14 59:1	differently 87:22	119:24	38:11,12 48:1,7
35:19,20 37:7	59:1	differs 75:9	discussing 73:23	48:16,17,19 49:10
62:9 64:18 66:17	descend 40:3 69:13	difficult 5:20 13:11	113:1	50:24 51:21 53:12
67:11 69:9 75:25	descended 69:14	15:17 43:21 48:24	discussion 110:17	53:21 54:1
75:25 79:22 83:8	135:20	69:2 70:3 84:13	111:19,22 130:21	dividend 31:20,21
83:12 89:14 95:6	Descending 69:4	88:19 113:23	discussions 9:10	49:24 79:16 98:19
109:4 122:23	describe 39:10	120:9,14 132:17	18:23 20:13 103:1	99:2,23
130:6 131:25	described 18:15	difficulties 62:13	110:3	dividends 31:25
132:4,5,6 134:22	63:21 80:16 100:3	difficulty 2:4 13:16	dismiss 131:12	DK 92:17
137:4	101:18 102:20,22	92:11 93:21	134:8	document 37:22
decision-makers	108:13	134:20	dismissal 38:23	39:20 40:12 45:9
104:19	describes 39:10	digging 40:21	39:19 131:9 134:9	51:1 57:23 58:3
decisions 4:19	80:25	diligently 107:15	disposal 62:21	78:23 81:11
81:22 108:19	describing 33:25	direct 3:21 18:17	dispose 137:14,16	documents 19:2,12
133:21	descriptions 69:24	29:5	disposing 39:16	20:2 30:22 37:12
declaration 76:8	desirable 60:13	directed 17:6,25	dispute 77:14	37:15 39:3,15,25
declared 99:24	111:16	83:15	disqualifying 70:17	42:9,16 46:18
deed 39:11,18,20	desire 25:10	directing 44:4	107:16	56:18,23 60:16
44:24 46:6 48:4	despite 67:12	direction 4:25 5:2	dissuade 64:7	61:25 69:23 72:12
49:8,9 50:17,22	detail 19:15 27:3	41:1 105:8 106:19	distinct 107:11	102:11 112:15
51:20 54:6,6,11	32:4 40:3,4 41:10	directions 105:23	distributable 6:9	114:5 130:23
57:13 77:24 78:21	42:20,22 51:7	directly 94:22	9:4	138:3
112:16,17,18,21	59:11 60:18 69:14	director 3:13,14,17	distribute 8:2	doing 2:19 4:5 8:1
129:6	69:20 109:2,11	3:21,21 4:3,8,15	25:10 34:11 35:13	13:18 38:3 61:23
deem 53:10	115:2 131:22	4:21 5:18 6:21,23	38:9 46:25 62:23	66:5 90:6,10
deeming 48:1 53:9	details 20:4,5,6	7:25 8:11 9:16	63:5,20 121:3	104:18 112:20
default 47:12	51:9 69:4 101:23	11:15 14:22,24	distributed 9:5	125:14
defined 33:24	116:3	16:15,16 17:9	85:5	dominion 2:9
54:11,12 55:11	determination	52:11 122:1,24	distributing 65:5	dot 130:24
78:9	77:12	123:11	68:2,20	double 44:18
definition 6:22	determine 2:9	director's 3:25	distribution 3:19	doubly 136:21
56:18	12:18	directors 1:18,21	3:22 4:13,21 5:18	doubt 4:11 45:8
definitions 57:19	determined 27:24	2:5,16 3:12 6:12	8:9 9:17 26:25	75:18
58:12,15	determining 62:11	7:12,23 9:2,7	34:12 35:6 46:17	doubtful 80:21
definitive 58:24	detriment 34:14	11:13 14:7 15:12	46:24 47:17 48:2	82:17
degree 108:18	develop 21:20	16:24 48:20 105:9	48:22 49:24 50:22	doubtless 80:10
delay 96:18 101:9	Dicker 84:19,25	directors' 122:24	52:19 54:4 59:5	Downs 33:2 35:16
101:16 106:22	85:23	discharges 46:11	63:1,2,20 64:3,18	36:16 74:4,16,22
delegation 71:23	dictat 66:16	disclose 55:6	77:2 82:16,25	76:20,21 80:16
75:14	die 131:8	disclosed 92:4	85:7,12 87:14	90:4 91:16 93:18
deliberately 125:19	difference 87:11	discomforts 88:12	89:3 99:1 100:22	Downs' 20:21,25
demonstrate 42:3	different 22:14	discretion 16:10,11	113:13 116:7	31:12 32:5 37:13
depend 49:3	36:12 51:25 55:7	62:8 105:25	119:15	76:16 80:24 90:3
128:10	68:12 79:8 82:18	108:18 109:1	distributions 3:4	93:10
dependent 25:17	93:13 99:6 108:9	discretions 108:22	5:7,8 18:18 25:10	draft 50:2 56:23
depending 69:19	120:23 128:17	discuss 73:18	29:14,16 31:18	59:16 112:8
depends 5:10	132:20	discussed 57:20	32:1 33:1,18	121:18
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

1 6 1100 10	54 10 16 55 10 10	10 12 10 1	75.20.76.5.100.7	1 . 1 0 7
drafted 122:10	54:10,16 55:10,18	enter 18:13 19:1	75:20 76:5 100:7	exclusively 9:7
drafting 9:20 19:12	56:17	111:17 112:14	100:8,15,19,23,25	execute 39:12,15
20:1 51:11 54:9	effectively 9:25	114:4 119:11	104:2 110:11	130:23
56:16 57:1,6	35:11 86:19	entered 16:21	116:4 119:19	executed 138:4
60:19 90:24	eight 17:21 30:25	102:12	121:2	execution 39:16
draftsmen 78:15	either 46:15 86:9	entering 55:1,9	estates 26:22,24	exercise 1:21,22
drain 24:7	90:11 92:9 132:23	64:8	29:14 32:15 33:1	2:3,6,16 60:19
draw 46:20 49:18	elaborate 29:24	entire 2:17	34:11,15,16 35:11	78:19 84:3,4
65:1	132:10	entirely 12:21	46:12,13,15 49:13	136:13
drawing 91:15	elaborateness	117:15	52:20 54:25 62:20	exercised 6:5 7:7
drawn 105:21	132:8	entirety 46:16 66:9	74:3 75:2,6 116:3	7:12 8:13 15:12
draws 102:1,7	electric 135:20	entities 19:5 49:1	128:12 132:18	exercising 108:17
dreamt 88:19	element 2:13 20:11	125:2,6 135:11	estates' 49:13	exhibited 19:17
dropping 38:16	77:18 81:20	entitled 4:17 41:19	estimate 135:22	exist 6:12 13:13
due 15:19 38:15	106:15	64:19 117:19	estimated 64:22	existing 34:10
53:13 96:11 134:9	elements 28:5 82:4	130:19	135:14	82:11 95:8 113:15
dull 51:10	106:20	entitlement 80:3	et 14:15	exit 65:19,22 68:7
duties 63:3 105:1	eliminating 46:16	entity 76:1 104:13	event 79:14 80:13	expanded 36:19
duty 15:1 17:2 65:3	email 91:21,25	104:23	87:16 133:24	115:3
65:4,12 74:2 89:2	92:14 126:12	entry 4:14 5:12,12	135:13 136:5	expect 29:20 31:3
dwell 73:23	136:18	5:16 12:17	137:11	132:9 136:19
	emails 21:14	envisage 2:12	eventuality 137:13	expected 92:8
E	emerge 120:4	121:10 132:11	everybody 130:22	116:7 134:23
E 116:5,7	emerged 93:15	envisaged 1:22	evidence 22:22	expeditious 135:12
earlier 5:3 7:21	136:17	envisages 9:13	25:3 27:21 30:15	expense 72:25
15:21 25:6 63:18	employees 98:20	envisaging 2:15	30:18 35:15 63:19	104:24 105:3
101:7 108:13	99:8	42:14 131:22	71:15 74:25 76:16	119:20
earth 61:23	enable 1:16,24	equal 78:10	80:22 82:18 90:2	expenses 129:19
easier 17:16 70:12	17:19 24:5 42:22	equating 73:1	95:20 110:22	132:15
easily 57:7	47:16	equivalence 105:21	114:6,10,20 115:4	explain 27:3
easy 45:19	encapsulate 133:11	equivalent 108:4	119:25	110:20 114:15
eaten 17:21	encapsulated 73:20	essence 16:1,15	evident 97:18	124:1
economic 26:7	encapsulates	23:25 70:18	evils 16:9	explained 30:3
economically 82:20	133:12	essentially 32:3	ex 16:1 117:18	51:20 119:10
economics 82:21	encourage 69:13	34:21 46:11 49:11	exactly 10:19 21:15	136:25
edges 112:24,25	endeavours 70:8	52:16 54:23 68:19	25:19 62:17 65:20	explaining 113:2
educated 91:1	enforce 61:19	111:13 118:22	92:18 134:12	explains 65:20
effect 19:4 27:22	engage 103:24	123:22	example 20:7 34:18	71:22 114:12,21
28:21 32:25 34:10	engagement 21:1	establish 118:21	36:14,19 37:25	115:12,16 124:15
34:16 36:9 37:10	29:5	119:18	56:25 72:25 106:6	exposed 104:19
44:3 52:15 53:1,2	engagements 107:3	established 1:20	106:10,12,24	exposure 77:7
53:9,12 55:12	English 60:25 61:1	94:2,4	exceeded 109:16	expressed 21:19
64:19 71:23 76:8	104:10	estate 24:21 26:8	exceptional 124:2	30:20 64:6
93:17 95:8,25	enormously 86:9	27:18 29:23 31:19	excess 77:17	expresses 84:9
111:16 113:21	ensure 16:9 22:17	32:21 34:19 51:23	exchanges 68:15	expression 45:18
116:21 117:25	74:14	62:19 64:10 69:19	excluding 77:17	67:20 120:22
effective 52:1 53:2	ensuring 84:7	73:25 74:12 75:18	exclusive 12:24	extend 26:11 52:23
		, 5.25 , 2 , 5.10		20.11 32.23
<u></u>				

				i age 147
extending 33:11	78:16	79:13 112:16	foregoing 116:10	58:5,5
extends 34:4 36:2	familiar 61:15	finalised 138:4	foreign 26:9	fundamental 136:6
extensive 101:22	115:19 116:1	Finally 14:21	forever 65:7	fundamentally
102:23 103:1	far 3:8 20:10 28:6,8	116:15	forgetting 68:5	101:12
extent 1:13 2:4	28:11 31:6 32:13	financial 22:23	forgotten 72:15	funding 27:6 80:9
45:1 60:8 79:7	36:7 37:9 39:3	38:14 63:22	form 2:19 34:4,7	82:9 85:2,21
86:6 87:22 99:8	43:19 46:15 48:21	financially 50:4,10	44:10 56:23 79:20	86:10 94:16,22
112:19 126:18	51:20 52:20 53:20	find 20:22 35:3	86:19 125:6	95:11,24 96:1
extra 91:23	54:25 60:24 62:18	36:4,20 37:23	formed 59:8	funds 2:9 8:15,16
extracts 24:23	70:7 75:25 77:4	84:7 105:11	former 98:20	8:17 83:22 84:16
extreme 97:4	84:10 85:10 92:15	110:25 119:17	forms 34:25 35:1,3	94:13 117:18
extremely 24:19	98:11 100:12,19	finds 79:3	formulated 33:14	furniture 13:17
eyes 66:18	117:12 131:24	fine 43:14 44:22	34:2	further 1:16 3:3
	134:7	90:1	fortifies 22:5	27:25 33:18 34:12
F	fashioned 97:14	finely 133:4	fortify 15:10 93:7	43:1,25 56:4,18
facilitate 7:17	favour 10:17 25:9	finished 91:15	fortiori 110:7	72:17,20 83:8,15
100:22	28:21 69:10 87:2	129:1	fortuitous 120:13	86:24 88:25 101:2
facilitated 6:19	96:21 123:12	first 2:22 6:3 12:6	forward 17:19 62:8	101:9,17 102:9,12
facilitating 6:17	FCA 23:6,11,25	28:13 39:5,5	114:7 115:21	102:21 111:15
7:22 15:5,6	feast 136:5	45:18 52:6,6,7	found 15:7 19:18	115:2 117:9
121:13	features 103:3	58:21 76:4 77:4	39:14	125:16 126:14,17
fact 2:17 3:19 4:12	feeds 24:16	77:13 78:2 80:1,2	four 18:10 31:8	134:15 139:8
6:25 12:8 15:3	feel 88:7	80:5 82:4 96:19	47:15 120:5	Furthermore 2:8
16:5 22:16 26:9	feeling 97:2	98:4 99:2 102:1	fourth 1:10 18:24	future 1:14 3:7,8,9
48:18 52:20 82:23	feels 97:1	112:14 117:5	framework 30:25	63:15 67:23 85:13
87:24 93:3 98:24	feet 129:1	137:23,24	39:4,18 44:24	85:19 120:3 121:4
100:11 102:21	felt 93:18 136:20	firstly 35:15 65:2	69:4 112:17	121:8
110:7 112:14	fettering 16:10,11	fits 10:5	frankly 68:13	futurity 2:23
113:7 132:17	field 107:13	five 36:2 74:1,3	136:18	
134:8	fifth 19:17	120:5 128:12	free 35:13 77:6	G
factor 64:5 80:17	fight 119:3	fixture 137:5	79:15 107:15	Gabriel 92:20
factors 24:17,20	figure 50:7 65:13	flatly 67:24	freezing 32:25	gap 12:18 13:5,6,15
25:2,3,5,9 26:7,21	77:21,21	flesh 72:2	Friday 18:23	Gareth 23:12
28:3 29:25 89:13	figures 3:16 27:11	fleshed 110:22	110:17 130:11	gate 27:5
103:17 107:1	40:22,24 51:22	flow 116:6	131:1,4,16,19	general 5:24 9:12
109:5,6,17 116:2	52:4 55:8 94:8	flowing 113:14	135:3 137:5,15,19	69:24 115:19
120:23	96:14	flows 112:13	137:25	generality 41:13
facts 97:3	file 22:9 39:24 40:7	focus 9:23 107:12	frolic 8:1	generally 40:13
factual 97:4	40:9 44:4 89:24	focused 9:11 75:25	frozen 29:17 33:18	68:20 127:22
factually 7:1	92:18	follow 18:6 51:3	FSA 23:9	131:9
failing 107:18	filed 114:19	followed 64:20	FSMA 23:8	gentleman 92:17
fair 130:25	files 43:3	following 16:21	full 10:3 59:14	getting 107:7
fairly 2:24 26:15	filled 12:19	18:23 108:8	106:20	give 16:15 17:9
39:22 48:8 50:20	Filling 13:15	follows 67:14,15	fully 3:2	23:20 30:13 38:18
54:20 55:5 57:19	final 51:25 52:1	footing 135:19	function 30:2,12	42:21 53:9,12
58:8 60:17 133:4	53:2 54:9,16	137:4	75:15 107:7	62:13 69:15 74:20
faith 58:24 78:12	55:10,11,18 56:17	forefront 118:12	fund 35:9,11 45:24	83:2 86:19 87:8
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>

00.2.01.4.02.10	42.10 44.22 40 22	half 126:10	120.22	72.15.20.72.1.4.7
90:2 91:4 92:10	43:19 44:23 49:22	half 136:19	128:23	72:15,20 73:1,4,7
95:22 96:13 97:3	50:9,25 51:23	hand 12:23,25 13:4	helpful 57:7 60:20	73:16 74:10,20
111:16 113:4	52:21 54:5 57:12	13:6 22:8 24:5,6	69:1 72:16 73:14	75:8,11,23 76:10
116:3,21 126:19	58:3 65:19,20	46:8,9 105:24	94:20 121:20	76:20,22 77:10
132:7 134:11	68:17 73:9 76:23	106:1	125:12 126:10	78:1,5 81:3 83:5
135:3,21	78:19 80:6,7,13	handed 3:20 22:11	helps 132:22	83:17,20,22 84:14
given 13:2 20:7	84:6 86:4 87:1,2,6	112:8,9 121:22	high 39:22 93:23	84:19,22,25 85:5
29:11 43:2 46:23	90:13,14 93:17,22	hands 3:25 4:23,24	highest 12:20	85:9,16,22 86:1
98:25 101:22	94:4 111:23,25	118:9	highlights 24:4	87:7,9,19 88:1,8
102:8,21,23	112:9 113:9,9,14	hang 67:22 93:11	highly 26:22	88:14 89:7,17,22
108:18 116:22	113:18 119:5,14	happen 2:23 4:2,19	HILDYARD 1:3,5	89:25 90:5,9,12
131:22	119:16,22 128:14	12:8,9 16:22	2:2 3:6,9,11 5:23	90:15,19 91:1,6
gives 43:9 51:6	136:9	63:23 65:21 88:16	6:6 7:9,18,24 8:4	91:10 92:14 93:5
87:4 93:3 96:25	Goldman 84:15	119:9 136:10	8:14,22,24 9:6,9	93:9,23 94:6,12
115:2	good 17:20 41:12	happened 15:14	9:20 10:4,8,14,22	94:24 95:2 96:12
giving 4:25 5:1	41:20,24 42:8	29:23 52:3 67:14	11:5,7,17,21 12:5	96:17,19,23 97:11
47:15 77:1 79:18	43:8 44:5 58:24	127:21 129:11	12:10,20 13:19	97:21 103:25
81:8 82:25 87:13	78:12,16 106:11	happening 51:8	14:21,25 15:3,6	104:7,11,15 105:8
101:13 108:18	124:7 132:25	happens 16:23	16:9,23 17:12,20	105:13,15,20
112:19 113:15,17	134:10 138:6	42:14 67:14 91:24	18:6 20:24 21:3,6	106:3,25 107:6,22
135:2	goodness 134:17	131:10,17	21:13 22:11 23:6	107:24 108:21,25
Global 62:5,6	Gotshal 19:15	happy 11:3 18:5	23:13,16,19 24:4	109:12,20,25
108:2 127:10	governed 48:16	44:12,14,16 45:1	24:9 25:5,16 27:2	110:5,13,19,25
glory 59:14	50:21 60:25 79:3	68:24 73:18 110:2	27:9,12 28:11	111:4,8,12 112:12
go 3:25 4:10 16:7	governing 61:10	110:6,7 112:5	29:2,10,24 30:8	112:19 115:7,11
17:19 21:17 22:2	governs 38:12 49:9	123:21 125:23	30:16,24 31:5	115:15,17 117:5
22:3,18 24:15	granting 111:25	hard 112:25	32:12 37:18,20	117:14 118:2,24
25:8 26:3 28:8	135:7	harmed 118:23	40:5,11,16,18,25	119:13 120:19
40:24 57:18 61:2	grapevine 83:7	head 54:8 96:5	41:7,12,18,22,25	121:9,22 122:5,14
70:8 72:17 73:9	grapple 24:10 67:2	104:16	42:11,14,23 43:20	122:20 123:16,18
79:25 80:11,15,19	grateful 10:13	headed 21:1 92:19	44:11,14,16,19,22	123:20,23 124:12
83:19 84:6 86:3	17:12,18 18:9	heads 37:21 102:13	44:25 45:5,12,15	125:12,14,22
88:4 95:12 98:17	97:21 137:1	hear 128:14	45:21 46:1,5 47:3	126:6,14,24 127:2
105:17 117:8,9,12	great 70:13 109:12	heard 73:19 83:6	47:6,21 48:18,25	127:12,17 128:24
119:1 127:23	136:1	83:13 116:23	49:5,20,23 50:15	129:4,7,18,23
128:16 135:1	greater 27:3	134:24	51:2,8,13 54:8,13	130:3,9,13,18
137:23,24	101:16	hearing 5:4,11 6:14	54:17 55:20,25	131:2,20 132:2,13
goes 7:25 24:6	green 126:19 127:7	20:5 28:16 43:17	56:4,7,11,14,21	132:23 133:2,9,15
79:14,24 83:17,18	ground 73:10 82:2	47:9 83:10 102:19	57:4,9,15 58:22	133:18,21,24
85:3 87:10 91:25	group 23:24 75:3,4	122:8 131:1,7,18	59:13,21 60:5,7	134:2,4,12,17
91:25 94:8,16	75:21 124:25	138:9	60:14,25 61:6,11	135:17,25 136:14
95:6 99:25 115:22	groups 20:13,18	hearings 44:1,2	61:24 62:3,7	136:16,24 137:10
130:19	28:24,25 29:4	133:18	64:12 65:10 66:11	137:16,18,21,24
going 3:20 4:2 8:2	guess 109:13	heavy 17:13	66:13,16 67:3,10	138:6
11:4 12:7 15:13	тт	help 18:1 40:11	67:17 68:4,10	HM 99:8
21:17 24:15 30:13	<u>H</u>	89:23 97:22 105:6	69:1 70:2,7,24	Hmm 67:17
37:16 40:2,10	H 21:1 39:9	105:12 128:3,19	71:15,22 72:3,7	Hogan 111:5,6
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

hold 31:9 127:17
holding 62:24
holiday 98:21
homework 90:15
134:24 135:6
honour 104:21
hope 10:10 14:21
15:23 22:1 57:4
73:14 103:5
110:15,24 135:2,3
hopefully 73:11
137:14
hoping 21:16 42:21
131:18
hours 56:2
hundreds 33:15
Hussein 98:6
hypothesi 117:18
hypothesis 85:21
ny pourcois 05.21

iceberg 97:14 idea 45:23 47:15 66:1 69:15 identical 128:2 **identified** 7:2 8:25 9:1 25:3 27:25 35:4 38:18 42:5 79:23 122:18 identifies 37:11 identify 28:24 43:11 47:10 49:12 62:20,23 63:24 70:4.8 112:2 115:22 122:22 ignorance 40:11 117:15 ignorant 27:3 ignored 70:5 ii 26:17 53:18 81:1 83:6 **IIC** 27:5 94:13 iii 33:22 34:6 38:6 38:22,22 39:17,19 53:18 57:20 62:22

124:22 130:11 IIIC 59:20 imaginative 88:19 **imagine** 5:20 15:22 16:2 immediate 36:7 37:5 59:11 66:25 immediately 130:25 **imminent** 66:24,25 imminently 84:6 **impact** 36:10,21 83:11 120:14 impediment 34:12 **impel** 29:25 **imply** 130:16 imponderables 27:15 28:3,9 importance 100:2 108:19 important 25:2 26:2 42:17 60:21 60:22 79:17 80:2 93:1 100:14 103:8 103:9 113:8 120:2 127:20 importantly 20:10 impossible 28:17 66:19 improvement 29:16 **in-depth** 107:10 **Inaudible** 110:10 **inbound** 95:13 include 124:19,24 included 122:7 123:5 includes 34:5 58:17 **including** 1:6 13:3 26:2 54:4 58:18 101:9 105:23 106:8 127:4 132:17 incoming 65:16 66:1

incomplete 56:25

inconsistent 64:24

increase 82:9 85:3 95:7,12 increased 86:9 indemnify 58:6 **indemnity** 38:17,19 58:4,8 61:5,10 77:19,25 78:22,24 103:25 129:3,6,16 130:1,7 independent 72:10 independently 71:13 **INDEX** 139:1 indicate 21:20 **indicated** 15:7 21:9 54:20 113:5 indicates 23:4 indication 136:12 **individual** 23:7,11 23:24 70:17 74:11 75:2.5 individuals 71:16 indubitably 8:12 inevitably 19:11 75:2,22 inexorable 89:12 infinite 27:6 **infinitum** 56:12 **influence** 125:1,2 information 3:15 49:15 **informed** 72:13 114:19 ingredients 120:21 inherent 101:8 initially 33:8 initiated 64:17 **input** 106:16 112:3 insolvencies 74:13 **insolvency** 4:12,14 5:16 6:7,13 7:4,5 11:14 12:16,24 76:9 104:23,24 105:2 107:12 inspect 42:9 **inspection** 40:14,15 41:4,8 43:12

instance 96:20 **instant** 59:23 instinctive 97:2 instinctively 89:9 institution 78:25 instructing 19:16 90:23 instructions 83:24 insufficient 26:14 78:13 insuperable 97:1 integral 18:21 19:25 63:22 **intended** 16:19 37:8 39:11 46:14 46:18 50:8 58:23 69:18 intention 17:24 38:8 46:25 53:10 99:1 interaffiliate 38:10 48:3 49:9 50:21 51:19 77:14 112:17 intercompany 34:17,17,20 100:10,13 113:16 interest 6:24 22:4 24:6 26:3,14 27:7 30:6 31:24 42:4 42:18 43:11 48:2 53:7,8 58:18 62:12 70:11,17 80:3,5 81:7,22 82:10 84:17 85:3 86:5,8,8 87:12 92:8 94:17 95:5 95:10 96:17,18,18 98:13 99:22 101:20 107:16 117:11 118:10 119:1,4 129:23 interested 7:13 42:3,25 87:4 90:20 117:22 134:4 interesting 128:4

132:13 **interests** 2:10 6:22 7:12 24:13 26:4 26:12 33:20 71:25 72:10 75:20 76:5 114:25 116:12,20 117:4 118:11,17 118:22 119:3 120:11,17,24 124:8 **interim** 3:12,14 14:20 99:2 internal 133:2 interrelating 70:14 intricacies 97:16 **intricate** 135:9,9 inverted 77:2 invite 131:6,12 **inviting** 123:14 **involve** 106:12 107:9 involved 19:11 68:5 114:17 115:13 irrationality 30:5 59:7,25 62:12 irrationally 79:10 irregularity 12:8 irrelevant 107:20 irrespective 15:12 isolated 71:16 issue 1:8 24:2 27:14 33:16 40:6 42:17 66:11 73:22 74:5 74:8 84:11 85:10 86:21 92:5 94:13 94:16 96:25 104:10 113:8,8 116:17 125:20 **issued** 18:24 110:16 issues 9:24 57:2 77:12 94:21 95:4 95:5 items 33:9,12 34:2 J

71:1,6 114:16

119:12,17 120:3,6

J 49:18,20
January 133:18
134:18
Jervis 74:17,22
98:6,9,12 99:16
101:2 102:1
Jervis' 98:15
101:24 106:11
job 69:8 108:17
joint 19:7 59:3,4
76:3 78:10 98:7
114:8,22,23
jointly 76:7
jolly 12:11
judge 2:7 16:3
127:5 128:16
judgment 15:19,21
27:4 36:8,10 67:9
88:13 109:7
111:21 124:1
131:21 132:10
134:5,11,14 135:3
July 1:1 19:16
83:25 98:24 102:9
102:14,16,22
June 81:12 102:7
jurisdiction 61:1,9
61:16 62:4 128:17
128:20
jurisdictions
132:24
justice 1:3,5 2:2,19
3:6,9,11 5:23 6:6
7:9,18,24 8:4,14
8:22,24 9:6,9,20
10:4,8,11,14,22
11:5,7,17,21 12:5
12:10,20 13:19
14:21,25 15:3,6
16:9,23 17:12,20
18:6 20:24 21:3,6
21:13 22:11 23:6
23:13,16,19 24:4
24:9 25:5,16 27:2
27:9,12 28:11
29:2,10,24 30:8
30:16,24 31:5
,

32:12 37:18,20 40:5,11,16,18,25 41:7,12,18,22,25 41:25 42:11,14,23 43:20 44:11,14,16 44:19,22,25 45:5 45:12,15,21 46:1 46:5 47:3,6,21 48:18,25 49:5,20 49:23 50:15 51:2 51:8,13 54:8,13 54:17 55:20,25 56:4,7,11,14,21 57:4,9,15 58:22 59:13,21 60:5,7 60:14,25 61:6,11 61:24 62:3,4,7 64:12 65:10 66:11 66:13,16 67:3,10 67:17 68:4,10 69:1 70:2,7,24 71:15,22 72:3,7 72:15,20 73:1,4,7 73:16 74:10,20 75:8,11,23 76:10 76:20,22 77:10 78:1,5 81:3 83:5 83:17,20,22 84:14 84:19,22,25 85:5 85:9,16,22 86:1 87:7,9,19 88:1,8 88:14 89:7,17,22 89:25 90:5,9,12 90:15,19 91:1,6 91:10 92:14 93:5 93:9,23 94:6,12 94:24 95:2 96:12 96:17,19,23 97:11 97:21 103:25 104:7,11,15 105:8 105:13,15,20 106:3,25 107:6,22 107:24 108:21,25 109:12,20,25 110:5,13,19,25 111:4,8,12 112:12 112:19 115:7,11

115:15,17 117:5 117:14 118:2,24 119:13 120:19 121:9,22 122:5,14 122:20 123:16,18 123:20,23 124:12 125:12,14,22 126:6,14,24 127:2 127:12,17,21 128:1,18,24 129:4 129:7,18,23 130:3 130:9,13,18 131:2 131:20 132:2,13 132:23 133:2,9,15 133:18,21,24 134:2,4,12,17 135:17,25 136:14 136:16,24 137:10 137:16,18,21,24 138:6

K **K** 49:18.20 keep 45:19 50:9 68:4 131:1.17 137:5 **kept** 84:7 114:19 **key** 103:9 kind 91:6 98:17 99:11 knock-on 75:5,22 **know** 3:2,4 6:11,25 7:3 8:1 15:25 22:15 26:10 28:18 41:12,15,16,18,19 41:19.21 43:1 45:8 57:10 65:17 67:3.5 71:17.20 74:1 86:14 89:8 104:15,22 126:3,5 127:3 129:25 135:21 136:16,18 136:21 137:3 knowing 2:25 known 27:7 98:25 **knows** 5:14 11:16

31:8 32:15,17 33:11 34:25 35:21 58:11 63:9 77:21 91:24 114:9 \mathbf{L} lack 25:15 lacuna 22:4 24:13 80:5 113:21 120:14 land 29:11,11 88:3 88:5 **landed** 47:7 108:22 landscape 35:22 large 99:10 125:8 largely 109:18 larger 58:1 largest 19:9,9 124:17 **late** 10:12 **latest** 126:13 136:17 lavished 17:23 law 32:18 60:25 61:10.13.15.22 78:22.23 79:1.3.8 **lawful** 126:8 **layers** 58:20 **LBEL** 2:25 31:16 31:22 33:9,19,21 47:24 48:22 50:22 52:15,18,22 53:7 53:17 68:9.10 74:19,23 113:13 113:18 116:8 117:25 119:10,14 119:15,16,22 120:10 **LBEL's** 68:13 100:19 110:18 120:1 **LBH** 7:1 9:18 18:23,23,25 31:15 31:22 34:4 46:9 47:24 49:3 52:11 70:23 71:6,10,25

24:21 29:19,23

72:25 74:18,23 79:15 100:23 110:21 114:9,11 114:23,25 115:24 116:11,12,19,20 121:1,25 122:3,18 126:11 **LBH's** 117:4 120:17 125:21 **LBHI** 19:6,8,11 38:18 58:6,9 60:6 77:20 78:24 104:4 104:5,17 105:7,8 124:24,25 129:3 129:11 **LBHI2** 18:16 19:10 19:24 20:6 31:15 31:21 32:14 33:6 34:4 39:2 46:9,23 46:25 47:24 49:2 62:18 71:6,18 72:25 74:17,22 77:2 103:13 104:7 110:6 113:11,12 114:11,23,25 116:7 **LBHI2's** 19:23 29:18 34:19 **LBIE** 19:24 20:6 20:12 21:2,17,24 22:18,18 24:14,20 26:1,23 28:25 31:9 32:7,10,15 32:21 33:8,16,17 35:11 36:20,23 38:8,19,25 39:2 46:8,21 47:12,23 48:11,11,12 58:6 61:18 64:6,9 68:13,17 74:17,22 77:22 79:15,16,24 80:18,19 96:11,21 100:7,8,11,15,19 101:15 103:10,11 103:13 118:15 124:24 133:5,8

14:19 18:9 20:15

135:15

I DIEL 26 0 12	1 4117 10	21 24 22 2 2 10	117 17 100 22	105 14 100 21
LBIE's 26:8,13	lest 117:12	21:24 22:2,3,19	117:17 128:22	105:14 109:21
27:17 28:5 29:22	let's 13:5 51:14	24:5,12,15 25:17	looks 26:15 32:3	110:2,15 111:2,7
38:3,20 46:22	85:20 131:21	26:3 28:20 30:1	62:19 72:18	111:13,19 112:24
68:12 74:3 76:15	letter 19:15,17,18	38:9 65:4,19	108:10	116:15,24 119:8
77:6,7,16 104:1	92:14 131:21	66:20 68:7,13,17	Lord 6:2 10:7,13	122:4,10 123:8
LBIE/LBH 38:25	letting 53:24	79:24,25 80:6,13	10:20 11:2,9,19	124:6,7 125:10,13
LBL 18:16 20:6	level 12:21 39:22	80:20 84:6 86:22	12:2,13,23 13:9	126:10,20 127:9
31:15,19 32:14	67:5 69:14,20	87:16 88:4 93:6	16:5,18 17:9,17	128:2 129:1,10
33:8 34:3,8,20	80:8 85:1 89:11	113:19 117:23	18:9 19:5,11,16	133:12 136:8
38:7,16 39:1 46:9	95:6 129:24	118:6,16,24 119:2	19:21 20:4,10,17	137:20 138:2
47:24 49:2,3	Lewis 72:1,9,11	119:11 120:11	21:8 24:12 25:9	Lordship 1:25 2:25
52:10,22 53:15	74:18,23 110:23	liquidator 48:11	26:5 27:10 29:13	3:23,24 4:4,11 5:3
74:18,23 77:3,15	114:7,8,15 115:3	67:1 96:11 119:14	30:13,20 31:6,10	5:11,14 7:21
77:23 98:4,6,7,11	Lewis' 71:21 115:5	119:16,22	31:17,25 32:13,17	11:11,16 12:4,14
98:15 99:19,21	115:9 124:11	liquidators 64:17	33:1,7,13,15,23	14:19 16:6 18:9
100:2,4,11,17,18	liabilities 28:5 34:5	Listing 137:11	34:14,24 35:7,18	18:10,20 19:19,22
100:20 101:2,12	49:13 58:13,16,19	litigation 25:7	35:22 36:8,22	19:24 20:2,11,15
102:7,10 118:8,14	liability 18:19	101:10 106:8	37:1,5,12,15,21	20:22 22:9,15
118:18 119:19	26:11 32:16 34:8	108:21 119:18	38:14,16 39:3,8	23:10,20 24:1,21
124:17	35:12 37:4,8	120:6,7 124:22	39:21,25 40:14,20	24:24 27:25 29:7
LBL's 98:18 99:15	47:10 63:11	138:1	41:2,10,15,20,23	29:19,20,23 30:14
100:7,8,15,25	119:21	little 21:9,21 22:9	42:2,13,20 43:9	30:18,21 31:3,7,7
103:4,8,16 109:22	liberty 17:10 18:13	89:24 91:23 92:2	43:16 44:8,8,12	31:14,18 32:3,11
121:17	18:17 111:14,17	92:4 96:5 101:3	44:18,20,23 45:17	32:14,17 33:3,11
lead 74:15 129:5	112:14 113:4	107:8	46:6,20,25 47:8	33:13,21 34:6,25
leading 53:12	122:18 123:15,16	live 65:25 88:1,3	48:5,21,22 49:8	35:9,21 36:20
leads 47:18 52:17	lie 29:11,11	load 105:16	49:17 50:12,18	37:16,23 39:5,6,9
121:1	lies 28:22	logic 89:11	51:19 52:5,16	39:21,22 40:1,8
leaps 61:21	light 9:10 23:16,17	long 7:15 10:14	53:20 54:5,11,16	41:4,15,16 42:5
leave 27:12 60:9	28:14 31:4 81:5	14:18 25:12 34:22	54:19 55:10,22	42:21 44:23 47:2
leaving 35:12	111:19 126:19	35:25 36:5 51:15	56:22 57:7,11,12	47:8,22 48:13
led 10:20	127:7	66:20 68:22 90:18	57:18,23 58:11,25	49:19 50:18,20,23
left 13:7 123:3	lights 72:23	91:8 131:13,15	59:6,23 60:11,15	51:5,20 54:5
legal 35:22 71:4	likelihood 26:19	longer 37:12 47:4	60:16,24 61:8,14	55:14 56:13,22
72:11 79:9 101:10	28:4 84:11 137:11	81:4 134:6	61:16,25 62:15,18	57:12,13 58:4,11
107:11 109:9	limit 38:1 108:20	look 4:4 5:4 6:21	63:7,12 64:11	58:17 59:20 60:2
128:7,9,13	limited 13:23,25	14:3 20:24 22:12	65:1,20 66:3 67:8	60:17,18,21 62:1
legally 128:12	14:6,16 30:3,12	22:20 42:15 57:5	67:18 68:19,21	62:17 63:9,17
legislation 68:1	45:10,11,12 54:6	65:25 69:23 74:2	69:11,11,12 70:20	65:8,8 66:4,14,23
76:6	57:13,17,21 62:10	75:20 82:21 89:18	73:9,21 76:13,14	67:1 68:15,24
legitimate 42:4	77:21 84:16	91:5 108:7 112:11	78:22 84:9 86:24	69:21,22 71:9
legitimately 11:25	134:21	120:20 121:18	87:6 88:12 90:18	73:11,15,17,18,19
legs 95:22	limits 77:7	looked 9:21 55:22	90:22 91:3,9,15	77:21 78:14 79:11
Lehman 74:13 99:9	line 86:20 89:1	109:11 127:21	92:13 94:11 96:5	80:24 81:1 84:3
124:24 125:5	108:2,8	looking 11:7 26:12	97:7,8 98:2,14	85:8,10 86:24
length 7:8 106:22	linked 78:7	28:9 56:23 65:9	99:14 101:21	87:17 89:15 90:25
lengthy 132:10	liquidation 21:17	69:20 75:1 77:19	103:3,17 104:8	91:24 92:23 94:9

04.16.00.15.17.10	Marwig 27, 10, 24			
94:16 98:15,17,18	Marris 27:19,24	meeting 102:6	mode 1:22	neatly 69:11
98:23 99:5,18	80:9 82:8 83:20	melting 80:15	model 1:19 38:14	necessarily 80:21
101:23 102:19	86:10 94:21 95:11	member 23:23 92:16	48:3 50:4,10 51:4 75:9	108:10
103:6,18,22 108:13 109:8,15	95:24 96:1 Marshall 44:12	members 6:21 8:10	modelled 51:22	necessary 13:5 60:17 61:20 69:6
,	61:4 90:17,18	26:10 32:14 52:19		120:20 128:5
110:17,20 112:5 113:1,3,13 114:1	97:24 98:1,2	81:20 82:3 85:12	modelling 51:3,24 63:23	132:7,11
113.1,3,13 114.1	104:6,8,14 105:17	95:23 102:17	modified 19:7	need 1:25 9:11,15
115:25 116:2	105:19 106:2,14	mention 93:19	moment 25:20	15:21 16:7,14
120:15 121:20,24	107:5,21,23 108:3	129:2	28:10 36:21 48:5	18:1 22:19 25:10
120:13 121:20,24	107.3,21,23 108.3	mentioned 34:3	50:2,14 82:16,22	27:14 38:3 40:3
125:14,21 125:17	109:21 110:2,6	55:14 116:5 124:7	115:4 117:24	41:18,19 44:1
127:1 131:4,7,12	133:12 139:6	mentions 72:9	124:6 127:14	48:17 50:19 56:25
132:5,6,12 134:8	master 39:4 112:17	merits 30:19 106:7	131:1,18	57:18 61:19 65:10
Lordship's 19:20	material 1:7 35:19	met 6:23	momentous 14:23	79:11 80:5,22
46:21 49:18 85:20	55:12 70:5 108:11	Metal 82:13	62:9,10 133:7	93:25 95:19 122:6
87:23 91:16	123:1	Metals 27:13 81:16	Monday 1:1	122:6 125:24
120:21 136:11	materially 55:7,7	81:24 82:1 86:16	monetary 116:4	131:15,20 132:4
loss 26:8	mathematical	95:1,16,21 96:15	money 2:11 4:22	137:21,22
lost 36:21 84:23	10:16	metaphors 97:15	25:6 42:18 50:9	needing 41:20
lot 73:10 106:16,25	matter 4:18,24	MF 62:5,5,6 108:2	79:15 113:9	needs 22:15 25:14
132:17	8:22 15:3 28:22	127:10	monies 3:19 4:2	41:4,15,16
lots 42:17	42:19 43:24 44:13	militates 135:7	7:11 113:14 118:9	negotiated 35:7
Lovells 71:4 111:6	81:7 100:6 106:17	million 31:15,15,16	118:10 119:23	79:5
lower 58:9,10	108:7 109:4	31:16,19,22 34:19	monitored 43:4	negotiation 20:1
Luncheon 91:13	135:19	38:21 46:3 58:5	months 36:2,3	35:1,25 36:6
	matters 50:21	77:17,22 100:23	morning 69:14	61:18 72:12
M	52:13 56:24 63:7	124:18	111:2,20,23	114:18
machinery 51:7	63:7 68:14,22	millions 33:15	movable 136:5	negotiations 19:12
main 68:16	101:7 135:12	mind 1:11 17:6	move 21:11 50:12	114:22
maintain 137:12	mayn't 112:22	35:23 45:6 56:1,5	62:23 66:20	net 48:6 49:15 50:7
maker 74:4	mean 4:25 24:4	78:15 87:10 88:15	118:16	50:11 52:4,20,24
making 4:7,8 5:1,2	27:2,4 30:24 31:8	88:24 90:1 93:5	moving 108:15	53:13 101:17
8:8,9 22:6 25:9	58:12 59:19 65:10	103:17 112:1,3	136:6	Neuberger 12:23
48:1,7,15,16	69:2 70:22 83:6	minded 113:4	muddle 127:18	65:20 67:8 84:9
75:24 85:12 89:3	97:17 108:3 117:5	136:19	muddled 97:22	88:12 97:7
96:2 119:15	117:16 123:7	mine 22:14		never 28:18 96:15
122:15	means 5:1 17:20	ministers 109:7	N 1125.25	136:2
man 61:12 92:21	77:11 124:3	minute 11:1 93:15	nailed 125:25	nevertheless 8:17
manage 116:25	meant 70:16	minutes 17:21	name 10:24	62:9 64:5 88:9
management 11:13	mechanics 4:18	minutiae 56:16	nature 22:6 37:7	109:1
manages 71:7	16:14 69:16	mirror-image	59:1 108:5 128:20	new 61:6,7,9,9
managing 71:5	mechanism 52:17	112:6 125:9	nauseam 4:11	78:22,23,25 79:1
manner 94:5	meditate 122:5	missed 57:8 81:12	navigating 13:10	79:3,8 92:2
March 102:2	126:6	mix 79:14 80:17	near 63:15 121:4	104:13,14 122:16
marked 111:10	medium 63:15	97:15	nearly 90:12,13	night 10:12
marks 82:17 94:3	meet 35:10	mixed 91:20	neatest 125:22	nod 42:23
			l	

noises 28:20
non-challenge 60:9
non-opposition
23:5
non-preferential
124:16
non-provable
27:23 58:13,15,19
81:9,14,15,20
82:6,12 85:4 86:3
86:6,14,15 87:12
87:15 94:25 95:4
95:16,17,20
Normally 108:23
Nortel 62:3 105:22
108:1 127:12,13
128:1,18 132:10
132:13
note 47:17 90:3
102:19
noted 60:11
notice 9:13,21 38:8
46:22,24,24 47:15
47:20 98:25
101:22 102:1,9
111:15
noticed 56:16
notices 102:20
notification 23:2
72:21 86:23 90:14
91:18,20 92:2
102:12,18,21,23
notifications 23:22
91:20 92:6
notified 28:13
92:25
notify 22:24 23:9
23:18
notion 67:21
notional 50:6 53:12
notwithstanding
17:2 101:22
novel 15:16
nuanced 119:8
nuances 69:3,19
nub 59:15,15 89:7
number 24:14 26:1
Humber 24.14 20.1

27 17 15 20 51 21	1114 00 10
27:17 45:20 51:24	oddity 89:10
74:11 77:11 136:6	office-holder
numbered 32:8	104:25 113:19
	127:7
0	office-holders 64:1
object 29:7 47:11	74:1 105:23
47:14,16,24 77:2	107:15
82:25	officer 17:5
objected 29:8	Okay 57:9 90:12
objecting 89:18	105:19
objection 10:18	once 30:17 32:1
26:24 41:7,10	55:15,17 68:23
102:24 110:4	109:17 112:1
126:2,4	135:1
objections 29:21,22	one's 96:5 97:2
101:21 102:17	ones 29:5 53:23
objective 35:2 63:1	onwards 36:25
objectives 34:24	39:10 49:17 58:7
109:18	76:17,18,21,21
obligation 39:15	open 40:12 41:8
53:19 79:7 129:15	42:2,5,17 118:25
obligations 23:6	119:5
52:22,23 53:15	opened 27:5 119:1
obscured 97:17	opening 53:8
observations 101:3	openly 45:2
observer 90:21	operate 1:14 95:17
97:19	operates 34:14
obvious 21:22	opinion 59:4,9
62:25 84:1	63:25
obviously 29:7	opinions 106:7
33:16 34:9,14	108:6,11
40:21,22 62:9	opportunity 92:9
70:9 74:11 80:2	112:11
89:1 107:3 109:9	oppose 20:19 28:24
110:11 124:8	43:12,13
126:3,21 128:15	option 1:19 10:21
130:5 135:25	11:4 17:19 19:4
138:3	52:15 68:4 110:21
occasion 7:21 18:4	111:17,21 112:22
occasions 16:2 67:7	113:2,8 116:17,21
occur 86:18	117:8,17,19
occurred 54:15	121:11,12,13,14
133:25	122:1,21,22,23
occurs 110:10	123:5 124:2 126:7
136:8	126:8
October 115:14	order 1:20 2:24,24
odd 61:12 128:11	9:11 10:23 11:3
044 01.12 120.11	9.11 10.23 11.3

16:3,8 22:14 31:10 32:24 38:23 39:16 47:2 52:5 90:24 91:5 93:24 96:9 111:24 112:6 112:8 113:20 121:18 122:6,7,17 122:22 123:10 125:18 126:2 128:9 129:14 131:5 137:19 ordinarily 17:24 40:12 ordinary 11:24 99:3,10,22 105:2 organs 104:18 originally 19:23 33:14 34:1 ought 111:11 124:9 outcome 28:8 55:2 61:20 101:18 108:16 119:17 120:7 outline 35:14 99:25 outlined 115:1 outside 6:7 108:15 outstanding 94:21 outweigh 26:24 64:1 overall 22:7 37:9 72:13 120:23 overlay 6:16 overtaken 35:18 overtook 35:21 owed 19:24 77:22 owes 15:1 P package 30:23 page 19:20 21:1 31:13 37:21 38:22 39:9 49:17,22 54:7 57:14 58:16 72:6 78:9 98:17 99:17 101:4 114:14 116:16 pages 20:23 32:9

46:7 58:7 101:25 paid 8:9 31:19,21 31:22,22,25 34:21 49:16 53:13 77:5 82:1 86:4 98:19 119:23 129:13 **paper** 130:1 paragraph 20:8 21:5 31:12,17 33:2,5 35:17 37:2 37:11,12,25 38:7 38:8,9,9,16,18 54:3 67:9 72:6 73:12,13 74:6,9 76:17,18 80:16,24 90:3 93:12 98:10 98:18,23 99:6,16 99:18,25 100:4,17 101:4,8,18 102:5 102:8,9,16,20,22 103:6,12,13 104:1 106:10 107:2 112:12 114:14,21 115:4,13,16,22 116:9,16 118:1 122:11,16,19 124:13 129:6 paragraphs 20:22 32:5 35:16 36:15 36:16,25 37:13 101:24 127:15 parameters 78:19 91:4 109:16 part 5:24 10:17 13:2 18:21 19:25 24:20,21,25 25:15 36:22 43:13 44:12 46:3 63:22 69:12 74:8 75:18 91:20 91:21 101:15 103:10 105:1 130:20,22 132:9 132:20 135:25 **parte** 16:1 participants 20:16 participated 20:1 72:11 114:21

				8
126:21	121:24	85:16,18 86:2	121:12 127:20,25	132:18
participating 123:6	pause 11:9 21:6	personal 70:16	128:21 131:9	potentially 27:6
participation 120:1	43:7 49:22 51:14	personally 43:25	132:14 136:8	120:5
126:17	61:7 81:2 105:13	persons 23:13	pointed 61:4 67:6	pound 31:23 98:19
particular 13:8	pay 26:14 53:15,16	perspective 62:19	points 1:18 3:24	99:3,13,21 101:19
20:12,14,21 41:14	53:19 58:9 66:7	74:3 75:1 76:15	5:10 45:2 54:20	pounds 33:15
64:9 68:11,21	79:16 80:5 82:12	100:2 117:7,7	54:21 61:8 63:17	124:17
75:20 76:1 93:2	98:21 118:9	132:3	66:4,14 96:6 98:3	power 4:9 7:9
94:15 99:18 100:1	payable 82:10	persuade 120:10	131:11 136:6	11:20,21,22,22
101:1,14 103:7	118:10 129:9	pick 39:8 114:13	pondered 27:15	12:18 13:3,4
109:21 112:3,7	payer 78:24	picked 39:23	pops 65:7	15:11 16:16,20
117:6 126:4,23	payers 52:21	picking 107:1	position 10:19	59:17
particularly 22:12	paying 48:1,6	picture 22:9 23:2	17:14 20:17 21:25	powers 1:21,23 2:3
33:21 36:24 37:2	78:24 86:5 96:18	23:21	22:18 28:12 29:16	2:6,16 6:11,12 7:3
37:2 53:2 59:24	payment 4:7,8 5:1	place 35:12 45:24	31:11 32:13 33:5	7:5,10,23 8:11
64:6 83:1 92:15	5:2 9:1 48:6	51:24 55:16 64:3	36:15 37:3 38:7	11:13,15 12:15
105:21 128:14	52:23 53:7,15	places 132:23	46:14 49:6 53:20	13:3,13 16:16
parties 16:1 19:5	99:20 101:18	plain 89:13	55:7 65:17 68:12	practical 32:24
19:21 25:1,21,21	122:3	plainly 72:24	69:3 73:24 80:18	precedent 12:7,11
25:24 26:18,19	payments 32:1	104:22	93:8 94:9 98:3,5	12:12
30:19 36:3 38:18	50:5,11 52:18,20	plan 19:7,8 129:12	98:14 99:5,11	precise 16:14
39:12 41:3 42:10	53:6,10,23 64:21	129:12,17,21,22	105:4,24 109:22	preferable 30:9
54:23,24 55:1,8	Pending 133:21	Plc 115:24 116:20	113:5 115:20	preferential 31:20
55:12 60:3 61:18	pension 100:5	please 42:16 66:7,8	117:17,24 119:23	98:20
63:24 79:9 93:16	people 41:12,18	plug 13:5 119:1	129:3 133:12	prejudice 64:1
93:20 94:5 101:5	42:24 82:19 87:22	plus 26:14 99:21	positions 113:16	118:17
103:23 109:9	91:22	101:19 109:8	133:11	premised 35:19
114:6 126:18	perceiving 97:12	pm 91:12,14 138:8	positive 62:24	prepared 121:19
parties' 24:25	perfect 43:16	point 1:12,18 2:18	possession 105:9	prerequisite 128:5
25:14 87:5	perfectly 11:2	2:19,23 3:6,16,19	possibility 24:18	prescribe 88:15
partly 16:11,12	117:2	3:23 4:3,10 5:23	26:15 27:1 77:8	prescribed 18:7
136:21	perform 111:17	6:11 7:20 11:11	77:15 103:15	present 16:25
parts 1:12 39:13	performing 112:21	11:12 15:16,17,18	110:8 116:25	19:13 67:3 79:19
91:16	period 29:17 35:25	21:15,16,19,20,21	possible 46:15	83:5 94:19
party 34:15 40:20	46:22 47:20 55:5	22:4 24:13 26:17	49:12 50:1,3 55:4	presented 128:13
42:3,3,5,7 44:9	55:17 80:4 84:8	27:19,20,25 33:2	63:2,6 64:1,4	presently 16:25
47:11 62:18 78:24	88:21	38:5 40:1 54:22	67:23 71:5 98:4	96:9 113:10
99:7,10 123:6	permissible 75:14	55:11 57:19 60:12	107:11 120:13	135:14
126:15	permission 40:16	63:5 65:2 77:16	possibly 2:18 22:14	press 11:11
pass 3:17 4:2 34:7	42:6 44:5 114:4	78:21 79:12,19	33:11 93:11	presumably 24:9
103:19 119:20	130:14,15,16	80:5,22 81:6,7,17	113:17 131:5	40:18
121:14	131:20 133:6	84:22,23 86:23	135:3	pretentious 57:5
passages 79:22	135:8,20 137:23	88:23 89:19 93:2	posted 102:2,9	pretty 36:11 89:12
127:10,24 128:4	permit 9:16 15:18	93:13 94:7 95:11	pot 80:15	97:1,8 134:10
passed 4:23 9:23	35:5 95:14	95:12 96:7 99:15	potential 29:25	135:9
14:10	person 5:1 23:15	103:4,8 109:18,24	48:10 71:7 84:1	prevail 85:1
passing 112:4	47:11 74:15,16	117:21 119:4,6	93:15 102:4	preventing 32:25
	<u> </u>	ı	<u> </u>	ı

112.20	1 107 22	40.02.04.100.10	42 12 12 5 11	76.05.70.10
112:20	processed 107:22	40:23,24 109:10	put 3:12,13 5:11	quo 76:25 79:18
prevents 42:8	procure 52:11	109:23 125:7	7:9 19:4 23:3	R
previous 102:19	produce 54:23	pros 69:8	28:19,19 30:23	raise 42:11 110:4
previously 2:4	55:24	prospect 15:13	67:10,12 69:11	raised 92:5 102:17
primarily 89:16	produced 55:6,15	59:5 63:14 66:24	70:2 81:5,10,13	
primary 74:2	produces 52:3	66:25 96:10	81:14 82:18 84:15	102:24 132:13,16 ran 33:15
principal 37:23	producing 111:24	prospectively	87:22 90:25 92:23	ranking 104:3
principally 33:8	product 35:24 36:5	117:21	104:18,21 111:14	ranking 104:3
principle 67:20	53:24 117:11	prospects 104:17	113:18 114:3,7	rate 27:7 54:2
93:16 132:14	production 106:6	130:7	118:25	84:17,23
principles 62:2	productive 51:12	protect 66:9	puts 59:6 93:23	rational 70:4 89:15
105:2	professional	protection 14:21	putting 5:23 52:14	108:16
prior 119:18	101:10	42:7,12 43:1,10	62:8	rationale 113:1
private 2:3 13:24	profits 6:9 9:4	44:1,10 47:3	PWC 71:2 102:10	
14:6 40:9 43:18	progress 102:3,8	provable 64:17	Q	rationality 103:19 reach 63:4 94:9
43:22	projected 113:10	87:11,16		reached 117:1
pro 76:25 79:18	promised 1:5	prove 79:21	quantified 96:16 quantum 57:24	120:24
probably 3:10	promising 82:21	proved 99:4	94:17	reaching 120:8
15:25 22:15 27:2	promoted 43:12	provide 5:16 50:24	query 84:8	reaction 59:12,24
27:10 35:9 45:18	proof 53:3 100:3,6	73:14 103:22		read 1:5 13:19
50:25 51:11 57:1	100:8,12,14	121:10,12 129:15	querying 44:6	17:22 21:6 31:1
57:2 59:6,23	103:10 106:21	provided 3:14 11:3	question 4:11 5:8,9	
69:21,24 79:17	proofs 32:15,18	54:14 58:6 108:6	6:13 7:6 11:17,20	49:19 62:3 81:2
88:8 104:2 111:2	68:2 100:5,13,18	provides 5:15	12:18 13:7 15:8	89:22,25 115:6,7
114:12 121:19	100:19 101:15	39:18 78:18 101:2	17:15 25:13,13,22	129:10 134:21,25
124:9 133:24	proper 5:13 107:24	112:6 122:17	43:22 59:17 63:10	reading 31:4 33:4
problem 1:13 10:7	123:2,5 134:24	providing 76:1	70:7 75:13 82:17	real 2:8 82:17
35:4 75:23 84:1	135:8	proving 8:6	85:14 94:3 104:2	realise 22:13 90:6
97:1,12 118:24	properly 7:10	provision 5:25 11:8	122:12 126:23	realistic 117:16
problematical 83:1	proportionate 69:7	13:19 23:7 45:8	127:5 133:5,16	really 1:12 5:10
procedure 103:23	proposal 23:5	45:23 87:14	questions 25:13	10:15 14:2 23:20
proceed 44:20	28:16 35:8 68:7	provisional 135:22	73:17 109:22	47:13 51:5 59:10
93:24 135:18	69:10 70:13 103:4	provisions 14:13	131:25 132:17	59:14,16 64:12
137:4	proposals 28:21	15:10 39:14 48:9	quick 20:24	65:6,11 69:6,8
proceeded 135:19	propose 16:15	53:9 129:16	quickly 21:6 48:8	70:16 75:13,16
proceedings 20:16	111:23 115:24	PTR 130:10 136:11	54:21 60:17 73:13	78:6 89:6 90:20
62:22 71:6 74:14	126:25 134:19,25	public 42:18 44:2	89:21	92:22,24 93:1
102:4 104:9,23	proposed 24:10	pulled 47:17	quid 76:25 79:17	94:19 97:8 99:4
119:12 128:9	40:8 48:19 99:14	purpose 13:12	quite 2:2 43:2,4	103:14 107:11,13
proceeds 49:11	99:20 100:1	60:22 122:21	45:2 51:14 71:17	107:14,22 108:2
process 6:7 8:6,20	101:23 102:11,23	purposes 5:19 6:18	81:4 93:11,23	109:3 113:7
8:21 35:6 47:19	102:25 111:18	6:19 7:15 9:19	96:6 97:11 98:2	121:11,25 128:18
53:14 54:21 64:18	112:15 114:24	10:23 32:25 43:8	99:7,9 101:22	132:16
65:5 75:19 87:5	115:23 116:11	46:17 52:14 94:19		reason 7:5 13:14
106:23 107:12,14	117:19 125:10	137:6	106:5,16 117:16	22:2 31:25 41:20
108:9,9 109:4,13	137:7	pursuant 48:3	119:6 125:23	41:24 42:8 61:11
118:4 128:22	proposing 15:18	pursue 44:10	132:10,17 134:1	65:21 67:19 78:6
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

02.2.05.15.05.12	55 10 15	1 4 26 0 400 42	20 2 24 7 5 10	
83:2 85:15 96:13	57:13,17	relate 26:8 100:13	30:2,24 76:10	resided 15:11
103:20 134:10	rectification 49:4	100:20	84:18	residual 42:18
reasonable 15:23	reduce 9:17 11:22	related 78:2 100:5	remind 65:10 91:7	resolution 13:25
59:4,8 69:7 70:18	13:23 95:13 96:1	relates 38:25 40:7,9	reminded 50:13	14:5,10,11 24:11
78:16	reduced 8:18,25	41:2 55:13 93:14	reminding 111:7	53:18 88:22 96:19
reasonableness	9:3	relating 7:10 18:11	remit 123:2	112:4 121:14,25
58:23	reduces 77:7	26:2	remote 24:19	123:13 135:12
reasonably 56:24	reducing 14:5	relation 3:3 21:16	removed 84:10	resolutions 3:17,18
63:6 73:11 78:11	reduction 1:23	31:11 47:10 74:5	removes 77:8,15	14:24
reasoned 15:19	5:25 11:7 13:20	74:14 75:17 77:24	103:14,15 121:6	resolve 136:5
reasoning 132:1,4	14:3 52:7,9 55:16	78:21 80:22 81:7	repeated 36:18	resolved 27:18 80:8
135:25	100:24 106:22	82:16 91:23 92:6	replicate 16:19	93:14,25 94:1
reasons 6:3 7:1,8	112:4 123:13	93:21 96:14 98:6	136:3	resort 17:3
10:15,20 15:18	reductions 121:7	101:1 105:6	report 102:3	respect 18:2,18
21:22 24:14 25:23	redundant 135:6	111:20 112:10	representative 71:2	38:2,4 39:24 49:2
25:25,25 26:1,6	Reed 23:12	113:6 114:7 128:7	representatives	50:16 57:22 79:16
79:25 96:13	refer 103:11	129:2	20:14	80:4 81:20,21
110:21,22 113:3	127:24	relatively 30:3	represented 19:6	82:6 83:4,6 84:4
113:22 116:22,23	reference 19:20	57:25 79:13 121:4	132:19	85:2 86:3,7,11,13
117:1,2 123:4	26:20 38:10 41:13	132:21	representing 98:11	86:20 87:15 88:22
132:7,8	53:17 54:12 55:11	release 2:11 53:4	represents 36:4	95:10,15,19
recall 33:13 34:6	98:24 100:9	57:17,17 103:9	Reproposed 92:19	100:23 135:15
47:8 133:19	references 30:14	121:1,2	require 53:11	respectfully 78:18
recalls 35:9	116:6	released 1:20,24	77:12 112:3 132:9	79:2,11 89:12
receive 122:3	referred 33:3 40:12	44:5 117:19	required 18:5 19:3	92:7 98:5 103:18
135:19	41:8 42:16 80:23	137:12	22:24 23:8,17	131:13
received 99:12	83:14 102:16	releases 46:11	43:2 46:23 52:11	respective 17:21
100:14 103:6	103:13 104:1	relevance 81:18	52:13,14 53:16	25:16 100:12
110:24 111:2	referring 102:3	86:24	54:14,23 59:2	respects 35:20
receiving 113:9,10	refers 39:1 101:4	relevant 19:2 23:11	134:6	62:20 75:6
recharge 33:9,23	102:5 115:1	24:17,25 40:2	requirement 47:1	respond 45:25
33:24 34:1,3,9,22	reflect 37:8	41:16 45:2 48:6	requisite 126:19	responded 21:25
38:16 77:16 101:5	reflected 47:1	49:16,16 57:16	rescue 97:23	response 23:11,21
101:13 106:13	reflecting 107:7	64:5 103:22	reservable 66:2	24:1,2 29:8 43:10
recharge-type	135:9	104:17,25 107:14	reserve 3:2 25:14	91:1 92:25 107:13
124:21	reflection 108:1	109:5 112:21	25:16 26:25 48:9	responses 22:10,13
recipients 52:25	reflects 37:6	135:11	48:17 63:12,14,21	22:17 23:23
reciprocal 100:7	regard 62:25	reliant 29:6	64:3,23 65:24	109:25
recitals 39:8,10	109:22	relied 116:2	66:8,8,12 68:21	responsibility
49:18,20,21 50:12	regarded 17:1	relief 20:19	83:4 84:7	74:16 114:16
recitation 122:8	regarding 98:14	rely 12:25 92:15,22	reserved 8:9	115:18
recognising 8:15	regards 70:3	92:24	134:14	rest 52:24
recollected 134:13	regime 118:12	remain 7:11 34:23	reserves 1:15 3:1	restrict 40:15
recommence 35:5	registered 14:11	remainder 125:4	18:18 25:11 31:10	restriction 41:3
record 15:15	92:1	remained 99:4,11	34:13	result 24:22 79:9
recourse 38:1	registration 14:15	remains 22:17	reserving 67:23	86:9,10 99:20
45:10,11,13 54:6	rejects 67:21,24	remember 15:24	134:22	101:17 106:22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

118:16	115:5	Schwartzmann's	seeking 111:13	137:12
resulted 32:22	rolled-up 49:23	121:16	112:13 114:4,6	sequence 50:5,6
results 29:13 108:6	rolls 55:19	Schwarzmann	116:21 123:9,22	sequences 50:6
retain 61:16	round 1:11 50:5,9	74:18,23	125:8,17 128:9	series 46:11 50:4
retained 8:16,17	54:9 96:5 106:8	scope 59:10	seeks 10:1 19:2	52:10 53:3 86:17
return 101:14	route 68:8 127:7	se 93:18 95:4	42:7 113:18	86:18 91:20
returnable 7:11	rude 66:17	sealed 39:24	seen 19:24 20:12	serve 46:24
returning 15:13	rule 81:8 82:20	second 5:24 10:9	42:1 46:13 48:14	served 116:20
revealed 1:15	rules 47:19 66:6	45:19 74:8 77:14	68:15 71:9 91:19	serves 93:7
Revenue 99:8	run 27:22 113:18	78:21 80:12	110:16 112:1	session 51:11
reversed 27:5	run-up 136:10	109:13 112:12	113:21 114:9	set 3:16 15:19
reviewed 106:4,5	running 21:4	132:1	116:2 120:15	82:23 89:2 101:7
revised 10:23 28:15	runs 72:6	secondly 76:6	135:7 136:24	103:6 127:9 135:6
Richards 127:21		section 13:22 14:3	sees 97:13 102:19	135:9
Richards' 62:4	S	14:12 18:19 21:1	segregation 75:14	sets 111:24 122:11
right 2:2 3:11	Sachs 84:15	21:4 36:24 81:19	seldom 108:25	setting 12:7,10,11
11:21 13:7 17:1	Safeguard 72:10	129:21	self-interested	120:17
17:20 24:24 28:1	sanction 111:22,25	secure 98:22	133:16	settle 46:14 57:24
28:2 29:20 30:12	112:7 125:8,9	secures 64:9	Sempra 27:13	settlement 38:10
30:21 33:9 34:3,9	130:15	see 10:17 13:16	81:16,24 82:1,13	39:20 44:24 46:6
36:5 40:15 41:3	satisfactorily 93:25	15:10 16:3,6,6	86:16 95:1,16,21	48:4 49:8 50:16
43:13,20 44:6,17	94:1	19:22 23:10 24:1	96:15	50:22 51:19 53:24
47:5,11 48:25	satisfied 41:25	30:4,23 31:14,18	send 127:1,2	62:21 76:15 92:19
49:4,5,25 51:13	61:20 69:22 92:7	32:4 35:24 37:25	senior 19:23 23:23	93:24 99:20 100:1
54:15,18,19 55:9	130:7,8	39:6,9 43:14	38:20 57:25 58:13	101:9 102:4
55:20,23 56:13,19	satisfy 129:14	45:16 46:1,9	58:14,15,18	111:18 112:15,16
56:22 62:15 67:22	satisfying 75:19	47:22 48:24 50:18	sense 22:5 43:10	112:17,21 113:6
69:12 73:10 77:1	saving 136:12	50:23 51:8 52:12	94:23 96:24 97:1	114:18 115:23
77:5,11 78:6	saying 28:1,2 43:3	53:17 57:21 58:17	108:10 110:6	116:12 117:3
79:20,21 80:7	72:22,24 117:8	59:9 60:11,21	133:4	119:11,25 120:1,4
81:4 82:24 83:1,2	128:18 135:18	65:7 68:3 69:6,8	sensible 22:7 96:14	121:10
87:13,18 90:5,15	says 2:20 6:4,9	86:25 88:20 89:10	117:2 131:13	settles 46:8 77:14
90:19 91:10 94:6	12:16,23 14:2,15	92:16 94:6 98:18	136:12	settling 113:16
95:2 96:12 97:11	14:16,18 42:15	98:24 99:5,18	sensibly 47:14 69:9	128:8
104:7 112:24	72:9 74:25 95:17	101:23 105:5,12	sensitive 42:10	seven 103:7
122:4,14 124:4	116:9,18 118:2	111:12 116:18,24	sent 19:15 102:14	seven-odd 36:3
128:22 132:15	125:24 126:8	117:1,6 120:14,15	111:9	seventh 102:3
135:15 137:8	scenario 119:24	121:24 122:20	separate 33:7 71:2	severally 76:8
rights 34:22 66:9	SCG 20:14 29:4	123:4,7 125:25	71:3,12,15 72:18	shape 87:8 89:6
113:15	81:5 84:15,19,23	128:6 129:18,24	73:24 74:1,6	share 8:25 13:23,24
ring 37:19	86:19,25 89:19,20	136:1	106:5 111:1 122:7	14:5 39:1 103:12
rise 62:13 81:8	92:15,15,16,21	seeing 11:10 43:3	128:12 131:25	106:21 110:9
86:19 92:11 95:22	schedule 50:2,3	109:4 113:23	separately 63:10	shared 63:9 94:4
96:25 97:3	schedules 56:25	seek 18:11 47:4	71:10 72:10	shareholder 4:24
risk 101:11	scheme 64:20,24,25	71:11 103:23	128:12 132:19	5:19 6:25 8:11
risks 121:6	schemes 97:13	113:3,18 118:19	September 15:24	9:17
role 50:16 62:10,10	Schwartz 92:20	118:21 133:6	99:24 131:7	shareholders 3:18
L				

			1	I
4:16 6:12 7:11,14	22:17 29:17 30:3	solicitor 90:23	spectacles 75:21	13:17 22:4 24:6
17:3 117:20,21	34:7 36:1 40:9	solicitors 19:13,15	speedy 63:1,1	24:13 26:3,11,14
118:13,22 119:15	42:8 44:4 49:1	solution 35:4 36:4	spoken 12:21	31:24 33:19 48:2
135:13	50:5,10 62:8	solvency 14:1,4,7,8	spot 61:2	53:7,8 58:18 63:3
shareholders'	64:24 67:24 68:1	14:11,14,17,18	stage 16:17 17:1	64:20 80:3 81:21
14:24	69:15 70:5 76:14	122:25	21:18,24 22:2,3	82:10 86:5,7,8
shares 13:25 14:6	87:25 93:16 94:7	solvent 6:5,8 14:19	22:19 41:1 82:5	94:17 95:5,10
39:2	94:16 97:18	somebody 42:8	82:11,13,19 85:18	99:22 101:20
short 2:24 10:14	123:25 136:19	72:1 86:3	stages 8:5 51:25	113:21 118:9
51:17 55:5,17	sine 131:8	somewhat 107:9	stakeholders 21:25	step 52:6 88:25
56:15 63:12 73:11	single 1:12 14:22	sonorous 12:21	stance 118:15	122:18 123:12,15
89:22 98:2 104:22	21:13 49:23 51:22	soon 63:5 132:6	stand 54:25 68:14	steps 16:19,22 19:3
105:20 131:5	51:23 70:12 76:2	sorry 2:2 3:13	standing 79:21,24	52:10,13 111:15
135:3 137:11	sit 40:8 90:14	17:13 50:15 58:7	82:15,24 87:25	111:25 112:2,7
shortfall 32:22	sitting 25:11 31:15	60:16 72:4 74:20	93:8 96:25	116:24 121:15
35:10 38:20 45:25	105:5	92:17 104:11	start 18:5 39:9 65:4	122:11 123:5,11
57:22 58:6,10,16	situation 104:19	127:13	73:13	125:7 137:25
58:17,22 59:14	108:4 109:8	sort 26:7 30:10	started 36:1 90:24	138:1
78:3,7,8,8 81:21	situations 97:5	46:2 47:9 49:23	starting 35:2 76:13	stipulated 47:19
81:25 82:5 85:25	six 30:25	50:5 51:10,25	startling 10:18	stone 3:16
104:1	sixth 121:16	54:23 58:20 59:15	starts 31:14 40:21	stop 85:12 87:13,25
shortfalls 35:10	size 24:20 26:8	60:19 69:19 75:14	54:22	117:23
shorthand 50:14	skeleton 17:23	87:8,22,24 88:9	state 2:5 78:12 83:5	stopping 82:16
shortly 62:15	27:13,21 36:20,22	88:11 92:23 96:4	stated 32:19 62:16	straight 96:4 119:2
show 2:13 16:4	37:1 73:12 76:18	97:4 106:11 126:1	62:17	straightforward
40:23 72:3 92:23	76:21 77:10 79:23	126:2 127:6 128:5	statement 14:1,4,7	133:3
114:12 124:9	80:23 103:5	130:14 131:21,22	14:8,11,14,17,18	strength 106:13
shown 28:12	110:23 111:8	135:22 136:4	19:18 20:9,21	strengthens 81:13
shut 28:19 66:18	114:2 119:10	sorts 10:15 43:21	21:1 31:12 32:5,6	stressing 94:18
side 13:8 107:8	127:10,14	97:12 116:1	32:9 33:5 36:16	strike 29:10 65:12
sign 4:15 5:17	skeletons 25:4	132:16	36:17 37:13 71:20	string 107:2
12:17	30:18 36:14,19	sought 20:19 25:22	71:21 72:19 74:5	stringent 44:10
signed 137:7	39:23 48:14 62:16		74:7 76:17 80:25	stronger 66:3
significance 80:25	63:19 69:16 70:1	110:20	91:17 93:10 98:10	67:18
significant 29:15	skip 115:21	sounds 56:9 66:16	98:16 99:17 101:3	struck 56:18
34:18 39:14 46:3	slight 69:19	sparse 71:16	101:25 106:11	structure 30:6
52:6 80:14 101:19	slightly 22:14 32:2	speaking 90:22	115:9 116:14	47:18 60:21 68:3
113:11,13 121:2,3	69:2 72:17 119:8	special 13:25 17:6	121:16 124:11	74:13 75:7
121:7	128:11,17	18:1 101:2	statements 17:25	stupid 45:21
signing 137:6	slim 104:21	species 26:16	20:7 36:13 54:24	subdebt 77:6,8,8
silver-tongued 68:6	small 31:20 57:25	specific 22:20	55:5,6 69:17,25	subject 1:15 2:11
similar 118:14	79:13	75:17 91:21	135:1 States 104:10	4:1 9:6 35:1
127:23	snookered 85:1,17	100:17 111:24	States 104:10	57:12 58:23 61:17
similarity 127:24	Snowden 128:1,18	112:2 113:4 114:5	status 29:21 105:11	78:25 100:6 104:9
similarly 71:7	so-called 7:10	116:3	statute 23:7,8	105:10 122:15
simply 11:12 14:15 14:16 16:18 21:21	Socimer 60:7	specifically 113:1 116:17	67:16 118:2	124:21 submission 41:23
14.10 10.10 21.21	solely 29:6	110.1/	statutory 5:15	SUDINISSIUN 41.23
	1		1	ı

61:21 63:12 65:3	suit 11:2	123:3,6 130:13	76:2 106:7 107:17	Thanks 91:10
71:7 103:14 117:2	sum 1:24 113:11	134:13 136:21	107:19 109:10	theoretical 26:15
submissions 1:6	summaries 36:9,11	surely 41:18	116:25 121:15	27:1
2:21 10:10 18:8	summarise 69:17	surface 97:17	122:12 125:2	theoretically 17:8
22:6 33:20 41:6	76:19,23	surplus 1:15,16,19	132:25 138:1	86:13
68:19,25 73:8	summarised 31:11	3:2,3,4 7:10 8:2,8	takes 35:23 36:20	theory 95:18
77:24 83:11,13,16	37:10 62:1 87:17	9:1,8 24:20 26:13	50:6 52:2 55:16	thesis 13:2
98:1 110:14	103:5	28:4 78:12 81:25	96:5	thing 2:14,18,22
125:16 139:3,4,5	summarises 32:6	82:6,12 85:5,7,25	tangible 113:17	5:9 16:18 22:21
139:6,7,8	36:14 74:7	86:4 95:8,13 96:1	targeted 9:25 10:23	36:12 57:23 87:13
submit 78:18 79:11	summary 37:13,23	124:3 135:14	task 17:6 70:3	89:18 106:9 126:8
89:12 92:7 97:2	62:3 73:14 116:10	surprising 29:10	107:15	128:22,25 129:2
98:5 103:18	summons 108:5	79:2	tasked 114:15	130:19 131:10,15
109:15	sums 51:23 113:9	surrender 105:25	tax 80:12	133:7,25
submitted 32:15	116:4,6 121:2,3	109:1	team 72:11	things 8:1 15:24
subordinated 19:9	129:9	surrendering 62:7	tell 28:17 30:17	27:9 52:5,8 54:25
19:23 28:6,7 38:2	supplied 1:7	survive 5:25 7:4,5	45:22 66:6 71:14	63:4 67:13 83:5
38:4 58:20	suppliers 99:7,10	11:16 12:1	104:16 105:4,6	93:21 108:16
subordination 58:1	support 7:15 10:21	surviving 11:13	130:10 134:19,20	121:11,12 125:18
subparagraphs	19:14 20:2 63:8	suspects 80:15	137:11	126:7 131:11
103:7 116:5	93:4 111:15	suspended 32:2	ten 50:6	136:9
subsequently 122:2	114:20 116:21	systems 79:9	tension 24:9,25	think 2:10 5:3 9:10
subset 8:14	121:17		term 45:20 54:10	9:20 10:4 11:17
subsidiaries 124:25	supported 13:25	T	terminate 55:10,12	12:2 15:8,16,16
substance 2:18	14:4,6	tab 19:20 20:9,25	55:17	16:7,14,18 17:1,3
24:2,19 25:23	supporting 110:21	31:13 32:10 72:5	terminated 38:23	17:14,18,22 18:23
93:18	supportive 7:1	92:18 98:16	terms 28:20 37:22	22:13,13,15,19
substantial 99:7	supports 40:20	111:11 114:13	37:24 52:6 60:22	23:14 24:12 27:10
succeeded 84:22	suppose 30:2 54:14	115:9	61:25 62:11,21	27:25 28:2 29:21
succeeds 82:14	68:10 70:21 72:20	table 99:5 120:1	68:11 71:18 72:17	30:20 31:7,13
success 82:7,8	75:9,12 122:12	take 16:19 17:6	79:4 84:10,11	36:24 41:2,4 43:7
95:24,25	supposes 79:6	19:3,19 20:2	93:23 98:4,14	43:13,16,18,20
successful 85:23	supposing 15:11	30:21 35:11 37:16	99:14,19 102:14	45:17,23 47:12
sudden 135:20	27:4	39:5 44:23 45:1	103:3 104:3	48:21,22 50:19,22
suddenly 119:23	Supreme 24:22,23	45:24 48:18 50:19	112:20 125:7	51:20 56:14,21
136:17	25:8 28:14 35:8	51:24 54:5 57:13	131:22	57:9,18,19 58:12
suffer 85:19	35:20 36:1,8,10	58:3 65:8,15,25	test 2:11 30:3 41:13	59:1,6,23 60:5,6
suffice 10:22	37:6 65:15 79:22	69:7,24 76:14	73:14 103:19	60:11,15 61:2,4
sufficient 10:11	80:10 81:22 83:8	83:24 89:20 91:8	tests 30:10,11	61:14,22 62:5,16
28:4 42:20,22	83:11 84:2 86:12	98:15 107:18	73:20	64:14 65:1 66:23
43:7 69:21	88:4 89:9 133:21	111:15 112:7	thank 10:10 22:11	67:19 68:21 69:1
suggest 79:2	sure 8:8,9 10:5	115:3,25 122:18	30:16 45:16 46:1	69:6,13,21 70:14
130:20,22 131:13	28:7 43:4 44:8	123:11,15,16	72:15,16 73:5,6	70:16,20 71:18,24
131:17	47:6 56:4,16	125:7 134:5	97:23 110:13	71:25 72:17 78:2
suggested 44:21	65:20 71:13 92:18	136:11	115:12 121:23	78:6,25 83:24
suggests 63:19	104:6,8 105:11	taken 4:19,20	125:13,14 137:20	84:3,14 87:1,2
suicidal 68:13	117:16 119:7	20:17 71:4,11	138:7	90:3,10,18 91:3
00.10	11,110 11,11	,	100.,	20.0,20,10 21.0

04.11.14.102.4.7	00.5.00.4.444.6	10.2.4.24.2.4.4	TD 120 24	
94:11,14 103:4,7	88:5 92:1 111:3	18:3,4 21:8,14	Ts 130:24	understands 51:5
104:17 106:10	tomorrow 83:10	22:13 23:8,14,17	turn 11:1 24:16	understood 87:21
108:8 120:9	90:7 136:16 137:3	23:20 27:2,10	47:16 73:12 78:2	undertaken 104:25
122:10 123:1	top 26:5 63:18,19	28:1 29:24 44:14	115:8 116:15	undertaking 2:12
125:22 127:9,11	104:16	44:15 61:8 73:7,8	124:10 127:14	4:1
128:1,17 131:3	total 124:16	73:9,17 74:11,21	turning 42:9 72:21	undoubtedly 29:15
132:3,9,20 134:21	Toube 1:3,4,25	75:10,16 76:4,12	turns 80:24	unfair 104:2
135:5,14 136:9	2:21,22 3:8,10,12	76:21,23 77:11	two 1:12 5:10,12	105:16
137:7	6:2,7 7:15,20,25	78:2,6 81:4 83:10	6:3 12:3 19:5	unfairly 118:23
thinking 75:3,16	8:5,19,23 9:3,8,14	83:18,21,24 84:18	28:19 29:3,4 33:1	unfortunately
78:15 84:4,5 91:4	10:2,7 11:6,9,19	84:21,24 85:2,6	34:2,25 35:1	111:10
94:20 126:1	12:2,6,13 13:9,22	85:10,18,23 86:2	49:21 52:8,21,24	United 104:10
127:13,15 128:20	14:24 15:2,5,7	87:8,17,21 88:3	57:24 58:15 60:3	unlikelihood 81:14
thinks 77:22	16:5,18 17:9,17	88:11,17 89:8,20	70:2 76:4 77:24	87:23
122:24	90:20,22 91:3	89:24 90:1,8,10	79:25 82:4 94:21	unpaid 98:21
third 1:10 34:15	111:20,23 121:20	90:13 91:15 92:16	94:22 95:3 100:16	unprovable 26:16
94:24,25 99:7,10	121:24 125:16,17	93:7,13 94:1,7,14	127:10,15,24	unreasonable
117:14	125:23 126:10,20	94:25 95:3 96:13	128:4 130:24	117:11
thirsting 16:3	126:25 137:20,22	96:18,21,24 97:11	131:24 136:9	unsecured 31:23
thought 17:5 18:4	138:2 139:3,8	97:20 104:9,13,16	type 106:17 108:9	48:7 98:20 99:3
26:6 28:2 47:16	Toube's 33:20 68:6	105:10,14 127:9		99:22 101:20
55:22 56:10 58:25	112:10 121:19	127:13,19 128:25	U	113:12 124:15,18
59:10,24 60:2,12	touched 35:16	129:5,8,20,25	ultimate 75:17,24	124:23 125:3
60:20 65:11 76:14	44:24 77:23	130:4,12,15,20	88:22	unspecified 121:8
129:2 136:1,2	traders 99:8	131:3,24 132:3,16	ultimately 1:15	unsubordinated
threats 87:10	transaction 16:21	133:1,3,17,20,23	10:15 13:1 76:2	19:10 124:16,23
three 17:25 51:1	19:2 30:22 37:11	134:1,3,7,16	96:7 135:13	125:3
58:20 94:19,21	37:15,22 39:3	135:16,24 136:7	uncertainty 83:23	unusual 5:17 88:8
time 1:10 2:7 3:5	46:4 50:19 60:15	136:15,23 137:8,9	uncollateralised	88:9
10:5 15:23 25:12	69:22 72:12	137:14,17 138:3	38:19	update 102:8
29:18 51:15 52:7	102:11 103:8	139:5	uncollaterallised	updates 21:10
53:3 54:16 55:5	114:5	true 13:10	103:25	upheld 35:20
55:17 56:17 68:22	transactions 18:14	trust 62:4 70:12	uncomfortable	upset 70:9
84:8 88:21 90:6	99:15 106:20	75:9 107:8 108:4	88:10	use 13:15 64:14
90:16 97:16 121:8	109:10	108:21 127:6	unconnected 71:2	78:22
134:21 135:23	transcript 135:1	trustee 105:24	undermine 30:6	useful 37:23 114:12
136:3 137:22	transcripts 1:6	128:6	93:2	117:6 121:17
times 17:21 124:8	transfer 39:1,1	trustees 75:11	underpins 25:25	usual 20:4 70:21
timing 84:10	103:12 106:21	try 30:22 35:3	understand 1:25	127:17 128:11
130:10	110:9	56:19 57:5 70:4	11:19 12:2 13:9	131:5
tiny 21:21	travelling 10:12	113:20 118:19	17:17 20:17 29:3	
tip 97:14	treatment 104:4	120:10	42:13 43:3 91:3	V
today 19:6,13	trial 128:14	trying 1:11 28:23	96:7 106:25 107:1	v 27:19,23 80:9
90:25	trigger 47:18	36:3 40:1 42:9	107:4 112:9	82:7 83:20 86:9
today's 134:25	troubled 126:22	47:9 54:8 61:1	113:22 118:2	94:21 95:11,24,25
told 28:15,16,17	troubling 94:15	69:23 107:6	120:19 129:25	valuation 64:21
31:7 65:14,22	Trower 7:20 11:10	110:25	130:4	65:11,12 66:11,12
31.7 03.1 1,22	210,,01 /.20 11.10	110.20		,
	•	•	•	•

			I	I
66:15 89:1	want 22:3 41:3	126:1 132:19	118:14	worry 49:5
value 46:17 64:22	43:1,6,14 50:18	135:10	wishes 44:9 113:19	worse 55:8
66:6 80:20 125:1	56:14 60:6 93:3	ways 74:24 82:18	120:12	worst 32:20
125:4	94:23 105:18	weather 17:13	wishing 41:25	worth 35:22 94:18
values 38:13	110:1 112:22	website 20:6 21:19	103:24 135:5	101:13 130:1
vanishing 12:8	123:2,25,25 127:4	23:22 29:6,9,9	withdraw 100:12	134:22 135:23
various 9:24 18:14	127:8 130:17	91:21,24,25 92:3	100:18	worthy 43:25
25:23 26:20 29:25	wanted 66:7 94:12	102:2,10	withdrawal 100:3,8	107:17
30:19 33:9 36:9	94:18 122:9 123:3	Wednesbury 30:11	101:4,15 103:10	wouldn't 8:3 15:22
36:11 46:12,15	125:25 128:25	Wednesbury-like	110:8,10	48:25 69:12 90:1
49:13 52:20 54:20	129:25 134:13	107:21	withdrawing 38:17	123:10
54:21 64:1 67:6	135:21	Wednesbury-type	witness 17:25	wrapped 120:5
76:3 82:18 107:10	wants 25:18 44:9	108:12	19:17 20:7,8,21	writers 50:14
115:22 120:22	warning 43:2	Wednesday 136:17	31:12 32:9 36:13	written 83:15
124:24	wasn't 82:11	137:3	36:16 37:13 69:16	130:2
verify 109:13	wasting 135:23	week 3:10 15:25	69:25 71:19 74:4	wrong 16:4 66:2
version 28:13	water 9:22 71:5	83:9 136:10	74:6 76:16 80:24	72:22 75:8 84:17
126:13	Waterfall 20:16	weekend 71:22	91:16 93:10 98:9	127:5 133:25
versions 112:16	24:23 26:17 27:5	72:19 111:9	98:16 99:17 101:3	
vesting 63:15	32:19 33:22 34:6	weeks' 47:15	106:11 115:9	X
vexed 59:19	38:6,22,22 39:17	weighed 120:23	121:16 124:11	
view 30:20 36:23	39:19 57:20 59:20	weight 10:25 109:6	135:1	Y
64:6 65:16,18,25	62:22 71:1,6 81:1	Weil 19:15	wonder 9:24 30:8	year 35:2 83:23,25
77:16 89:19 94:10	83:6 94:13 114:16	welcome 11:3	50:13	102:2
99:14,15 103:4,9	119:12,17 120:3,6	132:6	wondered 107:13	years 25:8 120:6
109:24 117:1	124:22 130:11	went 80:17 81:11	108:1	York 20:15 29:4
120:8,24 121:12	waters 13:11	136:20	wondering 45:7	61:6,7,9,9 78:22
views 72:8	way 2:17 4:6 5:5,23	Wentworth 19:21	105:20 135:23	78:23,25 79:1,3,8
virtually 103:15	7:9 12:3 14:16	45:9 54:6 57:14	word 125:19 135:8	104:13,14
voice 12:21	20:4 21:18,23	77:5 84:21,22	wording 9:14 16:7	-Z
volume 20:9,25	23:3 24:22 25:7	Wentworth's 38:1	59:2 125:24 126:4	
31:13 37:17,18	27:23 28:9 33:24	whichever 58:10	words 53:8 54:2	Zacaroli 84:20
46:7 72:5 114:13	33:25 34:22 38:11	Whilst 72:11	78:17 96:21	zero 77:15 100:15
voluntary 79:1,1	42:20 43:19 44:13	wider 34:3,9	work 5:10 10:4	0
105:10	44:21 51:6 52:18	113:24 120:16	11:4 51:6 58:12	
voting 123:12	58:11 64:24 67:15	widest 34:4	93:22 96:6,8	1
	67:20,25 69:17	wind 130:25	107:6 136:4	1 1:19 10:21 17:19
W	70:3,21 71:5 75:7	winding 118:3	worked 45:18	19:4 20:9,23,25
W3 92:19	75:9,16 81:5,10	wink 42:23	131:11	31:13 35:7,14,23
wages 98:21	81:14 84:7,9	winning 86:20	working 8:7,7,21	37:21,25 45:24
wait 56:2 65:6	92:10,22,22,25	wisdom 106:4	55:4,8 129:13	52:15 68:4 72:5
67:22 68:2 119:16	93:2 94:20 95:6	123:23	works 50:19 85:21	98:16 110:21
waive 47:20	96:6,8 97:18	wise 134:17	world 66:18 88:2,2	111:17,21 112:22
waived 47:20	103:2,16 104:18	wish 17:24 40:5	88:9 121:5	113:2,8 114:13
waiver 45:9 46:22	108:7 111:7 114:3	113:25 118:18	worlds 75:7	116:17,21 117:8
waives 77:5	114:5 118:19,25	123:4 133:10	worried 4:4 12:6	117:17,19 121:11
wand 9:12	124:4 125:22	wished 16:6 113:5	12:10,11	121:12,13,14
			·	121.12,13,11

122:1,11/2,12,223 218:15 19:6,14,20 34.3 100:9 34.3 100:9 37:6,6,10,21,24 38:7 39:13 46:13 34.5 100:17 101:8 37:6,6,10,21,24 38:7 39:13 46:13 35:16,5 129:21 122:16 139:3 35:91.6 35:2,24,25 648 35:99:16 36:0,24 36:1,2 18:4 83:14 36:0,24 36:1,2 18:4 83:14 36:0,24 36:1,2 18:4 83:14 36:0,24 38:7 39:13 38:25 35:1,2 16:1,2 18:3 19 2.00 91:11,14 2.88 81:8 32:2,1 18:3 19 2.00 91:11,14 2.88 81:8 33:61:5 39:36:15 39:3		Ī	Ī	İ	1
126.8 37.6.6.10.2.1.24 38.7 39:13 46:13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39:13 46:13 34.5 100:17 101:8 52:16.23 53:1 57:24 58:2 69:18 71:17 72:14 15:129:21 12:16 139:3 36.0:24 36.2.1 81:4 83:14 61.36:19 2.88 81:8 38.36:15 38.36:15 39:11 2.88 81:8 38.36:15 55:24.2.5 61.45:36.7 61.55:36.89 10.00 1:2 2008 42:18 30.30 131:2 2011 12:9:11 2014 98:24 99:2.12 2008 42:18 20.2 31:2 2016 115:14 43.26.10 37:17.18 79:20 101:19 2017 1:1 99:24 43.26.10 37:17.18 79:20 101:19 2017 1:1 99:24 43.26.10 37:17.18 79:20 101:19 21.20:23 32:5 33:2 11.45 51:16 21.20:23 32:5 33:2 11.10:19 139:7 23.127:15.18 127:23 41.10 139:7 23.127:15.18 127:23 41.10 139:7 24.10 14.12 199:22 11.45 51:16 11.52 24.10 14.12 10.2.8 43.37:11 10.2:5 66.5 33:4.5 66.5 33:5 67.33:5 67.33:5 67.33:5 67.39:6 68.90:3 40.22 10.2.2 124:13 43.19:20 13.19:20 101:25	122:1,11,21,22,23	2 18:15 19:6,14,20	34.2 100:9	6	8 32:9 38:22 98:16
126.8 37.6.6,10,21,24 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 34.4 100:10 34.4 100:10 38.7 39.13 46.13 36.2.2 81.17 10.13 36.2.2 81.17 86.16 36.2.2 81.17 86.16 36.2.2 81.17 86.15 36.2.2 81.17 86.15 39.3 66.1	123:5 124:2 126:7	35:18,24 36:4,7	34.3 100:9	6 32:8 38:16 48:3	98:24 99:17
1.00 1:12 38:7 39:13 46:13 34.5 100:17 101:8 64:10 13:22 55:22.42.5 56:40:10 13:22 55:22.24.25 56:40:10 13:22 55:24 53:59:10 50:22 24:35 53:12 36.2.2 81:17 86:16 56:37 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:24 58:25 57:25	126:8	37:6,6,10,21,24	34.4 100:10		115:13 135:15
1.3 12 12.5 63:22,42,5 64:8 69:18 71:11 72:14	1.00 91:12	38:7 39:13 46:13	34.5 100:17 101:8	The state of the s	
1.4 31:10	1.3 121:25	63:22,24,25 64:8	35 99:16		
1.5 129:21	1.4 31:10	69:18 71:11 72:14	36 80:24	` ' ` '	9 20:25 31:13 38:25
1.66 p9:3,12 2.00 91:11,14 2.88 81:8 38 36:15 38 36:15 53:12 102:9 20.2 31:21 39 36:15 39 36:15 53:12 102:9 2008 42:18 39 36:15 38 77:12 10.30 131:2 2011 129:11 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2014 129:12 2017 1:1 99:24 43 23:6,10 37:17,18 39 39:16 46:7 43 29:6 40 35:16 101:4 43 23:6,10 37:17,18 39 39:16 46:7 43 129:6 40 35:16 101:4 43 23:6,10 37:17,18 39 39:16 46:7 43 129:6 40 35:16 101:4 43 23:17 127:15,18 116 33 7 217:15,18 118 54:7 24 1:1 43 37:11 102:5 44 37:10 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 44 37:12 102:8 45 102:9 101:25 31 1:2 27 49:17 21 29:7,8 27 73:19 21 20:16 22 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:17,18 23 83:18 38:9 46:10 52 83:17 127:13 31 49:21 33 36:15 99:18 10:18 116:16 33 A 117:15 54 36:15 33 149:21 37:2 111:11 37:2 33 36:15 99:18 10:18 116:16 33 A 117:15 54 36:15 39 30:115 39 30:115 55:36.8,9 61.55:30:8,9 96 103:12 96 103:12 96 103:12 96 103:12 97 139:6 64:57 64.53:2 66.55:34.5 66.55	1.5 129:21	122:16 139:3	36.2.1 81:4 83:14	` ' ` '	
1.8 31:19 2.88 81:8 20 31:12 39 36:15 33 36:15 36:15 5:24,25 92 104:1 92 104:1 93 390 31:15 61.54:14,17 55:13 9.2 104:1 93 103:12 900 31:23 93 390 31:15 61.54:14,17 55:13 9.2 104:1 93 103:12 9.2 104:1 93 103:12 9.2 104:1 93 103:12 9.2 104:1 93 103:12 90 77:17 61.53:68,9 6.15.5:68,9 6.15.5:68,9 6.15.5:68,9 6.15.5:68,9 6.15.5:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.55:16 6.53:4:17 7.7 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:17 75:18 75:18 77:18 77:18 77:18 77:18 77:18 77:19 77:19 77:19	1.66p 99:3,12	2.00 91:11,14	36.2.2 81:17 86:16		
10 32:24 33:5 39:1 53:12 102:9 20.2 31:21 2008 42:18 2008 42:18 2010 32:21 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2016 115:14 99:20 101:19 11 198 102:14 2017 1:1 99:24 21 127:21 21.45 51:16 21.50 51:18 21.50 51:18 21.50 51:18 21.50 51:18 22 33:17 127:15,18 23 13:12 23 31:12 24 hour 97:18 24 hour 97:18 24 hour 97:18 21 15:22 23 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 27 31:12 29 3:12 101:4 21 29:32 31:12 29 3:12 101:4 21 29:32 31:12 21 393 6:15 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:16 39 3:1	1.8 31:19	2.88 81:8	38 36:15	` ' ' '	
53:12 102:9 20.2 31:21 2008 42:18 390 31:15 6.14 53:67, 6.15 53:6,8,9 9.6 103:13 9.6 103:13 900 77:17 9.6 103:13 <	10 32:24 33:5 39:1	20 31:12	39 36:15	l '	
10.00 1:2 2008 42:18 2011 129:11 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2016 115:14 38:9 39:16 46:7 4.3 129:6 4.3 110:24 1.0 12:4 1.	53:12 102:9	20.2 31:21	390 31:15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
10.3 13 12 2014 98:24 99:2,12 2016 115:14 432:6,10 37:17,18 38:9 39:16 46:7 43:12 29:22 11.45 51:16 127:23 127:15,18 118 54:7 24 11 18 54:7 24 11 18 54:7 24 11 18 54:7 24 11 18 54:7 24 11 22 23 25 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 47 100:12 53 21:12 21:14 21:12 22 31:12 22 31:12 23 34:17 16 33 34:17 16 33 34 17:15 33 34 17:15 33 34 17:15 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	10.00 1:2	2008 42:18	3A 77:12	l '	9.6 103:13
100 p 31:23 98:19 2016 115:14 2017 1:1 99:24 119:8 102:14 104:12 129:22 127:21 11.45 51:16 22 35:17 127:15,18 127:23 110 139:7 23 127:15,18 127:23 110 139:7 24 hour 97:18 118 54:7 24 hour 97:18 118 54:7 24 hour 97:18 115:22 27 49:17 27 49:17 27 49:17 27 49:17 27 31:16 27 73:19 6 13 19:20 101:25 102:16 23 127:16 134 61:5 102:22 124:13 13 19:20 101:25 102:22 124:13 13 19:20 101:25 102:22 124:13 13 19:20 133:8 31 19:20 13 18 138:8 16 73:12,13 16 56:56:9 17 126 114:14 18 139:4 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 37:2 1986 18:19 33 34 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 33 33:16 69:25 37 2.8 80:16 16 3.75 25:16 6.2 56:1 6.3 54:17	10.30 131:2	2011 129:11			
100	100 32:21	2014 98:24 99:2,12			95 125:3
99:20 101:19 11 19:8 102:14 104:12 129:22 11.45 51:16 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 11.50 51:18 127:23 24 1:1 24 1:1 24 1:1 25 37:13 25 111 10:25 24 1:1 25 33:12 26 46:7 98:18 27 49:17 29 31:21 101:4 115:22 27 49:17 27 129:7,8 277 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 13 19:20 101:25 102:16 13 461:5 102:22 124:13 14 56:2 101:25 102:22 124:13 14 56:7,9 15 13 19:20 101:25 102:21 124:13 14 56:7,9 15 13 19:20 15 14:9,15 3.18 138:8 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 17 72:6 114:14 18 139:4 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 37:2 1986 18:19 33	100p 31:23 98:19	2016 115:14	4 32:6,10 37:17,18		
11 19:8 102:14 21 20:23 32:5 33:2 4.3 129:6 6.4 53:2 6.5 53:4,5 6.5 53:4,5 6.5 53:4,5 6.6 53:5 6.7 53:5 6.8 53:5 6.1 20:22 20:4.4 44 37:12 102:8 47 102:16 475 100:23 47 102:10 475 100:23 47 102:10 62 238:21 46:2 58:5 77:22 63 31:16,22 46:3 67 39:6 68 90:3 68 90:3 72 20:8 32:8 38:18 46:21 53:22 54:3 72:5 55:15:15 52:12 72.5 55:15:15 52:12 72.5 55:15:15 52:12 <td>99:20 101:19</td> <td>2017 1:1 99:24</td> <td>38:9 39:16 46:7</td> <td></td> <td>99 54:7 57:14</td>	99:20 101:19	2017 1:1 99:24	38:9 39:16 46:7		99 54:7 57:14
104:12 129:22 127:21 22 35:17 127:15,18 106:10 107:2 6.5 53:4,5 6.6 53:5 11.50 51:18 127:23 41 101:24 6.7 53:5 6.6 53:5 118 54:7 24 1:1 42 35:16 118:1 6.7 53:5 6.7 53:5 119 58:7 24 hour 97:18 43 37:11 102:5 6.8 53:5 6.8 53:5 11h 20:21,25 25 73:13 43 37:11 102:5 6.8 53:5 6.8 53:5 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 45 102:9 62 38:21 46:2 58:5 77:22 125 139:8 27 49:17 270 31:16 76:21 102:20 76:21 102:20 125 139:8 277 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 531:13 38:9 46:10 52:8,8,9 57:24 53:13 38:9 46:10 134 61:5 338:8 39:14 46:7 33:15 59:12 55:52:13 72:5 98:17 114:13 143 19:20 31 49:21 51:52:10 59:12 52:55:21:3 73:29 15 14:9,15 31 49:21 32 36:16,25 49:22 73:20:9 74:49:21 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 99:16 33 36:15 99:18 70:39:9 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 A 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16 1986 18:19 33 43:6:6 99:25 57.2 80:16	11 19:8 102:14	21 20:23 32:5 33:2			
11.45 51:16 22 35:17 127:15,18 10 10 107:2 41 101:24 46.6 53:5 6.6 53:5 6.7 53:5 6.8 53:5 77:22 90:22 90:4.4 43 7:12 102:8 45 102:9 47 102:16 47 102:16 48 37:13 76:17,20 76:21 102:20 76:21 102:20 76:21 102:20 76:21 102:20 76:21 102:20 77:22 68 90:3 77 720:8 32:8 38:18 46:21 53:22 54:3 72:5 98:17 114:13 135:15 131:11 111:11 51 52:10 59:12 55:5 52:13 72:5 98:17 114:13 135:15 71.47:19 72.247:22 73.20:9 73.20:9 73.20:9 74.49:21 70.39:9 74.49:21 70.39:9 70.43	104:12 129:22	127:21			
11.50 51:18 127:23 23 127:15,18 42 35:16 118:1 6.7 53:5 6.8 53:5 118 54:7 24 1:1 43 37:11 102:5 60 37:14 74:6 61 20:22 90:4,4 118 52:7 24-hour 97:18 44 37:12 102:8 45 102:9 61 20:22 90:4,4 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 45 102:9 63 31:16 (22 290:4,4 129 31:2 101:4 115:22 475 100:23 76:21 102:20 125 139:8 270 31:16 273 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 127 129:7,8 27 77:10 99:6 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 5 134 61:5 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 52:8,8,9 57:24 134 56:2 101:25 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 55:52:13 14 39:20 31 81 38:8 50 72:7 101:24 135:15 14 39:20 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 72.47:22 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 16 56:9 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 70 99:16 70 99:16 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 70 99:25 70 99:4 1986 18:19 33 36:16 99:25 70 99:4 70 99:4 115:4 70 99:4 70 99:4 115:4 70 99:4 70 99:4 115:4 70 99:4<	11.45 51:16	22 35:17 127:15,18	106:10 107:2	,	
110 139:7 23 127:15,18 24 1:1 43 37:11 102:5 68 53:5 115 58:7 24-hour 97:18 43 37:11 102:5 61 20:22 90:4,4 11th 20:21,25 25 73:13 45 102:9 61 20:22 90:4,4 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 45 102:9 62 38:21 46:2 58:5 129 3:12 101:4 115:22 475 100:23 63 31:16,22 46:3 125 139:8 270 31:16 27 34:19 48 37:13 76:17,20 76:21 102:20 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 5 531:13 38:9 46:10 130:16 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 5 531:13 38:9 46:10 52:8,8 9 57:24 13th 28:15 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 15:9;2,12 111:11 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 51.5 52:13 72:998:17 114:13 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 55.5 52:13 72:47:22 15 14:9,15 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 1673:12,13 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 18 139:4 76:18,21 98:10 70 39:9 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 37:2 33 40:16 99:25 77:20:20 1986 18:19 33 31:16,22 46:3	11.50 51:18	127:23	41 101:24		
118 54:7 24 hour 97:18 43 37:11 102:5 44 37:12 102:8 61 20:22 90:4,4 61 20:22 90:4,4 62 38:21 46:2 58:5 77:22 72:20 90:4,4 62 38:21 46:2 58:5 77:22 72:21 102:8 77:22 72:21 102:20 72:22 90:4,4 72:22 90:4,4 72:22 90:4,4 72:22 90:4,4 72:23 8:11 6:2 58:5 77:22 72:22 90:4,4 72:23 8:11 6:2 58:5 77:22 97:102:20 72:22 90:4,4 72:23 8:11 6:2 58:5 77:22 97:22 90:4,4 72:23 8:11 6:2 58:5 77:22 93:11 58:11 6:2 58:5 77:22 93:11 58:11 59:2 12 58:11 59:2 12 58:3 72:5 98:17 114:13 13:15 72:14 72:5 98:17 114:13 13:15 72:14 72:5 98:17 114:13 13:15 72:14 72:5 98:17 114:13 13:15 72:14 72:5 98:17 114:13	110 139:7	23 127:15,18	42 35:16 118:1		
119 58:7 24-hour 97:18 44 37:12 102:8 45 102:9 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 47 102:16 47 102:16 1293:12 101:4 115:22 47 102:16 475 100:23 124 58:16 78:9 27 49:17 48 37:13 76:17,20 63 31:16,22 46:3 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 49 102:22 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 24 83:17,18 5 134 61:5 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 52:8,8,9 57:24 72:59 98:17 114:13 145 6:2 101:25 338:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 15:9 5.5 52:13 72:59 98:17 114:13 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 318 138:8 50 72:7 101:24 72 47:22 15 14:9,15 31 49:21 55.5 52:13 70 39:9 16 5 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 70 39:9 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 99:16 72 22:6,8 114:14,21 18 139:4 79:16 72 23 80:16 70 39:9 19 1:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 10:18 116:16 73 72:8 74 31:19 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 77 20:8 32:2 21:4,5 70 39:9 70 44:11 102:20 70 39:9 704 31:15 70 72:2 21:4,5 70 39:9 704 31:15 <td< td=""><td>118 54:7</td><td>24 1:1</td><td>43 37:11 102:5</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	118 54:7	24 1:1	43 37:11 102:5		
11th 20:21,25 25 73:13 45 102:9 31:12 26 46:7 98:18 47 102:16 12 93:12 101:4 115:22 475 100:23 124 58:16 78:9 27 49:17 48 37:13 76:17,20 125 139:8 270 31:16 76:21 102:20 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 49 102:22 12th 28:15 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 5 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 5 102:16 2A 83:17,18 531:13 38:9 46:10 134 61:5 338:8 39:14 46:7 58:1 59:2,12 111:11 52:8,8,9 57:24 58:1 15:9 58:8 115:9 15 14:9,15 31.8 138:8 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 33A 117:15 37:2 33A 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16 72 418:19 81:19	119 58:7	24-hour 97:18	44 37:12 102:8		
31:12 26 46:7 98:18 115:22 47 102:16 77:22 124 58:16 78:9 27 49:17 48 37:13 76:17,20 68 90:3 125 139:8 270 31:16 277 34:19 49 102:22 76:21 102:20 68 90:3 12th 28:15 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 29 77:10 99:6 29 77:10 99:6 5 5 31:13 38:9 46:10 720:8 32:8 38:18 134 61:5 3 338:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 52:8,8,9 57:24 58:1 59:2,12 111:11 134 19:20 58:8 115:9 318 138:8 318 138:8 72:5 98:17 114:13 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 70 39:9 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 70 39:9 18 139:4 99:16 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 70 39:9 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 73 139:5 1986 18:19 33 A 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 74 18:19 81:19	11th 20:21,25	25 73:13	45 102:9		
12 93:12 101:4 115:22 475 100:23 124 58:16 78:9 27 49:17 48 37:13 76:17,20 125 139:8 270 31:16 76:21 102:20 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 49 102:22 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 5 102:16 2A 83:17,18 53:13 38:9 46:10 134 61:5 338:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 58:8 115:9 15 14:9,15 318 138:8 50 72:7 101:24 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 572:6,8 114:14,21 18 139:4 99:16 53 72:8 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 6:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 33A 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	31:12	26 46:7 98:18	47 102:16		
124 58:16 78:9 27 49:17 125 139:8 270 31:16 127 129:7,8 277 34:19 12th 28:15 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 134 61:5 3 13th 28:15 3 1456:2 101:25 38:8 39:14 46:7 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 15 14:9,15 318 138:8 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 18 139:4 99:16 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 33A 117:15 33A 17:15 54 36:15 99:25 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 27 49:17 48 37:13 76:17,20 76:21 102:20 49 102:22 531:13 38:9 46:10 52:8,8,9 57:24 58:1 59:2,12 111:11 51.52:10 59:12 52:2 52:12,12 70.3 20:9 74 49:21 70 39:9 70 43:15 70 39:9 70 43:15 70 39:9 70 43:15 70 39:9 70 44:18 70 3	12 93:12 101:4	115:22	475 100:23		
125 139:8 270 31:16 76:21 102:20 127 129:7,8 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 76:21 102:20 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 77 134 61:5 2A 83:17,18 75:31:13 38:9 46:10 134 61:5 338:8 39:14 46:7 58:1 59:2,12 102:22 124:13 338:8 39:14 46:7 58:1 59:2,12 111:11 51.52:10 59:12 72:5 98:17 114:13 134 19:20 58:8 115:9 73.2 (10:22) 15 14:9,15 31.8 138:8 73.147:19 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 73.20:9 16 5 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 70.4 31:15 18 139:4 76:18,21 98:10 70.4 31:15 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 76:18,21 98:10 70.2 (20:8) 32:8 101:18 116:16 77 720:8 32:8 38:18 105:15 55:212 71.47:19 70 39:9 70.49:21 70 39:9 70.4 31:15 70 9 124:18 7120:22 21:4,5 70 90:4,4 73 139:5 70 13:9:5 74 18:19 81:19	124 58:16 78:9	27 49:17	48 37:13 76:17,20		
127 129:7,8 277 34:19 49 102:22 12th 28:15 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 7 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 5 134 61:5 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 1456:2 101:25 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 15:9 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 5.5 52:13 15 14:9,15 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 50 72:7 101:24 18 139:4 99:16 53 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 33 4 117:15 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	125 139:8	270 31:16	76:21 102:20		
12th 28:15 28 32:5 98:23 116:9 5 13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 5 134 61:5 3 13th 28:15 3 14 56:2 101:25 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 52:8,8,9 57:24 72:5 98:17 114:13 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 53:15 59:12 71:47:19 143 19:20 3.18 138:8 31 49:21 55:5 52:13 71:47:19 1673:12,13 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 72:41:19 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 52 72:6,8 114:14,21 70 39:9 18 139:4 99:16 53 72:8 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 A 117:15 53 G 36:15 73 139:5 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	127 129:7,8	277 34:19	49 102:22	00 70.3	
13 19:20 101:25 29 77:10 99:6 720:8 32:8 38:18 134 61:5 3 338:8 39:14 46:7 720:8 32:8 38:18 14 56:2 101:25 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 159:2,12 111:11 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 58:8 115:9 7.1 47:19 15 14:9,15 31 8138:8 5.5 52:13 7.4 99:21 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 703:99 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 704 31:15 18 139:4 76:18,21 98:10 99:16 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 709:124:18 101:18 116:16 709:124:18 33A 117:15 709:44 34 36:16 99:25 74 18:19 81:19	12th 28:15	28 32:5 98:23 116:9		7	
102:16 2A 83:17,18 53:13 38:9 46:10 46:21 53:22 54:3 13th 28:15 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 72:5 98:17 114:13 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 73:2 143 19:20 3.18 138:8 55:2:10 59:12 7.1 47:19 55:2:13 72:5 98:17 114:13 7.1 47:19 55:2:12,12 7.3 20:9 7.3 20:9 74:247:22 7.3 20:9 7.4 99:21 70 39:9 7.4 99:21 70 39:9 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 70 30:9 704 31:15 709 124:18 <tr< td=""><td>13 19:20 101:25</td><td>29 77:10 99:6</td><td></td><td>7 20:8 32:8 38:18</td><td></td></tr<>	13 19:20 101:25	29 77:10 99:6		7 20:8 32:8 38:18	
134 61:5 3 3 52:8,8,9 57:24 72:5 98:17 114:13 14 56:2 101:25 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 58:1 59:2,12 72:5 98:17 114:13 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 15:9 71.47:19 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 5.1 52:10 59:12 7.2 47:22 15 14:9,15 3.18 138:8 31 49:21 50.72:7 101:24 70.39:9 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 99:16 52.72:6,8 114:14,21 70.9 124:18 18 139:4 99:16 33 36:15 99:18 53 72:8 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 71 20:22 21:4,5 90:4,4 15:4 33A 117:15 56 36:15 74 18:19 81:19 18 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16 74 18:19 81:19	102:16	2A 83:17,18			
3 3 58:1 59:2,12 135:15 14 56:2 101:25 46:10,10 57:16 51 52:10 59:12 7.1 47:19 102:22 124:13 58:8 115:9 7.2 47:22 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 7.3 20:9 15 14:9,15 318 138:8 7.4 99:21 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 76:18,21 98:10 704 31:15 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 704 31:15 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 71 20:22 21:4,5 101:18 116:16 70 39:9 704 31:15 15:4 709 124:18 70 39:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 31:15 70 30:9 704 3	134 61:5			72:5 98:17 114:13	
14 56:2 101:25 3 38:8 39:14 46:7 111:11 7.1 47:19 102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 51 52:10 59:12 7.2 47:22 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 3.18 138:8 7.3 20:9 15 14:9,15 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 165 67:9 76:18,21 98:10 99:16 704 31:15 18 139:4 99:16 704 31:15 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 71 20:22 21:4,5 90:4,4 101:18 116:16 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	13th 28:15	3	,		
102:22 124:13 46:10,10 57:16 58:8 115:9 7.2 47:22 143 19:20 58:8 115:9 3.18 138:8 7.3 20:9 15 14:9,15 3.18 138:8 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 704 31:15 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 704 31:15 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 71 20:22 21:4,5 90:4,4 15:4 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	14 56:2 101:25	3 38:8 39:14 46:7			
143 19:20 58:8 115:9 58:8 115:9 7.3 20:9 15 14:9,15 3.18 138:8 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 704 31:15 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 709:14:18 101:18 116:16 709:22 21:4,5 33A 117:15 709:44 34 36:16 99:25 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	102:22 124:13	46:10,10 57:16			
15 14:9,15 3.18 138:8 5.5 52:13 7.4 99:21 16 73:12,13 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 704 31:15 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 52 72:6,8 114:14,21 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 71 20:22 21:4,5 37:2 101:18 116:16 56 36:15 90:4,4 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	143 19:20	58:8 115:9	'		
16 73:12,13 31 49:21 50 72:7 101:24 70 39:9 165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 76:18,21 98:10 704 31:15 17 72:6 114:14 99:16 52 72:6,8 114:14,21 709 124:18 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 71 20:22 21:4,5 101:18 116:16 33 A 117:15 56 36:15 73 139:5 103 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	15 14:9,15	3.18 138:8			
165 67:9 32 36:16,25 49:22 124:19 17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 52 72:6,8 114:14,21 18 139:4 99:16 53 72:8 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 37:2 101:18 116:16 1986 18:19 34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	16 73:12,13	31 49:21			
17 72:6 114:14 76:18,21 98:10 52 72:6,8 114:14,21 709 124:18 18 139:4 99:16 53 72:8 71 20:22 21:4,5 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 15:4 73 139:5 1986 18:19 33 A 117:15 56 36:15 74 18:19 81:19 57.2 80:16 57.2 80:16	165 67:9	· ·			
18 139:4 99:16 19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 37:2 54 36:17 72:6,7,9 1986 18:19 101:18 116:16 33A 117:15 56 36:15 57.2 80:16 71 20:22 21:4,5 90:4,4 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	17 72:6 114:14	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
19 19:16 20:23 21:1 33 36:15 99:18 101:18 116:16 115:4 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19 57.2 80:16 57.2 80:16 57.2 80:16	18 139:4				
37:2 1986 18:19 33A 117:15 34 36:16 99:25 115:4 56 36:15 57.2 80:16 73 139:5 74 18:19 81:19	19 19:16 20:23 21:1		, ,		
1986 18:19 33A 117:15 56 36:15 57.2 80:16 74 18:19 81:19				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
34 36:16 99:25 57.2 80:16	1986 18:19				
234.1 100:4					
	2	34.1 100:4	59 36:17	8	