| 1 | Monday, 24 July 2017 | 1 | they do what the reserves are for the creditors, will be |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | (10.00 am) | 2 | 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 | that time. |
| 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 | future. |
| 8 | There is one issue on which I would just like some | 8 | MS TOUBE: Not very far in the future. |
| 9 | comfort from you, with apologies that this is now the | 9 | 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 | problem I have had, and to some extent have always had, | 13 | 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 | those powers being to apply to the court for a reduction | 23 | 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 |
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| 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 | for them to exercise their powers as a private company. | 3 | 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 | advance, can they, how they will exercise their powers | 6 | otherwise do, is in a way amplified because it is the |
| 7 | in advance, they must judge it at the time? | 7 | administrators making the payment, but they are always |
| 8 | Furthermore, for it to be a real choice they have to | 8 | making the payment on behalf of the director because |
| 9 | 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 |
| 11 | your test. If you release the money to them subject to | 11 | Lordship no doubt ad nauseam that the question is, is |
| 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 | thing, so it is, in point of substance and possibly in | 18 | 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 |
| 21 | Submissions by MR TOUBE | 21 | 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 |
| 24 | fairly short order, if we get an order from your | 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | administration? | 1 | a frolic of their own doing these things. We know they |
| 2 | 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. |
| 4 | is nothing in the Companies Act which says this is not | 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No. |
| 5 | exercised except for when the company is solvent. | 5 | MS TOUBE: So you have to have gone through these stages, |
| 6 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It does -- | 6 | you have to have gone through the proving process, |
| 7 | MS TOUBE: Outside an insolvency process. So you have to be | 7 | working out who your creditors are, working out what |
| 8 | solvent because otherwise you would not have | 8 | your surplus is, making sure that all your creditors are |
| 9 | distributable profits, but there is nothing that says | 9 | paid or reserved for, making sure that the distribution |
| 10 | there is a bar. | 10 | to members would be for the benefit of the creditors, |
| 11 | The other point is we know that the powers of the | 11 | and then those powers which the director and shareholder |
| 12 | directors and the powers of the shareholders do exist in | 12 | indubitably do still have, we say, those can be |
| 13 | insolvency, so the question is, when can those be used? | 13 | exercised. |
| 14 | We debated that on the last hearing, and we say they can | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And as a subset of what I have been |
| 15 | be used whether for the benefit of the company and also | 15 | asking you and now recognising that the funds will be |
| 16 | because of this overlay of being in administration where | 16 | retained by the administrators, you say that funds so |
| 17 | it is the administrators are facilitating this for the | 17 | retained are nevertheless funds out of which capital |
| 18 | purposes of the administration. So you get -- it is | 18 | may, as it were, be reduced? |
| 19 | facilitated for the purposes of the administration | 19 | MS TOUBE: Yes. |
| 20 | because it is for the benefit of the creditors, and then | 20 | We have gone through that process, because that is |
| 21 | all the director has to do is look at the members | 21 | the process of working out what the debts are and who -- |
| 22 | because by very definition the creditor's interests are | 22 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is a matter for calculation? |
| 23 | being met by the administrators. So all the director | 23 | MS TOUBE: Yes. |
| 24 | has to do is say, is this in the interest of the | 24 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. But what is to be done is that |
| 25 | shareholder? Answer: yes. And in fact, we know | 25 | share capitalists be identified and then reduced by |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | what the application seeks, would be appropriate. | 1 | to survive? |
| 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 |
| 3 | with a full -- | 3 | a way, this brings together the two concerns that your |
| 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I think we will have to work something | 4 | Lordship has -- |
| 5 | out over the course of time to make sure that that fits | 5 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 6 | the bill. | 6 | MS TOUBE: -- which is, first of all, you are worried about |
| 7 | MS TOUBE: That is no problem, my Lord. | 7 | setting a precedent, to which our answer is, it is going |
| 8 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 8 | to happen with vanishing irregularity, and in fact this |
| 9 | I will get back to you in a second. | 9 | may be the only case in which it does happen. |
| 10 | Mr Beswetherick, thank you for your submissions. I hope | 10 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not too worried about setting |
| 11 | I have done them sufficient justice but I only got them | 11 | a precedent as such, I am worried about setting a jolly |
| 12 | late last night; I was travelling. | 12 | bad precedent. |
| 13 | MR BESWETHERICK: We are grateful, my Lord. | 13 | MS TOUBE: My Lord, yes. The answer to that we say is, as |
| 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The long and the short of it is, for | 14 | I have just said to your Lordship, it is clear that |
| 15 | all sorts of reasons that really come down ultimately to | 15 | powers continue. There is nothing in the Companies Act |
| 16 | an assessment of the mathematical benefit, you are in | 16 | which says they don't continue in insolvency, and if |
| 17 | favour of all this, and can for your part not see any | 17 | there is not a no entry sign, then the court has the |
| 18 | startling objection to it. | 18 | power to determine the question of whether this gap can |
| 19 | MR BESWETHERICK: Yes, that is exactly our position, | 19 | be filled or not. |
| 20 | my Lord. There is a cocktail of reasons which have led | 20 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The court has even at the highest |
| 21 | us to the conclusion that we support option 1. | 21 | level not spoken with an entirely sonorous voice on |
| 22 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. And it would suffice for your | 22 | this. |
| 23 | purposes if a targeted order and a revised application | 23 | On the one hand, Lord Neuberger says that the |
| 24 | were, as it were, approved, you having added your name | 24 | Insolvency Act is not a complete and exclusive code, and |
| 25 | and weight to the application? | 25 | you rely on that; on the other hand, in the actual |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | to show him wrong. |
| 5 | "A resolution for reducing share capital of | 5 | MS TOUBE: My Lord, no. Not at all. In fact, everyone |
| 6 | a private company limited by shares is supported by | 6 | wished to see it to see your Lordship is correct. But |
| 7 | a solvency statement if the directors of the company | 7 | 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 | the directors say that they have considered it and |
| 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So he has been blessed by the only | 25 | presently, on present circumstances, that is what they |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | My client, LBHI2 and LBL also ask that the court | 16 | participants in the Waterfall proceedings. |
| 17 | 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 | Act, and their ability to do so is, as your Lordship | 20 | applications and, again, this is dealt with in |
| 21 | will have appreciated, an integral part of the Backstop | 21 | particular in Mr Downs' 11th witness statement between |
| 22 | deal. | 22 | paragraphs 61 and 71 and your Lordship will find that in |
| 23 | LBH, I think following discussions on Friday, LBH | 23 | bundle 1, pages 19 to 21. |
| 24 | has also issued its application; that is the fourth. | 24 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Shall we have a quick look at that? |
| 25 | In the case of LBH, as well as asking for the | 25 | MR ARDEN: Yes. It is volume 1, tab 9, Mr Downs' 11th |
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| 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. |
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| 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. |
| 8 | 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 | 21 | estate, but as your Lordship knows, in part also as |
| 22 | dealt with in the evidence, there is some correspondence | 22 | a result of the way in which the Supreme Court dealt |
| 23 | there with the Financial Conduct Authority, who we are | 23 | with Waterfall I and what one extracts from the Supreme |
| 24 | required to notify of any application in the | 24 | 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' |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | not just the affiliates but also to LBIE, the advantages | 23 | MR ARDEN: Yes. But nobody -- if one were trying to |
| 24 | to all estates outweigh whatever objection could be made | 24 | identify creditor groups most likely to oppose, they |
| 25 | to a distribution without a reserve on the basis of | 25 | would be creditor groups within LBIE rather than the |
|  | Page 26 |  | Page 28 |


| 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | distributions from those two estates. My Lord, that is | 1 | been the two forms have been the subject of negotiation, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | a point which is made by Mr Downs at paragraph 21, which | 2 | starting from about the end of last year. The objective |
| 3 | I have already referred your Lordship to but without | 3 | of the Backstop deals in both forms was to try to find |
| 4 | reading it. It is also made by Ms Bruce in her | 4 | a solution to the problem that I have just identified |
| 5 | statement at paragraph 10, dealing with the position of | 5 | and to permit the affiliates to commence or recommence |
| 6 | LBHI2. | 6 | the process of distribution. |
| 7 | My Lord, separate from the contribution claim, then, | 7 | My Lord, Backstop 1 was negotiated before the |
| 8 | LBL has asserted initially principally against LBIE and | 8 | Supreme Court decision and the proposal there, as your |
| 9 | LBEL a right to recharge various items, and those are | 9 | Lordship probably recalls, was to create a fund which |
| 10 | the bad debt claims and the administration costs claims, | 10 | would be available to meet shortfalls, a shortfall in |
| 11 | but as your Lordship knows, possibly extending beyond | 11 | the LBIE estates, and that fund would effectively take |
| 12 | those items. | 12 | the place of the contributory's liability, leaving the |
| 13 | My Lord, again, your Lordship may recall that the | 13 | contributories free to distribute. |
| 14 | amount of those claims, even as originally formulated | 14 | The background and broad outline of Backstop 1 in |
| 15 | ran to many hundreds of millions of pounds. My Lord, | 15 | the evidence is dealt with, firstly by Ms Bruce at |
| 16 | that obviously creates an issue for LBIE because it is | 16 | paragraphs 40 to 42 and it is touched upon by Mr Downs |
| 17 | something that LBIE has to deal with, but also it has | 17 | at paragraph 22. |
| 18 | frozen the further distributions that would otherwise | 18 | My Lord, Backstop 2 has been overtaken. It was |
| 19 | have been made by LBEL on account of its statutory | 19 | premised upon the Court of Appeal's decision in material |
| 20 | interests and hence Ms Toube's submissions to your | 20 | respects being upheld and the Supreme Court decision |
| 21 | Lordship about how LBEL was particularly concerned to | 21 | overtook it and, as your Lordship knows, changed the |
| 22 | get on with Waterfall III. | 22 | legal landscape. But my Lord, it is worth bearing |
| 23 | My Lord, in addition to that recharge claim -- and | 23 | Backstop 1 in mind because if one takes both Backstops |
| 24 | I am using "recharge" not in any defined way but as | 24 | what one can see is that Backstop 2 is the product of |
| 25 | a convenient way of dealing with it, of describing it -- | 25 | a very long period of negotiation. It is not something |
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| 1 | in addition to the recharge claim as originally | 1 | which has simply started with the Supreme Court; it |
| 2 | formulated and confined to the two items I have | 2 | extends for some five months beyond that. So now for |
| 3 | mentioned, LBL has asserted a wider right of recharge, | 3 | some seven-odd months the parties have been trying to |
| 4 | which in its widest form extends to LBHI2 and LBH and | 4 | find a solution and Backstop 2 represents what they |
| 5 | includes its liabilities as a contributory. Your | 5 | believe to be the right one, so the product of a long |
| 6 | Lordship will recall all of this in Waterfall III. It | 6 | negotiation. |
| 7 | is simply an attempt to pass on in one form or another | 7 | As far as Backstop 2 is concerned, the immediate |
| 8 | whatever liability LBL has as a contributory and that | 8 | background was the Supreme Court judgment and, my Lord, |
| 9 | wider alleged right of recharge obviously creates, or it | 9 | there are various summaries both of the effect and |
| 10 | compounds the effect that the existing claims already | 10 | impact of the Supreme Court judgment and its |
| 11 | have on the estates and their ability to distribute. It | 11 | consequences, various summaries which all pretty much |
| 12 | is a further impediment to the distribution of the cash | 12 | say the same thing but sometimes with different angles |
| 13 | reserves. | 13 | and they appear both in the witness statements and in |
| 14 | My Lord, that obviously operates to the detriment of | 14 | the skeletons. So, for example, Ms Bruce summarises the |
| 15 | the third party creditors of each of the estates but it | 15 | position at paragraphs 33,38 to 39 and 56 of her |
| 16 | also has an effect on the estates themselves because | 16 | witness statement; Mr Downs at paragraphs 32 to 34 and |
| 17 | many of the debts are intercompany debts, intercompany | 17 | 54 to 59 of his statement. |
| 18 | balances and the like. So, for example, a significant | 18 | That analysis is then repeated and sometimes |
| 19 | asset in LBHI2's estate is a claim of around 277 million | 19 | expanded upon in the skeletons. So, for example, if one |
| 20 | against LBL, which is an intercompany claim, which | 20 | takes the LBIE skeleton, your Lordship will find the |
| 21 | essentially cannot be admitted and won't be paid for as | 21 | impact dealt with -- I have lost it for the moment. |
| 22 | long as the rights of recharge coming the other way | 22 | My Lord, the analysis is in the part of the skeleton |
| 23 | remain. | 23 | which deals with the LBIE administrators' view and it is |
| 24 | Now, my Lord, the objectives, Backstop, as your | 24 | dealt with particularly in section, I think, C, |
| 25 | Lordship knows, has been around in two forms and it has | 25 | paragraphs 32 and onwards. |
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| 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. |
| 3 | with the position of the contributories and the | 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 | 6 | in the bundle but your Lordship will see that between 67 |
| 7 | 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 |
| 9 | 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 |
| 12 | documents at paragraph 44. My Lord, there is a longer | 12 | agreements that the parties are to execute, which are |
| 13 | summary in Mr Downs' witness statement, paragraphs 48 to | 13 | the other component parts of Backstop 2. Then the |
| 14 | 60. | 14 | significant provisions are to be found at clause 3. |
| 15 | My Lord, the transaction documents, which is what | 15 | 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 | volume 4 of the bundles. | 17 | Waterfall III. |
| 18 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Volume 4? | 18 | So that is a framework deed, which then provides |
| 19 | MR ARDEN: It is a ring binder. | 19 | 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 |
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| 1 | is Wentworth's agreement to limit its recourse in | 1 | trying to do is to point your Lordship to the clauses, |
| 2 | respect of the subordinated debt to the assets, to | 2 | the relevant clauses, without going into them in too |
| 3 | LBIE's assets, so doing away with the need to make | 3 | much detail. I need to do that, but if I do not descend |
| 4 | a contribution claim in respect of the subordinated | 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 |
| 6 | arisen in Waterfall III. | 6 | issue of confidentiality? |
| 7 | Paragraph 2 deals with the position between LBL and | 7 | MR ARDEN: Because it relates to the court file, it is not |
| 8 | LBIE and paragraph 3 deals with notice of intention to | 8 | proposed that your Lordship deals with this or sit in |
| 9 | distribute. Paragraph 4, liquidation. At paragraph 5 | 9 | private. Because it simply relates to the court file |
| 10 | there is a reference to the interaffiliate settlement, | 10 | I was going to deal with it at the end. |
| 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 | affiliates, and it would be based on values which we | 13 | 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. |
| 21 | 62 million. | 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 | to costs. | 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | 6 | but I am just querying this. Are you all right with |
| 7 | with it. But what the protection that the party seeks | 7 | this? |
| 8 | simply prevents somebody for any reason, good or bad, | 8 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I am. I am not sure, my Lord, if anyone |
| 9 | turning up and trying to inspect documents that the | 9 | else wants to -- whether any other party wishes to |
| 10 | parties agree are commercially sensitive. | 10 | pursue a more stringent form of protection -- |
| 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I only raise it for your own | 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are you all content? |
| 12 | protection. | 12 | MR MARSHALL: Certainly, my Lord, on our part we are happy |
| 13 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I understand. | 13 | for the matter to be dealt with in that way. |
| 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am envisaging what happens when | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Happy, Mr Trower? |
| 15 | someone says "I would like to have a look at those | 15 | MR TROWER: Yes. |
| 16 | documents, please" and they say they have been referred | 16 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Everyone else happy? |
| 17 | to in open court, it was an important issue, lots of | 17 | All right. |
| 18 | money, certain residual public interest after 2008 in | 18 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, can I just double check behind me? |
| 19 | the whole matter, "Why shouldn't I have them?" | 19 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, of course. |
| 20 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, sufficient detail -- in the way in which | 20 | MR ARDEN: Well, my Lord, we are content to proceed in the |
| 21 | I am covering it, I am hoping to give your Lordship | 21 | way I have just suggested. |
| 22 | sufficient detail to enable -- | 22 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is fine. |
| 23 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: You and I can nod and wink at each | 23 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I was going to take your Lordship to the |
| 24 | other as much as we like, but other people may be | 24 | deed of settlement. I have touched on the framework. |
| 25 | interested on the basis on which we did so. | 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Can I just say this: that if you are |
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| 1 | happy with that, to some extent you must take me to | 1 | the requirement that is reflected or contained in the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | those points quite openly which you say are relevant to | 2 | order that your Lordship made. |
| 3 | the adjudication application. | 3 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That was for their protection, and |
| 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 | 6 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am not sure they ever did but |
| 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 | for waiver by Wentworth, is that in the document? | 9 | course of that hearing, one was trying to sort of |
| 10 | MR ARDEN: Yes. That is the limited recourse -- it is in | 10 | identify, in relation to any contributory liability, who |
| 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 | recourse? | 13 | 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 | but doesn't for the second. It is just easy to keep | 19 | 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 | MR ARDEN: I think backstop was the idea of the provision of | 23 | a confirmation that LBIE and its administrators do not |
| 24 | the fund in Backstop 1 which would take place, which | 24 | object to the LBHI2, LBL and LBEL and LBH |
| 25 | would respond to a shortfall, so that was the backstop. | 25 | administrators. And then it is: |
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| 1 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I see, thank you. | 1 | "Making or deeming to make distributions or paying |
| 2 | MR ARDEN: But it is a sort of backstop. There is the 62 or | 2 | statutory interest in accordance with the distribution |
| 3 | 63 million, it is a rather less significant part of the | 3 | model, pursuant to clause 6 of the interaffiliate |
| 4 | transaction. | 4 | settlement deed ..." |
| 5 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 5 | And, my Lord, I will come to that in a moment. |
| 6 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, the deed of settlement then is between | 6 | "... 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. |
| 9 | 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 | 16 | distributions that are governed by the -- in making |
| 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? |
| 21 | 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 |
| 24 | administrators serve a distribution notice or a notice | 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? |
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| 1 | MR ARDEN: It simply doesn't arise. The only entities in | 1 | three clauses in the document. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | respect of which it could arise, LBL no, LBHI2 and | 2 | 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 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is to see what is happening rather |
| 9 | is the interaffiliate deed and this governs the | 9 | than approve the details? |
| 10 | distributions that have been made amongst the | 10 | 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 | productive one at that. |
| 13 | various estates and all the estates' other liabilities | 13 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. |
| 14 | and their assets, and then, on the basis of that | 14 | Well, let's pause there. You have had a quite |
| 15 | information, to agree net amounts which will then be | 15 | a time. How long would you like? |
| 16 | paid by a relevant affiliate to a relevant affiliate. | 16 | (11.45 am) |
| 17 | My Lord, this is at page 27 onwards. If I could | 17 | (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. | 19 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, we were in the interaffiliate settlement |
| 20 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Where is recitals J and K? | 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 | and then modelled so that one arrives at single figures |
| 23 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So there is a sort of rolled-up single | 23 | or single sums going from one estate to the other and |
| 24 | dividend, distribution? | 24 | the modelling in the calculation take place at a number |
| 25 | MR ARDEN: That's right. | 25 | of different stages until you get to the sort of final |
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| 1 | What it is possible to do, what will appear as | 1 | effective date or the final date where the last |
| 2 | a schedule, there is a current draft at the moment, but | 2 | calculation is made which takes into account everything |
| 3 | what will appear as a schedule, it is possible just to | 3 | that has happened up to that date and then produces the |
| 4 | financially model so that rather than have a series, | 4 | net figures. |
| 5 | a sort of round sequence of actual payments, one simply | 5 | My Lord, there is an order in which things are done |
| 6 | takes the sequence and then has ten notional sequences | 6 | and the first in terms of first significant step or the |
| 7 | and then you arrive at a net figure at the end of it. | 7 | first in time is the capital reduction, which is dealt |
| 8 | That is what it is intended so, as I said, rather than | 8 | with at clause 5. Clause 5, there are two things in |
| 9 | have the money just keep going round over and over, you | 9 | that, it is the capital reduction, and clause 5 deals |
| 10 | just simply have, as I said, you financially model it | 10 | with a series of steps, which are LBL, in clause 5.1, is |
| 11 | and then you can arrive at net payments. | 11 | required to procure that the director does, and then LBH |
| 12 | My Lord, before I move away from the recitals, | 12 | is dealt with at 5.2. And you will see then between 5.2 |
| 13 | I have just been reminded, I wonder if it might be | 13 | and then 5.5 are the steps required, or the matters |
| 14 | a convenient moment for the shorthand writers ... | 14 | required to be dealt with for the purposes of putting |
| 15 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am sorry not to have asked. | 15 | into effect the LBEL option 1. |
| 16 | What is my role with respect to the affiliate settlement | 16 | And then, my Lord, at clause 6, it's essentially the |
| 17 | deed? | 17 | mechanism which deals with and then leads to the |
| 18 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I just want your Lordship to see how the | 18 | payments that are to be made both by LBEL by way of |
| 19 | transaction works and I think I do need to take your | 19 | distribution to its members but also as between the |
| 20 | Lordship to -- I can do this fairly briefly, but one of | 20 | various estates, and in fact, as far as net payments are |
| 21 | the matters that is governed by the interaffiliate | 21 | concerned, there are only going to be two payers, which |
| 22 | settlement deed is the LBEL distribution and I think | 22 | is LBL and LBEL, and that is why the obligations, the |
| 23 | your Lordship should see that clause as well, as well as | 23 | payment obligations, in clause 6 extend only to those |
| 24 | the other clauses which provide for distributions. | 24 | two companies. The rest, the other affiliates are net |
| 25 | But I am only going to ask -- there are probably | 25 | recipients. |
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| 1 | So what this does, what clause 6 does with effect, | 1 | parties are entering into this upon assumptions as to |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | particularly 6.4, with effect from the final effective | 2 | what the likely outcome will be. |
| 3 | time, there are a series of admissions to proof. And | 3 | It is unlikely that that will change but it is |
| 4 | then 6.5 is a release of claims other than those that | 4 | possible and so over the course of the working out of |
| 5 | are to be dealt with. That is $6.5,6.6,6.7$ and 6.8. | 5 | the agreement, a fairly short period of time, statements |
| 6 | And then the payments are dealt with at 6.14 and 6.15. | 6 | will be produced, and if the statements disclose |
| 7 | 6.14 is statutory interest, the payment by LBEL of | 7 | a position which is materially different and materially |
| 8 | statutory interest. And then 6.15, the opening words of | 8 | worse than the figures that the parties are working on |
| 9 | 6.15 give effect to -- there are deeming provisions and | 9 | in entering into the agreement, there is a right to |
| 10 | the intention of that is you deem payments to be made | 10 | terminate. And, my Lord, the final effective date is |
| 11 | rather than to require them to be made, and that is to | 11 | defined by reference to the final point at which |
| 12 | give effect to the 10 notional distributions leading to | 12 | a parties can terminate for a material adverse effect |
| 13 | a net amount due or to be paid at the end of that | 13 | and so it relates back to 6.1 and that is the last of |
| 14 | process. | 14 | the certificates that I have mentioned to your Lordship. |
| 15 | Then the payment obligations. 6.15.1, LBL is to pay | 15 | So once the last of the certificates is produced, |
| 16 | what it is required to pay, and then 6.15.2, it is back | 16 | which is after the capital reduction takes place, there |
| 17 | to LBEL. You see reference to the accounts at (i), | 17 | is a short period of time to terminate. Once that is |
| 18 | broad resolution at (ii) and then (iii) is the | 18 | over, that is the final effective date and then |
| 19 | obligation to pay. | 19 | everything rolls on from there. |
| 20 | My Lord, that deals with the position as far as the | 20 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And any business day is right, 9.00 am |
| 21 | affiliates are concerned and then distributions to other | 21 | on any business day after the certification? |
| 22 | creditors is dealt with by clause 7. So the complicated | 22 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, when I looked at it I thought it was |
| 23 | ones are the affiliates because they are the payments of | 23 | right but ... |
| 24 | the product of a settlement of balances and letting off | 24 | So under 6.1 you have to produce -- |
| 25 | and so on. | 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 6.1 you have the certificates and then |
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| 1 | The distributions to other creditors will be made on | 1 | you have 6.2, which is changes of mind; then you have to |
| 2 | the same basis, in other words at the same rate and in | 2 | wait 14 hours -- |
| 3 | accordance with paragraph 7, so there will be | 3 | MR ARDEN: Yes. |
| 4 | a distribution to all creditors, including affiliates. | 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: -- to make sure there are not further |
| 5 | My Lord, I was next going to take your Lordship to | 5 | changes in mind. |
| 6 | the limited recourse deed. This is the Wentworth deed. | 6 | MR ARDEN: Yes. |
| 7 | That is at page 99 of the bundle through to 118. | 7 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Is it the business day or a business |
| 8 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am just trying to get my head | 8 | day? |
| 9 | round -- I apologise because it is drafting -- the final | 9 | MR ARDEN: Well, it sounds to me like it should be "the", |
| 10 | effective term. | 10 | I would have thought, rather than ... |
| 11 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, that is defined, in the deed it is | 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Any business day carries on ad |
| 12 | defined by reference to -- | 12 | infinitum. |
| 13 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Any business day after the | 13 | MR ARDEN: Your Lordship is right. |
| 14 | certifications required by clause 6.1 provided I suppose | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Do you want to have a think about that |
| 15 | no certification has occurred. Is that right? | 15 | over the short adjournment -- there will be other |
| 16 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, final effective time is -- | 16 | drafting minutiae, I am sure, but I noticed that this |
| 17 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is 6.3 but it clocks back to 6.1, | 17 | "final effective time" carries through the other |
| 18 | is that right? | 18 | documents without further definition. So it just struck |
| 19 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, that is right. | 19 | me as one where we might as well try and get it right. |
| 20 | At various points, as I indicated but took it fairly | 20 | MR ARDEN: Yes. |
| 21 | quickly, at various points in the process, so at the | 21 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Just have a think about that. |
| 22 | beginning and then as it starts and then at this point, | 22 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, it is right to say, your Lordship is |
| 23 | the parties are required to essentially sort of produce | 23 | looking at documents that are still in a draft form, |
| 24 | statements which will convey to the other parties where | 24 | albeit reasonably advanced, and there are matters which |
| 25 | things stand as far as their estates are concerned. The | 25 | are incomplete, schedules, for example, which need to be |
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| 1 | 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 | joint administrators -- it is confirmation that in the |
| 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Well, I hope I would not be as | 4 | joint administrators' reasonable opinion there is no |
| 5 | 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 |
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| 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 | MR ARDEN: That the LBHI might want to have a think about. |
| 7 | 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 | Court of Appeal as to the extent as to which you could |
| 9 | the lower of -- on certification, LBHI, has to pay the | 9 | build in a non-challenge? Anyway, I will leave that |
| 10 | shortfall amount or the cap, whichever is the lower. | 10 | with you. |
| 11 | My Lord, just so your Lordship knows, the way in | 11 | MR ARDEN: My Lord noted I think and perhaps we will see |
| 12 | which the definitions work mean I think that this covers | 12 | whether that point can be clarified if it is thought |
| 13 | very senior claims, but also non-provable liabilities | 13 | desirable. |
| 14 | derived from senior claims, and one gets that -- they | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 15 | are the two definitions, senior claims and non-provable | 15 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think those are the transaction |
| 16 | liabilities. And the shortfall amount, on page 124, the | 16 | documents. My Lord, I am sorry it is taking your |
| 17 | shortfall amount includes, if your Lordship will see, | 17 | Lordship through fairly quickly. It is not necessary |
| 18 | senior claims, including statutory interest and, if | 18 | for your Lordship to get into the detail because |
| 19 | applicable, non-provable liabilities. So it covers the | 19 | otherwise it almost becomes a sort of drafting exercise, |
| 20 | sort of three layers, as it were, above the subordinated | 20 | which is not very helpful, but I thought it was |
| 21 | debt and not just the first. | 21 | important that your Lordship just see the structure and |
| 22 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the shortfall certificate is | 22 | the important terms and that was the purpose of taking |
| 23 | intended, subject to the constraints of reasonableness | 23 | you to those. |
| 24 | and good faith, to be definitive, is it? | 24 | My Lord, as far as the -- |
| 25 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I would have thought so. | 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: They are all governed by English law |
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| 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 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 24 | 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 |
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| 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 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 | looks at this from a perspective of their own estate, | 19 | was to the effect that they were entitled to do that and |
| 20 | but in many respects the estates identify the same | 20 | what followed from that under the statutory scheme was |
| 21 | benefits in terms of settlement of claims, disposal of | 21 | a valuation of contingent claims and payments on the |
| 22 | the Waterfall III proceedings, and all of the affiliates | 22 | value of those claims as estimated, and the argument in |
| 23 | identify the ability now to move to distribute the cash | 23 | that case by the creditor that a reserve should be made |
| 24 | that they are holding on to as being a positive and | 24 | was simply inconsistent with that scheme and the way in |
| 25 | obvious benefit to the creditors, and they would regard | 25 | which the scheme dealt with contingent debts. But |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | reservable claim, you are wrong. | 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 | as your Lordship points out, in Danka there was | 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course but for option 1, and I keep |
| 5 | a creditor and then the choice was between just doing | 5 | forgetting which company is involved with it, and with |
| 6 | what the rules tell you, value the contingent claim and | 6 | Ms Toube's silver-tongued advocacy one might be |
| 7 | pay, or what the creditor wanted, which is: please will | 7 | contemplating the proposal of a liquidation as the exit |
| 8 | you reserve, please will you reserve for my claim and | 8 | route. |
| 9 | protect my contractual rights in their entirety, and the | 9 | MR ARDEN: For LBEL? |
| 10 | Court of Appeal said no -- | 10 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: For LBEL, yes. Of course, I suppose |
| 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is a valuation issue. | 11 | that is by the by in terms of this particular context. |
| 12 | MR ARDEN: It is valuation and not reserve. | 12 | MR ARDEN: Because LBIE's position is so very different from |
| 13 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 13 | LBEL's. Liquidation for LBIE would be frankly suicidal |
| 14 | MR ARDEN: And as your Lordship points out, whereas here | 14 | for its creditors as matters stand, which is why, as |
| 15 | there cannot be a valuation or a -- | 15 | your Lordship will have seen from the exchanges, they |
| 16 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The apparent dictat -- that sounds | 16 | are so concerned. But their main concern about this |
| 17 | rude -- the apparent decision is when you are in the | 17 | application is to avoid LBIE going into liquidation, |
| 18 | administration world, you must shut your eyes to others | 18 | which it will not. |
| 19 | and even if it is not impossible, that the | 19 | My Lord, essentially those are my submissions on |
| 20 | administration will move into liquidation. For as long | 20 | benefits generally and the distributing without |
| 21 | as it is an administration, there is no creditor and | 21 | a reserve in particular. My Lord, I think I have |
| 22 | there is no claim. | 22 | covered it over rather a long time, both matters more |
| 23 | MR ARDEN: No, and I think your Lordship -- this case is | 23 | than once, but if there is anything I can assist your |
| 24 | a case where there is no imminent prospect, and nothing | 24 | Lordship on, I would be happy to do so, but if not, |
| 25 | said about an imminent or immediate prospect, of | 25 | those are my submissions. |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | skeletons. | 1 | but there is somebody else acting", and then Mr Lewis |
| 2 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Two curiosities, if I can put it that | 2 | does flesh that out. |
| 3 | way are, one, the difficult task as regards the "Is it | 3 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Could you just show me that, I am |
| 4 | rational?" is to try and identify whether there are any | 4 | sorry. |
| 5 | material considerations which have simply been ignored. | 5 | MR ARDEN: Yes. For Ms Bruce, it is volume 1, tab 7, and it |
| 6 | MR ARDEN: Yes. | 6 | is paragraph 52 at page 17. It runs through to 54. |
| 7 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That is one question as far as just | 7 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: 50 to 54? |
| 8 | your endeavours go. One has not been able to identify | 8 | MR ARDEN: Yes, 52 and 53 she deals with her views, and then |
| 9 | any, but obviously if there were, that would upset the | 9 | at 54 , what she says, she mentions Mr Lewis: |
| 10 | apple cart. | 10 | "Safeguard independent interests, separately ... |
| 11 | The other is that conflict of interest is much | 11 | Whilst Mr Lewis and his legal team have not participated |
| 12 | easier to assess in the trust context or in the single | 12 | in the day-to-day negotiation of transaction documents, |
| 13 | proposal context than where you have a great many | 13 | they have been informed of the overall architecture of |
| 14 | interrelating arrangements with, I think, some | 14 | Backstop 2". |
| 15 | cross-administrators acting for the companies. But | 15 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Thank you, I had forgotten that, that |
| 16 | I think what is really meant there is no personal or | 16 | is helpful. Thank you. |
| 17 | disqualifying individual conflict of interest, rather | 17 | MR ARDEN: I think it does go slightly further in terms of |
| 18 | than the essence of the deal, which is a reasonable | 18 | the separate consideration, when one looks at the |
| 19 | balance between conflicting concerns. | 19 | weekend statement. |
| 20 | MR ARDEN: My Lord, I think most of the conflicts have been | 20 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, and I suppose I have the further |
| 21 | addressed in I suppose what is the usual way, by which | 21 | comfort of notification and no creditor turning up and |
| 22 | I mean this: one of my administrators, Ms Bruce, is also | 22 | saying "Actually, this is absolutely wrong by my |
| 23 | an LBH administrator. | 23 | lights". |
| 24 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 24 | MR ARDEN: No one is saying it plainly benefits, for |
| 25 | MR ARDEN: But to address the conflict that arises there, it | 25 | example, LBHI2 at the expense of LBH. |
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| 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | Waterfall II application, and would your Lordship just | 1 | like a right that is not a particularly problematical |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | read that. (Pause). | 2 | right to give up, and it is the reason why Mr Arden's |
| 3 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 3 | 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 |
| 6 | Court of Appeal, the point being, they now argue the | 6 | with respect to Waterfall II? I mean, I had heard |
| 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 | a non-provable claim. | 9 | This week? |
| 10 | Now, that was a change in the way they put their | 10 | MR TROWER: Yes, there is a hearing tomorrow at which |
| 11 | case in a document that went into the Court of Appeal at | 11 | submissions are being made on the impact of the Supreme |
| 12 | the end of June and it was missed when this was being | 12 | Court decision, and it was in the context of those |
| 13 | put together. It actually strengthens though, if I can | 13 | submissions that we heard about the change that I have |
| 14 | put it this way, the unlikelihood of a non-provable | 14 | referred to in 36.2.1. It was in that context, because |
| 15 | claim being made, because the only non-provable claim | 15 | the Court of Appeal directed further written |
| 16 | that is now asserted is a Sempra Metals argument, which | 16 | submissions. |
| 17 | is the point made in 36.2.2. | 17 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That goes to 2A and B? |
| 18 | Now, the relevance of that is that a contributory | 18 | MR TROWER: It goes to 2 A and B . And that then conceptually |
| 19 | claim under section 74 can only be made against our own | 19 | 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 | Court. | 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 | there is a shortfall in our surplus, such that the | 25 | July next year in the Court of Appeal, and then we |
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| 1 | Sempra Metals claim cannot be paid, that a contribution | 1 | have the obvious problem that there is potential for the |
| 2 | claim could even get off the ground against our own | 2 | Supreme Court after that. |
| 3 | members. | 3 | So the exercise your Lordship has to think about, |
| 4 | So there are two elements here. First of all, you | 4 | with respect, and the exercise of thinking that we have |
| 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 | the surplus in respect of any non-provable claim, and | 6 | imminently going to go into liquidation, maybe the court |
| 7 | that will only arise if there is success on Bower v | 7 | would find a way of ensuring that a reserve was kept for |
| 8 | Marris in the Court of Appeal or the success on the cost | 8 | a period of time; or might -- query even that because of |
| 9 | of funding in the Court of Appeal so as to increase the | 9 | the way Lord Neuberger expresses himself. But we are so |
| 10 | amount of statutory interest payable, then you might get | 10 | 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 | get to the stage where the Sempra Metal argument | 13 | 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 | 16 | costs of funds not being limited by any commercial |
| 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 | moment. | 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 |
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| 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. |
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| 1 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 1 | 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? |
| 3 | a go is somebody in respect of a non-provable claim | 3 | MR TROWER: I have to live in the land of administration. |
| 4 | which was not going to be paid because the surplus had | 4 | I cannot go into liquidation and the Supreme Court has |
| 5 | all been used up in paying statutory interest, but it is | 5 | told me that, in the land of administration, I don't |
| 6 | only to the extent of the non-provable claim because we | 6 | have a claim. |
| 7 | cannot make a contribution claim in respect of statutory | 7 | So, whatever one may feel about that -- |
| 8 | interest. So even if the amount of statutory interest | 8 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is probably unusual but |
| 9 | is increased enormously, either as a result of Bower v | 9 | nevertheless in the unusual world, it is a sort of |
| 10 | Marris or as a result of cost of funding, we cannot make | 10 | uncomfortable -- |
| 11 | a contribution claim in respect of that because the | 11 | MR TROWER: Of course, and that was one of the sort of |
| 12 | Supreme Court has said we can't. What we can make | 12 | discomforts that Lord Neuberger addressed in his |
| 13 | a contribution claim in respect of, theoretically, is | 13 | judgment. |
| 14 | any non-provable claim. We now know that the only | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He just said "It is not enough and |
| 15 | non-provable claim that might be out there is the | 15 | made me change my mind", but he didn't prescribe what |
| 16 | Sempra Metals argument, which is in 36.2.2, which is why | 16 | was to happen. |
| 17 | there are a whole series of contingencies, that have to | 17 | MR TROWER: Yes, one accepts that and that is why I said |
| 18 | occur and a whole series of circumstances which have to | 18 | there might be some circumstances where something |
| 19 | give rise to some form of, well, effectively the SCG | 19 | imaginative would be dreamt up, but it is very difficult |
| 20 | winning across the line in respect of all their | 20 | to see how that could be done in a case such as this |
| 21 | arguments that this issue then arises, at all. Then we | 21 | where we are some considerable period of time away from |
| 22 | have got to get into liquidation as well. | 22 | ultimate resolution and I agree, with respect, with what |
| 23 | That is why the notification point becomes of | 23 | Mr Arden said about Danka on this point. One has to |
| 24 | further relevance to my Lord because your Lordship can | 24 | bear this in mind throughout this ... |
| 25 | see there has been correspondence with the SCG and, if | 25 | This is actually we are one step further down the |
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| 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 |
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| 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 | MR TROWER: I am nearly done. I was just going to address | 13 | So, my Lord -- |
| 14 | you on notification and then I was going to sit down. | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Which letter or email do you |
| 15 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: All right. I will do that homework | 15 | particularly rely on as far as SCG, the SCG? |
| 16 | and then we should be able to complete within the time. | 16 | MR TROWER: Yes, do you see the one, the member of the SCG |
| 17 | Mr Marshall? | 17 | is the gentleman from DK, which is -- sorry, I do not |
| 18 | MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I don't think I will be very long. | 18 | have exactly the same file so I am not sure which tab it |
| 19 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. | 19 | is in, but it is headed "Reproposed settlement of W3, |
| 20 | Ms Toube, you are really here as an interested | 20 | Gabriel Schwartz." |
| 21 | observer? | 21 | So he is the SCG man. |
| 22 | MS TOUBE: My Lord, I am, but I was just speaking to my | 22 | But in a way we don't really rely -- in a way that |
| 23 | instructing solicitor about maybe -- we have actually | 23 | is sort of put in there just to show your Lordship what |
| 24 | started drafting on the order. So I might be able to | 24 | has come back. What I really rely on is what has not |
| 25 | put that before your Lordship while we are here today. | 25 | come back by way of response to what has been notified, |
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| 1 | that is really rather more important because this | 1 | Sempra Metals. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | particular point doesn't in any way undermine what we | 2 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Right. |
| 3 | all want to do; in fact, if anything, it gives a bit of | 3 | 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. | 9 | 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 | that emerged at the last minute as a potential claim and | 15 | 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 | was appropriate just to mention it because, had the | 19 | 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 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: He puts it in quite high terms, that | 23 | 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 | will need to be resolved satisfactorily. | 25 | because the effect of there being success on Bower v |
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| 1 | MR TROWER: It has been resolved satisfactorily in that the | 1 | Marris or cost of funding is to reduce the surplus that |
| 2 | burden of the claim, if it were to be established, and | 2 | would otherwise be available to us without making |
| 3 | there are big question marks over whether or not it | 3 | a contribution claim. |
| 4 | would be established, is going to be shared between the | 4 | So that is the sort of -- can I say straight away, |
| 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 |
| 9 | something your Lordship is in a position to reach | 9 | presently don't anticipate they will, in order for there |
| 10 | a concluded view on. | 10 | 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 |
| 16 | Lordship. The cost of funding issue simply goes to the | 16 | quantified and -- |
| 17 | quantum of the statutory interest claim. | 17 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: This is interest on -- |
| 18 | So all I wanted just -- it is just worth stressing | 18 | MR TROWER: This is interest for delay in paying interest. |
| 19 | that there are really, for present purposes, three -- | 19 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: And the resolution of that at first |
| 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 | MR TROWER: The third is non-provable claim based on | 25 | of the day, the standing issue is what gives rise to |
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| 1 | a pretty insuperable problem, but in a sense one feels | 1 | an intention to make a distribution, and then |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | one's instinctive feeling, we submit, in a case such as | 2 | in December 2014, there was a first interim dividend of |
| 3 | this is that on the facts it doesn't give rise to the | 3 | 1.66 p in the pound to ordinary unsecured creditors with |
| 4 | sort of extreme consequences that in some factual | 4 | proved claims. And that has really remained the |
| 5 | situations one might be more concerned about; even if | 5 | position ever since. Your Lordship will see the table, |
| 6 | one could do anything about it, which one cannot because | 6 | the different categories of creditor, in paragraph 29, |
| 7 | of what Lord Neuberger said. | 7 | quite a substantial amount is third party suppliers, |
| 8 | So, my Lord, that was really pretty much it, and | 8 | debt traders to some extent employees, HM Revenue and |
| 9 | unless there is anything else you would like me to deal | 9 | Customs, and then also Lehman affiliates, but quite |
| 10 | with? | 10 | a large body of third party suppliers and ordinary |
| 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: No, Mr Trower. You are quite right in | 11 | creditors of that kind who have remained in the position |
| 12 | perceiving that the problem with these sorts of cases, | 12 | since December 2014 of only having received 1.66p in the |
| 13 | rather like schemes of arrangement, is that one sees the | 13 | pound. |
| 14 | tip of the iceberg which has been carefully fashioned, | 14 | My Lord, in terms of the view of the proposed |
| 15 | if that is not to mix metaphors, over the course of | 15 | transactions and their benefit from LBL's point of view, |
| 16 | time, the intricacies of which are all beneath the | 16 | Mr Jervis has addressed that in paragraph 32 to 35 of |
| 17 | surface. It doesn't mean they have been obscured in any | 17 | his witness statement, beginning at page 8. Your |
| 18 | way, simply that they are not evident to the 24 -hour | 18 | Lordship will see in particular at paragraph 33 that the |
| 19 | observer. | 19 | LBL administrators have concluded that the terms of the |
| 20 | MR TROWER: Yes. | 20 | proposed settlement would result in a payment of 100p in |
| 21 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: So I am very grateful to you for your | 21 | the pound to the LBL creditors, plus 7.4 per cent of |
| 22 | help. If I get muddled again I shall call on any of you | 22 | accrued statutory interest to ordinary unsecured |
| 23 | to rescue me, but thank you very much. | 23 | creditors, with it being anticipated the dividend could |
| 24 | Yes, Mr Marshall. | 24 | be declared in September 2017. |
| 25 |  | 25 | Then he goes on in paragraph 34 to outline |
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| 1 | Submissions by MR MARSHALL | 1 | particular aspects of the proposed settlement which are |
| 2 | MR MARSHALL: My Lord, I will be quite short, just a couple | 2 | of importance from the LBL perspective. There is |
| 3 | of points to clarify the position in connection with | 3 | a withdrawal of proof which is described in |
| 4 | LBL. First of all, in terms of possible conflict, we | 4 | paragraph 34.1 by LBL and that is in connection with |
| 5 | respectfully submit that is certainly not the position | 5 | proofs related to the contribution claim and pension |
| 6 | in relation to LBL. Mr Jervis and Mr Hussein are the | 6 | debt, which is a matter which was the subject of a proof |
| 7 | administrators, the joint administrators of LBL and they | 7 | in the LBL's estate by LBIE. There is a reciprocal |
| 8 | are only administrators of that company, not of any of | 8 | withdrawal by LBIE of its proof in LBL's estate. And |
| 9 | the others. And Mr Jervis confirms in his witness | 9 | then in 34.2 and 34.3, there is a reference to the |
| 10 | statement in paragraph 32 that they have sought advice | 10 | agreement of intercompany balances. Then in 34.4, the |
| 11 | from Dechert, who are representing LBL alone, and as far | 11 | fact that the LBL administrators and LBIE administrators |
| 12 | as Mr Jervis is concerned, he has not been affected by | 12 | will withdraw their respective proof of debts so far as |
| 13 | any conflict of interest in coming to his conclusions. | 13 | those proofs relate to an intercompany balance, which |
| 14 | My Lord, in terms of the creditor position regarding | 14 | was another important aspect of the proof received in |
| 15 | LBL, if I could just take your Lordship to Mr Jervis' | 15 | LBL's estate from LBIE, so there will be an agreed zero |
| 16 | witness statement; that is in bundle 1 at tab 8. | 16 | balance between the two. |
| 17 | Your Lordship will be kind enough to go to page 7, | 17 | Then also perhaps specific to LBL, paragraph 34.5, |
| 18 | paragraph 26. There your Lordship will see that LBL's | 18 | the LBL administrators will withdraw their proofs of |
| 19 | administrators have paid a dividend of 100p in the pound | 19 | debt in LBIE and LBEL's estate as far as those proofs |
| 20 | to former employees with preferential unsecured claims, | 20 | relate to bad debts. The LBL administrators have |
| 21 | comprising claims of unpaid wages and holiday pay. It | 21 | concluded that that is an appropriate concession to |
| 22 | doesn't have any secure creditors. | 22 | make. It will facilitate the distribution from the |
| 23 | In addition to that, paragraph 28, your Lordship | 23 | estate of LBH of some $£ 475$ million in respect of |
| 24 | will see reference to the fact that on 8 July 2014, | 24 | an admitted claim and that would then have a reduction |
| 25 | there was notice given to all known creditors of | 25 | of the bad debt balance in LBL's estate. |
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| 1 | In relation to that particular aspect, which is | 1 | quite extensive discussions with the creditors' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rather special to LBL, Mr Jervis provides some further | 2 | committee along the way. |
| 3 | observations a little bit later in the witness statement | 3 | My Lord, in terms of the critical features of the |
| 4 | at page 12, paragraph 40. He refers to the withdrawal | 4 | proposal from LBL's point of view, I think it is |
| 5 | of claims against other parties on the basis of recharge | 5 | summarised in the skeleton argument, which I hope your |
| 6 | arrangements and concludes that that is considered to be | 6 | Lordship received, at paragraph 9. We have set out in |
| 7 | balanced as against the matters set out earlier in | 7 | I think seven subparagraphs particular aspects of the |
| 8 | paragraph 34.5 above and the benefits inherent in the | 8 | transaction which are important from LBL's point of |
| 9 | settlement, including the avoidance of delay, further | 9 | view. Important and key amongst those is the release |
| 10 | legal and professional costs and associated litigation | 10 | and withdrawal of any proof of debt on the part of LBIE |
| 11 | risk. | 11 | and the LBIE administrators, which we refer to in |
| 12 | So fundamentally the administrators of LBL have | 12 | paragraph 9.3, and also the transfer of a share from |
| 13 | concluded that it is worth giving up the recharge | 13 | LBIE to LBHI2, which is referred to in paragraph 9.6, |
| 14 | claims, in particular that for bad debts, in return for | 14 | which in our submission really removes the -- well, |
| 15 | the withdrawal of proofs on the part of LBIE and the | 15 | virtually removes the possibility of any contribution |
| 16 | avoidance of delay and greater certainty and avoidance | 16 | claim coming LBL's way. |
| 17 | of further costs which will thereby result. The net | 17 | So, my Lord, bearing those factors in mind, we would |
| 18 | outcome will be, as described in paragraph 33, a payment | 18 | respectfully submit to your Lordship that we certainly |
| 19 | of 100 p in the pound, plus a significant amount of | 19 | pass the rationality test and there is no conflict and |
| 20 | accrued statutory interest to unsecured creditors. | 20 | there is no reason therefore why, applying the |
| 21 | My Lord, we have had no objections from creditors, | 21 | appropriate analysis in the authorities, that your |
| 22 | notwithstanding having given quite extensive notice of | 22 | Lordship shouldn't be able to provide the relevant |
| 23 | what is proposed, and your Lordship will see the details | 23 | approval which we seek to the procedure that the parties |
| 24 | of that in paragraphs 41 through to 50 of Mr Jervis' | 24 | are wishing to engage in. |
| 25 | statement at pages 13 to 14 . | 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The uncollaterallised indemnity |
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| 1 | 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. <br> 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. <br> 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 | 1 | referred to in paragraph 9.2 covers shortfall in LBIE's |
| 2 |  | 2 | estate. It is probably an unfair question to you, but |
| 3 |  | 3 | how is that dealt with in terms of its ranking or |
| 4 |  | 4 | treatment in the administration of LBHI? Who appears |
| 5 |  | 5 | for LBHI? |
| 6 |  | 6 | MR MARSHALL: That's Mr -- well, actually I'm not sure |
| 7 |  | 7 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Mr Arden is LBHI2, isn't that right? |
| 8 |  | 8 | MR MARSHALL: I am not sure, my Lord. |
| 9 |  | 9 | MR TROWER: They are subject to proceedings in the |
| 10 |  | 10 | United States. It is not an English issue. |
| 11 |  | 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I am so sorry. They are in chapter |
| 12 |  | 12 | 11, are they? |
| 13 |  | 13 | MR TROWER: Yes, they are the New York entity. |
| 14 |  | 14 | MR MARSHALL: This, of course, is the New York -- |
| 15 |  | 15 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Do we know how that -- |
| 16 |  | 16 | MR TROWER: I can't tell you off the top of my head but |
| 17 |  | 17 | I think the prospects of LBHI, through its relevant |
| 18 |  | 18 | organs, if I can put it that way, doing anything which |
| 19 |  | 19 | exposed the decision-makers to a situation where they |
| 20 |  | 20 | were committing to do something which they could not |
| 21 |  | 21 | honour is very slim, to put it at its ... |
| 22 |  | 22 | I don't know the short answer. Plainly if the |
| 23 |  | 23 | entity was in insolvency proceedings over here, it would |
| 24 |  | 24 | be an expense of that insolvency because it would be |
| 25 |  | 25 | undertaken by the relevant office-holder in accordance |
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| 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? |
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| 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 | results with the court being provided with opinions and |
| 7 | opinions from counsel assessing the merits taken in the | 7 | having to look at the matter in a confidential way, but |
| 8 | round, including of any adverse litigation sought to be | 8 | I think the line of authority which we are following is |
| 9 | compromised. In this case there is no such thing. | 9 | one which is a process, a different type of process in |
| 10 | For example, in paragraph 40 I think it was of | 10 | the sense that the court looks at it without necessarily |
| 11 | Mr Jervis' witness statement, there was a sort of good | 11 | having the benefit of opinions or confidential material |
| 12 | example which appears to involve an assessment of the | 12 | because it is adopting more of a Wednesbury-type of |
| 13 | strength or not of the recharge claims. | 13 | approach that your Lordship described earlier, which is |
| 14 | MR MARSHALL: Yes. | 14 | check whether there is any conflict, check whether |
| 15 | Well, there is an element of that, but there is also | 15 | anyone is moving outside of the ambit of what is |
| 16 | quite a lot of commercial input as well because it is | 16 | a rational outcome and, having done those things, the |
| 17 | a matter of balancing against one type of claim other | 17 | court is not taking on the job of actually exercising |
| 18 | commercial benefits that would come in the other | 18 | the discretion, but giving a degree of approval, given |
| 19 | direction, and among those, of course, are all the other | 19 | the importance of the decisions being made, but that is |
| 20 | elements of these transactions whereby there is full | 20 | the limit of it. |
| 21 | proof of the ability to transfer the share across. The | 21 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Even in trust litigation, it is rare |
| 22 | reduction in the length of delay which may result, which | 22 | for discretions to be landed with the court. |
| 23 | may come about through the appellate process continuing, | 23 | Normally -- |
| 24 | for example. | 24 | MR MARSHALL: Of course, yes. |
| 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I understand there are an awful lot of | 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is very seldom that the court |
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| 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 |  |
| 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, |
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| 1 | the constituency that you want me to consider? | 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, it would seem, from the discussions we have had. There | 2 | specific steps are, that we would identify those which |
| 3 |  | 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 preventing you, as it were, from doing anything in terms |
| 20 | MR BESWETHERICK: I sought to explain to your Lordship the | 20 |  |
| 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, |  | you? |
| 24 | which I hope you have received. | 23 24 | MR BESWETHERICK: My Lord, yes, that is right. The edges between them are not hard edges. Because we were |
| 25 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, I am just trying to find your -- | 24 25 |  |
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| 1 | specifically discussing with your Lordship the rationale | 1 | she refers to the advantages she has already outlined. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | for why we were adopting option 1 and explaining our | 2 | She gives some detail about those, which is further |
| 3 | reasons for it, we would seek, if your Lordship was | 3 | expanded upon by Mr Lewis, and I will take you to his |
| 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 | In relation to the actual settlement agreements | 6 | your Lordship to read that. |
| 7 | themselves, it is in our case in fact only really the | 7 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes, read that. |
| 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 | are going to be receiving sums of money, we are going to | 9 | Mr Lewis' witness statement, which is at tab 3 of the |
| 10 | be -- as presently projected, we anticipate receiving | 10 | blue bundle. |
| 11 | a significant sum from LBHI2, because we are | 11 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 12 | an unsecured creditor in LBHI2, and also, as your | 12 | MR BESWETHERICK: Thank you. He explains that which I have |
| 13 | Lordship is aware, a significant distribution from LBEL. | 13 | just said to you in paragraph 8, how he became involved |
| 14 | Those monies, there is going to be a flowing around. | 14 | in October 2016. |
| 15 | We are not giving up any existing rights, other than | 15 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 16 | settling certain intercompany positions, but if we are | 16 | MR BESWETHERICK: And then he explains in paragraph 9 -- |
| 17 | giving up anything that is possibly tangible, we are not | 17 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 18 | going to seek to run an argument that seeks to put LBEL | 18 | MR BESWETHERICK: -- that he has not had responsibility for |
| 19 | into liquidation against the wishes of its office-holder | 19 | all aspects, but he is familiar with the general |
| 20 | in order to try and crystallise and bring about the | 20 | position. |
| 21 | effect of the statutory lacuna, and you have seen, and | 21 | 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 | a combination of us seeing that as a very difficult | 23 | aspects of the proposed settlement which are of clear |
| 24 | application to make, but also one which, for wider | 24 | benefit to LBH Plc and its creditors. I do not propose |
| 25 | commercial considerations, it is not one we wish to | 25 | to take your Lordship through all of those; they are |
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| 1 | make. I will address your Lordship on that and | 1 | familiar to you because they are the same sorts of |
| 2 | I address it in my skeleton argument again. | 2 | factors that your Lordship has seen are relied upon by |
| 3 | But because we are here, if I can put it that way, | 3 | the other estates. He does give details of the specific |
| 4 | what we are seeking then is permission to enter into the | 4 | 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, |
| 6 | other parties are seeking as well. Our evidence in | 6 | the references to the sums anticipate to flow through |
| 7 | relation to that is put forward by Mr Lewis. | 7 | from LBHI2; and E is the distribution expected from |
| 8 | Now, Mr Lewis is not one of the joint administrators | 8 | LBEL. |
| 9 | 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 | I should explain, Mr Lewis has been tasked with the | 15 | 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 | day-to-day negotiation of the settlement agreements, but | 18 | 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 |
| 21 | 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 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 |
| 3 | the course of administration you cannot have a winding | 3 | Waterfall III continuing on into the future, and unless |
| 4 | up, but somehow the administration process has to be | 4 | another settlement agreement were to emerge, we would |
| 5 | brought to an end. If the contributories said, "Well, | 5 | potentially be wrapped up for the next four or five |
| 6 | actually we would rather a liquidation", what could the | 6 | years in the Waterfall III litigation with no certainty |
| 7 | administrators say against that? | 7 | as to what the outcome of that litigation will be. |
| 8 | MR BESWETHERICK: The administrators of LBL have in their | 8 | So that is why, aside from reaching the view that we |
| 9 | hands monies which could be available to pay statutory | 9 | think it would be something of a difficult application |
| 10 | interest, which are monies that would be payable to | 10 | to make, to try and persuade a court to bounce LBEL into |
| 11 | creditors, and the interests of the creditors are at the | 11 | liquidation where it would damage the interests of |
| 12 | forefront of the administration regime. | 12 | creditors against the wishes of the administrators, just |
| 13 | We are shareholders. And if the administrators of | 13 | because the fortuitous circumstances of the possible |
| 14 | LBL wished to continue administration similar to the | 14 | impact of the lacuna, we see that as being a difficult |
| 15 | stance that is adopted by the LBIE administrators, that | 15 | application, but also, as your Lordship has seen, we see |
| 16 | they would not move into liquidation where the result of | 16 | that as being something that in the wider commercial |
| 17 | that would be to prejudice or damage the interests of | 17 | setting is not in the interests of LBH's creditors as a |
| 18 | the creditors, then if the administrators of LBL wish to | 18 | whole. |
| 19 | continue, the only way that we could seek to try and | 19 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: That I understand. |
| 20 | make them do otherwise would be to make an application | 20 | MR BESWETHERICK: It is necessary, of course, to look at all |
| 21 | to court, where we would have to seek to establish | 21 | of these ingredients together. Your Lordship's |
| 22 | essentially that our interests as shareholders are being | 22 | expression is this is a cat's cradle. There are various |
| 23 | unfairly harmed. | 23 | different factors which are weighed up here, and overall |
| 24 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The problem is that a liquidation | 24 | that is a view we have reached is in the best interests |
| 25 | would open the -- I will put it another way. The claim | 25 | of the creditors. |
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| 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 |
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| 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 |
|  | 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | this was an indemnity that was worth the paper it was | 1 | second is the reasoning. |
| 2 | written on. | 2 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. |
| 3 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 3 | MR TROWER: I don't think, from my client's perspective, |
| 4 | MR TROWER: Yes, I understand that. | 4 | that we would need the reasoning before the decision. |
| 5 | Obviously at the end of the day that is a commercial | 5 | If your Lordship has made a decision, we would very much |
| 6 | decision as well for the administrators and they are | 6 | welcome the decision as soon as your Lordship ever can |
| 7 | satisfied as to the prospects of the indemnity being | 7 | give it, but the reasons aren't necessary. |
| 8 | satisfied when called on. | 8 | As to the elaborateness of the reasons, again, |
| 9 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. | 9 | I don't think for our part we require or expect anything |
| 10 | Tell me about timing. There is a PTR in the | 10 | elaborate. The Nortel judgment was quite a lengthy one. |
| 11 | Waterfall III this coming Friday. | 11 | I certainly would not envisage it being necessary for |
| 12 | MR TROWER: Yes, indeed. | 12 | your Lordship to -- |
| 13 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Assuming that you get -- I am not sure | 13 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: The Nortel one raised an interesting |
| 14 | what to call it; it is not sort of permission -- | 14 | point of principle as to whether administrators could |
| 15 | MR TROWER: "Permission" may be better than "sanction" | 15 | deal with expenses claims. Is that right? |
| 16 | because permission doesn't imply anything other than you | 16 | MR TROWER: Indeed it did, and it raised all sorts of really |
| 17 | can do it if you want to. | 17 | quite difficult questions, including the fact that a lot |
| 18 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. Assuming you get whatever it is | 18 | of these estates had potential conflicts within them and |
| 19 | you are entitled to, the whole thing goes? | 19 | were not separately represented in the same way. It was |
| 20 | MR TROWER: Yes. What we for our part would suggest -- and | 20 | a different case from this one. For our part, I think |
| 21 | we have had a brief discussion amongst some of us but | 21 | we would be content with something relatively |
| 22 | not everybody -- what we for our part will suggest is | 22 | abbreviated, if that helps. |
| 23 | that there are the documents themselves to execute and | 23 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Are there any other places, either |
| 24 | there are one or two Ts to cross and Is to dot, and with | 24 | jurisdictions or otherwise, in which you would have to |
| 25 | a fair wind that will all be done very immediately, that | 25 | make good the course that has been taken? |
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| 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 |
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| 1 | MR TROWER: Quite. | 1 | 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 |
| 3 | MR TROWER: Yes. | 3 | replicate in the time available. It is to be commended |
| 4 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Of course you would be interested in | 4 | that so much sort of constructive work has been done to |
| 5 | what my judgment might have been, but I take it that it | 5 | resolve what has been a movable feast, in the event, |
| 6 | will no longer be required? | 6 | dealing with a number of moving fundamental points. |
| 7 | MR TROWER: Not so far as my clients are concerned, and in | 7 | MR TROWER: Yes. |
| 8 | fact we are asking your Lordship to dismiss -- or will | 8 | The only point, my Lord, that just occurs to me, |
| 9 | be in due course, and if there is a dismissal before the | 9 | I think there were one or two things that were going to |
| 10 | argument is complete, that is a pretty good reason not | 10 | happen during the course of this week, in the run-up to |
| 11 | to give a judgment. | 11 | the PTR, and can we take it from your Lordship's |
| 12 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Exactly, yes. | 12 | indication that it would be a sensible saving of costs |
| 13 | I just wanted to make sure that I had recollected | 13 | not to carry on with that exercise? |
| 14 | that I hadn't adjourned it for a reserved judgment, | 14 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: It is. |
| 15 | I had adjourned it for further argument. | 15 | MR TROWER: Yes. |
| 16 | MR TROWER: You had. | 16 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: I would let you know by tomorrow, or |
| 17 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: Yes. My goodness, I was wise | 17 | latest Wednesday. If suddenly something had emerged, |
| 18 | in January. | 18 | I would let you know by email what it was. Frankly, |
| 19 | Now, I tell you what I propose to do and you must | 19 | I do not expect it. I was half minded simply to approve |
| 20 | tell me whether this causes a difficulty. I have had | 20 | it now but, as we went through it, I felt that I should |
| 21 | a limited time to read this. I think that if it is | 21 | just make doubly sure, partly so all concerned know |
| 22 | worth reserving and asking the court for its decision at | 22 | I have done. |
| 23 | all, it is also to be expected that the court does its | 23 | MR TROWER: Yes. |
| 24 | proper homework, having heard from you. | 24 | MR JUSTICE HILDYARD: But I haven't seen anything which |
| 25 | I would I propose therefore to read today's | 25 | causes me concern which has not been explained by all of |
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