

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain



Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr. Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

CROSS-BORDER INSOLVENCY AND ARBITRATION: COORDINATION, CONFLICTS, AND COOPERATION

AUTHORED BY - PRIYANSHU MISHRA¹ & SHASHWAT DWIVEDI²

Introduction

Globalization has resulted in an increase in cross-border insolvency cases involving debtors and creditors from multiple jurisdictions. Complex business transactions also increasingly provide arbitration clauses to benefit from arbitration's flexibility, expertise, and confidentiality. However, the goals of insolvency proceedings often directly clash with arbitration's private contractual nature, creating conflicts regarding which process takes precedence. When parties use jurisdictional differences for strategic benefit, tensions rise due to a lack of coordination and collaboration. Establishing clear protocols through reciprocal international accords can temper friction and uncertainty at the nexus of cross-border insolvency and arbitration.

Insolvency Threats Obstructing Arbitration

A thorny question is whether beginning bankruptcy proceedings immediately ends ongoing or impending arbitration sought under pre-insolvency agreements. Certain nations, such as France, strictly enforce arbitration agreements even after one side declares bankruptcy. Other nations, notably the United States and Switzerland, argue that insolvency trumps and essentially invalidates existing arbitration arrangements. Section 362 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, for example, imposes an automatic stay that prevents further arbitration until insolvency issues are resolved and assets are distributed equitably.

These inconsistent national regulations enable sophisticated multinational firms to employ opposing techniques by threatening insolvency in order to either impede or compel arbitration, depending on which best suits their interests. Under US bankruptcy rules, a Chinese respondent may request that arbitration be halted if they anticipate a negative decision. A French claimant, on the other hand, may file for insolvency to bypass US court jurisdiction and ensure arbitration continues if they predict a positive decision. Exploiting procedural gaps causes disagreements over the right forum, resulting in costs and delays.

¹ Student of Galgotias University School of Law BALLB (Hons.)

² Student of Galgotias University School of Law BALLB (Hons.)

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency represents a compromise. It empowers insolvency courts to temporarily refrain from staying arbitral claims to minimize superfluous expenditure and manipulation. However, model laws merely serve as non-binding recommendations without consistent international adoption. Codifying global procedures in reciprocal treaties that require or ban arbitration continuance regardless of jurisdiction will increase justice and efficiency. The ongoing worldwide judicial discourse must strike a balance between arbitration agreements and fair creditor prioritizing during insolvency.

Enforcing Arbitration Awards in Insolvency

Another difficult interplay develops when seeking to execute arbitration verdicts against overseas assets of an insolvent respondent. For instance, victory in a Hong Kong seated SIAC arbitration against a Chinese corporation means little if Chinese insolvency courts overseeing bankruptcy reject recognition and compliance. Unfortunately, most nations primarily emphasize domestic creditor interests without coordinating concern for international arbitral judgments that risk dispersing local assets offshore.

For example, US bankruptcy courts that adhere to "territoriality principles" seldom defer to offshore private arbitration rulings, instead stressing equal distribution of domestic assets under Chapter 15 bankruptcy processes. Foreign insolvency courts frequently reject Chapter 15 verdicts without bilateral cooperation arrangements in place. This parallels larger obstacles in implementing international arbitration verdicts, which still need confirming local court judgments.

The development of international judicial aid accords is necessary to facilitate the universal acceptance of valid offshore awards during cross-border insolvency. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency encourages the establishment of "ancillary processes," which allow international insolvency administrators to participate in local bankruptcy proceedings. Similarly, the American Law Institute's Transnational Insolvency Project guidelines help domestic courts evaluate appropriate international judgments. Continued progress toward multilateral judgement reciprocity can enable seamless award enforcement regardless of locational differences.

Coordinating Prioritization of Claims

A related issue is inconsistently ranking creditor claims seeking recovery from limited bankruptcy assets across jurisdictions. Certain nations, such as Austria, unfairly favor arbitration over other processes by classifying judgments as secured debt during insolvency distribution. This goes

against public policy by enabling secret private arbitration to override broad creditor interests without equitable explanation. However, UNCITRAL's Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency includes measures to prevent discriminatory prioritization. It proposes limiting favored status to arbitrations directly related to the insolvent debtor, begun prior to declaration or under special enforceable agreements.

Standardizing these qualification requirements worldwide gives consistent principles for balancing alternative conflict resolution results with collective court-supervised closure. It also encourages cross-border judicial cooperation to guarantee that domestic creditors are adequately safeguarded overseas. Ongoing reform promotes collaboration in navigating substantive and procedural heterogeneity between jurisdictional approaches.

Insolvency Proceedings Obstructing Pending Arbitration

A problematic issue is whether beginning bankruptcy proceedings immediately ends any ongoing or upcoming arbitration required under pre-insolvency agreements. Certain nations, such as France, strictly enforce arbitration agreements even after one side declares bankruptcy. Other nations, notably the United States and Switzerland, argue that insolvency trumps and essentially invalidates existing arbitration arrangements. Exploiting jurisdictional differences causes conflicts about the right venue, resulting in costs and delays.

Strategic Manipulation of Procedural Loopholes

These inconsistent national regulations enable sophisticated multinational firms to employ opposing techniques by threatening insolvency in order to either impede or compel arbitration, depending on which best suits their interests. Under US bankruptcy rules, a Chinese respondent may request that arbitration be halted if they anticipate a negative decision. A French claimant might seek bankruptcy to bypass US court jurisdiction and ensure arbitration continues if they foresee a positive conclusion.

Guidelines on Continuing Arbitration in Insolvency

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency provides a solution that allows insolvency courts to temporarily defer from staying arbitral claims in order to prevent unnecessary costs and manipulation. However, model laws are essentially non-binding guidelines that lack consistent worldwide adoption. Codifying global procedures in reciprocal treaties that require or ban arbitration continuance regardless of jurisdiction will increase justice and efficiency.

Enforcing Arbitral Awards in Foreign Insolvency Courts

Another difficult interplay develops when seeking to execute arbitration verdicts against an insolvent respondent's overseas assets. For example, winning a Hong Kong-seated SIAC arbitration against a Chinese corporation is meaningless if Chinese insolvency courts that oversee bankruptcy reject recognition and compliance. Unfortunately, most governments prioritize domestic creditor interests without considering foreign arbitral rulings, which risk losing local assets overseas.

Need for Improved Cross-Border Judicial Assistance

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency encourages the launch of "ancillary procedures," which allow international insolvency administrators to participate in local bankruptcy proceedings. Similarly, the American Law Institute's Transnational Insolvency Project guidelines help domestic courts evaluate appropriate international judgments. Continued progress toward multilateral judgement reciprocity can enable easy award enforcement regardless of locational discrepancies.

Inconsistent Prioritization of Claims Conflicts

Another issue is that creditor claims seeking recovery from restricted insolvency assets are not uniformly prioritized across countries. Certain nations, such as Austria, unfairly favour arbitration over other processes by classifying judgments as secured debt during insolvency distribution. This goes against public policy by enabling secret private arbitration to override broad creditor interests without equitable explanation.

Recommendations on Qualified Arbitration Claim Priority

However, UNCITRAL's Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency includes measures to prevent discriminatory prioritization. It proposes limiting favoured status to arbitrations directly related to the insolvent debtor, begun prior to declaration or under special enforceable agreements. Standardizing these qualified conditions internationally provides coherent guidelines when balancing alternative dispute resolution outcomes with collective court-supervised winding up.

Here are some more pertinent instances and cases that highlight crucial difficulties of cross-border bankruptcy and arbitration:

1. Drago Energy v. Exmar:

Drago Energy, a Hong Kong-based energy company, sought to enforce an arbitral ruling against

Belgian shipping corporation Exmar. Exmar filed for bankruptcy protection in Belgium following the award to preserve its assets. The case emphasized the difficulty in implementing international arbitration verdicts when the losing party declares insolvency in a foreign jurisdiction.

2. Vitro SAB v Vitro Assets:

Mexican glassmaker Vitro filed for insolvency in Mexican courts, eliminating obligations due to international creditors. However, the US bankruptcy court determined that this breached Chapter 15, which protects US creditor interests and prevents Vitro from concealing US-based assets. It was demonstrated that jurisdictional cooperation is required to balance domestic and international creditor rights.

3. Yukos Oil Company:

Yukos filed an investment treaty arbitration against Russia for claimed expropriation. Simultaneously, Russia imposed retroactive tax charges, declaring Yukos insolvent and dissolving assets. Parallel treaty arbitration and offshore bankruptcy proceedings against state enterprises present further hurdles in balancing public and private interests across forums.

4. China International Engineering v Mabey:

Mabey, a Chinese state-owned enterprise, was ordered to be rehabilitated by a Chinese insolvency tribunal after losing an ICC arbitration award to Turkish construction entity CIE. However, following talks, the award was finally fulfilled using secured assets, demonstrating that insolvency processes were effectively integrated with relevant external rulings.

Present scenario in cross-border insolvency and arbitration:

Rapid Rise of Cross-Border Activity

Globalization has increased the scope and complexity of international commerce and investment in recent decades. Complex transactions entail elaborate contracts involving parties from many jurisdictions, which increases the probability of cross-border insolvency when defaults occur. International arbitration case loads have increased as the primary dispute resolution option for transaction problems.

Pandemic Impact

COVID-19 caused widespread insolvencies, particularly among entities without localized businesses that relied on cross-border mobility. Simultaneous movement constraints pushed

arbitration to relocate online. This unexpectedly increased public access to traditionally secret procedures via virtual hearings, despite banking secrecy restrictions protecting sensitive client information. Conflict erupted about proper transparency standards.

Enforcement Inconsistency

A key ongoing issue is unequal execution of arbitral decisions against foreign assets, particularly when parties purposefully declare defensive bankruptcy after losing in arbitration. Recipient governments frequently see offshore arbitration rulings as infringing on sovereignty in domestic bankruptcy processes. Politically prominent corporate creditors exercise power, skewing asset allocation priorities notwithstanding lawful awards. Ad hoc remedies prevail in the absence of comprehensive mechanisms for overcoming enforcement barriers.

Emerging Economies Role

Advanced jurisdictions used landmark precedents to settle early ambiguities in arbitration's role in insolvency. However, growing economies such as India, Brazil, and African republics lack the necessary case history for local courts to develop cohesive jurisprudence. This creates ambiguity for international creditors when evaluating award reliability against assets in emerging nations with changing regulatory quality. Clearer legislative frameworks based on existing laws elsewhere help hasten coherence.

Here are some obstacles in cross-border bankruptcy cases that include international arbitration:

1. Asset Tracing Difficulties

Insolvent multinational corporations sometimes conceal ownership or intentionally move assets through complicated offshore company structures in order to evade creditors. This might render even lawful arbitral decisions invalid if monies have already left the jurisdiction. Specialist asset tracing assistance can be beneficial, but it incurs additional fees.

2. Disadvantaging Small Creditors

Larger creditor businesses with strong legal teams may frequently negotiate many concurrent insolvency and arbitration actions across borders to improve award enforcement. Smaller counterparties that lack such access confront inherent inequalities in the system.

3. Risk of Inconsistent Judgements

When several bankruptcy and arbitration proceedings involving an entity are conducted simultaneously throughout the world, there is always the danger of irreconcilable judgement collisions. For example, one court may approve asset sales or restructuring plans that another considers illegitimate. Resolving such contradictions is difficult.

4. Good Faith Principle- Erosion

Allowing purposeful manipulation of processes by threatening strategic litigation action undermines the credibility of the settlement procedures itself, albeit being legally authorized. Contract freedom principles make it difficult for regulators to explicitly prohibit such activity.

5. Race to Favorable Jurisdictions

The ability to file main insolvency action and specify venue terms provides a significant benefit. This encourages unduly hazardous worldwide growth initiatives by businesses hoping to reap jurisdiction shopping benefits later. Regulations struggle with limiting jurisdiction alternatives in order to prevent overstretch.

Suggestions based on connections between cross-border bankruptcy and international arbitration:

1. Global Insolvency Registry

A global register of cross-border bankruptcy files enables creditors anticipating bad foreign verdicts to locate the best venues for both offensive and defensive insolvency proceedings. This increases transparency, preventing jurisdiction shopping.

2. Multilateral Judgment Network

Regional entities, such as the EU Bankruptcy Regulation, require immediate acceptance of domestic verdicts overseas, banning asset flight from awaiting arbitration irrespective of local insolvency status. Expanding these reciprocal networks internationally improves award dependability.

3. Limit Insolvency Threat Strategy

Amending national laws to prevent purposeful insolvency threats and nullification of ongoing arbitration in the absence of solid financial distress proof discourages sophisticated entities from manipulating outcomes to avoid predictable negative consequences.

Conclusion

The growing worldwide interconnection of organizations makes multi-party cross-border bankruptcy unavoidable. The expansion of arbitration to handle foreign transaction issues will inevitably collide with collective bankruptcy procedures. In the absence of clear rules, tension arises when parties use procedural vulnerabilities by threatening bankruptcy proceedings in order to either impede or coerce arbitration. Enforcing awards against foreign assets governed under different insolvency regimes causes additional confusion.

Global agreements that align arbitration's interaction with insolvency might reduce procedural manipulation, provide equitable creditor prioritizing, and permit reciprocal cross-border verdicts. Continuous judicial conversation and collaboration are required to stitch together patchwork national legislation into a cohesive universal framework at the intersection of private arbitration and public bankruptcy for fair and efficient dispute resolution.

