

**INSOLVENCY LAW  
SUMMARY  
2011**



**LAWSKOOL.COM.AU**

**LAWSKOOL PTY LTD**

# CONTENTS

<b>CASE LIST</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. OVERVIEW AND THEORY</b>	<b>14</b>
1.1 THE INSOLVENCY PROCESS	14
1.2 INSOLVENCY THEORY	14
1.1.1 <i>The “Creditors Bargain” Model</i>	14
1.1.2 <i>Distributional Theory</i>	15
1.1.3 <i>Australian Law</i>	15
<b>2. ASSESSING INSOLVENCY</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 TEST FOR ASSESSING SOLVENCY	15
2.2 CASES INTERPRETING SECTION 95A	16
2.2.1 <i>The Test</i>	16
2.2.2 <i>Indicators of Insolvency</i>	16
2.2.3 <i>Ability to Pay</i>	16
2.2.4 <i>Debts (As Distinct From Claims)</i>	18
2.2.5 <i>As and When They Become Due and Payable</i>	18
<b>3. INFORMAL WORKOUTS</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 DEFINITION AND JUSTIFICATION	19
3.2 REVIEW BEFORE INFORMAL WORKOUT	20
3.3 THE BUSINESS PLAN	21
3.4 STRUCTURING A CONTRACTUAL WORKOUT	21
3.4.1 <i>The Standstill Phase as Acceptance</i>	21
3.4.2 <i>Documentation</i>	21
3.5 Issues Associated with Informal Workouts	22
3.5.1 <i>Creditors Committee</i>	22
3.5.2 <i>Shadow Directorship</i>	22
<b>4. COMPULSORY LIQUIDATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1 OVERVIEW OF LIQUIDATION	24
4.2 COMPULSORY LIQUIDATION UNDER SECTION 459A	24
4.2.1 <i>Order – Section 459A</i>	24
4.2.2 <i>Standing – Section 459P</i>	24
4.2.3 <i>Evidence of Insolvency</i>	25
4.3 WINDING UP APPLICATION AND THE HEARING	28
4.4 CONSEQUENCES OF LIQUIDATION	28
<b>5. ROLE AND POWERS OF THE LIQUIDATOR</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 OVERVIEW	29
5.2 DUTIES OF THE LIQUIDATOR	30
5.2.1 <i>General Duties</i>	30
5.2.2 <i>Specific Duties</i>	30
5.3 POWERS OF THE LIQUIDATOR	31
5.3.1 <i>General Power in Section 477</i>	31
5.3.2 <i>Restriction in Relation to Long Term Contracts</i>	31
5.3.3 <i>Engagement of Agents</i>	32
5.3.4 <i>Powers of Examination</i>	32
5.3.5 <i>Other Powers</i>	33
<b>6. INSOLVENT TRADING</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1 OVERVIEW	34
6.2 CONDITIONS OF LIABILITY UNDER SECTION 588G	34
6.2.1 <i>General</i>	34
6.2.2 <i>Reasonable Grounds to Suspect Insolvency</i>	34
6.3 DEFENCES	35
6.4 CONSEQUENCES OF LIABILITY	35

6.5	HOLDING COMPANY LIABILITY FOR SUBSIDIARY	36
6.6	APPLICATION OF COMPENSATION MONIES	37
6.7	CASE STUDY – METROPOLITAN FIRE SYSTEMS V MILLER	37
<b>7.</b>	<b>RIGHTS OF CREDITORS DURING INSOLVENCY</b>	<b>38</b>
7.1	OVERVIEW	38
7.2	IS THE PERSON A CREDITOR FOR THE PURPOSES OF WINDING UP?	38
7.3	PROOF OF DEBT	39
7.3.1	<i>General</i>	39
7.3.2	<i>Claims by Members</i>	39
7.3.3	<i>Deciding Proofs of Debt</i>	39
7.4	RIGHTS OF THE REQUISITE CREDITOR IN THE WINDING UP	39
7.4.1	<i>Payment of Dividends</i>	40
7.4.2	<i>Special Priorities</i>	40
7.4.3	<i>Employee Entitlements</i>	41
7.4.4	<i>Indemnifying Creditors</i>	41
7.4.5	<i>General Rights</i>	42
<b>8.</b>	<b>VOLUNTARY ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>43</b>
8.1	OVERVIEW	43
8.2	COMMENCEMENT AND TERMINATION OF VOLUNTARY ADMINISTRATION	44
8.2.1	<i>Appointment</i>	44
8.2.2	<i>Termination of Voluntary Administration</i>	45
8.3	EFFECT OF THE ADMINISTRATION	45
8.3.1	<i>Company and Shareholders</i>	46
8.3.2	<i>General Dealings with Company's Property</i>	46
8.3.3	<i>Company Officers</i>	46
8.3.4	<i>Company Employees</i>	46
8.3.5	<i>Company Contracts</i>	47
8.3.6	<i>Creditors</i>	47
8.3.7	<i>Owners and Lessors of Property</i>	48
8.4	THE ADMINISTRATOR	49
8.4.1	<i>Qualifications</i>	49
8.4.2	<i>Removal</i>	49
8.4.3	<i>Validity of Appointment</i>	50
8.4.4	<i>Court Supervision</i>	50
8.4.5	<i>Role and Powers/Duties</i>	50
8.5	CREDITORS' MEETINGS	51
8.5.1	<i>First Creditors' Meeting</i>	52
8.5.2	<i>Second Creditors' Meeting</i>	52
8.6	ROLE AND POWERS OF THE COURT	52
8.6.1	<i>General</i>	52
8.6.2	<i>Section 447A</i>	53
8.7	DEED OF COMPANY ARRANGEMENT	54
8.7.1	<i>Overview</i>	54
8.7.2	<i>Effects of the Deed</i>	55
8.7.3	<i>The Deed Administrator</i>	56
8.7.4	<i>Administration of the Deed</i>	56
8.7.5	<i>Variation of the Deed</i>	57
8.7.6	<i>Termination and Avoidance of a Deed</i>	57
<b>9.</b>	<b>RECEIVERSHIP</b>	<b>59</b>
9.1	OVERVIEW	59
9.2	PRIVATELY APPOINTED RECEIVERS	59
9.2.1	<i>Right to Appoint</i>	59
9.2.2	<i>Manner of Appointment</i>	59
9.2.3	<i>Qualifications of a Receiver</i>	60

9.2.4 <i>Validity of the Appointment</i>	60
9.2.5 <i>Role and Position</i>	61
9.2.6 <i>Powers</i>	61
9.2.7 <i>Duties</i>	62
9.2.8 <i>Liabilities</i>	63
9.2.9 <i>Effects of a Private Appointment</i>	65
9.3 COURT-APPOINTED RECEIVERS	66
9.3.1 <i>Appointment</i>	66
9.3.2 <i>Role and Position</i>	66
9.3.3 <i>Powers, Duties and Liabilities</i>	66
9.3.4 <i>Effect of a Court Appointment</i>	67
<b>10. BANKRUPTCY</b>	<b>67</b>
10.1 VOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY	67
10.1.1 <i>Overview</i>	67
10.1.2 <i>Moratorium Provisions</i>	68
10.1.3 <i>Debtor's Petitions</i>	68
10.2 COMPULSORY BANKRUPTCY	70
10.2.1 <i>Overview</i>	70
10.2.2 <i>Creditor's Petition</i>	70
10.2.3 <i>Failure to Comply with a Bankruptcy Notice</i>	71
10.2.4 <i>Hearing of the Creditor's Petition</i>	74
10.3 IMPACT OF BANKRUPTCY	75
10.3.1 <i>Effect on the Bankrupt</i>	75
10.3.2 <i>Effects on the Bankrupt's Family</i>	76
10.3.3 <i>Effect on the Bankrupt's Property</i>	77
10.3.4 <i>Effect on Creditors</i>	77
10.4 CRIMINAL CONDUCT OF THE BANKRIPT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES	77
10.5 ASSETS AVAILABLE TO THE TRUSTEE	78
10.5.1 <i>General</i>	78
10.5.2 <i>Specific Types of Property</i>	78
10.5.3 <i>Exempt and Protected Property</i>	79
<b>11. AVOIDANCE PROVISIONS</b>	<b>81</b>
11.1 OVERVIEW	81
11.2 UNFAIR PREFERENCES	82
11.2.1 <i>Conditions for a Unfair Preference – Section 588FA</i>	82
11.2.2 <i>Running Accounts</i>	83
11.3 UNCOMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS	84
11.4 DEFEATING OF DELAYING OR OBSTRUCTING CREDITORS	84
11.4.1 <i>General</i>	84
11.4.2 <i>Recovery from Related Entities</i>	85
11.5 UNFAIR LOANS	85
11.6 UNREASONABLE DIRECTOR-RELATED TRANSACATIONS	85
11.7 COURT ORDERS – SECTION 588FF	86
11.8 PROTECTIV E PROVISONS	86
11.8.1 <i>General – Section 588FG</i>	86
11.8.2 <i>Good Faith</i>	87
11.8.3 <i>Reasonable Grounds and Suspicion of Insolvency</i>	87
11.8.4 <i>Valuable Consideration and Change of Position</i>	87
<b>Sources Used</b>	<b>88</b>

## 1. Case List

<i>Advance Housing Pty Ltd (in liq) v Newcastle Classic Dvt Pty Ltd</i> (1994) 12 ACLC 701.....	5.1
<i>Airlines Airspares Ltd v Handly Page Ltd</i> [1970] 1 Ch 193.....	9.2.9
<i>Air Services Australia v Ferrier</i> (1996) 185 CLR 483.....	11.2.2
<i>Ames v Birkenhead Docks Trustees</i> (1855) 20 Beav 332.....	9.3.4
<i>ANZ Banking Group v TJF/EBC Pty Ltd</i> (2006) 24 ACLC 327.....	7.4.3
<i>ANZ Banking Group (NZ) Ltd v Gibson</i> (1981) 2 ACLR 513.....	9.2.2
<i>ASIC v Edge</i> (2007) 211 FLR 137.....	5.2.1
<i>ATSI v Jurnkurakurr ARC Aboriginal Corp (In Liq)</i> (1993) 110 FLR 1.....	5.1
<i>Australasian Memory Pty Ltd v O'Brien</i> (2000) 200 CLR 270.....	8.6.2
<i>Australian Guarantee Corporation v Lawrence</i> (1999) 17 ACLC 1226.....	8.7.6
<i>Bank of Australasia v Hall</i> (1907) 4 CLR 1514.....	2.2.5
<i>Barton v Official Receiver</i> (1986) 161 CLR 75.....	11.8.4
<i>Beaty v Brashs Pty Ltd</i> (1998) 79 FCR 551.....	8.2.1
<i>Besser Industries (NT) P/L v Steelcan Constructions P/L</i> (1995) 13 ACLRC 544...4.2.3	4.2.3
<i>Brash Holdings Ltd (admin apptd) v Katile Pty Ltd</i> (1994) 12 ACLC 472.....	8.3.4
<i>Brunninghausen v Glavanics</i> [1998] FCA 2073.....	10.2.3
<i>Bunburry Foods P/L v National Bank of Australasia Ltd</i> (1984) 153 CLR 491.....	9.2.2
<i>Burrell v Connell</i> (2000) 84 FCR 383.....	10.2.4
<i>Campbells Cash &amp; Carry Pty Ltd v Fostif Pty Ltd</i> (2006) 229 CLR 386.....	10.3.1
<i>Canberra Advance Bank v Benny</i> (1992) 9 ACSR 179.....	9.2.1
<i>Canpoint International Pty Ltd v Anar International Pty Ltd</i> [2008] FCA 4.....	4.2.3
<i>Cape v Redarb Pty Ltd</i> (1992) 8 ACSR 67.....	9.3.2
<i>Capital Finance v Tolcher</i> (2007) 165 FCR 83.....	11.2.1

<i>Chief Commissioner of Stamp Duties v Paliflex P/L</i> (1999) 17 ACLC 467.....	4.3
<i>Chief Commissioner (State Revenue) v Rafferty's Resort Mgt P/L (in liq)</i> [2008] NSWSC 452.....	8.6.2
<i>City &amp; Suburban v Smith as liquidator of Compac</i> (1998) 28 ACSR 328.....	5.2.1
<i>Commonwealth v Irving</i> (1996) 65 FCR 291.....	5.1
<i>Cox v Journeaux (No 2)</i> (1935) 52 CLR 713.....	10.3.1
<i>Crema P/L v Land Mark Property Developments P/L</i> (2006) 58 ACSR 631.....	2.1
<i>Crimmins v Glenview Home Units</i> [2001] NSWSC 699.....	8.2.1
<i>Cussen v Commissioner of Taxation</i> (2004) 22 ACLC 1,528.....	11.8.2, 11.8.3
<i>Daemar v Industrial Commission (NSW) (No 2)</i> (1990) 22 NSWLR 178.....	10.3.1
<i>David Lambourne Yacht Rigging v Perry Catamarans (Receivers Apptd)</i> (2006) 56 ACSR 155.....	8.3.6
<i>DCT v Clark</i> (2003) 45 ACSR 332.....	6.3
<i>DCT v Foodcorp Pty Ltd</i> (1994) 13 ACSR 796.....	8.7.2
<i>DCT v K J Consulting Pty Ltd</i> [2005] FCA 1827.....	8.3.6
<i>DCT v Winterburn Trading Pty Ltd</i> (1995) 16 ACSR 24.....	8.7.4
<i>Deangrove Pty Ltd (Receivers Apptd) v Buckby</i> (2006) 24 ACLC 414.....	9.2.7
<i>Demondrille Nominees Pty Ltd v Shirlaw</i> (1997) 25 ACSR 535.....	11.3
<i>Downey v Aira Pty Ltd</i> (2005) 23 ACLC 104.....	11.8.2
<i>Downs Distributing Co P/L v Associated Blue Star Stores P/L</i> (1948) 76 CLR 463.....	10.5.3
<i>Dwyer v R-Jay Pty Ltd</i> [2007] SASC 100.....	11.2.1
<i>Empire (Aust) Nominees Pty Ltd (in liq) v Vince</i> (2000) 35 ACSR 167.....	5.3.2
<i>Ex parte Merrett</i> (1997) 140 FLR 412.....	5.3.4
<i>Expo International Pty Ltd v Chant</i> [1979] 2 NSWLR 820.....	9.2.8
<i>Fekala Pty Ltd v Cenbond Pty Ltd</i> (2001) 37 ACSR 613.....	8.3.6

<i>FCT v Comcorp Australia Ltd</i> (1996) 14 ACLC 1616.....	8.7.1
<i>FCT v Official Receiver</i> (1956) 95 CLR 300.....	10.5.2
<i>FCT v Prescribing Biochemists Pty Ltd</i> (1994) 12 ACLC 905.....	8.4.5
<i>Florgale Uniforms Pty Ltd v NAB</i> (2004) 11 VR 54.....	9.2.7
<i>Fuji Xerox v Tolcher</i> (2004) 50 ACSR 402.....	7.4.4
<i>Gibbs v Trescott</i> (1995) 65 FCR 80.....	10.2.3
<i>Ginnane v Diners Club Limited</i> (1993) 120 ALR 375.....	10.2.3
<i>Goldspar Aust Pty Ltd v KWA Design Group Pty Ltd</i> (1999) 17 ACLC 456.....	4.2.3
<i>Gore v Australian Goldfields NL (in liq)</i> [2001] WASC 242.....	7.3.1
<i>Gray v Bridgestone</i> (1986) 4 ACLC 330.....	5.2.1
<i>Green v Giljohann</i> (1995) 17 ACSR 518.....	8.3.4
<i>Griffiths v Secretary of State for Social Services</i> [1974] QB 468.....	9.2.9
<i>Guss v Johnstone</i> (2000) 74 ALJR 884.....	10.2.3
<i>Hall v Poolman</i> [2007] NSWSC 1330.....	2.2.3, 2.2.4
<i>Hansmar v Perpetual Trustee</i> (2007) 61 ACSR 321.....	4.2.2, 4.2.3
<i>HIH v Building Insurers' Guarantee Corporation</i> (2005) 51 ACSR 21.....	5.3.5
<i>Hill v Venning</i> (1979) 4 ACLC 555.....	9.2.8
<i>Hornet Aviation Pty Ltd v Ansett International Air Freight</i> (1995) 13 ACLC 613.....	4.2.3
<i>Hymix Concrete Pty Ltd v Garrity</i> (1977) 2 ACLR 559.....	2.1
<i>In the matter of Pan Pharmaceuticals Ltd (Admin apptd)</i> (2003) 47 ACSR 139.....	8.4.4
<i>Jambrecina v Official Trustee in Bankruptcy</i> (2003) 2 ABC (NS) 58.....	10.3.1
<i>James v Commonwealth Bank of Australia</i> (1992) 37 FCR 445.....	9.2.7
<i>JA Pty Ltd v Jonco Holdings Pty Ltd</i> (2000) 33 ACSR 691.....	8.7.6

<i>Jenkins v Jonkay Pty Ltd</i> [2007] FCA 858.....	5.2.1
<i>Kleinwort Benson Australia v Cowl</i> (1988) 165 CLR 71.....	10.2.3
<i>Lam Soon Australia v Molit (No 55) Pty Ltd</i> (1996) 63 FCR 391.....	8.7.4, 8.7.6
<i>Lewis v Doran</i> (2004) 208 ALR 385.....	2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.5
<i>Ling v Enrobook Pty Ltd</i> (1997) 74 FCR 19.....	10.2.4
<i>Love v Ledger</i> (Unreported, WASC, 31 October 1994, Scott J).....	9.2.7
<i>Main Camp v Australian Rural</i> (2002) 20 ACLC 226.....	4.2.3
<i>Manpac Industries Pty Ltd v Ceccattini</i> (2002) 20 ACLC 1304.....	6.3
<i>Metropolitan Fire Systems Pty Ltd v Miller</i> (1997) 23 ACSR 699.....	6.2.2, 6.3, 6.7
<i>Mibor Investments v Commonwealth Bank of Australia</i> (1993) 11 ACSR 362.....	4.2.3
<i>National Australia Bank Limited v Westbrook</i> [2000] FCA 246.....	10.2.4
<i>National Provincial Bank Ltd v Ainsworth</i> [1965] AC 1175.....	10.3.2
<i>New Cap Reinsurance v All American Life Insurance</i> (2004) 49 ACSR 417.....	11.2.1
<i>Pan Foods Co Pty Ltd v ANZ Banking Group Ltd</i> [2000] 74 ALJR 791.....	9.2.2
<i>Peter Pan Mgt P/L v Capital Finance Group (Aust) P/L</i> (2001) 19 ACLC 1,392.....	11.3
<i>Poignland v NZI Securities Australia Ltd</i> (1994) 13 ACSR 523.....	8.2.1
<i>Portrait Express (Sales) P/L v Kodak (Australasia) P/L</i> (1996) 132 FLR 300.....	4.2.3
<i>Queensland Bacon Pty Ltd v Rees</i> (1967) 115 CLR 266.....	11.8.3
<i>Re Andersens Home Furnishing Co Ltd</i> (1996) 14 ACLC 1710.....	8.3.3
<i>Re Ansett Australia (admin apptd)</i> (2001) 39 ACSR 255.....	8.3.7

<i>Re AP &amp; PJ King Pty Ltd (in liq)</i> [2006] NSWSC 315.....	5.3.2
<i>Re Bartlett Researched Securities Pty Ltd (admin apptd)</i> (1994) 12 ACSR 707.....	8.4.5
<i>Re Behan</i> (1995) 13 ACLC 1644.....	8.3.3
<i>Re Bird; Ex parte Azzopardi</i> (1979) 39 FLR 277.....	10.5.3
<i>Re B Johnson &amp; Co (Builders) Ltd</i> [1955] Ch 634.....	9.2.5
<i>Re Brink; Ex parte Commercial Banking Co of Sydney Ltd</i> (1980) 30 ALR 433.....	10.2.3
<i>Re British Investments and Development Co Pty Ltd</i> (1979) ACLC 32.....	9.2.8
<i>Re Burnells Pty Ltd (in liq)</i> (1979) 4 ACLR 213.....	5.2.1
<i>Re Celestine; Ex parte Monte Paschi Australia Ltd</i> (1997) 71 FCR 399.....	10.2.3
<i>Re Central Commodities Services Pty Ltd</i> [1984] 1 NSWLR 25.....	9.3.3
<i>Re Donovan</i> (1972) 20 FLR 50.....	10.5.3
<i>Re Emanuel (No 14) Pty Ltd; Macks v Blacklaw</i> (1997) 147 ALR 281.....	11.2.1
<i>Re Evans</i> (1995) 61 FCR 556.....	10.5.2
<i>Re Excel Finance Corp</i> (1994) 52 FCR 69.....	5.3.4
<i>Re Francis; Ex parte Official Trustee in Bankruptcy</i> (1988) 19 FCR 149.....	10.3.2
<i>Re Geneva Finance Ltd</i> (1992) 7 ACSR 415.....	9.2.5
<i>Re Goldberg (No 2)</i> [1912] 1 KB 606.....	9.2.4, 9.2.8
<i>Re Gyngell; Ex parte Speedo Group Ltd</i> (1990) 27 FCR 531.....	10.2.3
<i>Re Hansen</i> (1985) 4 FCR 590.....	10.2.3
<i>Re Honeysett; Saxon Building Society v Donnelly</i> [1998] FCA 1398.....	10.1.3
<i>Re Intercontinental Properties Pty Ltd</i> (1977) 2 ACLR 488.....	5.2.1
<i>Re Ken Godfrey Pty Ltd (in liq)</i> (1994) 14 ACSR 610.....	7.4.4
<i>Re Mack Trucks (Britain) Ltd</i> [1967] 1 WLR 780.....	9.2.9
<i>Re Monadelphous Engineering Associates</i> (1988) 7 ACLC 220.....	5.3.4
<i>Re Morris Catering (Aust) Pty Ltd</i> (1993) 11 ACSR 601.....	4.2.3
<i>Re Mottee</i> (1977) 29 FLR 406.....	10.1.3
<i>Re National Safety Council of Australia (Vic Division)</i> (1989) 7 ACLC 607.....	5.1

<i>Re North City Development Pty Ltd</i> (1990) 2 ACSR 291.....	9.2.8
<i>Re Orbie Pty Ltd (in liq) (No 4)</i> (1984) 8 ACLR 967.....	5.1
<i>Re Oskar</i> (1984) 55 ALR 717.....	10.2.2
<i>Re Sharpe; Ex parte Donnelly</i> (1998) 80 FCR 536.....	10.5.2
<i>Re Simms</i> [1934] Ch 1.....	9.2.4
<i>Re Sterling; Ex parte Esanda Pty Ltd</i> (1980) 44 FLR 125.....	10.2.3
<i>Re The Walker Group Pty Ltd (in liq)</i> (1995) 13 ACLC 434.....	11.4.2
<i>Re Timberland Ltd</i> (1979) 4 ACLR 259.....	5.2.1
<i>Re Zorbas</i> [1994] FCA 1516.....	10.1.3
<i>Reid v Hubbard</i> (2003) 1 ABC (NS) 438.....	10.2.3
<i>Russell v East Anglican Rly Co</i> (1850) 20 LJ Ch 257.....	9.3.4
<i>Sandell v Porter</i> (1966) 115 CLR 666.....	2.2.3
<i>Sarina v Council of the Shire of Wollondilly</i> (1980) 48 FLR 372.....	10.2.4
<i>Scanhill Pty Ltd v Century 21 Aust Pty Ltd</i> (1993) 47 FCR 451.....	4.2.3
<i>Sims v Celcast Pty Ltd</i> (1998) 7 SASR 142.....	11.8.3
<i>Sipad Holding DDPO v Popovic</i> (1995) 14 ACLC 307.....	9.2.8
<i>Smith v DCT</i> (1996) 22 ACSR 331.....	8.3.5
<i>Sons of Gwalia v Margaretic</i> (2007) 81 ALJR 525.....	7.3.2
<i>Southern Cross Interiors Pty Ltd v DCT</i> (2001) 53 NSWLR 213.....	2.2.1, 2.2.5
<i>Standard Chartered Bank of Australia v Antico</i> (1995) 38 NSWLR 290.....	3.5.2, 6.2.2
<i>St George Wholesale Finance Pty Ltd v Spalla</i> (2001) 181 ALR 682.....	10.2.3
<i>Surber v Lean</i> (2000) 23 WAR 445.....	8.7.5
<i>Sydlow Pty Ltd v TG Kotselas Pty Ltd</i> (1996) 14 ACLC 846.....	5.1, 5.2.1
<i>Tanning Research Laboratories Inc v O'Brien</i> (1999) 169 CLR 332.....	7.3.3
<i>Telaro Pty Ltd v Burns</i> [2000] NSWSC 26.....	8.3.7

<i>The Bell Group Ltd v Westpac Banking Corp</i> (1997) 15 ACLC 8.....	7.4.4
<i>The Ink Group P/L v Hong Kong Bank of Australia Ltd</i> [1994] FCA 1413.....	9.2.4
<i>Thomas v Todd</i> [1926] 2 KB 511.....	9.2.8
<i>Totterdell v Nicol-Burmeister</i> (1995) 13 ACLC 1521.....	11.2.1
<i>Tourprint Pty Ltd v Bott</i> (1999) 17 ACLC 1543.....	6.3
<i>Trojan v Corporation of Hindmarsh</i> (1987) 16 FCR 37.....	10.2.4
<i>Trustee of the property of O'Reilly v Law Society of NSW</i> (2001) 110 FCR 574.....	10.5.2
<i>Tullet v Armstrong</i> (1836) 48 ER 371.....	9.3.1
<i>Van Reesema v Aust Growth Resources Corporation P/L</i> (1987) 75 ALR 311.....	9.3.2
<i>Wagner v International Health Promotions</i> (1994) 12 ACLC 986.....	8.4.3
<i>Westpac Banking Corp v Nageela Properties Ltd (in liq)</i> (1986) 3 NZCLC 99,588..	11.8.4
<i>Williams v Spautz</i> (1992) 174 CLR 509.....	5.3.4
<i>Woodgate v Davis</i> (2002) 20 ACLC 1,314.....	6.1

## 1. Overview and Theory

### 1.1 The Insolvency Process

- Insolvency is concerned with a process:
  - Appointment
    - What type of appointment has been made?
      - Receivership, voluntary administration, liquidator (what type of “insolvency practitioner”)?
    - Has this appointment been validly made?
  - Investigation

- What is the effect of the appointment in relation to the powers of the insolvency practitioner?
- Has the directors engaged in insolvent trading or entered into voidable transactions?
- Meeting / Priorities / Payments
  - Who are the creditors?
  - Has there been a valid meeting?
- Hence, in problem questions, the following questions need to be asked:
  - What type of appointment has occurred?
  - What is the stage of the insolvency process?

## 1.2 Insolvency Theory

### 1.2.1 The "Creditors Bargain" Model

- Basic corporate law theory is primarily influenced by the shareholder primacy norm whereby the board of directors is accountable to the shareholders because the shareholders are the primary risk-bearers. However, where the company becomes insolvent, the shareholder primacy norm becomes redundant and the "creditors bargain" model becomes relevant.
- The creditors bargain model is based on the notion that insolvency is a fact as opposed to an issue of morality. It asserts that there should be a stay of proceedings amongst the creditors of an insolvent company in order to preserve the pool of assets so that there can be an equitable distribution amongst the creditors (the 'pari passu' principle). Where there are secured (hold rights in rem) and unsecured creditors (hold rights in personam), this model enables recognition of these priorities such that secured creditors are paid out before unsecured creditors.

### 1.2.2 Distributional Theory

- The disadvantages associated with the creditors bargain model comes to fruition when consideration is given to employees and tort claimants who may become potential creditors of an insolvent company. Moreover, such creditors have limited bargaining power in relation to obtaining a secured charge over the company and, hence, the creditors bargain model operates to their disadvantage. In recognition of this disadvantage, distributional theories have emerged which assert that insolvency is a social problem and should be treated accordingly. Furthermore, insolvency is an opportunity to redistribute wealth amongst society such that employees and tort claimants should be given priority over secured creditors.

### 1.2.3 Australian Law

- Australian insolvency law is a combination of these theories.
- There has been a recent push by the ACTU to encourage the Rudd Government to pass legislation which penalises directors of insolvent companies who do not have enough assets to pay out employees' entitlements. Should such legislation be enacted it would reflect the distributional theory.

## 2. Assessing Solvency

### 2.1 Test for Assessing Solvency

- Section 95A(1) provides that a person (individual or company) is solvent where they can pay their debts as and when they become due and payable. Where a person does not have this ability they are insolvent (s 95A(2)).
- The provision imports the "cash flow" test (does the company have sufficient cash or realisable assets to pay their creditors when payment is demanded?) as opposed to the "balance sheet" test (does the company's total assets outweigh their total liabilities?) (*Crema Pty Ltd v Land Mark Property Developments Pty Ltd*). However, this test is not strictly applied because there is a need to distinguish between a temporary lack of liquidity (in which case the company is solvent) from an endemic shortage of working capital (in which case the company is insolvent) (*Hymix Concrete Pty Ltd v Garrity*).
- The elements can be broken down as such:
  - an ability (or practical capacity) to pay;
  - their debts (as distinct from claims);
  - as and when they become due and payable.

### 2.2 Cases Interpreting Section 95A

#### 2.2.1 The Test

- *Southern Cross Interiors Pty Ltd v DCT*
  - The question of whether a company is solvent or insolvent is a question of fact to be determined according to the company's financial position as a whole.
  - In considering the company's financial position, regard must be had to commercial realities in ascertaining:

- the company's available resources;
- the company's potential for acquiring resources by liquidating assets or acquiring loans; and
- when such realisation of assets is achievable.

### 2.2.2 Indicators of Insolvency

- In *Lewis v Doran*, Justice Palmer outlined the indicators of insolvency including:
  - whether there is a history of dishonouring cheques;
  - whether suppliers have provided goods on a COD basis;
  - whether the debtor company has issued post-dated or "rounded-sum" cheques;
  - whether the debtor company has made special arrangements with creditors;
  - whether the debtor company can produce timely, audited accounts;
  - whether the debtor company has unpaid group tax, payroll tax, workers compensation premiums or superannuation contributions;
  - whether the company has received demands from bankers to reduce its overdraft limits; and
  - whether the company has received statutory demands or letters of demand from creditors.

### 2.2.3 Ability to Pay

- The first element contained in s 95A concerns the ability of the person to pay their debts or their practical capacity to pay their debts. This ability is not limited to their cash reserves but also to assets which can be realised within a relatively short period of time.
- *Sandell v Porter*
  - The ability or practical capacity of the person to pay their debts is not limited to their cash reserves but also to assets which can be realised within a relatively short period of time.
  - Whether a period of time will suffice this test depends on the nature and amount of the debt and the circumstances of the debtor's business.

- *Lewis v Doran*
  - Facts
    - There was a corporate group restructure whereby a subsidiary company (Constructions) was confronted with substantial claims for breach of contract.
    - The issue was whether Constructions was insolvent at the date of this restructure and, more importantly, whether the court could take into account the ability of Constructions to obtain an unsecured loan from the parent company (Holdings) to pay their debts.
  - Held
    - The omission of “debtor’s own monies” from the definition of solvency in s 95A of the *Corporations Act* has the effect that the court can have regard to commercial realities when determining insolvency.
    - In a case of retrospective insolvency, the court can take into account the fact that as at and after the alleged date of insolvency the company continued to pay its debts through an unsecured loan by a related third party (holding company or company director).
    - In a case of prospective insolvency, the court is more reluctant to accept that a third party will advance funds to prevent the company from becoming insolvent. Whether this factor will support the company’s solvency will depend upon the willingness of the third party which must be cogently demonstrated.
    - Section 95A requires the court to determine whether the company is able to pay all their debts by reference to commercial realities. Where the court is satisfied that as a matter of commercial reality the company has resources available to pay its debts, it is immaterial whether the resource is an unsecured loan or a voluntary extension of credit by a third party.
- *ASIC v Edwards*
  - A court will not take into account the ability to borrow for the purposes of a solvency assessment where it amounts to the company replacing a debt with a new debt.
- *Hall v Poolman*

- In considering whether a company has the practical capacity to pay its debts by realising assets, the rule of thumb is that the assets must be capable of realisation within 90 days.



**To order the complete version of the lawskool Insolvency Law Summary  
please visit [www.lawskool.com.au](http://www.lawskool.com.au)**

**SAMPLE ONLY**