
Restructuring & Insolvency

Singapore Court Provides Guidance on the Conduct of a Debtor's Bankruptcy Application

Introduction

Debtor's bankruptcy applications may be seen as being less common than creditors' bankruptcy applications. The law regarding the conduct of debtor's bankruptcy applications, including the relevant tests and the burden of proof, is thus less often explored. In *Re Then Feng* [2022] SGHCR 1, the Singapore High Court provided guidance in this regard.

The Court considered a number of questions regarding debtor's bankruptcy applications. Who is entitled to intervene? What must the debtor show to succeed in an application? On what grounds will the Court dismiss an application, and what are the relevant tests?

In this case, the Applicant sought a bankruptcy order against himself, but various creditors opposed the application. The Court found in favour of the creditors, holding that they had a right to be heard in the proceedings.

The Court further found that the Applicant had committed a material contravention by failing to file a complete Statement of Affairs ("**SOA**"), ordering the Applicant to re-file the SOA. The Applicant eventually failed to do so within the specified deadline, and the bankruptcy application was dismissed.

In this Update, we provide a summary of the key points of the Court's decision and what it means for future debtor's bankruptcy applications.

Brief Facts

The Applicant debtor had applied to place himself in bankruptcy.

Certain creditors successfully obtained leave to intervene to oppose the bankruptcy application ("**BA**"). Among others, the creditors applied for:

- (a) the BA to be dismissed on account of the Applicant's failure to disclose certain assets and/or disposal of assets; and

Restructuring & Insolvency

- (b) the BA to be dismissed or stayed on the basis that triable issues had been raised as to the Applicant's professed inability to pay his debts

Holding of the High Court

The Court found in favour of the creditors and ordered the Applicant to re-file his SOA so as to disclose the necessary information. He failed to do so and the BA was accordingly dismissed.

Right of intervention

The Court granted the creditors leave to intervene in the BA. This was on the basis of rule 14 of the Insolvency, Restructuring and Dissolution (Personal Insolvency) Rules 2020 ("**PIR**"), which allows the Court to direct that service of an application and supporting affidavit be effected on any person who may be affected by the order or other relief sought, and provides that any person who is thus served or notified is entitled to be heard.

On the facts, the Court found that the creditors fell within the category of persons who may be "affected" by a bankruptcy order against the Applicant. The Court also rejected the Applicant's argument that rule 14 of the PIR does not apply to *debtor's* bankruptcy applications.

The Court thus ordered the Applicant to serve the BA, the supporting affidavit, and the SOA on the creditors.

Burden and standard of proof

The Court held that, in a debtor's BA, it is the debtor who must satisfy the Court of his inability to pay his debts. The Court also expressed its view that the cash flow test could be used to determine whether a debtor is unable to pay his debts, even in the context of an individual's bankruptcy.

As for the standard of proof, the Court highlighted that a debtor's admission of insolvency and his declarations as to his financial affairs would not be taken as conclusive, particularly where those opposing the application have some reasonable basis to question whether the debtor is in fact unable to pay his debts. In such circumstances, the debtor may be required to adduce evidence to substantiate the accuracy and truthfulness of his SOA, and if he fails to do so, the Court may draw an adverse inference against him.

Dismissal of application

Under section 315(2) of the Insolvency, Restructuring and Dissolution Act ("**IRDA**"), the Court may dismiss the bankruptcy application where it appears to the Court that the applicant has contravened any

Restructuring & Insolvency

of the provisions of the IRDA or the PIR. The Court here had to determine whether the Applicant's alleged non-disclosures warranted the dismissal of the BA.

The Court held that, when considering whether a contravention of the IRDA or PIR warrants dismissal of the bankruptcy application, it may consider the materiality of the contravention and whether the contravention is remediable.

- (a) On materiality, a contravention would be material where it directly affects the Court's ability to fairly and properly decide the bankruptcy application.
- (b) On remediability, where a material contravention is irremediable or the debtor refuses or fails to remedy it, the Court's ability to decide the bankruptcy application would be irreparably compromised, and this would justify the dismissal of the BA. Conversely, where the contravention can be remedied in a timely fashion, the Court should ordinarily be slow to dismiss the bankruptcy application.

On the facts, the Court found that the Applicant had failed to disclose certain sums as part of his assets and to satisfactorily account for the disposal of other sums. As such, he had failed to file a complete, comprehensive and accurate SOA in contravention of section 308(2)(a) of the IRDA.

While the Court found that this was a material contravention of the IRDA, it was of the view that the deficiencies could be remedied. The Court thus ordered the Applicant to re-file the SOA completed to the Court's satisfaction by the stipulated deadline, failing which the BA would be dismissed.

The Applicant eventually failed to re-file the SOA by the deadline, leading to the dismissal of the BA.

Opposing an application

The Court went on to consider the applicable principles when a creditor seeks to stay or dismiss proceedings in a debtor's BA.

The Court held that the same threshold applies whether it is a *debtor* seeking the dismissal of bankruptcy proceedings brought by a *creditor* or a *creditor* seeking the dismissal of bankruptcy proceedings brought by the *debtor* – the "triable issues" threshold. This means that the Court may stay or dismiss a debtor's BA if a creditor raises a triable issue (e.g., whether the debtor has other realisable assets that could be used to pay his debts, or the existence or quantum the debt).

In this instance, the Court found that the creditors had satisfied the threshold, showing triable issues as to the Applicant's ability to pay his debts which were pending determination in certain separate proceedings. This would have warranted a stay of the BA pending the conclusion of the separate proceedings.

Restructuring & Insolvency

Concluding Words

The Court's decision provides valuable guidance on the conduct of a debtor's BA, including what the applicant must prove for the application to succeed, and what must be shown for the application to be dismissed or stayed. The Court's approach to the various tests demonstrates a sense of consistency, generally adopting the equivalent principles applicable in a creditor's BA.

For further queries, please feel free to contact our team below.

Contacts



Chua Beng Chye
Deputy Head, Restructuring &
Insolvency

T +65 6232 0419

beng.chye.chua@rajahtann.com



Cherie Tan
Partner, Restructuring & Insolvency

T +65 6232 0428

cherie.tan@rajahtann.com

Please feel free to also contact Knowledge and Risk Management at eOASIS@rajahtann.com

Our Regional Contacts

RAJAH & TANN | *Singapore*

Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP

T +65 6535 3600
sg.rajahtannasia.com

R&T SOK & HENG | *Cambodia*

R&T Sok & Heng Law Office

T +855 23 963 112 / 113
F +855 23 963 116
kh.rajahtannasia.com

RAJAH & TANN 立杰上海

SHANGHAI REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE | *China*

**Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP
Shanghai Representative Office**

T +86 21 6120 8818
F +86 21 6120 8820
cn.rajahtannasia.com

ASSEGAF HAMZAH & PARTNERS | *Indonesia*

Assegaf Hamzah & Partners

Jakarta Office

T +62 21 2555 7800
F +62 21 2555 7899

Surabaya Office

T +62 31 5116 4550
F +62 31 5116 4560
www.ahp.co.id

RAJAH & TANN | *Lao PDR*

Rajah & Tann (Laos) Co., Ltd.

T +856 21 454 239
F +856 21 285 261
la.rajahtannasia.com

CHRISTOPHER & LEE ONG | *Malaysia*

Christopher & Lee Ong

T +60 3 2273 1919
F +60 3 2273 8310
www.christopherleeong.com

RAJAH & TANN | *Myanmar*

Rajah & Tann Myanmar Company Limited

T +95 1 9345 343 / +95 1 9345 346
F +95 1 9345 348
mm.rajahtannasia.com

GATMAYTAN YAP PATACSIL

GUTIERREZ & PROTACIO (C&G LAW) | *Philippines*

Gatmaytan Yap Patacsil Gutierrez & Protacio (C&G Law)

T +632 8894 0377 to 79 / +632 8894 4931 to 32
F +632 8552 1977 to 78
www.cagatlaw.com

RAJAH & TANN | *Thailand*

R&T Asia (Thailand) Limited

T +66 2 656 1991
F +66 2 656 0833
th.rajahtannasia.com

RAJAH & TANN LCT LAWYERS | *Vietnam*

Rajah & Tann LCT Lawyers

Ho Chi Minh City Office

T +84 28 3821 2382 / +84 28 3821 2673
F +84 28 3520 8206

Hanoi Office


T +84 24 3267 6127
F +84 24 3267 6128
www.rajahtannlct.com

Rajah & Tann Asia is a network of legal practices based in Asia.

Member firms are independently constituted and regulated in accordance with relevant local legal requirements. Services provided by a member firm are governed by the terms of engagement between the member firm and the client.

This update is solely intended to provide general information and does not provide any advice or create any relationship, whether legally binding or otherwise. Rajah & Tann Asia and its member firms do not accept, and fully disclaim, responsibility for any loss or damage which may result from accessing or relying on this update.

Our Regional Presence



Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP is one of the largest full-service law firms in Singapore, providing high quality advice to an impressive list of clients. We place strong emphasis on promptness, accessibility and reliability in dealing with clients. At the same time, the firm strives towards a practical yet creative approach in dealing with business and commercial problems. As the Singapore member firm of the Lex Mundi Network, we are able to offer access to excellent legal expertise in more than 100 countries.

Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP is part of Rajah & Tann Asia, a network of local law firms in Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Our Asian network also includes regional desks focused on Brunei, Japan and South Asia.

The contents of this Update are owned by Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP and subject to copyright protection under the laws of Singapore and, through international treaties, other countries. No part of this Update may be reproduced, licensed, sold, published, transmitted, modified, adapted, publicly displayed, broadcast (including storage in any medium by electronic means whether or not transiently for any purpose save as permitted herein) without the prior written permission of Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP.

Please note also that whilst the information in this Update is correct to the best of our knowledge and belief at the time of writing, it is only intended to provide a general guide to the subject matter and should not be treated as a substitute for specific professional advice for any particular course of action as such information may not suit your specific business and operational requirements. It is to your advantage to seek legal advice for your specific situation. In this regard, you may call the lawyer you normally deal with in Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP or email Knowledge & Risk Management at eOASIS@rajahtann.com.