

Statutory demands in the BVI: no longer truly optional?

Service area / [Restructuring and Insolvency](#)

Legal jurisdiction / [British Virgin Islands](#)

Date / [July 2020](#)

Statutory demands in the British Virgin Islands have long been a useful option for creditors of defaulting companies. Properly utilised, they either secure payment of the outstanding debt or provide the creditor with the benefit of a statutory presumption of insolvency to assist in their application to appoint a liquidator over the company. However, in light of the recent decisions in *Rangecroft Ltd v Lenox International Holdings Ltd*¹ and *IS Investment Fund Segregated Portfolio Company v Fair Cheerful Ltd*² a reassessment is required as to whether the procedure is truly optional.

The Court in *Lenox International* highlighted the importance of following the “two-step process” to wind up a company on the basis of its insolvency. In its view, the creditor should first serve a statutory demand before then issuing an application for the appointment of a liquidator. Although the Court recognised that a creditor is not obliged to serve a statutory demand, it went on to make it clear that the Court did not encourage proceeding without a statutory demand and asked whether there was a “good reason” for “failing” to serve a statutory demand. The underlying rationale was informed by a desire to prevent the debtor from being prejudiced by the creditor’s failure to serve a statute demand in the context of an arbitration clause of disputed effect. In the Court’s view, the “two-step process” provided an important safeguard for the company.

This marks a shift in approach and language which was also echoed in *Fair Cheerful*. In circumstances where a creditor may be called to upon to explain its “failure” to serve a statutory demand, it is arguable that the procedure is no longer truly optional in the traditional sense. Rather, the reasoning in *Lenox International* and *Fair Cheerful* suggests that the statutory demand route should be regarded as the default position and sounds a note of caution that a creditor will be required to justify electing to proceed directly to an application to appoint a liquidator without first serving a statutory demand.

This will be unwelcome news to creditors who previously would often proceed directly to an application to appoint a liquidator. It is likely to result in an increased use of the statutory demand procedure and, as a result, more disputes coming before the BVI Court by way of application to set aside a statutory demand, as opposed to at the stage of a contested application to appoint a liquidator.

For more information or for a copy of the Court’s decisions, please feel free to contact your usual Carey Olsen contact.

¹ BVIHC (COM) No 37 of 2020, unreported, 6 July 2020

² BVIHC (COM) 2020/0034, unreported, 16 July 2020

OFFSHORE LAW SPECIALISTS

BERMUDA BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS CAYMAN ISLANDS GUERNSEY JERSEY
CAPE TOWN HONG KONG LONDON SINGAPORE



FIND US

Carey Olsen
Rodus Building
PO Box 3093
Road Town
Tortola VG1110
British Virgin Islands

T +1 284 394 4030
E bvi@careyolsen.com

Carey Olsen Hong Kong LLP
Suites 3610-13
Jardine House
1 Connaught Place
Central
Hong Kong

T +852 3628 9000
E hongkong@careyolsen.com



FOLLOW US

Visit our restructuring and
insolvency team at [careyolsen.com](https://www.careyolsen.com)



PLEASE NOTE

This briefing is only intended to
provide a very general overview
of the matters to which it relates.
It is not intended as legal advice
and should not be relied on as
such. © Carey Olsen 2020.