


# **Secured Finance Law** in China and Hong Kong



**Mark Williams  
Haitian Lu and  
Chin Aun Ong**

CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

[www.cambridge.org/9780521519342](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521519342)

This page intentionally left blank

## SECURED FINANCE LAW IN CHINA AND HONG KONG

This book examines systematically the current systems of secured lending in China and Hong Kong, where companies or individuals offer personal property as security for credit advanced by a lender. Valid and enforceable security reduces the risk to the lender and so lowers the cost of credit to the borrower. However, the Hong Kong system, being largely derived from English law, is highly complex and in need of root-and-branch reform. The forces of inaction have triumphed and valuable opportunities to create a modern, rational and efficient system have been squandered. In China, on the other hand, a completely new system has been created in the last twenty years which, whilst it has various problems and defects, has some notable advantages over the common law equivalent found in Hong Kong.

MARK WILLIAMS is Professor of Law at the School of Accounting and Finance, Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

LU HAITIAN is Assistant Professor of Law at the School of Accounting and Finance, Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

ONG CHIN-AUN served as Associate Professor of Law at the School of Accounting and Finance, Hong Kong Polytechnic University.



# SECURED FINANCE LAW IN CHINA AND HONG KONG

MARK WILLIAMS,  
LU HAITIAN  
AND  
ONG CHIN-AUN



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,  
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521519342](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521519342)

© Mark Williams, Haitian Lu and Chin-aun Ong 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2010

ISBN-13 978-0-511-77131-6 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-51934-2 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Table of cases</i>	ix
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xxii
1 Introduction	1
2 Security over tangible personal property	36
3 Security over intangible personal property	94
4 Company security over personal property	145
5 Hire-purchase, leasing and conditional sale of tangible personal property	219
6 Priority of security interests over personal property	268
7 Enforcement, and creditor's remedies	329
8 Conclusion	374
<i>Index</i>	407





## P R E F A C E

This book owes its genesis to a tragedy. Some six years ago, my dear friend, Ong Chin-aun, died quite unexpectedly. He had just completed a PhD thesis which had been submitted to Bond University, Australia. The dissertation compared the law of Hong Kong and the Philippines in relation to credit advances that were secured against personal property rights. Sadly, he did not live to celebrate the award of his degree and his doctorate was bestowed posthumously.

As a result of this chain of events, and with the enthusiastic agreement of his widow, Rebecca, I conceived the notion to have a modified version of his manuscript published. The result is this book. Lu Haitian and I have worked together to rewrite the original text and to alter its focus, but not its analytical structure, to compare the common law-based provisions relating to personal property credit security lending in Hong Kong with the new Chinese law which is largely (though exclusively based on civilian concepts).

This book attempts to create a comprehensive analytical framework to assess whether either system of credit security law can be assessed as being 'efficient'. As the reader will discover, we come to the conclusion that neither of them pass muster, though for different reasons. The current state of the law in Hong Kong is in the same deplorable state as it is in England, largely as a result of the plethora of security devices and the highly technical, complex and (often) confusing legal rules that govern their creation and perfection.

The English Law Commission has recommended substantial change in relation to security devices over personal property but there seems little evidence of support from the United Kingdom Parliament. The Companies Act 2006 made no substantial change to corporate security structures over personal property and there seems little prospect that a new regime for secured interests over personal property granted by individual or corporate borrowers will be introduced in the foreseeable future, despite the manifold weaknesses that have been identified in existing arrangements.

Unfortunately, the same reluctance to countenance change is evident in Hong Kong. As regards corporate security, the Hong Kong authorities

appear unlikely to adopt substantial change to the existing system in the long overdue rewrite of the Hong Kong Companies Ordinance. The new legislation is due to be published in draft in 2010 and is likely to mirror the English statute and will probably only make cosmetic changes to the company security regime. More generally, the Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong has not yet investigated this subject and so it is also unlikely that a comprehensive overhaul of the law of personal property security will be attempted in the foreseeable future.

However, in China, a wholly new system of granting security interests by individual and corporate borrowers over personal property has been created in the last decade. As China has striven to develop a coherent and comprehensive system of commercial law, the grant of security by corporate and individual borrowers to providers of credit has been accorded significant priority. The enactment of the first comprehensive modern Property Law in China in 2007 included substantial and significant clarification of the types of property rights that exist in Chinese law as well as amplifying and expanding the types of security interests that can be created. This book attempts to examine these developments and submit them to critical analysis.

As a result of our analysis, we reach the somewhat surprising conclusion that whilst both the Hong Kong and the Chinese systems are inefficient, within the analytical framework we adopt the deficiencies are more manifold and serious in Hong Kong as the substantive law is the root of the problem. The new Chinese law certainly lacks detail and the publicity and registration arrangements are obviously unsatisfactory, but the system does have the benefit of simplicity and lacks the crucial distinction between the security that can be offered by personal borrowers and that which can be offered by corporate borrowers that bedevils the common law regime. However, the effective enforcement of security interests is superior in Hong Kong and China suffers notably in this respect.

We hope that this work will be a fitting tribute to Ong's scholarship and his fascination with this technical but vital aspect of commercial law.

We take responsibility for all errors and omissions in this text but we have attempted to state the law as at 1 March 2009.

Mark Williams

Lu Haitian

School of Accounting and Finance

Li Ka Shing Building

Hong Kong Polytechnic University

June 2009

## TABLE OF CASES

- ABN Amro Bank NV v Chiyu Banking Corp Ltd and Others* [2000] 3 HKC 381, [2001] 2 HKLRD 175: 113, 125, 152, 178, 179, 183, 185, 202, 268, 283, 286, 287, 288, 298, 301, 309, 344
- AG v Chan Nai Keung* [1987] 1 WLR 1339: 24
- Agip (Africa) Ltd v Jackson* [1990] Ch 265, [1992] 4 All ER 385: 249, 251, 252
- Agnew and Another v Commissioner of Inland Revenue* [2001] UKPC 28, [2001] 3 WLR 454: 74, 75, 120, 126, 151, 154, 157, 161, 163, 165, 166, 255, 256
- Agra Bank v Barry* (1874) LR 7 HL 135: 281
- Aluminium Industrie Vaassen BV v Romalpa Aluminium Ltd* [1976] 2 All ER 552, [1976] 1 WLR 676: 224, 227, 237, 238, 252, 256
- AMEV-UDC Finance Ltd v Austin and Another* [1986] 68 ALR 185: 351, 354
- Andrabbell Ltd (in liquidation) Airborne Accessories Ltd v Goodman* [1984] 3 All ER 407, [1984] BCLC 522: 248, 250
- Anglo-Auto Finance Co. Ltd v James* [1963] 3 All ER 566: 348
- Anning v Anning* [1907] 4 CLR 1049: 106, 118
- Apex Supply Co. Ltd, Re* [1941] 3 All ER 473: 348, 349, 350
- Armagh Shoes Ltd, Re* [1984] BCLC 405, [1982] NI 59: 156, 158, 161
- Armour and Another v Thyssen Edelstahlwerke AG* [1991] 2 AC 339: 29, 30, 227, 256, 257, 360
- Ashpurton Estates Ltd, Re* [1983] 1 Ch 110: 186, 187
- Associated Alloys Pty Limited v ACN 001 452 106 Pty Limited (in liquidation) and Another* [2000] 202 CLR 588: 52, 110, 225, 241, 249, 252, 255
- Associated Distributors Ltd v Hall* [1938] 1 All ER 511: 348, 350
- Atlantic Computer Systems plc, Re* [1992] 1 WLR 367: 168
- Attorney General for Hong Kong v Reid* [1994] 1 AC 324: 248, 249, 252
- Automatic Bottle Makers Ltd, Re* [1926] All ER 619; [1926] Ch 412: 151, 290
- Automobile and General Finance Corporation Ltd v Morris and Another* (1929) 73 Sol J 451: 228
- Automobile Association (Canterbury) Incorporated v Australasian Secured Deposits Ltd* [1973] 1 NZLR 417: 191
- Bailey v Barnes* [1894] 1 Ch 25: 278

- Bank of China (Hong Kong) Ltd v Kanishi (Far East) Ltd and Another* [2002] 2 HKLRD 52: 95, 128
- Bank of Credit & Commerce International SA (No 8), Re* [1997] 4 All ER 568, [1998] 1 BCLC 68: 65, 124, 126
- Bank of Montreal v Union Gas Co. of Canada and Revelstoke Companies Ltd* (1979) 94 DLR (3d) 962: 298
- Banque Belge pour l'Etranger v Hambrouck* [1921] 1 KB 321: 251
- Barnett v Weston* (1806) 12 Ves 130, 33 ER 50: 281
- Bateman v Gren and King* [1868] IR 2 Ch 607: 224, 314
- Benjamin Cope & Sons Ltd* [1914] 1 Ch 800, 807: 151, 290
- Bianchi v Offord* (1886) 17 QBD 484: 60
- Bishop v Shillito* (1816) 2 B & Ald 329, 106 ER 387: 224
- Blackwell v England* (1857) 8 E & B 541: 59
- Boardman and Another v Phipps* [1966] 3 All ER 721, [1967] 2 AC 46: 248
- Bond Worth Ltd, Re* [1980] Ch 228, [1979] 3 All ER 919, [1979] 3 WLR 629: 51, 52, 53, 156, 157, 184, 227, 232, 240, 249, 255, 258, 259
- Bonds Ltd, Re* (1922) 1 FMSLR 263: 49, 52, 53
- Borden (UK) Ltd v Scottish Timber Products Ltd and Another* [1979] 3 All ER 961: 29, 227, 243, 247, 256
- Bourne v Wall* (1891) 64 LT 530: 342
- Braemar Investments Ltd, Re* [1988] BCLC 556: 187, 188
- Bridge v Campbell Discount Co. Ltd* [1962] AC 600, [1962] 1 All ER 385: 28, 263, 348, 349, 350, 353, 354
- Bright's Trust, Re* (1856) 21 Beav 430, 2 ER 784: 113
- Brightlife Ltd, Re* [1986] 3 All ER 673, [1987] 2 WLR 197, [1986] BCLC 418: 123, 125, 156, 158, 160, 180, 193
- British India Steam Navigation Co. v IRC* (1881) 7 QBD 165: 145
- Broad v Commissioner of Stamp Duties* (1980) 2 NSWLR 40, 40: 124
- Browne v Savage* (1859) 4 Drewery 635, 62 ER 244: 113
- Calisher v Forbes* [1871] 2 Ch App 109: 305
- Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v Otto Timm Enterprises Ltd* (1995) 130 DLR (4th ed) 91: 396
- Capital Finance Co. Ltd v Stokes* [1969] 1 Ch 261: 195
- Cardiff Workmen's Cottage Co. Ltd, Re* [1906] 2 Ch 627: 187
- Caroma Enterprises Ltd, Re* (1979) 108 DLR (3d) 412: 183
- Carritt v Real and Personal Advance Co.* (1889) 42 Ch D 263: 281
- Castell & Brown Ltd, Re* [1898] 1 Ch 315: 285
- Cator v Croydon Canal Co.* (1841) 4 Y&C Ex 593, 160 ER 1149: 99
- Chaigley Farmers Ltd v Crawford, Kaye & Grayshire Ltd (t/a Leylands)* [1996] BCC 957: 242
- Chan Kim Chune v JF Webber*: 40

- Charge Card Services Ltd, Re* [1986] 3 All ER 289: 124
- Charlesworth v Mills* [1892] AC 231, 238: 39, 47
- Chartered Finance (Hong Kong) Ltd v Helen Fashions Garment Co. Ltd and Another* [1978] DCLR 20: 354, 356
- Chase Manhattan Asia v Official Receiver and Liquidator of First Bangkok City Finance* [1990] 1 WLR 1181: 184
- Chase Manhattan Bank v Israel-British Bank (London)* [1980] 2 WLR 202: 249
- Chester & Cole Ltd v Wright* (1930): 348
- China and South Sea Bank Ltd, The, v Tan Soon-gin, George alias George Tan* [1990] 1 HKLR 546, PC: 342, 343
- China Ocean Shipping Co. v Mitrans Shipping Co. Ltd* [1995] 3 HKC 720: 34
- Chingman Company v Popular Fabrics Inc.* [1963] HKLR 855: 203
- Chu Kit Yuk and Another v County Wide Industrial Ltd and Others* [1995] 1 HKC: 278
- CIC-Union Européenne International et Cie v Wing Sun and Company (a firm) and Another* [1985] 1 HKC 568: 54, 55, 58, 66, 67, 68, 72
- Cinema Plus Ltd (Administrators Appointed) and Another v Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd* (2000) 49 NSWLR 513: 124, 147
- City Life Assurance Company Limited, Re* [1926] Ch 191: 104, 106
- City Securities (Pte) Ltd, Re* [1990] 2 MLJ 257: 160, 176, 192
- CL Nye Ltd, Re* [1971] Ch 442, [1970] 3 All ER 1061, CA: 199, 200
- Clarke v Palmer* (1882) 21 Ch D 124: 279, 281, 309
- Cleaver, Re* (1887) 18 QBD 489: 60
- Cleveland Museum of Art v Capricorn International SA* [1990] BCLC 546: 202
- Clough Mill Ltd v Martin* [1984] 3 All ER 982, [1985] 1 WLR 111: 239, 241, 243, 244, 245, 246, 258, 346
- Coggs v Bernard* (1703) 2 Ld Raym 909: 65
- Coleman v Harvey* [1989] 1 NZLR 723: 243
- Colonial Trusts Corpn, Re, ex parte Bradshaw* (1879) 15 Ch D 465: 172
- Colyer v Finch* (1856) 5 HL Cas 905, 10 ER 1159: 279
- Compania Colombiana de Seguros v Pacific Steam Navigation Co.* [1964] 1 All ER 216: 107
- Compaq Computer Ltd v Abercorn Group Ltd* [1991] BCC 484: 253, 255
- Comptroller of Stamps (Vict) v Howard-Smith* (1936) 54 CLR, 622: 104
- Cooden Engineering Co. Ltd v Stanford* [1953] 1 QB 86, CA: 348
- Cookson v Swire* [1884] 9 AC 653, 664: 39
- Cosslett (Contractors) Ltd, Re* [1997] 4 All ER 115, CA, [1998] Ch 495: 49, 74, 153, 154, 155
- Cotton, ex parte* (1883) 11 QBD 301: 353
- Country Stores Pty Ltd, Re Tandrio Pty Ltd, Re* [1987] 2 Qd R 318: 225
- Cox Moore v Peruvian Corpn Ltd* [1908] Ch 604: 290
- Cramer v Giles* (1883) Cab & El 151: 219
- Credit Co. v Pott* (1880) 6 QBD 295, CA: 59

- Crompton & Co., Re* [1914] 1 Ch 954: 172  
*Crouch v Credit Foncier of England Ltd* (1873) LR 8 QB 374: 95
- Dallas, Re* [1904] 2 Ch 385: 113  
*David Allester Limited, Re* [1922] 2 Ch 211: 51, 54, 55  
*Davis v Burton* (1883) 11 QBD 537, 539, 52 LJQB 636: 58, 60  
*De Mattos v Gibson* (1859) 4 DE G & J 276: 296  
*Dearle v Hall* (1828) 3 Russ 1, 38 ER 475: 104, 115, 125, 128, 143, 178, 269, 277, 294, 301, 302, 305, 306, 325, 327, 334, 381, 382, 386  
*Denney, Gasquet and Metcalfe v Conklin* [1913] 3 KB 177: 112  
*Derry v Peek* (1889) 14 AC 337: 279, 280  
*Deverges v Sandeman, Clark & Co.* [1902] 1 Ch 579: 340, 342  
*Diplock, Re* [1947] 1 Ch 716, [1948] Ch 465, [1948] 2 All ER 318: 249  
*Dixon v Fisher* (1843) 5 Sess Cas 775, 793: 313  
*Dixon v Muckleston* (1872) App 8 Ch 155: 281  
*Don King Productions Inc v Warren* [1998] affirmed [1999] 2 All ER 218: 102  
*Donald v Suckling* (1866) LR 1 QB 585: 65, 297  
*Donaldson v Donaldson* (1854) Kay 711; 69 ER 303: 99, 105  
*Downsview Nominees Ltd and Another v First City Corporation Ltd and Another* [1993] 2 WLR 86: 343  
*Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Ltd v New Garage & Motor Ltd* [1915] AC 79, HL: 352, 354
- E Pfeiffer Weinkellerei-Weineinkauf GmbH & Co. v Arbuthnot-Factors Ltd* [1988] 1 WLR 150: 227, 259  
*Edward Nelson & Co. Ltd v Faber* [1903] 2 KB 367: 173  
*Elitestone Ltd v Morris and Another* [1997] 2 All ER 513, 519, HL: 45, 313, 314, 316  
*Ellis v Glover & Hobson, Ltd* [1908] 1 KB 388: 310, 311  
*Elsev v JG Insurance Agencies Ltd* (1978) 83 DLR 15: 351  
*Elsev & Co. Ltd v Hyde* (1926): 348  
*Elsinct (Asia-Pacific) Ltd v Commercial Bank of Korea Ltd* [1994] 3 HKC 365: 203  
*Elwes v Maw* (1802) 3 East 38, 102 ER 510: 315  
*Emsworth Ltd v Howard William Burdett* [1978] HKLR 506: 336, 337  
*Erhmann Bros Ltd* [1906] 2 Ch 697: 186  
*Esanda Finance Corporation Ltd v Plessnig and Another* [1989] 63 ALJR 238, (1989) 166 CLR 131: 28, 351, 354  
*Esberger & Son Ltd v Capital and Counties* [1913] 2 Ch 366: 184  
*Estate Planning Associates (Australia) Pty Ltd v Commissioner of Stamp Duties* (1985) 2 NSWLR 495: 124, 134  
*Evans v Bicknell* (1801) 6 Ves 174, 189, 3 ER 988, 1003: 279  
*Evans v Rival Granite Quarries Ltd* [1910] 2 KB 979: 151, 153, 155, 172, 175, 179  
*Export Credits Guarantee Dept v Universal Oil Products* [1983] 2 All ER 205: 349, 350

- Fanlin Investment Ltd v Hang Seng Finance Ltd and Another* [1994] 3 HKC 433: 232
- Far East Bank Ltd v Donna Maria Knitters and Another* [1963] HKLR 390: 58, 160
- Far East Bank Ltd v Meng Yung* [1963] HKLR 391: 59
- Fat Kee Firm and Another v The Po On Marine Insurance Co. Ltd and Chan Wai Chi* [1905–10] 2 HKLR 64: 65
- FCT v Lai Company Pty Ltd* [1987] WAR 15: 178
- Financings Ltd v Baldock* [1963] 2 QB 104, [1963] 1 All ER 443: 348, 353, 354
- Fire Nymph Products Ltd v The Heating Centre Pty Ltd (in liq.) and Others* (1992) 10 ACLC 629: 174, 178, 179, 180
- Florence Land and Public Works Company, Re* (1878) 10 Ch D 530: 286
- Four-Maids Ltd v Dudley Marshall (Properties) Ltd* [1957] Ch 317, 320: 331
- Garfitt v Allen* (1887) 37 Ch D 48: 332
- Garnett v M’Kewan* [1872] LR 8 Ex 10: 147
- Gebrueder Buehler AG v Peter Chi Man Kwong and Two Others* [1988] 2 MLJ 69  
CA: 309, 310, 312, 313, 314
- Gibraltar Resources Inc. and Others, Re* (United States Bankruptcy Court For the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division), (1997) 211BR 216; 1997 Bankr Lexis 1193: 102
- Gilman & Co. Ltd v Yokohama Musen Industrial Co. (HK) Ltd* [1976] HKLR 821: 224
- Ginger, Re* [1897] 2 QB 461: 283
- Goh Chong Hin and Another v The Consolidated Malay Rubber Estates Ltd* 5 FMSLR 86: 313, 314
- Goldcorp Exchange Limited, Re* [1995] 1 AC 74: 249
- Golden Eagle Ltd v Golden Achievement Ltd* [1997] 1 HKC 173, (PC): 358
- Golden Wall Shirts Factory Ltd v The Director of Trade, Industry and Customs, Re* [1981] 1 HKLR 144: 24
- Good Profit Development Ltd v Leung Hoi* [1993] 2 HKLR 176: 34
- Goodson v Ellison* (1827) 3 Russ 583, 38 ER 694: 99
- Gorringe v Irwell India Rubber and Gutta Percha Works* (1885) 34 Ch D 128: 103
- Gosper v Sawyer* (1985) 160 CLR 548: 255
- Gough v Wood & Co.* [1894] 1 QB 713: 311, 313, 315
- Government Stock and Other Securities Investment Co. Ltd v Manila Rly Co. Ltd* [1897] AC 81: 153, 173, 183
- Gray v Fidler* [1943] 2 All ER 289: 44
- Grey v Australian Motorists & General Insurance Co. Pty Ltd* [1976] 1 NSWLR 669 112
- Griffin Hotel Co. Ltd, Re* [1940] 4 All ER 324: 175
- Hallett’s Estate, Re* [1880] 13 Ch D 696: 239, 249, 252
- Halliday v Holgate* (1868) LR 3 Ex 299: 96

- Hamilton, Young & Co., ex parte Carter, Re* [1905] 2 KB 772: 49, 52, 53, 56
- Hang Seng Credit Card Limited and Others v Tsang Nga Lee and Others* [2000] HKC 210: 352
- Harold v Plenty* [1901] 2 Ch 314: 96
- Hedley Byrne & Co. Ltd v Heller and Partners Ltd* [1964] AC 465: 116
- Helby v Matthews* [1895] AC 471: 219, 231
- Hellawell v Eastwood* (1851) 6 Exch 295, 155 ER 554: 315
- Helstan Securities Ltd v Hertfordshire County Council* [1978] 3 All ER 262: 101
- Hemingway, Re, ex parte Hauxwell* (1883) 23 Ch D 626: 41
- Hendy Lennox (Industrial Engines) Ltd v Grahame Puttick Ltd* [1984] 2 All ER 152: 241, 245, 247, 250, 254
- Herbert v The King* [1941] 64 CLR 461: 27
- Hewison v Ricketts* (1894) 63 LJQB 711: 238
- Hill v Alex Lawrie Factors* [2000] BPIR 1038: 114
- Hobson v Gorringe* [1897] 1 Ch 182, [1895–9] All ER Rep 1231, CA: 313
- Holland v Hodgson* [1861–73] All ER Rep 237, HL: 310, 315
- Hollingshead v Egan* [1913] AC 564: 283
- Holt v Henley* (1913) USSCR 58 L Ed 767, 772: 326
- Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation v Star Trans International Ltd* [1998] 2 HKLR 549: 24, 133, 134, 152, 154
- Hopkinson v Rolt* (1861) 9 HL Cas 514: 292
- Household Products Co. Ltd et al and Federal Business Development Bank, Re* (1981) 124 DLR (3d) 325: 289, 290
- Hubbard & Co. Ltd, Re* [1898] 68 LJ Ch 54: 172
- Hubbuck v Helms* (1887) 56 LJ Ch 536: 173
- Hudston v Viney* [1921] 1 Ch 98: 280
- Hunt v Elmes* (1860) 2 De G F & J 578, 45 ER 745: 281
- ICI New Zealand Ltd v Agnew* [1998] 2 NZLR 129: 242, 243, 244, 245, 259
- Illingworth v Holdsworth* [1904] AC 355: 43, 153
- Intex Garment Factory Ltd, Re* [1977–9] HKC 579: 191
- Irene Loong v Pun Tsun Hang and American Engineering Corp., Fed. Inc. and Far East Import & Export Ltd* [1959] HKDCLR 192: 45, 313, 317
- Jamieson v Croker* (*China Mail*, 8 March 1887): 40
- Jebsen & Co. Ltd v Asia Furniture* [1982] HKC 218: 224, 236, 237
- Jennings v Credit Corp Australia Pty Ltd* [2000] 48 NSWLR 709: 99, 110
- John Snow & Co. Ltd v DBG Woodcroft & Co. Ltd* [1985] BCLC 54: 29, 227, 238, 249, 256, 257
- Johnson v Diprose* [1893] 1 QB 512: 333
- Jones v Barnett* [1899] 1 Ch 611: 286



*Joseph v Lyons* (1884) 15 QBD 280: 62, 283, 296, 304

*Kan-tat alias Kan Fat v Kan Yin Tat* [1987] HKLR 516: 19

*Keenan Bros Ltd, Re* [1986] BCLC 242: 43, 151, 156, 157, 158, 161, 169

*Keller v Ying Wah Tak Holdings Ltd and Another* [1997] 3 HKC 301: 95, 142

*Kemble v Addison* [1900] 1 QB 430: 59

*Kemp v Westbrook* (1749) 1 Ves Sen 278, 27 ER 1030: 342

*Kennedy v Glasgow and South-Western Railway* (1905) 43 SLR 31: 12

*Kingsnorth Finance Co. v Tizard* [1986] 1 WLR 783: 282, 310

*Knatchbull v Hallett* see *Re Hallett's Estate*

*Knightsbridge Estates Trust Ltd v Byrne* [1940] AC 613: 145

*Kreglinger v New Patagonia Meat and Cold Storage Company* [1914] AC 25: 70

*Lane v Dighton* (1841) Cr & Ph 126: 252

*Le Feure v Sullivan* (1855) 10 Moore PC, 14 ER 88: 303

*Lee v Butler* [1893] 2 QB 318: 219, 226, 233, 259

*Leigh v Taylor* [1902] AC 157: 315, 316

*Len Vidgen Ski & Leisure Ltd v Timaru Marine Supplies (1982) Ltd* [1986] 1 NZLR 349: 225, 256

*Leung Hoi, Re* [2000] HKEC 1404: 59

*Levy v Abercorris Slate & Slab Co.* (1887), 37 Ch D 260, 264: 145

*Lin Securities (Pte), Re* [1988] 2 MLJ 137: 43, 95, 156, 159, 161

*Linden Gardens Trust v Lenesta Sludge Disposals* [1993] 3 All ER 417: 101, 109

*Lister v Stubbs* (1890) 45 Ch D 1: 248

*Lloyd v Banks* [1868] LR 3 Ch App 488: 111

*Lloyds Bank Ltd v Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association* [1938] 2 KB 147: 50, 54, 67, 68

*Lockwood v Ever* (1742) 2 Atk 303, 26 ER 585: 342

*London and Cheshire Insurance Co. Ltd v Laplagrene Property Co. Ltd* [1971] Ch 499, [1971] 1 All ER 766: 195

*Long Leys Co. Pty Ltd v Silkdale Pty Ltd* (1991) BPR 11, 512: 110

*Lord Advocate v. Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.* (1911) SC 612: 202

*Lord Chedworth v Edwards* (1802) 8 Ves 46, 34 ER 1005: 252

*Lord Strathcona Steamship Co. v Dominion Coal Co.* [1926] AC 108: 296

*Low v Bouverie* [1891] 3 Ch 82: 115, 116

*Manchester, Sheffield and Lincolnshire Railway Co. v North Central Wagon Co.* (1888) 13 App Cas 554, 560: 39, 40

*Manchester Trust v Furness* [1895] 2 QB 539: 296, 304

*Mannai Investment Co. Ltd v Eagle Star Life Assurance Co. Ltd* [1997] 3 All ER 352, 369: 112

*Manners v Mew* (1885) 59 Ch D 725: 281

- Manurewa Transport Ltd, Re* (1971) NZLR 909: 178
- Martin v National Surety Co.* (1937) 81 L Ed 822: 302
- Maugham v Ridley* (1863) 8 LT (NS) 309: 303
- McEntire v Crossley Brothers Ltd* [1985] 1 AC 457: 224
- Medforth v Blake* [1999] All ER 97, 111: 344
- Melluish (Inspector of Taxes) v BMI (No 3) Ltd* [1996] AC 454, [1995] 4 All ER 453: 45, 317
- Melville v Stringer* (1884) 13 QBD 392: 60
- Mercantile Bank of India Ltd v Central Bank of India Ltd* [1938] AC 287: 233, 279
- Mercantile Bank of India Ltd v Chartered Bank of India, Australia and China and Another* (1937) 43 Com Cas 80: 49, 50, 51
- Mercantile Union Guarantee Corp v Ball* [1937] 2 KB 498: 230
- Meux v Jacobs* LR 7 HL 481: 45
- MG Charley Pty v FH Wells Pty Ltd* [1963] NSW 22: 112
- Miami National Bank, Appellant, S Krudsen, Trustee for Ladman Corporation, Bankruptcy, Appellee* (No 19009) 26 February 1962, US App Lexis 5821: 121
- Midland Realty (Shatin) Limited v Lau Pui King* (DCC J 26284/98, unreported): 352
- Miller v Race* (1978) 1 Burr 452, 97 ER 398: 95, 98
- Milroy v Lord* (1862) 4 De G F & J 264, 45 ER 1185: 106
- Modelboard Ltd v Outer Box Ltd* [1992] BCC 945: 253, 255
- Moorgate Mercantile Co. Ltd v Twitchings* [1977] AC 890: 279
- Morris, Re, ex parte Official Receiver* (1882) 22 Ch D 136: 58
- Morrison, Jones & Taylor Limited, Re* [1914] 1 Ch 51: 313
- Morritt, Re, ex parte Official Receiver* (1886) 18 QBD 222, CA: 339, 340, 342
- Mountain Road (No 9) Ltd v Michael Edgley Corporation Pty Ltd* [1999] 1 NZLR 335: 104, 107, 108, 110
- Mutual Life Assurance Society v Langley* (1886) 32 Ch D 460: 302
- National Bank of Canada v Commercial Bank of Korea Ltd* (Comm L 23/92, unreported): 203
- National Mercantile Bank Limited v Hampson* (1880) 5 QBD 177: 43, 62, 297
- National Provincial and Union Bank of England v Charnley* [1924] 1 KB 431, 449–450: 147
- National Provincial and Union Bank of England v Lindsell* [1922] 1 KB 21: 53, 56
- National Westminster Bank plc v Spectrum Plus Ltd* [2005] UKHL 41, [2005] 3 WLR 58: 126
- New Bullas Trading Ltd, Re* [1994] BCLC 36: 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168
- New Zealand Forest Products Ltd v Pongakawa Sawmill Ltd* [1991] 3 NZLR 112: 225
- Newlove & Others v Shrewsbury* [1888] 21 QBD 41: 41
- Ngan Chung-ching and Others v Yeung Yuk Sang trading as Cheung Yuen Dyeing Factory* [1968] HKDCLR 31: 60
- Nocton v Lord Ashburton* [1914] AC 932: 279

- Norman v Federal Commissioner of Taxation* [1962–3] 109 CLR 9, 26: 97
- North Western Bank Ltd v John Poynter Son and Macdonalds* [1895] AC 56: 54
- Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Company v Whipp* (1884) 26 Ch D 482, 495: 279
- Nurse v Barns* [1664] T Raym 77, 83 ER 43: 221
- Odessa, The* (1916) 1 AC 145: 65, 297
- Olds Discount Co. Ltd v Cohen* [1938] 3 All ER 281: 228
- Oliver v Hinton* (1899) 2 Ch 264: 279
- On Demand Information plc (in administrative receivership) and Another v Michael Gerson (Finance) plc and Another* [2000] 4 All ER 734: 222, 254, 358, 359, 360
- On Demand Information plc (in administrative receivership) and Another v Michael Gerson (Finance) plc and Another (HOL)* [2003] 1 AC 368, [2002] 2 All ER 949, HL: 30, 222, 254, 341, 358, 359, 360
- On Demand Information plc (in administrative receivership) and Another v Michael Gerson (Finance) plc and Another* [1999] 2 All ER 811: 222
- Ord v White* (1840) 3 Beav 356, 49 ER 140: 303
- Oriel Ltd, Re* [1986] 1 WLR 180: 202
- Orient Leasing (Hong Kong) Ltd v NP Etches and Others* [1985] HKLR 292: 45, 314, 317
- Panama, New Zealand and Australian Royal Mail Co., Re* (1870) 5 Ch App 318: 153
- Paul & Frank Ltd v Discount Bank (Overseas) Ltd and Board of Trade* [1967] Ch 348: 195
- Payne v Fern* (1881) 6 QBD 620: 62
- Peachdart Ltd, Re* [1984] Ch 131, [1983] 3 All ER 204: 237, 242, 247, 250, 259
- Pearl Maintenance Services Ltd, Re* [1995] 1 BCLC 449: 163
- Peerless Carpets Ltd v Moorhouse Carpet Market Ltd* (1992) 4 NZBLC 102: 253, 256
- Pennel v Deffell* (1853) 4 DM & G 372, 43 ER 551: 252
- Penta Continental Land Investment Co. Ltd v Chung Kwok Restaurant Ltd and Tai Shing Company Ltd* [1967] HKDCLR 192: 45, 314
- Peregrine Investments Holdings Ltd and Others, Re* [1999] 3 HKC 91, CA: 337
- Permanent Houses (Holdings) Ltd, Re* [1988] BCLCC 563: 125
- Philips Hong Kong Ltd v The Attorney General of Hong Kong* [1993] 1 HKLR 269 (PC): 351
- Pongakawa Sawmill Ltd v NZ Forest Products Ltd* [1992] 3 NZLR 481: 241, 242
- Potter v Turner, Winch.* 8, 124 ER 1657: 99
- Pullen v Abalcheck Pty Ltd* (1990) 8 ACLC 1087: 287
- Puma Australia Ltd v Sportsman's Australia Ltd* (1990, unreported) 1991 Con 375: 55, 225
- Queen, The, v Wong Wing-ho* [1982] HKDCLR 69: 55
- R v Consolidated Churchill Copper Corp Ltd* [1978] 5 WWR 652: 175
- R v Miller* [1977] 3 All ER 986: 27
- R v Registrar of Companies, ex parte Central Bank of India* [1986] 1 All ER 105: 198, 199
- R v Townshend* (1884) 15 Cox CC 466: 50, 55, 56
- Ramsay v Margrett* [1894] 2 QB 18, [1891–4] All ER Rep 453: 41

- Ratcliffe v Barnard* (1871) LR 6 Ch 652: 281
- Real Meat Co. Ltd, Re* [1996] BCC 254: 177
- Rees Plastics Ltd v Ineson (unreported)*, High Court, Christchurch CP 104/90, 5 July 1990: 258
- Reid v Smith* [1906] 3 CLR 656: 314
- Reynolds v Ashby & Son* [1904] AC 466: 45, 309, 314
- Rhine Holding Ltd (in liquidation), Re* [2000] 3 HKC 543: 337
- Rhodes v Allied Dunbar Pension Services* [1987] 1 WLR 1703, 1708: 302, 306
- Rice v Rice* (1853) 2 Drew 73: 302
- Roberts v Roberts* (1884) 13 QBD 794: 60
- Robin Hood Flour Mills v Fuller Bakeries Ltd, The Queen (garnishee) and Bank of Nova Scotia (intervenor)* (1963) 42 DLR (2d) 534: 298
- Robophone Facilities v Blank* [1966] 1 WLR 1428: 351
- Robson v Smith* [1895] 2 Ch 118: 173, 175
- Roundwood Colliery Co., Re* [1897] 1 Ch 373: 172
- Roxburghe v Cox* (1881) 17 Ch D 520: 111, 117
- Ryall v Rowles* (1749) 1 Ves Sen 349, 27 ER 1074: 105
- Ryall v Ryall* (1739) 1 Atk 59, 26 ER 39: 252
- Salem Trust Co. v Manufacturers' Finance Co. et al.* (11 April 1922) No 1515: 327
- Salomon v A Salomon & Co. Ltd* [1897] AC 22: 34
- Saltoon v Lake and Others* [1978] 1 NSWLR 52: 279
- Samuel Allen & Sons Limited, Re* [1907] 1 Ch 575: 313
- Schuler AG v Wickman Machine Tool Sales Ltd* [1974] 2 Ch 284: 161
- Shell Co. of the Federation of Malaya Ltd, The, v Commissioner of the Federal Capital of Kuala Lumpur* [1964] MLJ 302: 314
- Shiloh Spinners Ltd v Harding* [1973] AC 691, 722, HL: 358, 359
- Showa Shoji Australia Pty Ltd v Oceanic Life Ltd* (1994) 34 NSWLR 548: 104
- Shropshire Union Railways and Canal Co. v R* (1875) 7 HL 496: 281
- Siebe Gorman v Barclays Bank* [1979] 2 Lloyd's Law Reports 142: 125, 153, 154, 156, 157, 159, 163, 167, 168, 292
- Simmons v Woodward* [1892] AC 100: 59
- Sinclair v Brougham* [1914] AC 398, 420: 249
- Slavenburg's Bank NV v Intercontinental Natural Resources Ltd and Others* [1980] 1 All ER 955: 203
- Slee, Re, ex parte North Western Bank* (1872) LR 15 Eq 69: 50, 51, 56
- Smith (Administrator of Cosslett (Contractors) Ltd) v Bridgend County Borough Council* [2002] 1 AC 336; 1 All ER 292, UKHL 13: 75, 153, 155, 163, 165, 166, 168, 185, 255
- Smith v Smith* (1833) 2 Cl & M 231, 149 ER 745: 113
- Société Générale de Paris and Colladon v Walker* (1885) 11 App Cas 20: 138
- Spectrum Plus Ltd, Re* [2005] UKHL 41, [2005] 2 AC 680, [2005] 4 All ER 209: 127, 161, 163, 166, 167, 256

- Spencer v Clarke* [1878] 9 Ch D 137: 281, 302, 303, 304
- Spyer v Phillipson* [1931] 2 Ch 183, 194: 314
- Stadium Finance Ltd v Helm* 109 Sol J 471: 230
- Standard Chartered Bank Ltd v Walker* [1982] 3 All ER 938, [1982] 1 WLR 1410: 336, 337
- Standard Manufacturing Co., Re* [1891–4] All ER Rep 1245, 1246–7: 36
- Standard Rotary Machine Co. Ltd* (1906) LT 826: 283
- Stanley v English Fibres Industries* (1889) 68 LJQB 839: 112
- State Bank of India and Another v Lisbellow Ltd and Others* [1989] 2 HKLR 604: 24, 192
- Stave Falls Lumber Co. v Westminster Trust Co.* (1940) 4 DLR 382: 155
- Steele, Re, ex parte Conning* (1873) LR 16 Eq 414: 53, 54
- Stein v Saywell* (1969) 121 CLR 526: 178, 181
- Stephenson v Thompson* [1924] 2 KB 240, [1924] All ER Rep 736: 46
- Tiger, Re* 202 Fed. 791 (DNJ). 1913) 102
- Stocks v Dobson* (1853) 4 De G M & G 15; 43 ER 411: 111
- Street v Mountford* [1985] AC 809: 167
- Stubbs v Slatter* [1910] 1 Ch 632: 342
- Sun Hung Kai v Attorney General* [1986] HKLR 587: 186
- Sun Hung Kai Credit Ltd v Szeto Yuk-Mei and Others* [1986] HKDCLR 1: 231, 236
- Sun Tai Cheung Credits Ltd v Attorney General* [1987] HKLR 1010: 186, 198, 199, 200, 201
- Sungei Way Leasing Sdn Bhd v Lian Seng Properties Sdn Bhd and Others (Bank Bumiputra Malaysia Bhd and Another, interveners)* [1989] 2 MLJ 123: 317
- Swiss Bank Corp v Lloyds Bank Ltd* [1982] AC 584: 166
- Tai Hing Cotton Mill Ltd v Liu Chong Hing Bank Ltd and Others* [1986] HKLR 1041: 20
- Tailby v Official Receiver* (1888) 13 AC 523: 151
- Tam Wing Chuen and Another v Bank of Credit & Commerce Hong Kong Ltd (in liquidation)* [1996] 1 HKC 692, PC: 124
- Tatung (UK) Ltd v Galex Telesure Ltd* [1989] 5 BCC 325: 253, 255
- Taylor v Russell* (1891) Ch D 8: 280
- Thomas v Kelly* (1888) 13 App Cas 506: 40, 42, 89
- Thomas v NAB Ltd and Others* [1999] QCA 525: 99, 104, 107, 109, 110, 120
- Three Rivers District Council and Others v Bank of England* [1995] 4 All ER 312: 99, 107
- Townsend, Re, ex parte Parsons* (1886) 16 QBD 532, 545: 58
- Trade Promotion Trust Ltd v Young* (1940) 84 Sol J 646: 228
- Trust Bank Central Ltd v Southdown Properties Ltd* (1991) 1 NZ Conv C 190, 851: 309
- Tse Kwong Lam v Wong Chit Sen and Others* [1983] 1 WLR 1349, PC: 343
- Turcan Trust, Re* (1888) 40 Ch D 5: 102
- Ty Chee & Company v The Sik Knitting Factory and Chan Sing Ming* [1933] 26 HKLR 25: 219

- UDI (HK) Limited v Fantana Limited* (1978) High Court CWU No 19/76, unreported: 51, 56
- United Asian Bank Bhd v Tai Soon Heng Construction Sdn Bhd* [1993] 1 MLJ 182: 20
- United Dominions Trust (Commercial) Ltd v Ennis* [1967] 2 All ER 345: 348
- United Merchants Finance Limited v Tang Woon-wing* [1980] DCLR 53: 231
- UTG Investment (Far East) Ltd v Petra Bank and Another* [1995] 2 HKC 157: 101, 102, 343
- Van Lynn Developments Ltd v Pelias Construction Co. Ltd* [1969] 1 QB 607: 112
- Vector Capital Ltd v SNS Software Network Systems Pty Ltd* (1988) 12 ACLR 723: 187
- Victoria Steamboats Ltd, Re* [1897] 1 Ch 158: 171, 173
- Walker v Clay* (1880) LT 369: 43, 62, 297
- Walker v Clyde* (1861) 10 CBNS 381, 142 ER 500: 224
- Walker v Linom* [1907] 2 Ch 104: 279
- Wallace v Universal Automatic Machines* (1894) 2 Ch 547, CA: 172
- Walsh v Lonsdale* (1882) 21 Ch D 9: 332
- Walter & Sullivan Ltd v J. Murphy & Sons Ltd* [1955] 1 All ER 843: 104, 111
- Ward v Duncombe* [1892] 1 Ch 188, (1893) AC 369: 105, 106, 109, 113, 115, 327
- Warner Bros Records Inc. v Rollgreen Ltd and Others* [1975] 2 All ER 105: 104, 106
- Watson v Duff Morgan and Vermont (Holdings) Ltd* [1974] 1 WLR 450: 188
- Wayfoong Credit Limited v Ho Fai* [1975] DCLR 130: 353, 355, 356
- Wayfoong Finance Ltd v Ng Chung and Another* [1975] DCLR 70: 354
- Weddell and Another v J.A. Pearce & Major (a firm) and Another* [1987] 3 All ER 624: 104
- Weddell New Zealand Ltd, Re* [1996] 5 NZBLC 104, 55: 242, 243
- Welsh Development Agency v Export Finance Co. Ltd* [1992] BCC 270, [1992] BCLC 148, CA, [1991] BCLC 936: 124, 152
- Welsh Irish Ferries (The Ugland Trailer), Re* [1986] Ch 471: 197
- Weniger's Policy, Re* [1910] 2 Ch 291: 302, 304, 306
- West v Williams* [1899] 1 Ch 132: 291
- W.F. Harrison & Co. Ltd v Burke* [1956] 1 WLR 419: 112
- WH Coole Trading as JT Shaw v B. Pasco* (1925) 23 HKLR 62, 63: 100
- Wheatley v Silkstone and Haigh Moor Coal Company* [1885] 29 Ch 715: 286
- Whitworth Street Estates Ltd v J. Miller and Partners Ltd* [1970] AC 583: 161
- Wickens, ex parte* [1898] 1 QB 543: 333
- Wilkes v Goodwin* [1923] 2 KB 86: 44
- William Brandt's Sons & Co. v Dunlop Rubber Company Limited* [1905] AC 454: 99, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 111, 117, 119
- Williams, Re* (1883) 25 Ch D 656: 60
- Willis, Re* (1888) 21 QBD 384: 47
- Wilson v Kelland* [1910] 2 Ch 306: 176, 283, 285

- Wilson v Tooker* (1714) 5 Broc PC 193, 2 ER 622: 342
- Wily as Liquidator of AUR NL (in liquidation) and Another v Rothschild Australia* (1999) 47 NSWLR 555: 124
- Winch v Keely* (1787) 1 TR 619, 99 ER 1284: 99
- Winklemann & Lubking Limited, Re* (1915) SSLR 19: 52
- WOC Finance Co. Ltd v Fullrate Enterprises Ltd* [1982] HKLR 476: 233, 308
- Wong Chim Ying v Cheng Kam Wing* [1990] 2 HKLR 3: 282
- Wong Shau Kee v Leung Hin Huen* (1930) 25 HKLR 7: 59, 60
- Woodroffes (Musical Instruments) Ltd, Re* [1986] Ch 366: 173, 181
- Worthington v Morgan* (1849) 16 Sim 547, 60 ER 987: 281, 303
- Wrights Hardware Pty Ltd, Re* (31 October 1988, unreported): 178
- Yau Yung and Others v Tse Hap Man* [1958] HKDCLR 12: 60
- Yeoman Credit Ltd v Latter* [1961] 1 WLR 828: 230
- Yeoman Credit Ltd v Waragowski* [1961] 3 All ER 145: 354
- Yeung Kai Yung v The Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation* [1980] 2 All ER, PC: 129
- Yolland, Husson and Birkett Ltd, Re* [1908] 1 Ch 152: 198
- Yorkshire Woolcombers Association Ltd, Re* [1903] 2 Ch 284: 43, 73, 74, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 159, 258
- Youngs v Youngs* [1940] 1 KB 760: 47, 48

## TABLE OF LEGISLATION

### UK

- Agricultural Credits Act 1928: 317
- Bills of Sale Acts: 39, 41, 54, 89, 197, 226, 280, 283, 296, 304, 398
- Bills of Sale (Amendment) Act 1882: 42
- Bills of Sale Act 1852: 38
- Bills of Sale Act 1878: 38, 197
- Bills of Sale Act 1882: 40
- Bills of Sale Act 1890: 38
- Companies Act 1948
  - §95(1): 240, 259
- Companies Act 1985
  - §395: 131, 197
  - §397: 191, 201
  - §405(1): 189
  - §417(3)(e): 289
  - §419: 183
- Companies Act 1989
  - §410(3): 182
  - §415(1): 288
  - §416 (1): 289
- Companies Act 2006: 1, 90, 178, 206, 265, 284, 289, 293, 299, 301, 305
  - §860: 131, 197
  - §860(7)(b): 68, 192
  - §861(2): 190
  - §863: 191
  - §869(5): 201
  - §874: 131
  - §877: 183
  - §888: 189
  - §1044: 202, 203
  - §1052: 203
  - §1282: 170



Consumer Credit Act 1974: 401  
Enterprise Act 2002: 170  
Factors Act 1889: 50, 226, 227  
    §3(1): 50  
Hire Purchase Act 1964: 401  
Increase of Rent Act 1920: 44  
Insolvency Act 1986: 170, 177  
Judicature Act 1873  
    §25(6): 100  
Judicature Act 1875: 332  
Law of Property Act 1925  
    §94(1): 292  
    §101: 340  
    §136: 142  
Money Lenders Act: 226  
Sale of Goods Act 1923: 254  
Sale of Goods Act 1979: 224  
The English Act of 13 Eliz c 5 (1571): 39  
Trade Marks Act 1994 §25(3): 300

## United States

Uniform Commercial Code  
    Article 9: 1, 10, 12, 17, 18, 118, 317, 384, 391  
    Article 9–312(4): 403  
    Section 9–334: 402

## New Zealand

Personal Property Securities Act 1999: 1, 118, 294, 391, 396, 402  
    §16: 392, 403  
    §17: 29  
    §71(1)(2): 294  
    §73: 318, 403  
Personal Property Securities Act 2001: 391  
Personal Property Securities Amendment Act 2000: 391  
Law of Property Act 1952  
    §130: 107

## Canada

Personal Property Security Acts of Canada: 391, 396, 397

Saskatchewan Personal Property Security Act 1993: 402  
§35(5): 294

## EU Legislation

Directive 2002/47/EC of the European Parliament and Council of 6 June 2002, OJ L  
168/43: 131  
Financial Collateral Arrangements (No 2) Regulations 2003 (FCAR) SI 2003  
No 3226: 131, 197, 324

## Australia

Corporation Acts  
§263(1) (a): 289

## International Agreement

WTO Agreement on Textiles and Clothing 1995–2004: 133

## Hong Kong Self-Administrative Region

### Ordinances

Bankruptcy Ordinance (Cap 6): 59, 283

§35: 123, 227

§48: 113, 114, 117, 122, 126

§131(a): 27

Basic Law of Hong Kong: 2, 20, 100, 152

Bills of Sale Ordinance: 36, 37, 38, 41, 45, 46, 48, 55, 57, 60, 61, 63, 66, 82, 89, 90, 91,  
126, 191, 214, 216, 226, 228, 234, 235, 260, 265, 280, 283, 294, 295, 297, 304,  
325, 329, 333, 335, 338, 341, 344, 377, 378, 379, 382, 383, 384, 386, 387, 394, 403  
§2: 42, 43, 54, 56, 297  
§7: 61, 259  
§7(b): 295  
§9(1)(b): 63  
§9(2): 295  
§9(3): 63  
§11: 42, 43, 53  
§12: 42, 43  
§14: 40, 58, 333, 344  
§15: 57, 58  
§17: 333, 344

- §20: 59, 61
- Schedule: 63
- Companies (Amendment) Ordinance: 204
- Companies Ordinance of 1911: 185
- Companies Ordinance (Cap 32): 33, 36, 265, 337
  - Part III: 202
  - Part XI: 202
  - Section 2(1): 145
  - §79: 177
  - §80: 130, 200
  - §80(1A): 185
  - §80(2): 36, 41, 133, 149, 184, 190, 194
  - §80(7): 191, 259
  - §81(2): 198
  - §83(2): 198
  - §87(1): 174, 337
  - §88: 186
  - §90(1): 186
  - §91: 202
  - §91(5): 202
  - §184(2): 174
  - §264: 123
  - §299(1): 174, 337
  - §300A(1)(a): 337
  - §332: 202
  - §333: 33
- Control of Exemption Clause Ordinance (Cap 71): 32, 116
  - §4 (1): 32
- Conveyancing and Property Ordinance (Cap 219): 146, 341
  - §2: 23, 146
  - §44(1): 146
  - §45 (1): 291, 292
- Copyright Ordinance (Cap 528): 132
  - §102(3): 132
- Factors Ordinance (Cap 48): 233, 294, 308
  - §3(1): 50
  - §9: 226, 259, 294
  - §10: 307
- Fraudulent Transfers of Business Ordinance: 336
- High Court Ordinance: 335
- Hong Kong Reunification Ordinance No 110
  - §7(1): 20

Inland Revenue Ordinance (Cap 112)	
§39E(5): 221; 37A: 229	
Land Registration Ordinance: 395	
Law Amendment Reform (Consolidation) Ordinance: 344, 378	
§9: 100, 101, 107, 118, 120, 122, 126, 128, 378, 386	
§15A: 124	
Money Lenders Ordinance (Cap 163): 226, 228, 355	
§24(1): 228	
Patents Ordinance (Cap 514): 133, 134, 135, 136, 294, 300, 325, 382, 383, 386	
§50(6): 134, 135	
§52(1): 135, 300	
Pawnbrokers Ordinance (Cap 166): 339	
Sale of Goods Ordinance: 224, 226, 233, 269, 294	
§21: 224	
§23(1): 273, 308	
§26: 44	
§27(1): 294	
§27(2): 226, 259, 308, 319	
Stamp Duty Ordinance: 64, 209, 234	
Theft Ordinance (Cap 210): 55, 256	
§2(1): 55, 256	
§6(2): 55, 256	
Trade Mark Ordinance (Cap 40): 136	
§31: 136	
§41(1): 136	
§43(1): 136	
Unconscionable Contracts Ordinance (Cap 458): 350, 352	
§3(1): 32	
Miscellaneous Rules	
District Court Civil Procedure (Fees) Rules, LN 26/2001: 334	
Rules of High Court (Cap 4A)	
Order 29 rule 4: 341	
Order 75 rule 23: 341	
Order 84A r 1: 220, 224	
High Court Fees Rules, LN 25/2001: 334	

## People's Republic of China (PRC)

### Laws of PRC

The Auction Law: 362, 366, 367, 369
The Civil Procedure Law (1991): 370
The Company Law 2006 : 34, 209, 210

- Article 2: 34
- Article 3: 34
- Article 60(3): 209
- Article 154: 147
- The Consumer Rights Protection Law 1993: 32
- The Contract Law 1999: 30, 222, 223, 260, 262, 277, 330, 365, 369
  - Article 44: 272
  - Article 45: 225
  - Article 51: 70, 268, 273
  - Article 74: 367
  - Article 75: 367
  - Article 133: 271
  - Article 134: 225
  - Article 212: 262
  - Article 225: 223
  - Article 226: 223
  - Article 235: 262
  - Article 237: 220, 260
  - Article 238: 261, 262
  - Article 248: 221
  - Article 249: 221
  - Article 250: 220, 261
- The General Principles of Civil Law of the PRC 1986: 37, 368
- The Partnership Enterprise Law
  - Article 2: 73
- The Property Law 2007: 380
  - Article 2: 25
  - Article 23: 274
  - Article 34: 273, 275, 324
  - Article 67: 73
  - Article 106: 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 323, 385
  - Article 176: 364
  - Article 178: 25, 77, 81, 271
  - Article 179: 30, 69, 70, 362
  - Article 180: 69, 75, 77, 80, 81, 211, 322
  - Article 180(4): 73, 75, 80, 82, 271
  - Article 180(5): 75, 80, 82, 271
  - Article 180(6): 75, 271
  - Article 180(7): 77, 141, 271
  - Article 181: 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 80, 82, 92, 141, 217, 367, 380, 385, 405
  - Article 184: 77, 78
  - Article 185: 69, 78, 79

Article 186:	70, 79
Article 187 :	81, 322
Article 188:	80, 271
Article 189:	74, 80, 271, 272
Article 191:	70, 74, 75, 218, 268, 276, 385
Article 192:	70
Article 195:	362, 367, 368, 369, 370, 372
Article 196:	73, 367
Article 197:	361
Article 198:	368
Article 199:	269, 270, 319, 384
Article 202:	368
Article 203:	85
Article 208:	30, 65, 71, 85, 361
Article 209:	71
Article 210:	86, 88, 137
Article 212:	71, 85, 272, 275
Article 213:	361, 380
Article 214:	87
Article 215:	87
Article 216:	85, 87
Article 217:	87, 275, 332
Article 218:	87
Article 219:	85, 364, 365, 366
Article 220:	366
Article 221:	366
Article 222:	85
Article 223:	25, 71, 137, 138, 272
Article 223(4):	139
Article 224:	86, 138, 272
Article 226:	71, 86, 138, 140, 272
Article 227:	71, 86, 138, 140, 272
Article 228:	71, 86, 137, 138, 140, 272
Article 229:	138, 361, 367
Article 230:	31, 71
Article 233(6):	137
The Security Law	
Article 28:	364
Article 34:	76, 271
Article 34(1):	148
Article 34(2):	271
Article 34(4):	271

Article 34(6): 77, 271  
Article 37: 77  
Article 39: 76, 78, 148  
Article 40: 79, 275, 330  
Article 41: 80, 81  
Article 42: 77, 80, 81, 82, 210, 321  
Article 42(3): 80, 211  
Article 43: 77, 80, 82, 211, 212, 271  
Article 44: 81  
Article 45: 81, 83  
Article 47: 361  
Article 49: 385  
Article 53: 362, 367, 368, 370, 372  
Article 54: 269  
Article 63: 65, 85, 339, 361  
Article 64: 86, 88  
Article 66: 330  
Article 69: 361  
Article 71: 85, 364, 366  
Article 75: 137, 139  
Article 81: 138, 367  
Article 82: 31  
Article 84: 31, 71  
Article 89: 72  
Article 92: 25  
Article 93: 79

The Trust Law 2001: 36, 38, 87

#### Miscellaneous Rules of PRC

Judicial Interpretation of the General Principles of Civil Law

Article 113: 76

Judicial Interpretation of the Supreme People's Court on Some Issues Regarding

Application of Security Law (2000): 25, 78, 92, 145, 269, 271, 320, 362, 364,  
366, 371, 389

Article 3: 78

Article 4: 209

Article 5: 78

Article 12: 368

Article 47: 76

Article 50: 148

Article 53: 78

Article 56: 79

Article 57: 70, 79, 367

- Article 58: 270
- Article 67: 74, 82, 276
- Article 69: 320, 327
- Article 74: 367, 369
- Article 76: 270
- Article 79: 321
- Article 84: 275
- Article 87: 85, 272
- Article 94: 87, 275, 323
- Article 95: 361, 365, 366
- Article 106: 276
- Mortgage Registration of Forest Resources
  - Article 7: 84
- Provisions on Sale and Auction of Properties in Civil Enforcement Proceedings by the People's Court 2005: 371
  - Article 34: 371
- Provisions on Various Issues Concerning People's Court's Implementation Work by Supreme People's Court 1998: 371
- Registration and Administration Rules for Mortgaged Movable Property of Enterprise 2000: 212
  - Article 2: 82, 211
  - Article 15.: 84
  - Article 16: 83
- Rules for Notary Department to Handle Mortgage Registration 2002: 212
  - Article 3: 77, 78
  - Article 17: 83



# Chapter 1

---

## Introduction

Over many years, commentators have observed that the law governing credit security over personal property in common law jurisdictions (such as Australia, England, Malaysia and Singapore) is generally complex, cumbersome and inadequate, and have called for radical reform of the law.<sup>1</sup> The same is true of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

<sup>1</sup> For example, in Australia, the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No 64, *Personal Property Securities* (1993), para. 1.11, opined that there were serious inadequacies in the existing law governing secured lending over personal property, and recommended reform. Currently, the Australian Personal Property Security Law Reform Committee has produced a new bill based on a notice-filing system to replace the existing law. The English Law Commission Consultation Paper No 164, *Registration of Security Interest: Company Charges and Property Other than Land* (July 2002), as modified by the Consultation Paper No 176, *Company Security Interests: A Consultative Report* (August 2004), proposed radical reform of the present legal framework governing the creation and perfection of security of personal property of companies, and of corporate and non-corporate businesses. The English Law Commission Report No 296 (August 2005), based on the views elicited in response to Consultation Papers Nos 164 and 176, was limited only to reform of corporate security in a narrow sense and certain sales of receivables by companies; changes to this aspect of the law have been included in the Companies Act 2006. The original Law Commission paper recommended that a new notice-filing system along the lines of Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code (Revised) of the United States of America should be seriously considered for adoption in the UK. This conclusion followed a series of company law reviews carried out by the UK Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), notably Final Report, *Modern Company Law for a Competitive Economy* (URN 01/942, 26/7/2001) and the recent DTI consultation document, *The Registration of Companies' Security Interests (Company Charges) – The Economic Impact of the Law Commissions' Proposals* (July 2005). Earlier reports that criticised the existing legal framework and called for reform included the Crowther Report, *Consumer Credit*, Cmnd 4596; and A.L. Diamond, *A Review of Security Interests in Personal Property* (London: HMSO, 1989), particularly para. 17.17, p. 1. In New Zealand, the New Zealand Law Commission Report No. 8, *A Personal Property Securities Act for New Zealand*, Wellington Law Commission, April 1989, p. 1, commented that its legal framework was a 'quagmire' and badly in need of reform. The New Zealand Law Commission's earlier Preliminary Paper No. 6, *Reform of Personal Property Security Law* (1989) (J.H. Farrar and M.A. O'Regan), stated (p. 10), 'The law relating to security over personal chattels and intangibles in New Zealand is in a mess'. In 1999, New Zealand, in pursuance of the recommendations, enacted the Personal Property Securities Act 1999 (No. 126) ('PPSA').

(‘Hong Kong’).<sup>2</sup> Being a former British colony, Hong Kong’s legal system has a common origin with and exhibits similar features to these jurisdictions.<sup>3</sup> However, the Hong Kong Law Reform Commission has yet to turn its attention to this topic and call for a comprehensive review of the existing structure of credit security law affecting personal property.

China’s legal system largely follows the continental civilian model and has not yet enacted a comprehensive civil code despite almost thirty years of transition from a classical socialist model to one that more closely resembles capitalism. Although the influence of common law systems has become more noticeable in Chinese law in recent years, the fundamental concepts and principles of Chinese civil law originate from the German paradigm.<sup>4</sup> Intensive legislative effort in the last twenty years has begun to create a unified and systematic legal framework. However, its credit security legal framework over personal property has been generally recognised as being both inadequate and ineffective.<sup>5</sup> Despite this state of

This basically adopted the notice-filing system, and it came into force on 1 May 2002 (Commencement Order 2002/60). In respect of Malaysia and Singapore, see D.E. Allan, M.E. Hiscock and D. Roebuck, *Credit and Security – The Legal Problems of Development Financing* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1974), pp. 31–40, where the authors commented that the credit security laws of these jurisdictions were generally cumbersome and inadequate.

<sup>2</sup> Hong Kong comprises the island of Hong Kong, the Kowloon Peninsula, the New Territories and a number of outlying islands (see Schedule 2 of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1)). All came under British rule at different times in the nineteenth century (see G.B. Endacott, *Government and People in Hong Kong 1841–1962 (A Constitutional History)* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 124–5). The British colonisation of Hong Kong officially began on 26 June 1843. The People’s Republic of China resumed sovereignty over Hong Kong on 1 July 1997.

<sup>3</sup> By virtue of a series of colonial ordinances, namely Ordinance No 6 of 1845, §4, Ordinance No 2 of 1846, §3 (repealed), the Supreme Court Ordinance 1873 (repealed), and the Application of English Law Ordinance (Cap. 88) of 1966 (repealed) (‘AEO’), English law comprising English legislation and common law and equity were, subject to limitations, applicable to the colony of Hong Kong. The limitations were: (a) where the English law was inapplicable to the circumstances of Hong Kong or its inhabitants: §3(1)(a) AEO; (b) where it was applicable but subject to such modifications as such circumstances may require: §3(1)(b) AEO; and (c) where its application was annulled by any order in Council, any English Act which applied to Hong Kong, or any Ordinance: §3(1)(c) AEO. The AEO was repealed by Annex 1, para. 2 of the Decision of the National People’s Congress Standing Committee made on 23 February 1997. However, English common law and equity as a source of Hong Kong law was preserved by the Basic Law, Article 8.

<sup>4</sup> Bing Ling, ‘Civil Law’, in Chenguang Wang and Xianchu Zhang (eds.), *Introduction to Chinese Law* (Hong Kong: Sweet & Maxwell Asia, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> Chi Zhang, ‘Some Thoughts on Security over Movables’, *Law Science* 4 (2003), 64; Nengbi Yu and Xianglei Hou, ‘Drawbacks and Perfection of Registration Rules of Security over Movables in China’, *Law Science* 5 (2001), 33; Jinguang Xiong, ‘Drawbacks and Perfection

affairs, no comprehensive review of the credit security legal framework has been undertaken in China. As part of the process of drafting a new comprehensive Civil Code, the method of improving the current credit security provisions has attracted the attention of many Chinese civil law scholars and caused a fierce debate amongst them.<sup>6</sup> The standalone provisions of the Security Law (1995) relating to this topic will be examined, as will the new provisions in the Property Law (2007) which form a major part of the legislation that will eventually be incorporated into the new Civil Code.<sup>7</sup>

### 1.1 Objective, hypothesis and significance

In view of the inaction noted in Hong Kong and the recent legislative activity in China, the objective of this book is to answer the following questions:

- Does the credit security legal framework governing security over personal property in Hong Kong and China function efficiently?
- Is there a need to reform the existing legal framework in Hong Kong and is the new Chinese law appropriate?
- What particular form and direction should the new legal framework take in Hong Kong and what revisions are needed to the Chinese system?

To help answer these questions and thus achieve this objective, the following hypothesis is postulated: the credit security legal frameworks governing security over personal property in domestic credit security arrangements in Hong Kong and China are not efficient if they fail to promote effectively the functions of (i) reducing the financial risk of the secured creditor, (ii) asset utilisation, (iii) fraud prevention and (iv) cost

of Chattel Mortgage Registering Institution in our Country', *Hebei Law Science* 22(5) (2004); Fumin Jiao, 'Legal Reflections on Perfection of Pledge Rules in China', *Law Science Magazine* 23(5) (2002), 36.

<sup>6</sup> Shengping Gao, *Studies on Chattel Mortgage* (Beijing: China Industry and Commerce Press, 2004); Benhan Chen, *A Comparative Study of Security Law* (Wuhan: Wuhan University Press, 2003).

<sup>7</sup> The official English translation of the Security Law (1995) can be found on the website of the National People's Congress, the People's Republic of China. See [www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/english/news/newsDetail.jsp?id=2204&articleId=345071](http://www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/english/news/newsDetail.jsp?id=2204&articleId=345071) (English). The Chinese version can be found at [www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/common/zw.jsp?label=WXYZLK&id=339451&pdm=1502](http://www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/common/zw.jsp?label=WXYZLK&id=339451&pdm=1502) (Chinese); another unofficial translation can be found at [www.lawinfochina.com/law/display.asp?db=1&id=6642&keyword=propertylaw](http://www.lawinfochina.com/law/display.asp?db=1&id=6642&keyword=propertylaw).

minimisation through four functional mechanisms, namely (a) creation, (b) perfection, (c) publicity and (d) enforcement of such security.

This book is thought to be the first detailed critical analysis of this subject as regards the law in Hong Kong and China.

The book will, we hope, provide new insights as to how these two substantially different legal systems function, both in theory and in practice, as regards the taking of security over personal assets. The book will also discuss issues concerning the relevance of law in relation to the contemporary commercial environment in Hong Kong and China. Finally, it will offer suggestions for reform of the credit security laws of other Asian jurisdictions to promote greater economic efficiency and legal certainty.

## 1.2 Methodology

In the social sciences, two types of research methodology can be discerned. The first is the 'verification-of-hypothesis method' or 'theory-methodological' approach (the 'verification approach').<sup>8</sup> The second is the grounded theory methodological approach ('grounded theory approach'), which was originally developed by the sociologists Glasser and Strauss.<sup>9</sup>

The verification approach involves two stages. The first is the construction of a hypothesis. The second is the testing of this hypothesis in a defined environment using a qualitative or quantitative method.<sup>10</sup> The qualitative method focuses on the collection and examination of data from personal observations, interviews, documents, journals, books and videotapes.<sup>11</sup> In contrast, the quantitative method focuses on the examination of statistical data collected, usually by means of empirical surveys.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See B.G. Glasser and A.L. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1967), pp. 10–15.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Whether one or the other should be used depends on the circumstances; see Glasser and Strauss, above, note 8, p. 17. See also M.B. Miles and A.M. Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis – A Sourcebook of New Methods*, 3rd printing (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 1985), p. 215; and K.M. Eisenhardt, 'Building Theories from Case Study Research', *Academy of Management Review* 14 (1989), 532 at p. 535.

<sup>11</sup> See Glasser and Strauss, above, note 8, p. 18. The other method is called the quantitative method. Here the findings of the research are arrived at by means of statistical procedure or other means of quantification: see A. Strauss and J. Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research* (London: Sage Publications Inc., 1990), p. 17.

<sup>12</sup> See Glasser and Strauss, above, note 8, p. 18.

Grounded theory, as defined by Glasser, is a general methodology of analysis linked with data collection that uses a systematically applied set of methods to generate an inductive theory about a substantive area.<sup>13</sup> The end result is the development of theories or hypotheses, without testing such theories or hypotheses. The testing or verification is left to others interested in these areas of research. This approach is particularly useful in areas in which there is an absence of theory or hypotheses.

The present book adopts the verification approach and the qualitative method of verifying hypotheses. This approach and method fit very well with the type of work undertaken here, because the existing credit security legal framework of Hong Kong is constant and well settled, and has a rich source of case law and statute with well-developed systems of law reporting. However, in China the system is, in many ways, much more rudimentary and lacks many of the attributes of a well-settled jurisprudence as might be found in established civilian jurisdictions such as Germany, Japan or France. Despite this problem, the ongoing process of creating a Civil Code, and the enactment of the Security Law and the Property Law, together with a significant Supreme Court Interpretation of the Security Law in 2000, does provide a sufficient basis for proper analysis. Further, the existing provisions in the Security Law have been well tested, and have been re-enacted in the new Property Law, thus providing some legislative stability in this area.

### 1.3 Key constructs of the hypothesis

The key constructs of the hypothesis are:

- the functions of financial risk reduction, asset utilisation, fraud prevention and cost minimisation in any security device;
- the creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement of such security devices; and
- the efficiency of such measures.

The functions of credit security, and the form of an efficient credit security legal framework to realise these functions, are matters of debate. Theories on the subject range from broad economic concepts, such as the promotion and development of a country's commerce and functioning

<sup>13</sup> B.G. Glasser, *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis* (Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press, 1992), p. 16.

financial markets,<sup>14</sup> leading to an expansion of a country's gross domestic product (GDP),<sup>15</sup> to narrow concepts, such as the reduction of the cost of borrowing,<sup>16</sup> the encouragement of creditors to lend to risky businesses (which they would otherwise refuse),<sup>17</sup> reduction of creditors' administrative costs in monitoring the loan, and the financial performance of the debtor.<sup>18</sup> Although it is generally recognised that the grant of security to creditors has a positive effect on economic activity, there are conflicting views as to the extent to which it does;<sup>19</sup> but it is not within the ambit of this book to verify which of these is correct. In addition, as Duggan has commented, it is not easy to determine precisely what constitutes an

<sup>14</sup> See F.S. Mishkin and S.G. Eakins, *Financial Markets and Institutions*, 2nd ed. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1998), pp. 14–15; and R. Eyre, 'Collateral Security Damages', in 'Legal and Judicial Reform in Asia: Agenda for the New Millennium', Roundtable Meeting of Chief Justices and Ministers of Justice, Asian Development Bank (25 August 1997); available at [www.adb.org/Documents/Conference/Seminar\\_Roundtable/round070.asp](http://www.adb.org/Documents/Conference/Seminar_Roundtable/round070.asp).

<sup>15</sup> See Eyre, above, note 14. The author noted that without such a legal framework no capital would be available and estimated that there would be a loss of between 5 and 10 per cent of GDP. A similar view was adopted by D. Fairgrieve, 'Reforming Secured Transaction Laws in Central and Eastern Europe', *EBLR* 9(7/8) (1998), 254.

<sup>16</sup> The argument is that the higher the risk, as in unsecured lending, the higher the interest; see S. Levmore, 'Monitor and Freeriders in Commercial and Corporate Setting', *Yale LJ* 92 (1982), 49–51.

<sup>17</sup> A. Schwartz, 'Security Interests and Bankruptcy Priorities: A Review of Current Theories', *JLS* 10 (1981), 1–37.

<sup>18</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 9–11; P. Jackson and A.T. Kronman, 'Secured Financing and Priorities among Creditors', *Yale LJ* 88 (1979), 1143 at p. 1147; R. Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1986), p. 373; and see M. Gillooly (ed.), *Securities over Personality* (Annandale, NSW: Federation Press, 1994), p. 241. They effectively suggested that 'the advantage of taking security is that it enables the creditor to focus its monitoring efforts more narrowly on a particular asset, whereas an unsecured creditor must monitor dealings in all the debtor's assets'. Note, however, that literature on the management of problem loans and loan losses by banks did not suggest that there was any difference in demands on managing secured loans and unsecured loans: see T.W. Koch, *Bank Management*, 3rd ed. (Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press, 1995), Chapter 23, pp. 733–61.

<sup>19</sup> For example, the theory that an efficient credit security legal framework promotes the development of a country's commerce and a fully functioning market economy (see Mishkin and Eakins, above, note 14; and Eyre, above, note 14) is doubted by the views of Allan, Hiscock and Roebuck, above, note 1, pp. 3–4. See also J.J. Norton and M. Andenas (eds.), *Emerging Financial Markets and Secured Transactions* (London: Kluwer Law International, 1998) for discussion of the criticisms of the theories, in particular Chapter 3, H.W. Fleisig, 'Economic Functions of Security in a Market', pp. 21–25; also R.J. Mann, 'Explaining the Pattern of Credit', *Harv LR* 10 (1996–7) 625 at p. 633, where the author states, 'no single factor can capture the multiple and interrelated considerations that motivate borrowers and lenders as they structure their various transactions'.

efficient credit security framework and what direction law reform should take from an economic perspective.<sup>20</sup>

This book therefore emphasises the functions of a credit security legal framework from the perspective of creditors, debtors and third parties who might deal with the debtor in respect of the same secured asset as a subsequent purchaser or creditor.<sup>21</sup> This approach is adopted because these players are participants in real businesses with direct economic interests in the security arrangement.<sup>22</sup> They are not abstract economic actors. Their perceptions of what might be the appropriate function of a credit security legal framework are real and substantial.

What are their perceptions? The most serious concern of the creditor is the risk of being unable to recover the amount due if the debtor becomes insolvent,<sup>23</sup> because after the debtor's property has been distributed amongst secured creditors and preferential creditors, nothing may be left for unsecured creditors.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, from the point of view of the creditor, security reduces the creditor's financial risk associated with advances<sup>25</sup> by allowing the creditor to

<sup>20</sup> A.J. Duggan, 'Personal Property Security Interests and Third Party Disputes: Economic Considerations in Reforming the Law', Chapter 9 of Gillooly, *Securities over Personality*, above, note 18.

<sup>21</sup> According to the Asian Development Bank (*Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank* (2000 ed.), vol. 2, para. 11, p. 3), the persons who might be interested in a secured transaction comprise a broad spectrum of persons, including the producers and suppliers of goods and services; the consumers; and the banks, savers and other financial intermediaries. This concept is too broad to provide a working definition for the present book. This book adopts the position that the creditor, debtor and third party are interested parties, as presented by J.L. Simpson and J.H.M. Rover, 'An Introduction to the European Bank's Model Law on Secured Transactions', in J.J. Norton and M. Andenas (eds.), *Emerging Financial Markets and the Role of International Financial Organizations* (London: Kluwer Law International, 1996), Chapter 10, p. 169. The authors opined that these three persons have direct legitimate interest in a credit security legal framework that fairly balances their competing interests.

<sup>22</sup> See Mann, above, note 19, pp. 630–1, 682, where the author postulates that abstract theory, however elegant, is not useful in studying the costs and benefits of secured and unsecured transactions, unless the analysis is focused on the actual decision makers.

<sup>23</sup> See Norton and Andenas, above, note 19, in particular Chapter 7, J.L. Simpson and J.H.M. Rover, 'General Principles of a Modern Secured Transactions Law', at pp. 144–6. See also Eyre, above, note 14, para. 11.

<sup>24</sup> See *Borden (UK) Ltd v Scottish Timber Products Ltd and Another* [1979] 3 All ER 961, 971, per Templeman LJ. See also *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, above, note 21, para. 9, p. 3, where it was stated, 'Without a security interest, a creditor only has a general claim against a debtor's property.'

<sup>25</sup> See Eyre, above, note 14, section II: 'Taking security reduces risk and the cost of lending and contributes to sound banking practices.' See also the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No 64, above, note 1, para. 1.9, where it states, 'Securities ... reduce



have priority recourse to the secured property.<sup>26</sup> In this regard the function of a credit security legal framework is that it must promote the creation of effective security that is capable of reducing the creditor's financial risk.<sup>27</sup>

For a commercial debtor,<sup>28</sup> the smooth functioning of its business depends on being able to pursue its operations without restriction and, subject to the security interests of the creditor, being allowed to use the secured asset productively in the ordinary course of business.<sup>29</sup> As Gough has observed, one of the expectations of a borrower is to 'avoid the need for detailed and intrusive supervision and control of its business operations, whether by a bank or any other credit supplier'.<sup>30</sup> Simpson and Rover have made a similar observation.<sup>31</sup> They postulated that, without this freedom, financing would often be useless to the debtor because the debtor's business and trade would be seriously impeded.<sup>32</sup> Thus, from the perspective of a debtor, the function of a credit security legal framework is to promote the debtor's utilisation of the secured asset in the widest possible range of situations.<sup>33</sup>

A third party who wishes to deal with the debtor in respect of the same secured assets as a potential subsequent creditor is concerned with two factors – (i) the status of the debtor's assets offered as security;<sup>34</sup> and (ii) the creditworthiness of the debtor.<sup>35</sup>

In the absence of an independent and reliable mechanism that allows the third party easy access to the required information, the third party

the risk that the money advanced will not be repaid by enabling the creditor to have recourse to the property secured'; and Simpson and Rover, above, note 21, p. 144.

<sup>26</sup> See the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No 64, above, note 1, para. 1.9; Mann, above, note 19, p. 639; and C.C. Wappett and D.E. Allan, *Securities over Personal Property* (Sydney: Butterworths, 1999), p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> See Simpson and Rover, above, note 23.

<sup>28</sup> The book is not concerned with consumer debtors.

<sup>29</sup> See R.W. Turner, *The Equity of Redemption*, reprint (Holmes Beach, FL: W.M.W. Gaunt & Sons Inc., 1986) pp. ix and 1; and see also R.L. Jordan and W.D. Warren, *Commercial Law*, 4th ed. (New York: Westbury, 1928), p. 13, where the authors expressed the view that the major disadvantage of the pledge was that it paralysed the debtor's business operation.

<sup>30</sup> W.J. Gough, *Company Charges*, 2nd ed. (London: Butterworths, 1996), p. 441.

<sup>31</sup> Simpson and Rover, above, note 23, p. 153, and also *idem*, above, note 21, at p. 169, where the authors say, 'the lender must obtain real benefit from holding security but not at the expense of depriving the borrower of the use of the assets given as security of the flexibility needed to operate an efficient business'.

<sup>32</sup> Simpson and Rover, above, note 23. <sup>33</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>34</sup> This was one factor identified in the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No 64, above, note 1, para. 2.17.

<sup>35</sup> As postulated in Diamond, above, note 1, para. 11.1.5.



must rely on the goodwill and honesty of the debtor. However, in many cases, this is worthless. Furthermore, the absence of such a mechanism might subject the third party to the risk of loss of priority.<sup>36</sup> Thus, unsurprisingly, commentators on this issue have recommended that an efficient credit security legal framework must have an accurate and cost-effective publicity system.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, from the perspective of a third party, a credit security legal framework must contain an effective mechanism that protects the third party against the fraud of the debtor.

The creditor, debtor and third party are also concerned with the costs of creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement of security. As these costs are ultimately borne by the debtor,<sup>38</sup> high costs in any of these aspects mean that only large borrowers (who can bear such expense) can obtain credit.<sup>39</sup> This is not in the best economic interests of society as a whole or of the interested parties. Thus, to ensure that secured transactions are economically practical, the legal framework has to minimise the cost of creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement.<sup>40</sup>

A good credit security legal framework must therefore ensure that:

- the financial risk of the secured creditor is reduced in the event of default by the debtor ('reduction of risk' function);
- the debtor, as far as practicable, is able to continue to utilise the secured assets in the ordinary course of business ('asset utilisation' function);
- a third party is effectively protected against the fraud of the debtor in relation to the secured asset ('fraud prevention' function); and

<sup>36</sup> See *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, above, note 21, at para. 267, p. 69.

<sup>37</sup> For example, the English Law Commission Report No 296, above, note 1; and the Australian Law Commission Report No 64, above, note 1, both advocated that the existing registration system be replaced with a notice-filing system. See also note 21 above, *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, Part VII, 'Problems in Publicizing Security Interests', and Part VIII, 'Problems in Enforcing Security Interests'. See also Article 33 of the European Model Law on Secured Transactions at [www.ebrd.com/sectrans/modellaw5.htm](http://www.ebrd.com/sectrans/modellaw5.htm), which sets out a purportedly efficient registration and information system.

<sup>38</sup> Fairgrieve, above, note 15, at p. 256. See also Gough, above, note 30, at p. 441, for a similar view on cost.

<sup>39</sup> See *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, above, note 21, at para. 101, p. 19, and para. 10, p. xiv, where it was observed that if the process of creating secured transactions is expensive, only the largest borrowers can bear the cost. Further, in the event that the cost is borne by the creditor, the creditor will inevitably seek to recover the cost from the debtor: see Fairgrieve, above, note 15; and Gough, above, note 30.

<sup>40</sup> See Simpson and Rover, above, note 21, at pp. 145, 148.

- the costs of credit security arrangements are minimised ('costs minimisation' function).

This book contends that these functions are practical, substantive and conceptually sound. Accordingly, they form the central constructs of the hypothesis.

However, these functions are, in themselves, insufficient to provide clear direction on a number of critical issues – in particular, the formulation of the criteria to test the hypothesis, and the collection and analysis of data to substantiate the criteria. Two further steps are therefore necessary: (i) the identification and incorporation in the hypothesis of the essential functional mechanisms of creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement, and (ii) the identification and incorporation in the hypothesis of a mechanism that can confirm whether the legal framework has fully achieved its functions and has thus met the benchmark of efficiency.

### *1.3.1 Creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement of security*

Four basic functional mechanisms can be identified in the security laws of Hong Kong and China, although they are not explicitly mentioned. However, Article 9 of the American Uniform Commercial Code describes three of the four mechanisms as being creation, perfection and enforcement.<sup>41</sup> Article 9 treats the fourth mechanism, publicity, as an aspect of perfection; however, for the purposes of this book, it is treated separately. Enforcement arises when the debtor defaults in the repayment of the credit. Each of mechanisms is linked to the objectives of the creditor, debtor and third party as discussed above. Indeed, the English Law Commission, in its Consultation Paper No 164 (2002), commented that these processes are inherent in the English credit security law, although they have not been explicitly stated as such.<sup>42</sup> The Consultation Paper No 176 (2004), on the other hand, has provided general explanations of the terms of attachment and perfection. Attachment is described as the point at which the secured party acquires a proprietary right in the collateral, and is a necessary step for perfection to occur. Perfection applies when a security interest has attached and it means completing the steps to secure,

<sup>41</sup> The first is called the 'attachment stage' (Article 9, §§201–10), the second 'perfection' (Article 9, §§308–16, sub-part 2, revised) and the third 'enforcement' (Article 9, §§601–24, Part 6, Revised).

<sup>42</sup> English Law Commission Consultation Paper No 164, above, note 1, para. 2.5.

so far as legally permissible and necessary, the effectiveness and priority of a security interest as against third persons.<sup>43</sup> For the purpose of this book, a precise functional definition is assigned as follows. 'Creation' is defined as the process by which the secured creditor and the debtor create the security interest and thereby confer on the secured party special rights, such as enforcement of the collateral against the debtor.<sup>44</sup> Thus, according to Davidson, Knowles and Forsythe, this process is primarily concerned with the relationship between the creditor and the debtor.<sup>45</sup> They do not necessarily confer on the creditor superior rights vis-à-vis other creditors of the debtor.<sup>46</sup> To acquire superior rights to the secured asset of the debtor, the secured creditor has to 'perfect' its security. In summary:

*Perfection* means the process by which the secured creditor protects its security from the claim of subsequent creditors, secured or general.<sup>47</sup> It might, for example, require the security to be registered with the relevant authority because failure to do so will render the security ineffective against the other creditors of the debtor.

*Publicity* is the means by which the security interest of the creditor is made known to the public.<sup>48</sup> The primary purpose of publicising secured transactions is to protect third parties who wish to deal with the debtor against any misleading representation on the part of the debtor that the secured assets are free from encumbrances or that the debtor is creditworthy.<sup>49</sup>

*Enforcement* is often regarded as relating to the 'rights' of the secured creditor to enforce the security.<sup>50</sup> However, more accurately, it deals with

<sup>43</sup> English Law Commission Consultation Paper No 176, above, note 1, at paras. 2.14–2.15, 3.72–3.73, 3.86–3.91. For the conditions to be fulfilled as 'attachment', see draft reg. 15(1). For the methods and steps required for 'perfection', see also draft reg. 19 attached at the end of the Consultation Paper. However, in the English Law Commission Report No 296, para. 3.6, the employment of the word 'attachment' was regarded as unnecessary, while the word 'perfection' was to be used only on the occasion 'when it is desirable to have a single word to refer to any steps necessary to render a type of security effective in the debtor's insolvency'. This was because the concepts 'attachment' and 'perfection' were found to be unfamiliar to most consultees of the report.

<sup>44</sup> This concept is modelled on the exposition of D.V. Davidson, B.E. Knowles and L.M. Forsythe regarding the meaning of 'attachment' and creation of security interest under the American Uniform Commercial Code; see their text, *Business Law*, 6th ed. (New York: West Educational Publishing Company, 1998), p. 652.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 659. <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 659. <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 659.

<sup>48</sup> See *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, above, note 21, Part VII, p. 56.

<sup>49</sup> See Diamond, above, note 1, para. 11.1.3., p. 54.

<sup>50</sup> See note 44, above.

the types of remedy that the creditor is entitled to exercise in respect of the secured property if the debtor defaults in payment,<sup>51</sup> including the creditor's right to possession, sale and foreclosure.<sup>52</sup>

Because creation, perfection, publicity and enforcement are facilitating mechanisms of an efficient credit security legal framework, they are incorporated in the hypothesis.

### 1.3.2 *The efficiency of security*

The expression 'efficient' or 'efficiency' appear frequently in any discussion of the essentials of a credit security legal framework.<sup>53</sup> However, this term often lacks precise definition, and bears different meanings in different contexts. For the purposes of this book, the expression is construed in a functional legal sense. In this regard, Lord Dunedin defined 'efficient' in its general sense as indicating whether a 'thing is fit for the purposes for which it is intended'.<sup>54</sup> In the context of the credit security legal frameworks of Hong Kong and China, 'efficient' thus refers to whether the existing credit security legal framework governing personal property has realised the functions of risk reduction, asset utilisation, fraud prevention and cost minimisation. The hypothesis of this book thus postulates that a credit security legal framework is 'efficient' if its functions are realised through the effective operation of the four functional mechanisms.

## 1.4 Criteria for testing validity of hypothesis

To test the external validity of the hypothesis, the book establishes a set of criteria to measure the performance of the credit security laws of Hong Kong and China in respect of the four functional mechanisms of creation,

<sup>51</sup> For an example of this meaning, see J. Ziegel, 'Canadian Perspectives on the New Zealand Chattel Securities Act', *NZBLR* 7 (2001), 118 at pp. 123–4.

<sup>52</sup> For example, see Article 9-601 of the United States Uniform Commercial Code entitled 'Default and Enforcement of Security Interest', which specified the remedies of foreclosure, possession and sale of the secured property; and also R.M. Goode, *Legal Problems of Credit and Security*, 3rd ed. (London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2003), pp. 151–2, where the author discusses enforcement of security in the context of floating charge remedies.

<sup>53</sup> See Fairgrieve, above, note 15, generally; and Wappett and Allan, above, note 26, pp. 4–5.

<sup>54</sup> *Kennedy v Glasgow and South-Western Railway*, 43 SLR 321.

perfection, publicity and enforcement. These criteria will prove or disprove the effectiveness of the four functional mechanisms and, in turn, establish the validity or otherwise of the hypothesis.

The relevant criteria for assessing creation are as follows:

- (1) the process of creating secured transactions must be simple, comprehensible, expeditious, and inexpensive;
- (2) the process must enable security to be created over clearly defined and identifiable assets with a minimum of formality.<sup>55</sup>

Once created, the security device must:

- (1) leave the debtor in possession of the asset;<sup>56</sup>
- (2) be capable of identifying and protecting the legitimate interests of all parties to the transaction;<sup>57</sup>
- (3) allow the debtor to deal freely with the secured assets, subject to the interest of the creditor;<sup>58</sup>
- (4) be able to secure future advances made to the debtor by the creditor; and<sup>59</sup>
- (5) be applicable to after-acquired or future assets.<sup>60</sup>

The relevant criteria for assessing perfection are as follows:

- (1) the perfection process must be simple, comprehensible, expeditious and inexpensive;
- (2) the rule regulating the priority of competing claims against the secured asset must be perfected in a manner that provides a fair and just ordering of such claims.

The relevant criteria for assessing publicity are as follows:

- (1) there must be publicity given to security transactions, and it must be inexpensive to file and easy to search for particulars;
- (2) the publicity process must be simple, comprehensible, expeditious and inexpensive;
- (3) the information provided must be accurate as to the nature of the security, its status and exposure of the affected assets to priority claims; and
- (4) accessibility to the information must be inexpensive and expeditious.

<sup>55</sup> Wappett and Allan, above, note 26, pp. 4–5, para. 1.5.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.    <sup>57</sup> Ibid.    <sup>58</sup> Ibid.    <sup>59</sup> Ibid.    <sup>60</sup> Ibid.

The relevant criteria for assessing enforcement are as follows:

- (1) the creditor's remedies must be certain;
- (2) enforcement of the creditor's remedies must be expeditious;
- (3) the cost of enforcing the remedies must be inexpensive; and<sup>61</sup>
- (4) the quantum of money which the creditor is entitled to recover under the security arrangement must be certain.

These criteria were developed after a review of the relevant literature. This included the work of Turner,<sup>62</sup> Diamond,<sup>63</sup> Goode,<sup>64</sup> Ellinger,<sup>65</sup> Rudden and Moseley,<sup>66</sup> Fairgrieve<sup>67</sup> and Allan;<sup>68</sup> reports of various Commonwealth Law Commissions;<sup>69</sup> and reports of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development<sup>70</sup> and the Asian Development Bank. Surprisingly, except for Fairgrieve, Allan and the Asian Development Bank, none of the above has established any substantial criteria for assessing an efficient credit security legal framework.<sup>71</sup> There is little literature in China discussing the criteria of an efficient credit security legal mechanism. The available literature indicates that Chinese scholars seem to be more concerned about borrowing concrete provisions from established Western practices rather than about reflecting the criteria of an efficient credit security legal framework.<sup>72</sup> Other Chinese authors only mention

<sup>61</sup> See *Law and Policy Reform at the Asian Development Bank*, above, note 21, in general.

<sup>62</sup> Turner, above, note 26, at p. 118.

<sup>63</sup> See Diamond, above, note 1, generally. Note that although Diamond made it in the context of security over goods, his observation would generally apply.

<sup>64</sup> See Goode, above, note 52, and R.M. Goode, *Commercial Law* (London: Penguin, 1982), particularly pp. 774–7.

<sup>65</sup> E.P. Ellinger, E. Lomnicka and R.J.A. Hooley, *Modern Banking Law*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) Chapter 18, particularly pp. 721–8.

<sup>66</sup> B. Rudden and H. Moseley, *An Outline of the Law of Mortgages* (London: The Estates Gazette Ltd, 1967), p. 2.

<sup>67</sup> See Fairgrieve, above, note 15, generally.

<sup>68</sup> See Wappett and Allan, above, note 26.

<sup>69</sup> For example, the English Law Commission Consultation Papers Nos 164 and 176 (and the resulting 2005 Report No 296) and the Australian Law Reform Commission Report No 46.

<sup>70</sup> The EBRD was established in 1991 to help economic reform in the former communist states in central and eastern Europe; see [www.ebrd.com/about/main.htm](http://www.ebrd.com/about/main.htm). In 1994 a model law for secured transactions was published as a catalyst for reform in these states.

<sup>71</sup> For example, the English Law Commission Consultation Papers Nos 164 and 176 (and the resulting 2005 Report No 296) were, at best, sketchy on the criteria for an efficient credit security legal framework.

<sup>72</sup> See Mingyue Xu, *On Mortgage* (Beijing: Law Press, 1998); and Huabin Chen, *Studies on Property Law* (Beijing: Law Press, 2000).