Presenter Mariette van Ryn

10 August 2007

# **PPSA CASE UPDATE** King Robb – Unsigned Security Agreements, an issue now put to bed

Presentation to Banking & Financial Services Law Association Conference 2007



Simpson Grierson

	PPSA CASE UPDATE King Robb – Unsigned Security Agreements, an issue now put to bed Presentation to Banking &
Presenter Mariette van Ryn 10 August 2007	Financial Services Law Association Conference 2007 C Simpson Grierson

Dunphy & Anor v Sleepyhead Manufacturing Co Ltd CA CA63/06 [14 June 2007]

 An appeal from the High Court by Dunphy and Shephard, liquidators of King Robb Ltd (In Liquidation)

Reasons of the Court given by O'Regan J

Simpson Grierson

# Facts Goods supplied to King Robb on Sleepyhead's ordinary terms and conditions of trade (included retention of title provisions). Terms and conditions received by King Robb, however, no signed agreement. Sleepyhead registered financing statement in respect of its security interest on PPSR.

🔍 Simpson Grierson

## Facts (cont'd)

- Sleepyhead supplied goods up until liquidation.
- King Robb liquidated by special resolution of shareholders.
- King Robb had already granted
- debenture in favour of BNZ registered on the PPSR.
- No issue taken by Sleepyhead as to the bank's priority over total collateral.

Simpson Grierson

#### Facts (cont'd)

- Liquidators sold all of King Robb's assets, including the goods supplied by Sleepyhead.
- More than sufficient from sale of collateral to meet amount owing to BNZ.
- Liquidators applied entire surplus to liquidation without paying Sleepyhead anything.
- Sleepyhead brought proceedings against liquidators for, among other things, conversion.

Simpson Grierson

### Issues

¢,

- Did Sleepyhead have an enforceable security interest?
- If so, did that security interest survive the liquidation?
- Is the liquidator a "third party" for the purposes of the PPSA and is this relevant?
- Was there a distinction between Sleepyhead's "security interest" under the PPSA and a "charge" under the New
- Zealand Companies Act 1993?

Simpson Grierson

#### ISSUES (cont'd)

If Sleepyhead held an enforceable security interest, did the liquidator have any right to take possession of the goods secured in favour of Sleepyhead? If the liquidators uplifted the goods as agent for BNZ were the liquidators obliged to distribute the surplus in accordance with \$117(1) PPSA after payment to BNZ?

🐔 Simpson Grierson

#### Decision

- The Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. Court found:

   Sleepyhead had a security interest in the goods supplied to King Robb and in the proceeds of sale of those goods;
   Sleepyhead's security interest was enforceable against the liquidators;
  - Sleepyhead's security interest was a charge for the purposes of the Companies Act;

Simpson Grierson

conversion they account to Sleep of the sale of the	yhead for the proceeds goods subject to
for the purposes - Section 254(a) sl limited sense tha	ere not a "third party"
of a secured cred	

0	ther recent PPSA cases
0	Orix New Zealand Ltd v Milne, HC Auckland, 17 May 2007, Hansen J New Zealand Bloodstock Leasing Ltd v Jenkins, HC Auckland, 19 April 2007, Winkelmann J Keybank National Association v The Ship "Blaze", HC Auckland, 9 February 2007, Baragwanath J (reported [2007] 2 NZLR 271)
	Simpson Grierson

•	Simpson v New Zealand Associated Refrigerated Food Distributors Ltd, CA36/06, 11 December 2006 (reported [2007] 2 NZLR 130, (2007) 10 NZCLC
•	264,263) Harvestpro Logging Ltd v Cordyline Holdings Ltd, HC Auckland, 3 October
•	2006, Associate Judge Doogue Asset Traders Ltd v Favas Sportscar
	World Ltd, HC Auckland, 3 August 2006, Winkelmann J (reported (2006) 9 NZCLC 264,138; (2006) 3 NZCCLR 545)