DAVIES & DAVIES

Davies & Davies Associates Ltd
Solicitors & Chartered Surveyors

31 Pearce Drive Faringdon Oxfordshire SN7 7ND
0800 840 4025 enquiries@dda.law **www.dda.law**

November 15, 2024

The interplay between adjudication and insolvency requires a nuanced approach - Malin Industrial Concrete Floors Ltd v Volkerfitzpatrick Ltd [2024] EWHC 2890 (TCC) (22 October 2024)

Malin Industrial Concrete Floors Ltd v Volkerfitzpatrick Ltd [2024] EWHC 2890 (TCC)

Date: 22 October 2024

Key Words:

Adjudication Enforcement, Insolvency, Security, Stay of Enforcement, Summary Judgment

Summary

District Judge Baldwin granted Malin Industrial Concrete Floors Ltd's application for summary judgment to enforce an adjudication decision against Volkerfitzpatrick Ltd. However, due to the Claimant's insolvency and the Defendant's potential cross-claim, enforcement was stayed. This stay is conditional: within three months, the Defendant must provide prima facie evidence of a likely successful cross-claim sufficient to offset the adjudicator's award [47].

Key Themes:

1. ***Enforcement of Adjudication Awards vs. Insolvency Set-off:*** *The judgment highlights the tension between swift adjudication enforcement and insolvency law principles, which aim for fairness among creditors.*
2. ***Security for Cross-Claims in Insolvency Cases:*** *Adequate security is essential to protect defendants from losing the chance to recover money if their cross-claim succeeds.*
3. ***Fact-Specific Approach to Enforcement:*** *Decisions on enforcing adjudication awards in insolvency cases depend on the specific circumstances and the potential prejudice to either party.*

Background

Malin Industrial Concrete Floors Ltd (Claimant), now in administration, entered a sub-contract with Volkerfitzpatrick Ltd (Defendant) for concrete flooring works. After completion, a dispute over the final retention payment led to adjudication. The adjudicator awarded the Claimant £59,950 plus interest and VAT [7, 8].

The Defendant resisted enforcement, initially citing jurisdiction and natural justice issues, which were later dropped, and pointed to a significant cross-claim for defective flooring. They argued that enforcement, given the Claimant's insolvency, would leave them unable to recover potential cross-claim amounts [4-6].

Legal Issues and Analysis

(a) Substance of the Cross-Claim:

- The judge reviewed reports indicating potential flooring defects, such as cracks, possibly linked to the Claimant's workmanship [35-37].
- Although the Defendant incurred repair costs, the judge noted other non-workmanship factors could have contributed [38-39].
- The evidence was deemed sufficient to elevate the cross-claim beyond speculation, warranting further review in the insolvency context [38-39].

(b) Adjudicator's Determination:

- The Defendant argued the adjudicator ruled only on the "net position under the contract," not the "net balance" considering the cross-claim, making the decision provisional under insolvency set-off rules [34].
- The judge found the adjudicator's decision lacked a thorough examination of the cross-claim's merits, aligning with Lord Briggs' view in Bresco Electrical Services Ltd v Michael J Lonsdale (Electrical) Ltd [38-41].

(c) Summary Enforcement and Insolvency:

- Enforcement must defer to insolvency rules where conflicts arise [44-46].
- Given the Claimant's administration and absence of security, immediate enforcement risked compromising the Defendant's ability to recover on the cross-claim [42, 43, 45].
- Applying Wimbledon v Vago principles, the judge stayed enforcement to balance interests and prevent insolvency misuse [45].
- The Claimant's request for a 6-month stay, citing JA Ball Ltd v St Philips Homes (Courthaulds) Ltd, was rejected due to insufficient security for both the cross-claim and related costs [45-46].

Conclusion

The court granted the Claimant's application for summary judgment but stayed enforcement until further order. The stay will only be lifted if the Defendant, within three months, provides prima facie evidence that their cross-claim is likely to succeed and could offset the adjudicator's award [47]

Key Takeaway:

This judgment highlights the courts' pragmatic approach to balancing swift adjudication enforcement with insolvency law's protective principles. When an insolvent claimant faces a genuine cross-claim, the court may stay enforcement to protect the defendant's recovery, requiring timely substantiation of the cross-claim. This ensures fairness while maintaining the objectives of both adjudication and insolvency frameworks.

Ratio Decidendi & Obiter Dicta:

Ratio: The key legal principle established is that, in enforcing an adjudication award where the claimant is in administration and there is a real risk of the defendant losing security for a valid cross-claim, the court should grant summary judgment but stay enforcement until the defendant substantiates its cross-claim [45, 47].

Key factors:

- **Tension between adjudication and insolvency rules:** The judge highlights the conflict between adjudication's "pay now, argue later" principle and insolvency's goal of protecting creditors [44-46].
- **Claimant's insolvency and lack of security:** The Claimant's insolvency, inferred from the lack of security and counter-arguments, risks the Defendant's recovery on the cross-claim [42, 43, 45].
- **Discouraging tactical insolvency use:** The judge stresses preventing misuse of insolvency to avoid paying valid debts [45-46].
- **Defendant's burden to demonstrate a prima facie case:** The court imposes a burden on the Defendant to present evidence within a specified timeframe, supporting the likelihood of a successful cross-claim to lift the stay.

This ratio reflects a balanced approach, respecting adjudication awards while protecting the Defendant's interests in insolvency.

Obiter: The judge's obiter dicta offer valuable guidance for future cases:

- **Lord Briggs' judgment in Bresco:** The judge concludes the adjudicator did not fully consider the cross-claim's merits, limiting Bresco's applicability [38-41].
- **'Net position under the contract' v 'net balance':** The judgment underscores the difference, noting that determining the net contract position may not address the cross-claim fully [34, 39, 40].
- **Rejection of a fixed 6-month stay (JA Ball Ltd):** The judge differentiates this case, emphasising the need for flexible stays due to insufficient security for the cross-claim and associated costs [47].
- **Security for costs in cross-claims:** The judge notes the challenges defendants may face in seeking security for cross-claim costs [35].

These observations provide nuanced insights into adjudication and insolvency, guiding practitioners in similar cases.

Parting Thoughts

The interplay between adjudication and insolvency requires a nuanced approach that balances the objectives of both regimes while ensuring fairness. Malin Industrial Concrete Floors Ltd v Volkerfitzpatrick Ltd illustrates this balance. The court upheld adjudication's "pay now, argue later" principle but recognised the need to protect a solvent defendant from losing recovery rights on a valid cross-claim when the claimant is insolvent. By imposing a stay on enforcement, conditional on the defendant substantiating their cross-claim within a reasonable timeframe, the court achieved a practical compromise. This case underscores the importance of fact-specific analysis and equitable resolutions over rigid rules in disputes involving insolvency and adjudication [45-46].

#ConstructionLaw #Adjudication #Insolvency #DisputeResolution #LegalFramework #ConstructionIndustry #CommercialDisputes #ContractLaw #Litigation #Arbitration

#Mediation #CivilEngineering #QuantitySurveying #LegalInsights #CaseLaw #InsolvencyLaw #SummaryJudgmen t#CrossClaim #EnforcementAndInsolvency #SecurityForCosts #StayOfEnforcement #PayNowArgueLater #MalinVVolkerfitzpatrick #TCC #LiverpoolTCC

Nigel Davies BSc(Hons) (Q.Surv), PGCert.Psych, GDipLaw, PGDipLP, DipArb, MSc (Built Environment), LLM (Construction Law & Practice), MSc (Mechanical & Electrical), FRICS, FCIOB, FCInstCES, FCIArb, CArb, Panel Registered Adjudicator, Mediator, Mediation Advocate, Chartered Builder, Chartered Construction Manager, Chartered Surveyor, Chartered Civil Engineering Surveyor, Chartered Arbitrator, Author, and Solicitor-Advocate

Adjudicator Assessor and Re-Assessor for the ICE and the CIArb
Arbitrator Assessor for the CIArb
ICE DRC CPD Committee Member
CIArb Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
CIArb Arbitration Panel Member since 2006
CIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2010
Law Society Panel Arbitrator
RIBA Adjudication Panel Member since 2018
RICS Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
TECSA Adjudication Panel Member since 2012
FIDIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
ICE Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
RICS Dispute Board Registered since 2013

The information & opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily comprehensive, nor do they represent the trenchant view of the author; in any event, this article does not purport to offer professional advice. This article has been prepared as a summary and is intended for general guidance only. In the case of a specific problem, it is recommended that professional advice be sought.

© 2024 Davies & Davies Associates Ltd

Back to Legal Updates