



Contributing Editor

Thomas Mellor, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Sales Director

Florjan Osmani

Account Director

Oliver Smith

Sales Support Manager

Paul Mochalski

Editor

Sam Friend

Senior Editors

Suzie Levy, Rachel Williams

Chief Operating Officer

Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

Publisher

Rory Smith

Published by

Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design

F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source

iStockphoto

Printed by

Stephens & George
Print Group
April 2017

Copyright © 2017

Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-911367-46-8

ISSN 2050-9847

Strategic Partners



Editorial Chapters:

1	Loan Syndications and Trading: An Overview of the Syndicated Loan Market – Bridget Marsh & Ted Basta, The Loan Syndications and Trading Association	1
2	Loan Market Association – An Overview – Nigel Houghton, Loan Market Association	7
3	Asia Pacific Loan Market Association – An Overview – Janet Field & Katy Chan, Asia Pacific Loan Market Association	12

General Chapters:

4	An Introduction to Legal Risk and Structuring Cross-Border Lending Transactions – Thomas Mellor & Marcus Marsh, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	15
5	Global Trends in the Leveraged Loan Market in 2016 – Joshua W. Thompson & Caroline Leeds Ruby, Shearman & Sterling LLP	20
6	Escrow Funding in the Term Loan B Market – Meyer C. Dworkin & Samantha Hait, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	26
7	Commercial Lending in a Changing Global Regulatory Environment: 2017 and Beyond – Bill Satchell & Elizabeth Leckie, Allen & Overy LLP	30
8	Acquisition Financing in the United States: 2017... Uncertainty! – Geoffrey R. Peck & Mark S. Wojciechowski, Morrison & Foerster LLP	33
9	A Comparative Overview of Transatlantic Intercreditor Agreements – Lauren Hanrahan & Suhred Mehta, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP	39
10	A Comparison of Key Provisions in U.S. and European Leveraged Loan Agreements – Sarah M. Ward & Mark L. Darley, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	46
11	The Global Subscription Credit Facility and Fund Finance Markets – Key Trends and Forecasts – Michael C. Mascia & Wesley A. Misson, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP	56
12	Recent Developments in U.S. Term Loan B – Denise Ryan & David Almroth, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP	59
13	The Growth of European Covenant Lite – James Chesterman & Jane Summers, Latham & Watkins LLP	65
14	Yankee Loans – What You Need to Know – Alan Rockwell & Denise Gibson, Allen & Overy LLP	68
15	Debt Retirement in Leveraged Financings – David A. Brittenham & Scott B. Selinger, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP	76
16	In re Motors Expands Future Claimants' Rights at Expense of 363 Purchasers – George E. Zobitz & Omid H. Nasab, Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP	82
17	The Continuing Evolution of Middle Market Lending – Sandra Lee Montgomery, Proskauer Rose LLP	87
18	An In-house Legal Team's Views on the Roles and Responsibilities of External Deal Counsel on Lending Transactions – Clifton Prabhu & Charles Bronowski, HSBC	93
19	The Section 363 Sale Process: Key Considerations for the Prepetition Secured Lender – Zachary H. Smith, Moore & Van Allen, PLLC	97
20	Distributed Ledger Technology, The Internet of Things (IoT) and Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Analytics: The Future of Trade Finance is Rapidly Approaching – Josias Dewey, Holland & Knight LLP	102
21	Marketplace Lending – Vanessa Spiro & Edward Dartley, K&L Gates LLP	108
22	Overview of Sanctions Programs Affecting the Lending Market in the United States – Joseph F. Giannini & Adrienne Sebring, Chadbourne & Parke LLP	114

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

23	Andorra	Montel&Manciet Advocats: Audrey Montel Rossell & Liliana Ranaldi González	119
24	Argentina	Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal: Juan M. Diehl Moreno & Diego A. Chighizola	125
25	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Yuen-Yee Cho & Elizabeth Hundt Russell	134
26	Belgium	White & Case LLP: Hadrien Servais & Nathalie Colin	142
27	Bolivia	Crales & Urcullo: Andrea Mariah Urcullo Pereira & Daniel Mariaca Alvarez	149
28	Botswana	Khan Corporate Law: Shakila Khan	156

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

29	Brazil	Pinheiro Neto Advogados: Ricardo Simões Russo & Leonardo Baptista Rodrigues Cruz	164
30	British Virgin Islands	Maples and Calder: Michael Gagie & Matthew Gilbert	172
31	Canada	McMillan LLP: Jeff Rogers & Don Waters	179
32	Cayman Islands	Maples and Calder: Tina Meigh	188
33	Chile	Carey: Diego Peralta	195
34	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Jack Wang & Stanley Zhou	202
35	Cyprus	E & G Economides LLC: Marinella Kilikitas & George Economides	209
36	Denmark	Nielsen Nørager Law Firm LLP: Thomas Melchior Fischer & Brian Jørgensen	217
37	England	Allen & Overy LLP: Darren Hanwell & Temi Esho	224
38	Finland	White & Case LLP: Tanja Törnkvist & Oona Lilja	233
39	France	Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP: Emmanuel Ringeval & Cristina Radu	240
40	Germany	King & Spalding LLP: Dr. Werner Meier & Dr. Axel J. Schilder	250
41	Greece	KPP Law Firm: George N. Kerameus & Ilianna Sotiria Koraki	262
42	Hong Kong	King & Wood Mallesons: Richard Mazzochi & David Lam	270
43	Hungary	Lakatos, Köves and Partners: Szabolcs Mestyán & Andrea Spisák	277
44	India	HSA Advocates: Anjan Dasgupta & Harsh Arora	285
45	Indonesia	Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Theodoor Bakker & Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi	295
46	Ireland	Maples and Calder: John Breslin & David Burke	303
47	Italy	Chiomenti: Giulia Battaglia & Gregorio Consoli	310
48	Ivory Coast	IKT & associates: Annick Imboua-Niava & Osther Henri Tella	319
49	Japan	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Taro Awataguchi & Yuki Kohmaru	325
50	Korea	Lee & Ko: Woo Young Jung & Yong-Jae Chang	333
51	Mexico	Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.: José Ignacio Rivero Andere	341
52	Norway	Advokatfirma Ræder DA: Kyrre W. Kielland & Anne Christine Wettre	348
53	Peru	Estudio Saco-Vertiz & Landerer: Carlos Saco-Vertiz Tudela & Jaime Sabat Pancorvo	357
54	Russia	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Grigory Marinichev & Alexey Chertov	366
55	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Valerie Kwok & Blossom Hing	373
56	South Africa	Allen & Overy LLP: Lionel Shawe & Lisa Botha	382
57	Spain	CUATRECASAS: Manuel Follía & María Lérida	391
58	Sweden	White & Case LLP: Carl Hugo Parment & Tobias Johansson	401
59	Switzerland	Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd.: Oliver Widmer & Urs Klöti	408
60	Taiwan	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Hsin-Lan Hsu & Cyun-Ren Jhou	417
61	UAE	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Ayman A. Khaleq & Amanjit K. Fagura	425
62	USA	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Thomas Mellor & Rick Eisenbiegler	437
63	Venezuela	Rodner, Martínez & Asociados: Jaime Martínez Estévez	448

Japan

Taro Awataguchi



Yuki Kohmaru



Anderson Mori & Tomotsune

1 Overview

1.1 What are the main trends/significant developments in the lending markets in your jurisdiction?

Japanese lending has traditionally relied upon mortgages over real estate to secure loans. In the case of small and medium-sized entities, personal guarantees by representative directors of the borrowers have also been common (a guideline called the “*keieisha-hosho* guideline” on this type of guarantee became effective on February 1, 2014). While new types of asset-backed or cash flow financing such as (i) acquisition financing (leveraged buyout (LBO) financing, etc.), (ii) asset-based lending (ABL), (iii) debtor-in-possession (DIP) financing, and (iv) project financing are developing in Japan, the traditional practice of lending against real estate collateral remains one of the preferred methods among Japanese banks.

1.2 What are some significant lending transactions that have taken place in your jurisdiction in recent years?

Since the great earthquake and tsunami of March 11, 2011, there has been growing anti-nuclear sentiment in Japan and intensified analysis by policymakers regarding Japan’s energy demands. Financing the costs of alternative clean energy solutions (such as solar, wind, hydro-power and geothermal) through project financing structures is one of the key focuses in Japan now and for the next decade.

2 Guarantees

2.1 Can a company guarantee borrowings of one or more other members of its corporate group (see below for questions relating to fraudulent transfer/financial assistance)?

Yes, guarantees from related companies are permissible in Japan.

2.2 Are there enforceability or other concerns (such as director liability) if only a disproportionately small (or no) benefit to the guaranteeing/securing company can be shown?

In general, there are no enforceability concerns, although directors may be personally in breach of their duty of care under the Companies Act (Act No. 86 of July 26, 2005, as amended) in such situations. That said, if only a disproportionately small benefit or no

benefit at all is received by the guarantor, in a bankruptcy proceeding of the guarantor, the guarantee may be subject to avoidance by the bankruptcy trustee.

2.3 Is lack of corporate power an issue?

Corporate power is necessary for a guarantor to grant guarantees.

2.4 Are any governmental or other consents or filings, or other formalities (such as shareholder approval), required?

The Civil Code (Act No. 89 of April 27, 1896, as amended) requires that any guarantee agreement must be in writing. Shareholder approval is not required. Depending upon the materiality of the amount guaranteed, the board of directors’ approval may be required. In practice, the loan and/or guarantee agreement will contain a representation and warranty as to the board of directors’ approval, and such approval will often be a condition precedent to funding a loan.

2.5 Are net worth, solvency or similar limitations imposed on the amount of a guarantee?

Japanese law does not provide net worth, solvency or similar limitations on the amount of a guarantee. (Please note that, where an obligor has the obligation to furnish a guarantor, such guarantor must be a person with capacity to act, and have sufficient financial resources to pay the obligation. This does not apply in cases where the creditor designated the guarantor.)

2.6 Are there any exchange control or similar obstacles to enforcement of a guarantee?

No. However, please note that a payment exceeding JPY 30,000,000 from a resident in Japan to overseas by way of bank remittance may be subject to reporting requirements.

3 Collateral Security

3.1 What types of collateral are available to secure lending obligations?

In Japan, many types of property may be pledged to secure debt obligations, including real property (buildings and land), plant, machinery, equipment, receivables, accounts, shares and inventory.

3.2 Is it possible to give asset security by means of a general security agreement or is an agreement required in relation to each type of asset? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Different types of security interests may be created by one security agreement; however, as discussed in questions 3.3 to 3.8 below, the security interest in each type of asset must be perfected separately.

3.3 Can collateral security be taken over real property (land), plant, machinery and equipment? Briefly, what is the procedure?

(1) Real property (land)

Under Japanese law, a typical security interest upon real property is a mortgage (*teito-ken*). For a revolving facility with a maximum claim amount (*kyokudo-gaku*), a revolving mortgage (*ne-teito-ken*) is applicable.

A mortgage on land or a building is created by an agreement between a mortgagor and a mortgagee. In order to perfect the mortgage against a third party, the mortgage must be registered with the Legal Affairs Bureau (LAB) having jurisdiction over the property. There are approximately 500 LABs throughout Japan.

Under Japanese law, the land and any building on the land are treated independently. Therefore, the mortgagor of the land and the mortgagor of any building on the land could be different entities. It is, therefore, important to separately create and perfect the mortgage as a first lien upon both the land and the building. In Japan, almost all land (by parcel) and buildings (by building, upon completion) are already registered with the LAB. The registration of the mortgage is made as an addition to such existing registration. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the title and confirm whether the property is already encumbered by an existing mortgage. Typically, a mortgage registration includes (i) the name and address of the debtor and mortgagor, (ii) the origin and date of the mortgage, (iii) the priority, and (iv) the claim amount (in the case of a revolving mortgage, the maximum claim amount). Though various covenants and other provisions may be included in the mortgage agreement, the full mortgage agreement is not recorded in the registration. Only the registrable items including those enumerated above will appear in a registration.

(2) Plant

A typical “plant” consists of land, a building, machinery and equipment. As mentioned above, land and a building can be collateralised by a mortgage (*teito-ken* or *ne-teito-ken*). Machinery and equipment are classified as movables, and can be collateralised by a security interest (*joto-tanpo*) (discussed below).

In addition, Japanese law provides for two comprehensive security interests for property located in a factory. One is a factory mortgage (*kojo-teito-ken*), and the other is a factory estate mortgage (*kojo-zaidan-teito-ken*). A factory mortgage over the land covers all machinery and equipment located in the factory. A factory estate mortgage is a very strong security interest that can actually eliminate pre-existing security interests over movables in the factory estate. Notice regarding the factory estate is published in the Japanese official gazette and if an existing security interest holder fails to object within a certain period (specified from one to three months), the existing security interest is extinguished. Both a factory mortgage and a factory estate mortgage require identification of each piece of machinery and equipment, and therefore require more burdensome procedures and costs than normal types of mortgages. The factory mortgage and factory estate mortgage are not very common and are used mostly for large factories.

(3) Machinery and equipment

Machinery and equipment are movables. Movables can be collateralised by way of assignment as security (*joto-tanpo*). This security interest can be created by a security agreement between an assignor and an assignee. In order to perfect this security interest, the target movable must be “delivered” from the assignor to the assignee. Delivery can be made by (i) physical delivery, (ii) constructive delivery, or (iii) (where the assignor is a legal entity (including a company)) if a movable assignment registration (*dosan-joto-toki*) is filed with the LAB, the registration itself is deemed delivery from the assignor to the assignee. The LAB located in the Nakano Ward of Tokyo is the exclusive designated LAB for any movable assignment registration.

In creation of *joto-tanpo*, it is necessary to identify the target movable by whatever means is enough to specify it, such as kind, location, number and so forth. This identification rule is also applicable in perfection of *joto-tanpo* by way of physical or constructive delivery. In perfection by movable assignment registration, there are two statutory ways to identify the target movable: (i) specification by kind and a definitive way to specify the target (such as a serial number); and (ii) specification by kind and location. The former is usually used for a fixed asset, and the latter is usually used for inventory (aggregate movables).

Note that the movable assignment registration is compiled by the assignor (not by the target movable). Therefore, unlike a real estate registration which can be searched by the property, a movable assignment registration cannot be searched by the target movable, and priority cannot be registered because there is no statutory registration system to reflect the priority in the movable assignment registration. There is continued debate as to whether a second lien (*joto-tanpo*) is valid. Anyone can search whether an assignor has already filed a movable assignment registration and obtain an outline certificate of the registration for a fee of JPY 500. If there is no existing movable assignment registration filed with the LAB, a certificate of non-existence of movable assignment registration will be issued. However, this does not mean there is no physical or constructive delivery. Therefore, it is necessary to perform due diligence with respect to possible physical or constructive delivery by an assignor. If a movable assignment registration has been filed with the LAB, the outline certificate describes (i) the existence of such registration, (ii) the timing of the assignment, and (iii) the name and address of the assignee, but it does not provide detailed information regarding the target movable. A comprehensive registration certificate is only accessible to limited persons, and in practice, a lender will ask the debtor to obtain the latest comprehensive certificate.

3.4 Can collateral security be taken over receivables? Briefly, what is the procedure? Are debtors required to be notified of the security?

A security interest in receivables (claim) may be taken by a pledge (*shichi-ken*) or assignment as security (*joto-tanpo*). These security interests can be created by a security agreement between the pledgor/assignor and pledgee/assignee.

In creation of the security interest, it is necessary to identify the target receivable enough to specify it (such as kind, date of origination and other items to the extent applicable). If the target is a claim to be generated in the future (*shorai-saiken*, “future claim”), the period (beginning and end dates of the period during which the claim will be generated) must be specified in the security agreement and in connection with perfection. If there is an agreement made between the debtor and the obligor of the target receivable which prohibits pledge/assignment of the target receivable, the pledge/assignment is

basically invalid, with two exceptions: (i) if the pledgee/assignee is unaware of the prohibition agreement without gross negligence, the pledge/assignment shall be valid; and (ii) the pledge/assignment will become valid retroactively from the time of the pledge/assignment (to the extent not harmful to a third party) if the obligor of the target receivable consents to the pledge/assignment, even if there has been a prohibition agreement.

The pledgee/assignee can assert the security interest **against the obligor of the target receivable** upon (i) notice to the obligor from the pledgor/assignor, or (ii) acknowledgment of the obligor. The pledgee/assignee can assert the security interest **against a third party** (such as a double pledgee/assignee or bankruptcy trustee of the pledgor/assignor) upon (i) notice to the obligor of the target receivable from the pledgor/assignor by a certificate with (a stamp of) a fixed date, (ii) an acknowledgment of the obligor of the target receivable by a certificate with (a stamp of) a fixed date, or (iii) (only where the pledgor/assignor is a legal entity (including a company)) a claim pledge/assignment registration with the special LAB located in Nakano Ward of Tokyo. The registration can be made with the LAB upon creation of the security interest without notice to the obligor. In such a case, practically, the notice to the obligor of the target receivable will be sent upon the event of default of the pledgor/assignor, and the notice must be accompanied by a registration certificate (this notice can be sent by the pledgee/assignee).

The claim assignment registration is not compiled based upon the target receivable, but by the assignor. Therefore, unlike the real estate registration, the claim assignment registration cannot be searched by the target receivables, and, as with movables, priority cannot be registered.

3.5 Can collateral security be taken over cash deposited in bank accounts? Briefly, what is the procedure?

There are various types of bank deposits in Japan. We will discuss two typical deposit claims used for a pledge: (i) a term deposit (*teiki-yokin*); and (ii) an ordinary deposit (*futsu-yokin*). Validity of a pledge over a term deposit is well established; however, there has been debate as to the validity of a pledge over an ordinary deposit because there is no Supreme Court decision addressing this issue. Nevertheless, a pledge over an ordinary deposit is often used for structured financing. As a pledge or assignment of a deposit is usually prohibited by the deposit agreement, a pledge without the bank's consent is invalid. A pledge over deposits is usually created by a standard form of pledge agreement created by the depository bank, including consent by such bank. If the bank's consent is made with a fixed date stamp, that consent constitutes perfection against a third party. If the lender is itself the depository bank, the bank can either set off or exercise the pledge over the deposit claim.

3.6 Can collateral security be taken over shares in companies incorporated in your jurisdiction? Are the shares in certificated form? Can such security validly be granted under a New York or English law governed document? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Under Japanese law, shares of stock companies (*kabushiki-kaisha*) incorporated in Japan can be pledged or assigned as security (*joto-tampo*). The articles of incorporation of a Japanese stock company will specify whether the shares are represented by physical certificates. If the shares are "certificated" (i.e., if physical certificates representing the shares are issued or will be issued), a

pledge can be created by physical delivery of the certificates to the pledgee, and perfected against the issuing company and any third party by continuous possession of the certificates by the pledgee. As this type of pledge is usually unregistered and thus unknown to the issuer (*ryaku-shiki-shichi*), any dividend will be paid to the pledgor, and upon an event of default, the pledgee has to seize the dividend before it is paid to the pledgor. In contrast, if the name and address of the pledgee and target shares are registered on the shareholders' list at the request of the pledgor (*toroku-shichi*), the dividend can be paid directly to the registered pledgee.

If the shares are not and will not be certificated, a pledge may be created by a security agreement between the pledgor and pledgee, and perfected against the issuer and any third party by registration of the pledge on the issuer's shareholders' list.

After January 5, 2009, all share certificates of all listed stock companies incorporated in Japan became null and void. The shares and shareholders of all listed companies are now subject to the book-entry system controlled by the Japan Securities Depository Center, Inc. (JASDEC). A pledge over listed shares is created and perfected by registering the pledge with the pledgor's account established at the applicable institution under the book-entry system.

Please note that a company which is not listed may, in its articles of incorporation, restrict the transfer of shares and make any transfer subject to the approval of the issuer (such as consent by the board of directors).

Since the valid creation and perfection of a pledge over shares of stock companies (*kabushiki-kaisha*) incorporated in Japan should be governed by Japanese law, it is not practically recommended to elect New York law or English law as the governing law of the security agreement.

3.7 Can security be taken over inventory? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Yes, inventory is usually treated as an aggregate movable. Creation and perfection are as discussed in question 3.3 above.

3.8 Can a company grant a security interest in order to secure its obligations (i) as a borrower under a credit facility, and (ii) as a guarantor of the obligations of other borrowers and/or guarantors of obligations under a credit facility (see below for questions relating to the giving of guarantees and financial assistance)?

Yes, subject to the other items discussed within this chapter regarding guarantees and security interests.

3.9 What are the notarisation, registration, stamp duty and other fees (whether related to property value or otherwise) in relation to security over different types of assets?

Registration taxes are imposed on (i) mortgage registration (0.4% of the claim amount (as for revolving mortgage, 0.4% of the maximum claim amount)), (ii) movable assignment registration (JPY 7,500 per a filing (up to 1,000 movables)), and (iii) claim assignment registration (JPY 7,500 per a filing (up to 5,000 claims) and JPY 15,000 per a filing (exceeding 5,000 claims)). Creation of assignment as security (*joto-tampo*) over claims may be subject to a fixed stamp duty of JPY 200 as discussed in question 6.2.

3.10 Do the filing, notification or registration requirements in relation to security over different types of assets involve a significant amount of time or expense?

No, except for the factory estate mortgage which requires the procedures discussed in question 3.3 above.

3.11 Are any regulatory or similar consents required with respect to the creation of security?

No regulatory consents are required to grant security, except for general consents for transfers required by the terms of the asset itself (such as licences).

3.12 If the borrowings to be secured are under a revolving credit facility, are there any special priority or other concerns?

Taking an example of a revolving mortgage over real property, loans up to the registered maximum amount will be secured by the mortgage in accordance with the priority of the original registration filing.

3.13 Are there particular documentary or execution requirements (notarisation, execution under power of attorney, counterparts, deeds)?

In general, most of the official documents are executed with a registered seal. The seal registration certificate is also necessary (for example, for filing an official registration). In many cases, there are alternative ways available to foreign lenders.

4 Financial Assistance

4.1 Are there prohibitions or restrictions on the ability of a company to guarantee and/or give security to support borrowings incurred to finance or refinance the direct or indirect acquisition of: (a) shares of the company; (b) shares of any company which directly or indirectly owns shares in the company; or (c) shares in a sister subsidiary?

- (a) Shares of the company: no.
- (b) Shares of any company which directly or indirectly owns shares in the company: no.
- (c) Shares in a sister subsidiary: no.

Apart from financial assistance restrictions, the directors of a company may be deemed in breach of their fiduciary duty of care if the company provides a guarantee or security to secure the borrowings of its shareholder without gaining any benefit in return (as discussed in question 2.2 above).

5 Syndicated Lending/Agency/Trustee/Transfers

5.1 Will your jurisdiction recognise the role of an agent or trustee and allow the agent or trustee (rather than each lender acting separately) to enforce the loan documentation and collateral security and to apply the proceeds from the collateral to the claims of all the lenders?

In the practice of Japanese syndicated loans, an agent usually exists for the syndicated group. However, even if one of the syndicated secured lenders serves as such an agent, it cannot enforce the security interest held by other creditors. In addition, enforcement on behalf of other creditors may be prohibited by the Attorney Act (Act No. 205 of June 10, 1949).

Under the general rule of the Civil Code and other related laws, it is generally understood that the “secured creditor” and the “security holder” must be the same person/entity (“Same Person/Entity Principle”). However, under a security trust system, separation between the “secured creditor” and the “security holder” can be achieved. Until 2007, based on the Secured Bonds Trust Act (Act No. 52 of March 13, 1905), such security trust system only applied to bonds. In 2007, a new Trust Act (Act No. 108 of December 15, 2006) provided for a more general security trust system. Under the new system, if a trust is created with a security interest as the trust property and the terms of the trust provide that the beneficiary is the creditor whose claim is secured, the trustee can be a security trustee (“Security Trust”). As the holder of the security interest, the security trustee may, within the scope of affairs of the Security Trust (subject to instruction by trust beneficiaries in many cases), file petitions for enforcement and take other actions necessary, including distribution of proceeds.

One of the benefits of using a Security Trust is that no individual transfer and perfection procedures are necessary when a secured creditor assigns its secured claims because the security holder does not change under the Security Trust.

However, this new Security Trust system is not used often. While the Trust Act was amended to provide for the Security Trust system, other Japanese laws have not been amended to conform and retain features of the Same Person/Entity Principle. This lack of harmonisation creates practical enforcement risks that have yet to be tested in Japanese courts.

5.2 If an agent or trustee is not recognised in your jurisdiction, is an alternative mechanism available to achieve the effect referred to above which would allow one party to enforce claims on behalf of all the lenders so that individual lenders do not need to enforce their security separately?

Under Japanese practice, when a Security Trust is not used, secured creditors (such as syndicated loan lenders) elect a “security agent” for administrative purposes only (“Security Administrative Agent”).

The basic difference between the security trustee and the Security Administrative Agent is that the Security Administrative Agent is not a holder of all collateral security for all secured creditors. As a result, with respect to the Security Administrative Agent, (i) perfection must be obtained individually for each secured creditor, (ii) when a secured creditor assigns its secured claim and its collateral security, individual perfection procedures to transfer the collateral security are required, and (iii) each secured creditor has to take enforcement actions under its own name notwithstanding that syndicated secured creditors typically act in concert (subject to the majority approval of the syndication group).

Under Japanese law, when several secured creditors share the single/same collateral in the same ranking, there are two possible legal structures (where applicable): (i) “independent and in the same ranking security” (“Same Rank Security”) where each secured creditor owns independent security of the same ranking; and (ii) “joint share security” where all secured creditors share one security (“Joint Security”). The basic difference is that each secured creditor may enforce its security in the Same Rank Security, while unanimous consent of all secured creditors is required to enforce security in the Joint Security. However, secured creditors in a Same Rank Security often enter into an inter-creditor agreement prohibiting individual secured creditors from enforcing the collateral security without majority consent; and, in the case of a syndicated loan, such inter-creditor arrangement is usually provided for in the collateral agreements to which all secured creditors each having a Same Rank Security are parties. Violation of the inter-creditor agreement does not invalidate the enforcement, but only constitutes a damage claim of the other secured creditors.

5.3 Assume a loan is made to a company organised under the laws of your jurisdiction and guaranteed by a guarantor organised under the laws of your jurisdiction. If such loan is transferred by Lender A to Lender B, are there any special requirements necessary to make the loan and guarantee enforceable by Lender B?

If the loan transfer is not prohibited by the terms of the loan documents, the loan can be transferred by agreement between Lenders A and B, and the guarantee is automatically transferred to the same assignee (Lender B). In order to perfect the loan transfer against the guarantor, according to a prevalent theory, either (i) a notice to the borrower, or (ii) consent by the borrower is sufficient. However, practically, it is sometimes prudent to send a certified notice to both the borrower and guarantor. In practice, however, instead of providing notice to both the borrower and guarantor, Japanese lenders often require certified written consents from both of them to be obtained in order to avoid any dispute regarding the transfer.

6 Withholding, Stamp and Other Taxes; Notarial and Other Costs

6.1 Are there any requirements to deduct or withhold tax from (a) interest payable on loans made to domestic or foreign lenders, or (b) the proceeds of a claim under a guarantee or the proceeds of enforcing security?

Yes. Under the Income Tax Act of Japan (Act No. 33 of March 31, 1965) (“Income Tax Act”) and other relevant statutes, a 20.42% withholding tax (including Special Reconstruction Income Tax, which is imposed until December 2037) is levied on the interest paid to foreign lenders where such foreign lender is a corporation having neither a head nor main office in Japan under a loan.

However, if Japan and the country where the foreign lender resides are parties to a tax treaty (such as the United States or the United Kingdom), the withholding tax rate may be lowered or the obligation to withhold tax may be relieved entirely. For example, (i) no withholding tax is levied on interest paid to all UK lenders, and (ii) no more than 10% withholding tax is levied on interest paid to US lenders under the general rules provided by the tax treaties effective as of February 28, 2017. Under the tax treaty between the US and Japan, if a lender is a bank, insurance company or registered securities dealer, the obligation to withhold tax in Japan is relieved entirely. As of February 28, 2017, the tax treaty between the US and Japan is scheduled to be amended, subject to the US ratifying the amendment. After the amendment, all US lenders (including other

lenders which are not listed above) are to be generally exempted from the withholding tax in Japan.

Withholding tax is not levied on interest paid to domestic lenders because that interest is taxed under the Corporation Tax Act of Japan (Act No. 34 of March 31, 1965) (“Corporation Tax Act”).

6.2 What tax incentives or other incentives are provided preferentially to foreign lenders? What taxes apply to foreign lenders with respect to their loans, mortgages or other security documents, either for the purposes of effectiveness or registration?

Under the Corporation Tax Act and other local government tax laws, foreign creditors making loans to Japanese domestic borrowers, but not otherwise having a “permanent establishment” in Japan, are not required to pay (i) the national corporation income tax, (ii) the prefectural and municipal inhabitants’ tax, or (iii) the prefectural enterprise tax. The effective corporate tax rate for the fiscal years commencing until March 31, 2018 is 29.97% (based on the standard tax rate, including local tax) and the effective corporate tax rate for the fiscal year commencing on or after April 1, 2018 is scheduled to be 29.74%. Activities in Japan such as (i) having a branch office, (ii) performing operating construction work for more than one year, or (iii) having independent agent(s), may constitute having a “permanent establishment” in Japan. If a tax treaty exists between Japan and the country where the foreign lender resides (such as the United States and the United Kingdom), special preferential tax treatment may be applicable to interest income.

A stamp tax is imposed based on the amount of indebtedness evidenced by a loan agreement and can range from JPY 200 to JPY 600,000. A flat fee stamp tax of JPY 200 is required for a guarantee. Collateral agreements such as mortgages and pledge agreements are in general not subject to additional stamp tax. However, certain types of collateral agreements collateralising claims (such as trade receivables) by way of assignment as security (*joto-tanpo*), as opposed to a pledge (*shichi-ken*) may be subject to a fixed stamp duty of JPY 200 applicable to claim assignment agreements.

Registration tax is discussed in question 3.9.

Stamp tax and registration tax apply without regard to the foreign or domestic status of a lender.

6.3 Will any income of a foreign lender become taxable in your jurisdiction solely because of a loan to or guarantee and/or grant of security from a company in your jurisdiction?

No. There is no corporation income tax or individual income tax under the Corporation Tax Act or the Income Tax Act specifically applicable to foreign lenders solely due to the fact they are lending to Japanese borrowers (or accepting a guarantee or security in connection with a loan to a Japanese borrower).

6.4 Will there be any other significant costs which would be incurred by foreign lenders in the grant of such loan/guarantee/security, such as notarial fees, etc.?

No. Documents can be notarised to facilitate compulsory execution in the future. If documents are notarised, a creditor does not need to obtain a court judgment when filing an attachment.

Possible additional fees include (i) process fees based on the Foreign Exchange and Foreign Trade Control Act (Act No. 228 of December 1, 1949) (“Foreign Exchange Act”) (mainly attorneys’ fees), (ii) attorneys’ fees and other fees required to draft contracts and process various registrations, and (iii) tax accountant fees.

6.5 Are there any adverse consequences to a company that is a borrower (such as under thin capitalisation principles) if some or all of the lenders are organised under the laws of a jurisdiction other than your own? Please disregard withholding tax concerns for purposes of this question.

As a basic rule, before starting to lend in Japan, foreign lenders must acquire a licence as a “branch office of a foreign bank” residing in Japan under the Banking Act (Act No. 59 of 1981) or register as a “money lender” under the Money Lending Business Act (Act No. 32 of May 13, 1983).

Based on the Foreign Exchange Act, a foreign lender (including both individuals and corporations) which lends money to a Japanese corporation is required to report to a government authority (such as the Ministry of Finance) if certain conditions are met. In most cases, only *post facto* reporting is applicable, and it is usually not burdensome. Also, there are wide exemptions from the reporting requirement (including, but not limited to, such cases: (i) if the lender of loans is a bank or other financial institutions specified in a Cabinet Order; (ii) if the term of loans does not exceed one year; or (iii) if the amount of loans does not exceed JPY 100 million).

7 Judicial Enforcement

7.1 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise a governing law in a contract that is the law of another jurisdiction (a “foreign governing law”)? Will courts in your jurisdiction enforce a contract that has a foreign governing law?

Yes; in principle, they will.

Article 7 of the Act on General Rules for Application of Laws (Act No. 78 of June 21, 2006) adopts a “party autonomy rule” whereby the formation and effect of a juridical act shall be governed by the law of the place chosen by the parties at the time of the act.

7.2 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise and enforce a judgment given against a company in New York courts or English courts (a “foreign judgment”) without re-examination of the merits of the case?

Generally, courts in Japan will enforce a New York or English court judgment without re-examination of the merits; however, courts in Japan may evaluate the merits to the extent necessary to determine that the judgment satisfies the criteria for recognition.

Article 118 of the Code of Civil Procedure (Act No. 109 of June 26, 1996, as amended) (“Code of Civil Procedure”) and Article 24 of the Civil Execution Act (Act No. 4 of March 30, 1979, as amended) (“Civil Execution Act”) establish the mechanism for recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments.

The Civil Execution Act specifically provides that “the judgment granting execution shall be rendered without reviewing the substance of the judgment of a foreign court”; however, it also provides that (i) the foreign judgment must be final and non-appealable, and (ii) the judgment must fulfil the four conditions set out in Article 118 of the Code of Civil Procedure, as follows:

- (i) The foreign court must have had jurisdiction over the defendant.
- (ii) The defendant must have received adequate service of process.

- (iii) The foreign judgment must not violate the public policy of Japan. Particular types of awards, such as punitive damages, may violate this requirement. When a public policy defence is raised, a Japanese court will look beyond the judgment to the underlying transaction. A defendant can also raise a public policy defence if the procedures through which the judgment was rendered were not consistent with Japanese public policy.
- (iv) Reciprocity is assured. Japan has reciprocity with both the United States and England.

7.3 Assuming a company is in payment default under a loan agreement or a guarantee agreement and has no legal defence to payment, approximately how long would it take for a foreign lender to (a) assuming the answer to question 7.1 is yes, file a suit against the company in a court in your jurisdiction, obtain a judgment, and enforce the judgment against the assets of the company, and (b) assuming the answer to question 7.2 is yes, enforce a foreign judgment in a court in your jurisdiction against the assets of the company?

It differs depending upon the circumstances, but generally it would take approximately six months to one year to complete such proceedings.

7.4 With respect to enforcing collateral security, are there any significant restrictions which may impact the timing and value of enforcement, such as (a) a requirement for a public auction or (b) regulatory consents?

If a secured lender intends to foreclose the secured assets non-consensually, it may file a petition for a public auction of the collateral with the court, if applicable (typically, real estate). Before payment is made by the winning bidder at the real estate auction, a private sale would take place if there is a consensual arrangement with the debtor.

Other than regulatory consents that may be specific to the nature of the collateral as a regulated asset, no general regulatory consents are required to enforce collateral.

7.5 Do restrictions apply to foreign lenders in the event of (a) filing suit against a company in your jurisdiction, or (b) foreclosure on collateral security?

In general, there are no restrictions on foreign lenders seeking to file suits against a company in Japan or to foreclosure on collateral.

7.6 Do the bankruptcy, reorganisation or similar laws in your jurisdiction provide for any kind of moratorium on enforcement of lender claims? If so, does the moratorium apply to the enforcement of collateral security?

Yes, the in-court insolvency proceedings described below provide a stay against the enforcement of certain claims.

Japanese law provides for two types of restructuring proceedings (Corporate Reorganisation and Civil Rehabilitation) and two types of liquidation proceedings (Bankruptcy and Special Liquidation).

In Corporate Reorganisation proceedings, unsecured and secured creditors are stayed from exercising their rights (security interests) outside of the proceedings.

In Civil Rehabilitation proceedings, unsecured creditors are stayed from exercising their rights outside of the proceedings, but secured

creditors are not stayed from exercising their security interests (although secured creditors may become subject to a suspension order by the court having the effect of a temporary stay).

In Bankruptcy and Special Liquidation proceedings, unsecured creditors are stayed from exercising their rights outside of the proceedings, but secured creditors are not stayed from exercising their security interests (although secured creditors may become subject to a suspension order by the court in Special Liquidation proceedings).

7.7 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise and enforce an arbitral award given against the company without re-examination of the merits?

Yes. The Code of Civil Procedure does not specifically discuss the enforcement of a foreign arbitral award. However, Article 45 of the Arbitration Law (Act No. 138 of August 1, 2003) discusses recognition of arbitral awards generally, providing that “an arbitral award (irrespective of whether or not the place of arbitration is in the territory of Japan; this shall apply throughout this chapter) shall have the same effect as a final and conclusive judgment”. The Arbitration Law is based upon the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. Japan is also party to various international protocols and bilateral treaties, such as the New York Convention that addresses recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards. Japan acceded to the New York Convention on June 20, 1961 and the Convention entered into force on September 18, 1961.

8 Bankruptcy Proceedings

8.1 How does a bankruptcy proceeding in respect of a company affect the ability of a lender to enforce its rights as a secured party over the collateral security?

As stated in question 7.6 above, in Corporate Reorganisation proceedings, secured creditors are stayed from enforcing their security interests. The claims of secured creditors will be treated as secured claims up to the value of the collateral as of the date of the commencement of the Corporate Reorganisation proceedings. Such value will be determined by way of an amicable settlement between the parties, a valuation order or a judgment by the court. Secured creditors will receive repayment in accordance with the reorganisation plan as approved by the borrower’s creditors and confirmed by the court. In proceedings other than Corporate Reorganisation, secured creditors may enforce their security interests outside of the relevant proceedings. In practice, however, secured creditors sometimes refrain from exercising their security interests in exchange for settlements where the value of the relevant collaterals are agreed upon and repaid.

8.2 Are there any preference periods, clawback rights or other preferential creditors’ rights (e.g., tax debts, employees’ claims) with respect to the security?

In a Corporate Reorganisation proceeding, the Trustee exercises the right of avoidance. In the case of a Civil Rehabilitation proceeding, the Supervisor exercises the right of avoidance.

If a loan is “new money” and the collateral is fair equivalent value, the secured transaction (collateralisation) is, as a basic rule, not subject to avoidance. However, if the change of the type of the property (e.g. from real property to cash) gives rise to an actual risk of the debtor’s disposition prejudicial to the unsecured ordinary creditors (in a Corporate Reorganisation, secured and unsecured creditors), and the debtor had such intention and the lender was aware of the debtor’s intention as of the time of the transaction, such transaction may be subject to avoidance.

If a secured creditor obtained security for an existing debt knowing that the debtor became “unable to pay debts”, the lien could be avoided. If collateralisation for an existing debt was carried out within 30 days prior to the debtor becoming “unable to pay debts” in the event where the debtor did not owe any duty to provide such security, it could also be avoided.

8.3 Are there any entities that are excluded from bankruptcy proceedings and, if so, what is the applicable legislation?

Among the four insolvency proceedings stated in question 7.6 above, Civil Rehabilitation and Bankruptcy are available for both legal entities (including companies) and individuals, while Corporate Reorganisation and Special Liquidation are limited to stock companies (*kabushiki-kaisha*). Note that there is a special legislation that applies to Corporate Reorganisation, Civil Rehabilitation and Bankruptcy proceedings of financial institutions (including banks).

8.4 Are there any processes other than court proceedings that are available to a creditor to seize the assets of a company in an enforcement?

A secured creditor may exercise its rights independently from the Civil Rehabilitation, Special Liquidation or Bankruptcy (however, in the Civil Rehabilitation and Special Liquidation, such exercise may be subject to a suspension order by the court).

9 Jurisdiction and Waiver of Immunity

9.1 Is a party’s submission to a foreign jurisdiction legally binding and enforceable under the laws of your jurisdiction?

Under the Code of Civil Procedure, the amendment of which has been effective since April 1, 2012, the parties’ agreement on the foreign (non-Japanese) jurisdiction is, as a basic rule, legally valid and enforceable if:

- (i) it is made with respect to an action based on certain legal relationships and made in writing;
- (ii) the designated foreign court is able to exercise its jurisdiction over the case by the foreign law and in fact; and
- (iii) the exclusive jurisdiction of a court of Japan over an action in question is not provided for in laws or regulations.

Please note that jurisdiction over actions relating to (i) consumer contracts, or (ii) labour relationships are subject to the independent rule specified under the amended Code of Civil Procedure.

See question 7.2 regarding recognition of foreign judgments.

9.2 Is a party's waiver of sovereign immunity legally binding and enforceable under the laws of your jurisdiction?

A waiver of sovereign immunity is legally valid and enforceable subject to the conditions in the Act on the Civil Jurisdiction of Japan with respect to a Foreign State, etc. (Act No. 24 of April 24, 2009) (the "Immunity Act").

The Immunity Act is based on the United Nations Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property (2004) and is effective from April 1, 2010.

10 Licensing

10.1 What are the licensing and other eligibility requirements in your jurisdiction for lenders to a company in your jurisdiction, if any? Are these licensing and eligibility requirements different for a "foreign" lender (i.e. a lender that is not located in your jurisdiction)? In connection with any such requirements, is a distinction made under the laws of your jurisdiction between a lender that is a bank versus a lender that is a non-bank? If there are such requirements in your jurisdiction, what are the consequences for a lender that has not satisfied such requirements but has nonetheless made a loan to a company in your jurisdiction? What are the licensing and other eligibility requirements in your jurisdiction for an agent under a syndicated facility for lenders to a company in your jurisdiction?

See questions 5.1, 5.2 and 6.5.



Taro Awataguchi

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune
Akasaka K-Tower, 2-7
Motoakasaka 1-chome
Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-0051
Japan

Tel: +81 3 6894 1073
Fax: +81 3 6894 1074
Email: taro.awataguchi@amt-law.com
URL: www.amt-law.com

Taro Awataguchi focuses his practice on secured financing transactions (including asset-based lending transactions), complex debt restructurings and cross-border insolvency cases (including successful representation (full recovery plus award) of the first statutory secured creditors committee in the history of Japanese corporate reorganisation proceedings). He also has experience in complex litigations pertaining to finance and insolvency.

11 Other Matters

11.1 Are there any other material considerations which should be taken into account by lenders when participating in financings in your jurisdiction?

No; however, foreign lenders should note that court dockets in Japan are not available online and are not accessible to the general public. In general, there is also less transparency in court proceedings in Japan than in some jurisdictions, fewer hearings and *ex parte* communications are permitted. In particular, this lack of publicly available information can pose concerns for distressed debt investors regarding trading restrictions and non-public information.



Yuki Kohmaru

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune
Akasaka K-Tower, 2-7
Motoakasaka 1-chome
Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-0051
Japan

Tel: +81 3 6888 5838
Fax: +81 3 6888 6838
Email: yuki.kohmaru@amt-law.com
URL: www.amt-law.com

Yuki Kohmaru is well-versed in acquisition finance and other secured financing transactions. He also has extensive experience in M&A transactions, venture capital investments, joint ventures and corporate reorganisations. He regularly advises banks and financial institutions, private equity funds, institutional investors and business corporations on a broad range of domestic and cross-border transactional matters.

ANDERSON MORI & TOMOTSUNE

Anderson Mori & Tomotsune is among the largest and most diversified law firms in Japan offering full corporate services. Our flexible operational structure enables us to provide our corporate clients with effective and time-sensitive solutions to legal issues of any kind. We are pleased to serve Japanese companies as well as foreign companies doing business in Japan. In response to the increasingly complex and varied legal needs of our clients, we have grown significantly, augmenting both the breadth and depth of expertise of our practice. Our principal areas of practice consist of Corporate, M&A, Capital Market, Finance and Financial Institutions, Real Estate, Labour and Employment, Intellectual Property/Life Sciences/TMT, Competition/Antitrust, Tax, Energy and Natural Resources, Litigation/Arbitration/Dispute Resolution, Bankruptcy and Insolvency/Restructuring, International Trade and International Practice (China, India, Asia, US, EU and others).

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms

glg global legal group

59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.co.uk