HB 439

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1994 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 439

Revision Date: February 1, 1994
Title: "An Act enacting the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act."
Sponsor: Representative Porter
Requestor: Representative Porter

Department Affected: Department of Law
BRU: Legal Services
Component: Operations

COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 0093

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:

OPERATING	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00
PERSONAL						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND &						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
CAPITAL						
REVENUE						
FUNDING:						
1002 Federal						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
OTHER						
TOTAL	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
POSITIONS:						
FULL-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year (FY94) impact: -0-

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)
Please see the attached analysis.

Richard L. Pegues

Prepared by: Richard I. Pegues, Director
Phone: 465-3672
Division: Administrative Services Division
Date: February 1, 1994

Richard L. Pegues /FOR/

Approved by Commissioner: Bruce M. Botelho, Attorney General
Agency: Department of Law
Date: February 1, 1994

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL
For further distribu
'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
islative Office

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1994 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. _____

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION:

This bill amends AS 34 to adopt the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act for Alaska. The uniform act is recommended by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL). Its purpose is to protect creditors against the fraudulent transfer of assets and fraudulent obligations that would otherwise work to defeat a creditor's interests. The proposed act includes personal as well as real property. Current law, which was adopted in the 1940's and is based on even older law, only addresses real property. Because the bill is a Uniform Act based on the NCCUSL model, it will conform to the requirements of most of the other state's thus making its provisions (and protections) available for many interstate transactions. The bill deals primarily with private transactions. It will not have a fiscal impact for the Department of Law.

Alaska State Legislature

House of Representatives
House Judiciary Committee

P. O. Box V
State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-4990
(907) 465-4712

SPONSOR STATEMENT

HB 439 UNIFORM FAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT

Obligation to a financial debt is reinforced by law. Or is it? If a person acquired debt, should (s)he be able to manipulate the assets so that creditors will be deprived of their value when (s)he defaults on the debt? The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act (UFTA) works as a *deterrent*, preventing such transgressions against obligations incurred. This Act provides creditors with a *remedy* when debtors transfer or hide assets that would otherwise be available to satisfy legitimate debts.

Current Alaska law in this area was adopted in 1949 from the state of Oregon and has received little legislative attention. Nevertheless, many changes in both state and federal law, particularly in the area of bankruptcy, and relationships between creditors and debtors have become more complex. In fact, Alaska law provides that a conveyance of real or personal property will be void if it was made "with the *intent* to hinder, delay or defraud creditors." AS 34.40.010. The existence of this fraudulent intent is a question of fact and the burden of proof is upon the plaintiff (Summers v. Hagen __ P.2d __, No. 3961, May 28, 1993). This burden of proof can be extremely hard to prove.

UFTA would eliminate the present Alaskan necessity of finding actual intent by a property transferor to hinder, delay or defraud a creditor in many situtations where the transferor is obviously transferring assets solely to keep them out of the reach of the transferor's creditors. This Act renders a transfer made or obligation incurred without *adequate consideration* to be constructively fraudulent. UFTA sets out numerous non-exclusive factors to be considered by the court when determining if the debtor had "actual intent." The transferee's "good faith" defense is irrelevant. Consequently, UFTA defines insolvency and establishes a new category of fraudulent transfers, namely, a preferential transfer by an insolvent "insider" (i.e., relative or a person in control of the debtor) to a creditor who had reasonable cause to believe the debtor to be insolvent.

Thirty-two (32) states have adopted UFTA into their laws. Uniformity has become not only a question of law between states, but also between state and federal law. Without *uniformity*, credit becomes less available, and the credit mechanism is less reliable. The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act takes into account the considerable development in both law and practice in creditor-debtor relationships.

A Few Facts About

THE UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT

PURPOSE: Providing a creditor with the capacity to procure assets a debtor has transferred to another person to keep them from being used to satisfy the debt.

ORIGIN: The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, completed by the Uniform Law Commissioners in 1984, revises the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act of 1918.

ENDORSED BY: American Bar Association

STATE ADOPTIONS: 30

Alabama	Maine	Ohio
Arizona	Minnesota	Oklahoma
Arkansas	Missouri	Oregon
California	Montana	Rhode Island
Colorado	Nebraska	South Dakota
Connecticut	Nevada	Texas
Florida	New Hampshire	Utah
Hawaii	New Jersey	Washington
Idaho	New Mexico	West Virginia
Illinois	North Dakota	Wisconsin

1993 INTRODUCTIONS: Virginia

For any further information regarding the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, please contact John McCabe or Katie Robinson at 312-915-0195.

(4/15/93)

FACTS:
ABOUT THE UNIFORM
FRAUDULENT TRANSFER
ACT

WHY STATES SHOULD ADOPT
THE UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT

Are we only as good as the extent to which we honor our obligations? Many would argue for this proposition. And when our obligations are financial, the argument is reinforced by law. It is to this proposition that the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act is addressed. If we have acquired debt we should not be able to manipulate our assets so that creditors will be deprived of their value when we default on our debt. We should not be able to plan an artificial insolvency by transferring assets to others against the interests of our creditors.

The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act works as a deterrent, preventing such transgressions against obligations incurred, and provides creditors with a remedy when debtors transfer or hide assets that would otherwise be available to satisfy legitimate debts.

While the issue of obligation is preeminent, the economic issue is no less important. Credit is essential to the economic life of this country. Consumer credit, commercial credit, secured and unsecured credit enter into our lives, everyday. Credit remains available so long as those who extend it are given certain assurances about their rights at default. The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act provides assurances to creditors that help make credit available to all of us.

THE UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT

by

FRED H. MILLER
Professor of Law at the University of Oklahoma

Section by Section Analysis of the Act

Section 1 contains definitions. Section 2 also contains the definition of "insolvent," and Section 3 the definition of "value." The definition of "asset" in Section 2(2), together with the latter definitions of "insolvent" and "value," in a general sense formulate the core concept of the act: the transfer of an asset (or incurring an obligation) for inadequate value by an insolvent debtor or one rendered insolvent by the transaction is a fraudulent transfer. Subsection 3(B) is worth particular note in this respect because it overrules for state law the controversial holding in Durrett v. Washington Nat. Ins. Co., 621 F.2d 201 (5th Cir. 1980), that a regularly conducted mortgage foreclosure that produces a price "too low" may be avoided as a fraudulent conveyance. By clouding property titles the Durrett rule virtually is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Section 4 Subsection a(1) states the basic rule of the act: a transfer made or an obligation incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud creditors is actionable by creditors. How does a creditor prove the debtor's actual intent? Subsection b sets out "badges of fraud" if several of these appear it is strong evidence. Subsection a(2), on the other hand, sets out two cases where the law decrees the intent exists if the facts are as stated.

Section 5 states two further cases where the law decrees the transaction is fraudulent, but only as to present creditors and not also as to creditors arising later as is the case for transfers covered by Section 5.

Section 6 defines when a transaction occurs. It occurs when it can prejudice the rights of third parties, and not when it actually occurs between the parties to it. For example, a creditor does not need this act to set aside a fraudulent security interest that is never filed; the creditor can defeat that interest under the Uniform Commercial Code. Subsection 5 of this Section also states the time when an obligation is incurred.

Section 7 describes the remedies a creditor has to attack and avoid a fraudulent transfer or obligation.

UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT

When we say a person "owns" something, we tend to think in all or nothing terms. Whatever a person owns is at that person's disposal - to sell, to give, to abandon, or to pledge as security for a debt. But relationships between people over property are never so simple or so unqualified. A creditor-debtor relationship, for example, may materially change an owner's power over the property owned. A mortgage, clearly, restricts what an owner may do with mortgaged real estate. The creditor has legally protected rights in the real estate securing the debt. Under Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code, secured creditors, also, obtain rights in collateral that are protected.

A less clear category, but important to the maintenance of credit, is that of the unsecured creditor-debtor relationship in which the debtor manipulates property to defeat the creditor's interest solely for that purpose and for no other. Perhaps the debtor foresees insolvency and tries to conceal property that a creditor might use to satisfy the debt. Perhaps the debtor never intends to satisfy the debt and manipulates property to make himself judgment-proof. Should the creditor be without recourse, and should the debtor's rights to deal with property be unrestricted in these kinds of cases?

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (ULC) proposed the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act (UFCA) in 1918 as an answer to that question. It was created to supersede the Statute of 13 Elizabeth which was enacted in some form by many states, and which introduced the concept of the fraudulent conveyance into the law of every American jurisdiction, with or without enactment. The UFCA was adopted in twenty-six states, and its provisions were incorporated into the Federal Bankruptcy Act.

In 1984, this 1918 Act was revised and renamed the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act (UFTA). The intent of the UFTA is the same as the UFCA - it classifies a category of transfers as fraudulent to creditors and provides creditors with a remedy for such transfers. The fundamental remedy is the recovery of the property for the creditor. Why a new Act at this time? The terminology of the UFCA had become considerably archaic, and needed to be modernized. The Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 changed the federal law on fraudulent transfers in significant ways, and made it imperative to reconsider state law. And creditor-debtor relationships have changed and become more complicated, so that the whole issue of fraudulent transfers needed rethinking. In 1984, the UFTA is ready to promote the modernization of this subject area of law.

UFTA creates a right of action for any creditor against any debtor and any other person who has received property from the debtor in a fraudulent transfer. A fraudulent transfer occurs when a debtor intends to hinder, delay, or defraud a creditor, or transfers property under certain conditions to another person without receiving reasonably equivalent value in return. But not all such transfers are fraudulent to every creditor.

UFTA distinguishes between present and future creditors, and specifies the kinds of transfers that are fraudulent to each of the two categories of creditors. Both present and future creditors may recover property when there is a transfer with intent to defraud. Both may recover when a transfer is made without receiving reasonably equivalent value when the result is to make the debtor's assets unreasonably small in relation to the business or transaction in which the debtor is engaged or about to be engaged. Also, present and future creditors can both recover when a debtor transfers property without receiving reasonably equivalent value when intending to incur debts beyond the ability to pay.

Present creditors, however, can recover property when it is transferred by a debtor to another person without receiving reasonably equivalent value if the debtor is insolvent or becomes insolvent as a result of the transfer. A transfer to an "insider" without receiving reasonably equivalent value when the debtor is insolvent, is also fraudulent to present creditors. The term "insider" is defined, and is someone with a special relationship to the debtor. Examples are relatives or business partners (when the debtor is a partner). To be liable, an "insider" must have reasonable cause to believe that the debtor is insolvent.

The fundamental relief for a creditor when there is a fraudulent transfer is recovery of the property from the person to whom it has been transferred. UFTA allows "avoidance of the transfer or obligation to the extent necessary to satisfy the creditor's claim...." Whatever is necessary to obtain the property is provided for, including attachment, injunctive relief, appointment of a receiver, or "any other relief the circumstances may require." If the creditor has reduced the claim to a judgment, the court may levy execution against the recovered assets. This means that the property can be sold to satisfy the amount of the judgment.

Much of the UFTA resembles the UFCA, its predecessor. What, then, are some of the differences? (A more detailed comparison is available from the ULC.) To begin with, the term "transfer" taken from the Federal Bankruptcy Act replaces the term "conveyance." UFCA uses the term "fair consideration" instead of "reasonably equivalent value." "Reasonably equivalent value" does not include the element of good faith as "fair consideration" does, and is more sharply defined than "fair consideration" is in the UFCA. UFTA overcomes the problem raised in the case of

Durrett v. Washington National Insurance Co., 621 F.2d 201 (5th Cir. 1980), a case that jeopardized mortgage foreclosure sales. Under UFTA, a properly conducted foreclosure sale is not a fraudulent transfer, notwithstanding the fact that it does not recover an amount somewhat near the actual market value of the property. The concept of the "insider" is new in the UFTA. UFTA provides for defenses of transferees and for a statute of limitations. Both issues are not addressed in the UFCA.

The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act continues the concept of a civil action for transfers fraudulent to creditors first created in the Statute of 13 Elizabeth, and comprehensively continued in the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act. The new Act takes into account the considerable development in both law and practice in creditor-debtor relationships since 1918. The ULC hopes that it will be adopted uniformly in all states.

D ISION OF LEGAL SERVIC.
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY
STATE OF ALASKA

(907) 465-3867 or 465-2450
FAX (907) 465-2029
Mail Stop 3101

130 Seward Street, Suite 409
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2105

MEMORANDUM January 21, 1994

SUBJECT: Sectional Summary of Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act. (Work Order No. 8-LS1461\A)

TO: Representative Brian Porter

FROM: David R. Dierdorff
Revisor of Statutes

You have requested a sectional summary of the above-described bill.

As a preliminary matter, note that a sectional summary of a bill should not be considered an authoritative interpretation of the bill and the bill itself is the best statement of its contents. If you would like an interpretation of the bill as it may apply to a particular set of circumstances, please advise.

This summary relies heavily on the prefatory notes and comments to the Uniform Act that were prepared by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL). In most instances, the text will be that of the NCCUSL, with modifications only as necessary to correct section references and the like.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act was approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1984 and by the American Bar Association on February 18, 1985. This Act was preceded by the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act, promulgated by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1918 and adopted in 25 jurisdictions, including the Virgin Islands. The 1918 Act has also been adopted in the sections of the Bankruptcy Act of 1938 and the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 that deal with fraudulent transfers and obligations.

Alaska did not adopt the earlier Act. Current Alaska law, found at AS 34.40, derives from late 19th century Oregon law, and has received little legislative attention. Even though Alaska did not enact the 1918 Act, the official commentary's references to it and to differences between the new Uniform Act and it, are helpful in understanding

the substantive effect of the bill. Consequently, this memorandum retains those references.

The 1918 Uniform Act was a codification of the "better" decisions applying the Statute of 13 Elizabeth. See Analysis of H.R. 12339, 74th Cong., 2d Sess. 213 (1936). The English statute was enacted in some form in many states, but, whether or not so enacted, the voidability of a fraudulent transfer was part of the law of every American jurisdiction (*c.f.* AS 34.40.010). Because the intent to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors is seldom susceptible of direct proof, courts have relied on "badges of fraud." The weight given these badges varied greatly between jurisdictions, and the Conference sought to minimize or eliminate the diversity by providing that proof of certain fact combinations would conclusively establish fraud. In the absence of evidence of the existence of such facts, proof of a fraudulent transfer was to depend on the evidence of actual intent. An important reform effected by the 1918 Uniform Act was the elimination of any requirement that a creditor have obtained a judgment or execution returned unsatisfied before bringing an action to avoid a transfer as fraudulent. See American Surety Co. v. Conner, 251 N.Y. 1, 166 N.E. 783, 67 A.L.R. 244 (1929) (per C.J. Cardozo).

The NCCUSL was persuaded in 1979 to appoint a committee to undertake a study of the 1918 Uniform Act with a view to preparing the draft of a revision. The Conference was influenced by the following considerations:

(1) The Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 made numerous changes in the section of that Act dealing with fraudulent transfers and obligations, thereby substantially reducing the correspondence of the provisions of the federal bankruptcy law on fraudulent transfers with the Uniform Act.

(2) The Committee on Corporate Laws of the Section of Corporations, Banking & Business Law of the American Bar Association, engaged in revising the Model Corporation Act, suggested that the Conference review provisions of the Uniform Act with a view to determining whether the Acts are consistent in respect to the treatment of dividend distributions.

(3) The Uniform Commercial Code, enacted at least in part by all 50 states, had substantially modified related rules of law regulating transfers of personal property, notably by facilitating the making and perfection of security transfers against attack by unsecured creditors.

(4) Debtors and trustees in a number of cases have avoided foreclosure of security interests by invoking the fraudulent transfer section of the Bankruptcy Reform Act.

(5) The Model Rules of Professional Conduct adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on August 2, 1983, forbid a lawyer to counsel or to assist a client in conduct that the lawyer knows is fraudulent.

The drafting committee determined to rename the Act the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act in recognition of its applicability to transfers of personal property as well as real property, "conveyance" having a connotation restricting it to a transfer of personal property. This Act, like the original Uniform Act, does not purport to cover the whole law of voidable transfers and obligations. The limited scope of the original Act did not impair its effectiveness in achieving uniformity in the areas covered. See McLaughlin, Application of the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act, 46 Harv.L.Rev. 404, 405 (1933).

The basic structure and approach of the 1918 Act are preserved in the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act. There are two sections in the new Act delineating what transfers and obligations are fraudulent. Section 4(a) (Sec. 34.41.030(a)) is an adaptation of three sections of the 1918 Act; § 5(a) (Sec. 34.41.040(a)) is an adaptation of another section of that Act and § 5(b) (Sec. 34.41.040(b)) is new. One section of the 1918 Act (§ 8) is not carried forward into the new Act because it was believed to be redundant in part and in part susceptible of inequitable application. Both Acts declare a transfer made or an obligation incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors to be fraudulent. Both Acts render a transfer made or obligation incurred without adequate consideration to be constructively fraudulent -- *ie.*, without regard to the actual intent of the parties -- under one of the following conditions:

(1) the debtor was left by the transfer or obligation with unreasonably small assets for a transaction or the business in which the debtor was engaged;

(2) the debtor intended to incur, or believed that the debtor would incur, more debts than the debtor would be able to pay; or

(3) the debtor was insolvent at the time or as a result of the transfer or obligation.

As under the 1918 Act a transfer or obligation that is constructively fraudulent because insolvency concurs with or follows failure to receive adequate consideration is voidable only by a creditor in existence at the time the transfer occurs or the obligation is incurred. Either an existing or subsequent creditor may avoid a transfer or obligation for inadequate consideration when accompanied by the financial condition specified in Sec. 34.41.030(a)(2)(A) or the mental state specified in Sec. 34.41.030(a)(2)(B).

Reasonably equivalent value is required in order to constitute adequate consideration under the revised Act. The revision follows the Bankruptcy Code in eliminating good faith on the part of the transferee or obligee as an issue in the determination of whether adequate consideration is given by a transferee or obligee. The new Act, like the Bankruptcy Act, allows the transferee or obligee to show good faith in defense after a creditor establishes that a fraudulent transfer has been made or a fraudulent obligation has been incurred. Thus, a showing by a defendant that a reasonable equivalent has been given in good faith for a transfer or obligation is a complete defense although the debtor is shown to have intended to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors.

A good faith transferee or obligee who has given less than a reasonable equivalent is nevertheless allowed a reduction in a liability to the extent of the value given. The new Act, like the Bankruptcy Code, eliminates the provision of the 1918 Act that enables a creditor to attack a security transfer on the ground that the value of the property transferred is disproportionate to the debt secured. The premise of the new Act is that the value of the interest transferred for security is measured by and thus corresponds exactly to the debt secured. Foreclosure of a debtor's interest by a regularly conducted, noncollusive sale on default under a mortgage or other security agreement may not be avoided under the Act as a transfer for less than a reasonably equivalent value.

The definition of insolvency under the Act is adapted from the definition of the term in the Bankruptcy Code. Insolvency is presumed from proof of a failure generally to pay debts as they become due.

The new Act adds a new category of fraudulent transfer, namely, a preferential transfer by an insolvent insider to a creditor who had reasonable cause to believe the debtor to be insolvent. An insider is defined in much the same way as in the Bankruptcy Code and includes a relative, also defined as in the Bankruptcy Code, a director or officer of a corporate debtor, a partner, or a person in control of a debtor. This provision is available only to an existing creditor. Its premise is that an insolvent debtor is obliged to pay debts to creditors not related to the debtor before paying those who are insiders.

The new Act omits any provision directed particularly at transfers or obligations of insolvent partnership debtors. Under § 8 of the 1918 Act, any transfer made or obligation incurred by an insolvent partnership to a partner was deemed fraudulent without regard to intent or adequacy of consideration. So categorical a condemnation of a partnership transaction with a partner may unfairly prejudice the interests of a partner's separate creditors. The new Act also omits as redundant a provision in the 1918 Act that makes fraudulent a transfer made or obligation incurred by an insolvent partnership for less than a fair consideration to the partnership.

Section 34.41.060 lists the remedies available to creditors under the new Act. It eliminates as unnecessary and confusing a differentiation made in the 1918 Act between the remedies available to holders of matured claims and those holding unmatured claims. Since promulgation of the 1918 Act, the United States Supreme Court has imposed restrictions on the availability and use of prejudgment remedies. As a result many states have amended their statutes and rules applicable to such remedies, and it is frequently unclear whether a state's procedures include a prejudgment remedy against a fraudulent transfer or obligation. Paragraph (a)(2) is included in Sec. 34.41.060 to make such a remedy available.

Section 34.41.070 prescribes the measure of liability of a transferee or obligee under the Act and enumerates defenses. Defenses against avoidance of a preferential transfer to an insider under Sec. 34.41.040(b) include an adaptation of defenses available under § 547(c)(2) and (4) of the Bankruptcy Code when such a transfer is sought to be avoided as a preference by the trustee in bankruptcy. In addition a preferential transfer may be justified when shown to be made pursuant to a good faith effort to stave off forced liquidation and rehabilitate the debtor. Section 34.41.070 also precludes avoidance, as a constructively fraudulent transfer, of the termination of a lease on default or the enforcement of a security interest in compliance with Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code (AS 45.09).

The new Act includes a new section specifying when a transfer is made or an obligation is incurred. The section specifying the time when a transfer occurs is adapted from § 548(d) of the Bankruptcy Code. Its premise is that if the law prescribes a mode for making the transfer a matter of public record or notice, it is not deemed to be made for any purpose under the Act until it has become such a matter of record or notice.

The new Act also includes a statute of limitations that bars the right rather than the remedy on expiration of the statutory periods prescribed. The law governing limitations on actions to avoid fraudulent transfers among the states is unclear and full of diversity. The Act recognizes that laches and estoppel may operate to preclude a particular creditor from pursuing a remedy against a fraudulent transfer or obligation even though the statutory period of limitations has not run.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY

Section 1. Enacts the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act as a new chapter, AS 34.41. The chapter consists of the following provisions:

Sec. 34.41.010. This section sets out the circumstances under which a debtor is deemed to be insolvent.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) Subsection (a) is derived from the definition of "insolvent" in § 101 (29)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code. The definition in subsection (a) and the correlated definition of partnership insolvency in subsection (c) contemplate a fair valuation of the debts as well as the assets of the debtor. As under the definition of the same term in § 2 of the 1918 Act, exempt property is excluded from the computation of the value of the assets. See Sec. 34.41.110(2). For similar reasons, interests in valid spendthrift trusts and interests in tenancies by the entireties that cannot be severed by a creditor of only one tenant are not included. See the comment to Sec. 34.41.110(2), *infra*. Since a valid lien also precludes an unsecured creditor from collecting the creditor's claim from the encumbered interest in a debtor's property, both the encumbered interest and the debt secured thereby are excluded from the computation of insolvency under this Act. See Sec. 34.41.110(2) and subsection (e) of this section.

(2) Subsection (b) establishes a rebuttable presumption of insolvency from the fact of general nonpayment of debts as they become due. Such general nonpayment is a ground for the filing of an involuntary petition under § 303(h)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code. See also AS 45.01.201(24) (Uniform Commercial Code), which, in part, declares a person to be "insolvent" who "has ceased to pay the person's debts in the ordinary course of business or cannot pay the person's debts as they become due." The presumption imposes on the party against whom the presumption is directed the burden of proving that the nonexistence of insolvency as defined in subsection (a) is more probable than its existence. See Uniform Rules of Evidence (1974 Act), Rule 310(a). The 1974 Uniform Rule 301(a) conforms to the Final Draft of Federal Rule 301 as submitted to the United States Supreme Court by the Advisory Committee on Federal Rules of Evidence. "The so-called 'bursting bubble' theory, under which a presumption vanishes upon the introduction of evidence which would support a finding of the nonexistence of the presumed fact, even though not believed is rejected as according presumptions too 'slight and evanescent' an effect." Advisory Committee's Note to Rule 301. See also 1 J. Weinstein & M. Berger, Evidence (1982).

The presumption is established in recognition of the difficulties typically imposed on a creditor in proving insolvency in the bankruptcy sense, as provided in subsection (a). See generally Levit, The Archaic Concept of Balance-Sheet Insolvency, 47 Am.Bankr.L.J. 215 (1973). Not only is the relevant information in the possession of a noncooperative debtor but the debtor's records are more often than not incomplete and inaccurate. As a practical matter, insolvency is most cogently evidenced by a general cessation of payment of debts, as has long been recognized by the laws of other countries and is now reflected in the Bankruptcy Code. See Honsberger, Failure to Pay One's Debts Generally as They Become Due: The Experience of France and Canada, 54 Am.Bankr.L.J. 153 (1980); J. MacLachlan,

Bankruptcy 13, 63-64, 436 (1956). In determining whether a debtor is paying its debts generally as they become due, the court should look at more than the amount and due dates of the indebtedness. The court should also take into account such factors as the number of the debtor's debts, the proportion of those debts not being paid, the duration of the nonpayment, and the existence of bona fide disputes or other special circumstances alleged to constitute an explanation for the stoppage of payments. The court's determination may be affected by a consideration of the debtor's payment practices prior to the period of alleged nonpayment and the payment practices of the trade or industry in which the debtor is engaged. The case law that has developed under § 303(h)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code has not required a showing that a debtor has failed or refused to pay a majority in number and amount of the person's debts in order to prove general nonpayment of debts as they become due. See, *e.g.*, Hill v. Cargill, Inc. (*In re* Hill), 8 B.R. 779, 3 C.B.C.2d 920 (Bk.D.Minn.1981) (non-payment of three largest debts held to constitute general nonpayment, although small debts were being paid); *In re* All Media Properties, Inc., 5 B.R. 126, 6 B.C.D. 586, 2 C.B.C.2d 449 (Bk.S.D.Tex.1980) (missing significant number of payments or regularly missing payments significant in amount said to constitute general nonpayment; missing payments on more than 50% of aggregate of claims said not to be required to show general nonpayment; nonpayment for more than 30 days after billing held to establish nonpayment of a debt when it is due); *In re* Kreidler Import Corp., 4 B.R. 256, 6 B.C.D. 608, 2 C.B.C.2d 159 (Bk.D.Md. 1980) (nonpayment of one debt constituting 97% of debtor's total indebtedness held to constitute general nonpayment). A presumption of insolvency does not arise from nonpayment of a debt as to which there is a genuine bona fide dispute, even though the debt is a substantial part of the debtor's indebtedness. *Cf.* 11 U.S.C. 303(h)(1), as amended by § 426(b) of Public Law No. 98-882, the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984.

(3) Subsection (c) is derived from the definition of partnership insolvency in § 101(29)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code. The definition conforms generally to the definition of the same term in § 2(2) of the 1918 Act.

(4) Subsection (d) follows the approach of the definition of "insolvency" in § 101(29) of the Bankruptcy Code by excluding from the computation of the value of the debtor's assets any value that can be realized only by avoiding a transfer of an interest formerly held by the debtor or by discovery or pursuit of property that has been fraudulently concealed or removed.

(5) Subsection (e) is new. It makes clear the purpose not to render a person insolvent under this section by counting as a debt an obligation secured by property of the debtor that is not counted as an asset. See also comments to subsection (a), *supra*, and Sec. 34.41.110(2), *infra*.

Sec. 34.41.020. This section defines "value" as used in various contexts in this Act, frequently with a qualifying adjective. The word appears in the following provisions:

Sec. 34.41.030(a)(2) ("reasonably equivalent value");
Sec. 34.41.030(b)(8) ("value ... reasonably equivalent");
Sec. 34.41.040(a) ("reasonably equivalent value");
Sec. 34.41.040(b) ("present, reasonably equivalent value");
Sec. 34.41.070(a) ("reasonably equivalent value");
Sec. 34.41.070(b), (c), (d), and (e) ("value");
Sec. 34.41.070(f)(1) ("new value"); and
Sec. 34.41.070(f)(3) ("present value").

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) Subsection (a) is adapted from § 548(d)(2)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code. See also § 3(a) of the 1918 Act. The definition in the section is not exclusive. "Value" is to be determined in light of the purpose of the Act to protect a debtor's estate from being depleted to the prejudice of the debtor's unsecured creditors. Consideration having no utility from a creditor's viewpoint does not satisfy the statutory definition. The definition does not specify all the kinds of consideration that do not constitute value for the purposes of this Act -- *e.g.*, love and affection. See, *e.g.*, United States v. West, 299 F.Supp. 661, 666 (D.Del. 1969).

(2) Subsection (a) does not indicate what is "reasonably equivalent value" for a transfer or obligation. Under this Act, as under § 548(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, a transfer for security is ordinarily for a reasonably equivalent value notwithstanding a discrepancy between the value of the asset transferred and the debt secured, since the amount of the debt is the measure of the value of the interest in the asset that is transferred. See, *e.g.*, Peoples-Pittsburgh Trust Co., v. Holy Family Polish Nat'l Catholic Church, Carnegie, Pa., 341 Pa. 390, 19 A.2d 360 (1941). If, however, a transfer purports to secure more than the debt actually incurred or to be incurred, it may be found to be for less than a reasonably equivalent value. See *e.g.*, *In re* Peoria Braumeister Co., 138 F.2d 520, 523 (7th Cir. 1943) (chattel mortgage securing a $3,000 note held to be fraudulent when the debt secured was only $2,500); Hartford Acc. & Indemnity Co. v. Jirasek, 254 Mich. 131, 140, 235 N.W. 836, 839 (1931) (quitclaim deed given as mortgage held to be fraudulent to the extent the value of the property transferred exceeded the indebtedness secured). If the debt is a fraudulent obligation under this Act, a transfer to secure it as well as the obligation would be vulnerable to attack as fraudulent. A transfer to satisfy or secure an antecedent debt owed an insider is also subject to avoidance under the conditions specified in Sec. 34.41.040(b).

(3) Section 3(a) of the 1918 Act has been thought not to recognize that an unperformed promise could constitute fair consideration. See McLaughlin, Application of the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act, 46 Harv.L. Rev. 404, 414 (1933). Courts construing these provisions of the prior law nevertheless have held unperformed promises to constitute value in a variety of circumstances. See, *e.g.*, Harper v. Lloyd's Factors, Inc., 214 F.2d 662 (2d Cir. 1954) (transfer of money for promise of factor to discount transferor's purchase-money notes given to fur dealer); Schlecht v. Schlecht, 168 Minn. 168, 176-77, 209 N.W. 883, 886-87 (1926) (transfer for promise to make repairs and improvements on transferor's homestead); Farmer's Exchange Bank v. Oneida Motor Truck Co., 202 Wis. 266, 232 N.W. 536 (1930) (transfer in consideration of assumption of certain of transferor's liabilities); see also Hummel v. Cernocky, 161 F.2d 685 (7th Cir. 1947) (transfer in consideration of cash, assumption of a mortgage, payment of certain debts, and agreement to pay other debts). Likewise a transfer in consideration of a negotiable note discountable at a commercial bank, or the purchase from an established, solvent institution of an insurance policy, annuity, or contract to provide care and accommodations clearly appears to be for value. On the other hand, a transfer for an unperformed promise by an individual to support a parent or other transferor has generally been held voidable as a fraud on creditors of the transferor. See, *e.g.*, Springfield Ins. Co. v. Fry, 267 F.Supp. 693 (N.D.Okla. 1967); Sandler v. Parlapiano, 236 App.Div. 70, 258 N.Y.Supp. 88 (1st Dep't 1932); Warwick Municipal Employees Credit Union v. Higham, 106 R.I. 363, 259 A.2d 852 (1969); Hulsether v. Sanders, 54 S.D. 412, 223 N.W. 335 (1929); Cooper v. Cooper, 22 Tenn.App. 473, 477, 124 S.W.2d 264, 267 (1939); Note, Rights of Creditors in Property Conveyed in Consideration of Future Support, 45 Iowa L.Rev. 546, 550-62 (1960). This Act adopts the view taken in the cases cited in determining whether an unperformed promise is value.

(4) Subsection (b) rejects the rule of such cases as Durrett v. Washington Nat. Ins. Co., 621 F.2d 201 (5th Cir.1980) (nonjudicial foreclosure of a mortgage avoided as a fraudulent transfer when the property of an insolvent mortgagor was sold for less than 70% of its fair value), and Abramson v. Lakewood Bank & Trust Co., 647 F.2d 547 (5th Cir.1981), cert. denied, 454 U.S. 1164 (1982) (nonjudicial foreclosure held to be fraudulent transfer if made without fair consideration). Subsection (b) adopts the view taken in Lawyers Title Ins. Corp. v. Madrid (*In re* Madrid), 21 B.R. 424 (B.A.P. 9th Cir.1982), aff'd on another ground, 725 F.2d 1197 (9th Cir.1984), that the price bid at a public foreclosure sale determines the fair value of the property sold. Subsection (b) prescribes the effect of a sale meeting its requirements, whether the asset sold is personal or real property. The rule of this subsection applies to a foreclosure by sale of the interest of a vendee under an installment land contract in accordance with applicable law that requires or permits the foreclosure to be effected by a sale in the same manner as the foreclosure of a mortgage. See G. Osborne, G. Nelson, & D. Whitman, Real Estate Finance Law 83-84, 95-97 (1979). The premise of the subsection is that "a sale of the collateral by the secured party as the normal

consequence of default ... [is] the safest way of establishing the fair value of the collateral ...." 2 G. Gilmore, Security Interests in Personal Property 1227 (1965).

If a lien given an insider for a present consideration is not perfected as against a subsequent bona fide purchaser or is so perfected after a delay following an extension of credit secured by the lien, foreclosure of the lien may result in a transfer for an antecedent debt that is voidable under Sec. 34.41.040(b), *infra*. Subsection (b) does not apply to an action under Sec. 34.41.030(a)(1) to avoid a transfer or obligation because made or incurred with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud any creditor.

(5) Subsection (c) is an adaptation of § 547(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code. A transfer to an insider for an antecedent debt may be voidable under Sec. 34.41.-040(b), *infra*.

Sec. 34.41.030. This section describes the transfers that are fraudulent as to present and future creditors and sets out factors that may be given consideration in determining whether the requisite intent to defraud was present.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) Paragraph (a)(1) is derived from § 7 of the 1918 Act. Factors appropriate for consideration in determining actual intent under paragraph (a)(1) are specified in subsection (b).

(2) Paragraph (a)(2) is derived from §§ 5 and 6 of the 1918 Act but substitutes "reasonably equivalent value" for "fair consideration." The transferee's good faith was an element of "fair consideration" as defined in § 3 of the 1918 Act, and lack of fair consideration was one of the elements of a fraudulent transfer as defined in four sections of that Act. The transferee's good faith is irrelevant to a determination of the adequacy of the consideration under the new Act, but lack of good faith may be a basis for withholding protection of a transferee or obligee under Sec. 34.41.070, *infra*.

(3) Unlike the 1918 Act as originally promulgated, this Act does not prescribe different tests when a transfer is made for the purpose of security and when it is intended to be absolute. The premise of this Act is that when a transfer is for security only, the equity or value of the asset that exceeds the amount of the debt secured remains available to unsecured creditors and thus cannot be regarded as the subject of a fraudulent transfer merely because of the encumbrance resulting from an otherwise valid security transfer. Disproportion between the value of the asset securing the debt and the size of the debt secured does not, in the absence of circumstances indicating a purpose to hinder, delay, or defraud creditors, constitute

an impermissible hindrance to the enforcement of other creditors' rights against the debtor-transferor. *Cf.* AS 45.09.311 (Uniform Commercial Code).

(4) Subparagraph (a)(2)(A) of this section is an adaptation of § 5 of the 1918 Act, but substitutes "unreasonably small [assets] in relation to the business or transaction" for "unreasonably small capital." The reference to "capital" in the 1918 Act is ambiguous in that it may refer to net worth or to the par value of stock or to the consideration received for stock issued. The special meanings of "capital" in corporation law have no relevance in the law of fraudulent transfers. The subparagraph focuses attention on whether the amount of all the assets retained by the debtor was inadequate, *i.e.*, unreasonably small, in light of the needs of the business or transaction in which the debtor was engaged or about to engage.

(5) Subsection (b) is a nonexclusive catalogue of factors appropriate for consideration by the court in determining whether the debtor had an actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud one or more creditors. Proof of the existence of any one or more of the factors enumerated in subsection (b) may be relevant evidence as to the debtor's actual intent, but does not create a presumption that the debtor has made a fraudulent transfer or incurred a fraudulent obligation. The list of factors includes most of the badges of fraud that have been recognized by the courts in construing and applying the Statute of 13 Elizabeth and § 7 of the 1918 Act. Proof of the presence of certain badges in combination establishes fraud conclusively -- *i.e.*, without regard to the actual intent of the parties -- when they concur as provided in (a)(2) of this section or in Sec. 34.41.040. The fact that a transfer has been made to a relative or to an affiliated corporation has not been regarded as a badge of fraud sufficient to warrant avoidance when unaccompanied by any other evidence of fraud. The courts have uniformly recognized, however, that a transfer to a closely related person warrants close scrutiny of the other circumstances, including the nature and extent of the consideration exchanged. See 1 G. Glenn, Fraudulent Conveyances and Preferences § 307 (Rev. ed. 1940). The second, third, fourth, and fifth factors listed are all adapted from the classic catalogue of badges of fraud provided by Lord Coke in Twyne's Case, 3 Coke 80b, 76 Eng.Rep. 809 (Star Chamber 1601). Lord Coke also included the use of a trust and the recitation in the instrument of transfer that it "was made honestly, truly, and bona fide," but the use of the trust is fraudulent only when accompanied by elements or badges specified in this Act, and recitals of "good faith" can no longer be regarded as significant evidence of a fraudulent intent.

(6) In considering the factors listed in subsection (b) a court should evaluate all the relevant circumstances involving a challenged transfer or obligation. Thus the court may appropriately take into account all indicia negativing as well as those suggesting fraud, as illustrated in the following reported cases:

(a) Whether the transfer or obligation was to an insider: Salomon v. Kaiser (*In re* Kaiser), 722 F.2d 1574, 1582-83 (2d Cir.1983) (insolvent debtor's

purchase of two residences in the name of his spouse and the creation of a dummy corporation for the purpose of concealing assets held to evidence fraudulent intent); Banner Construction Corp. v. Arnold, 128 So.2d 893 (Fla.Dist.App. 1961) (assignment by one corporation to another having identical directors and stockholders constituted a badge of fraud); Travelers Indemnity Co. v. Cormaney, 258 Iowa 237, 138 N.W.2d 50 (1965) (transfer between spouses said to be a circumstance that shed suspicion on the transfer and that with other circumstances warranted avoidance); Hathewav v. Hanson, 230 Iowa 386, 297 N.W. 824 (1941) (transfer from parent to child said to require a critical examination of surrounding circumstances, which, together with other indicia of fraud, warranted avoidance); Lumpkins v. McPhee, 59 N.M. 442, 286 P.2d 299 (1955) (transfer from daughter to mother said to be indicative of fraud but transfer held not to be fraudulent due to adequacy of consideration and delivery of possession by transferor).

(b) Whether the transferor retained possession or control of the property after the transfer: Harris v. Shaw, 224 Ark. 150, 272 S.W.2d 53 (1954) (retention of property by transferor said to be a badge of fraud and, together with other badges, to warrant avoidance of transfer); Stephens v. Reginstein, 89 Ala. 561, 8 So. 68 (1890) (transferor's retention of control and management of property and business after transfer held material in determining transfer to be fraudulent); Allen v. Massey, 84 U.S. (17 Wall.) 351 (1872) (joint possession of furniture by transferor and transferee considered in holding transfer to be fraudulent); Warner v. Norton, 61 U.S. (20 How.) 448 (1857) (surrender of possession by transferor deemed to negate allegations of fraud).

(c) Whether the transfer or obligation was concealed or disclosed: Walton v. First National Bank, 13 Colo. 265, 22 P. 440 (1889) (agreement between parties to conceal the transfer from the public said to be one of the strongest badges of fraud); Warner v. Norton, 61 U.S. (20 How.) 448 (1857) (although secrecy said to be a circumstance from which, when coupled with other badges, fraud may be inferred, transfer was held not to be fraudulent when made in good faith and transferor surrendered possession); W.T. Raleigh Co. v. Barnett, 253 Ala. 433, 44 So.2d 585 (1950) (failure to record a deed in itself said not to evidence fraud, and transfer held not to be fraudulent).

(d) Whether, before the transfer was made or obligation was incurred, a creditor sued or threatened to sue the debtor: Harris v. Shaw, 224 Ark. 150, 272 S.W.2d 53 (1954) (transfer held to be fraudulent when causally connected to pendency of litigation and accompanied by other badges of fraud); Pergrem v. Smith, 255 S.W.2d 42 (Ky.App.1953) (transfer in anticipation of suit deemed to be a badge of fraud; transfer held fraudulent when accompanied by

insolvency of transferor who was related to transferee); Bank of Sun Prairie v. Hovig, 218 F.Supp. 769 (W.D.Ark.1963) (although threat or pendency of litigation said to be an indicator of fraud, transfer was held not to be fraudulent when adequate consideration and good faith were shown).

(e) Whether the transfer was of substantially all the debtor's assets: Walbrun v. Babbitt, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 577 (1872) (sale by insolvent retail shop owner of all of his inventory in a single transaction held to be fraudulent); Cole v. Mercantile Trust Co., 133 N.Y. 164, 30 N.E. 847 (1892) (transfer of all property before plaintiff could obtain a judgment held to be fraudulent); Lumpkins v. McPhee, 59 N.M. 442, 286 P.2d 299 (1955) (although transfer of all assets said to indicate fraud, transfer held not to be fraudulent because full consideration was paid and transferor surrendered possession).

(f) Whether the debtor had absconded: *In re* Thomas, 199 F. 214 (N.D.N.Y.1912) (when debtor collected all of his money and property with the intent to abscond, fraudulent intent was held to be shown).

(g) Whether the debtor had removed or concealed assets: Bentley v. Young, 210 F. 202 (S.D.N.Y.1914), aff'd, 223 F. 536 (2d Cir.1915) (debtor's removal of goods from store to conceal their whereabouts and to sell them held to render sale fraudulent); Cioli v. Kenourgios, 59 Cal.App. 690, 211 P. 838 (1922) (debtor's sale of all assets and shipment of proceeds out of the country held to be fraudulent notwithstanding adequacy of consideration).

(h) Whether the value of the consideration received by the debtor was reasonably equivalent to the value of the asset transferred or the amount of the obligation incurred: Toomay v. Graham, 151 S.W.2d 119 (Mo.App.1941) (although mere inadequacy of consideration said not to be a badge of fraud, transfer held to be fraudulent when accompanied by badges of fraud); Texas Sand Co. v. Shield, 381 S.W.2d 48 (Tex.1964) (inadequate consideration said to be an indicator of fraud, and transfer held to be fraudulent because of inadequate consideration, pendency of suit, family relationship of transferee, and fact that all non-exempt property was transferred); Weigel v. Wood, 355 Mo. 11, 194 S.W.2d 40 (1946) (although inadequate consideration said to be a badge of fraud, transfer held not to be fraudulent when inadequacy not gross and not accompanied by any other badge fact that transfer was from father to son held not sufficient to establish fraud).

(i) Whether the debtor was insolvent or became insolvent shortly after the transfer was made or obligation was incurred: Harris v. Shaw, 224 Ark. 150, 272 S.W.2d 53 (1954) (insolvency of transferor said to be a badge of fraud and transfer held fraudulent when accompanied by other badges of fraud); Bank of Sun Prairie v. Hovig, 218 F.Supp. 769 (W.D.Ark.1963)

(although the insolvency of the debtor said to be a badge of fraud, transfer held not fraudulent when debtor was shown to be solvent, adequate consideration was paid, and good faith was shown, despite the pendency of suit); Wareheim v. Bayliss, 149 Md. 103, 131 A. 27 (1925) (although insolvency of debtor acknowledged to be an indicator of fraud, transfer held not to be fraudulent when adequate consideration was paid and whether debtor was insolvent in fact was doubtful).

(j) Whether the transfer occurred shortly before or shortly after a substantial debt was incurred: Commerce Bank of Lebanon v. Halladale A Corp., 618 S.W.2d 288, 292 (Mo.App.1981) (when transferors incurred substantial debts near in time to the transfer, transfer was held to be fraudulent due to inadequate consideration, close family relationship, the debtor's retention of possession, and the fact that almost all the debtors' property was transferred).

(7) The effect of the two transfers described in paragraph (b)(11), if not avoided, may be to permit a debtor and a lienor to deprive the debtor's unsecured creditors of access to the debtor's assets for the purpose of collecting their claims while the debtor, the debtor's affiliate or insider, and the lienor arrange for the beneficial use or disposition of the assets in accordance with their interests. The kind of disposition sought to be reached here is exemplified by that found in Northern Pacific Co. v. Boyd, 228 U.S. 482 (1913), the leading case in establishing the absolute priority doctrine in reorganization law. There the court held that a reorganization whereby the secured creditors and the management-owners retained their economic interests in a railroad through a foreclosure that cut off claims of unsecured creditors against its assets was in effect a fraudulent disposition (*id.* at 502-05). See Frank, Some Realistic Reflections on Some Aspects of Corporate Reorganization, 19 Va.L.Rev. 541, 693 (1933). For cases in which an analogous injury to unsecured creditors was inflicted by a lienor and a debtor, see Jackson v. Star Sprinkler Corp. of Florida, 575 F.2d 1223, 1231-34 (8th Cir. 1978); Heath v. Helmick, 173 F.2d 157, 161-62 (9th Cir.1949); Toner v. Nuss, 234 F.S. 457, 461-62 (E.D.Pa.1964); and see *In re* Spotless Tavern Co., Inc., 4 F.Supp. 752, 753, 755 (D.Md.1933).

(8) Nothing in subsection (b) is intended to affect the application of AS 45.02.402(b), AS 45.09.205, or 45.09.301, or former AS 45.06.105 (Uniform Commercial Code). AS 45.02.402(b) recognizes the generally prevailing rule that retention of possession of goods by a seller may be fraudulent, but limits the application of the rule by negating any imputation of fraud from "retention of possession in good faith and current course of trade by a merchant seller for a commercially reasonable time after a sale or identification." AS 45.09.205 explicitly negates any imputation of fraud from the grant of liberty by a secured creditor to a debtor to use, commingle, or dispose of personal property collateral or to account for its proceeds. The section recognizes that it does not relax prevailing requirements

for delivery of possession by a pledgor. Moreover, the section does not mitigate the general requirement of AS 45.09.301(a)(2) that a nonpossessory security interest in personal property must be perfected to be effective against a levying creditor. Finally, like the 1918 Act, this Act does not pre-empt the statutes governing bulk transfers, such as former AS 45.06 of the Uniform Commercial Code. Compliance with the cited sections of the Uniform Commercial Code does not, however, insulate a transfer or obligation from avoidance. Thus a sale by an insolvent debtor for less than a reasonably equivalent value would be voidable under this Act notwithstanding compliance with the Uniform Commercial Code.

Sec. 34.41.040. This section describes the transfers that are fraudulent as to creditors whose claims arose before the transfer was made or obligation was incurred by the debtor.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) Subsection (a) is derived from § 4 of the 1918 Act. It adheres to the limitation of the protection of that section to a creditor who extended credit before the transfer or obligation described. As pointed out in comment (2) accompanying Sec. 34.41.030, this Act substitutes "reasonably equivalent value" for "fair consideration."

(2) Subsection (b) renders a preferential transfer -- *i.e.*, a transfer by an insolvent debtor for or on account of an antecedent debt -- to an insider vulnerable as a fraudulent transfer when the insider had reasonable cause to believe that the debtor was insolvent. This subsection adopts for general application the rule of such cases as Jackson Sound Studios, Inc. v. Travis, 473 F.2d 503 (5th Cir. 1973) (security transfer of corporation's equipment to corporate principal's mother perfected on eve of bankruptcy of corporation held to be fraudulent); *In re* Lamie Chemical Co., 296 F. 24 (4th Cir 1924)(corporate preference to corporate officers and directors held voidable by receiver when corporation was insolvent or nearly so and directors had already voted for liquidation); Stuart v. Larson, 298 F. 223 (8th Cir 1924), noted 38 Harv.L.Rev. 521 (1925) (corporate preference to director held voidable). See generally 2 G. Glenn, Fraudulent Conveyances and Preferences 386 (Rev. ed 1940). Subsection (b) overrules such cases as Epstein v. Goldstein, 107 F.2d 755, 757 (2d Cir. 1939) (transfer by insolvent husband to wife to secure his debt to her sustained against attack by husband's trustee); Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. v. Jirasek, 254 Mich. 131, 139, 235 N.W. 836, 839 (1931) (mortgage given by debtor to his brother to secure an antecedent debt owed the brother sustained as not fraudulent).

(3) Subsection (b) does not extend as far as § 8(a) of the 1918 Act and § 548(b) of the Bankruptcy Code in rendering voidable a transfer or obligation incurred by an insolvent partnership to a partner, who is an insider of the partnership. The transfer to the partner is not vulnerable to avoidance under subsection (b) unless the

transfer was for an antecedent debt and the partner had reasonable cause to believe that the partnership was insolvent. The cited provisions of the 1918 Act and the Bankruptcy Act make any transfer by an insolvent partnership to a partner voidable. Avoidance of the partnership transfer without reference to the partner's state of mind and the nature of the consideration exchanged would be unduly harsh treatment of the creditors of the partner and unduly favorable to the creditors of the partnership.

Sec. 34.41.050. This section defines the moments in time at which when a claim for relief or cause of action to avoid a transfer or obligation arises.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) One of the uncertainties in the law governing the avoidance of fraudulent transfers and obligations is the difficulty of determining when the claim for relief or cause of action arises. This section clarifies this point in time. For transfers of real estate, paragraph (1) fixes the time as the date of perfection against a good faith purchaser from the transferor. For transfers of fixtures and assets constituting personalty, the time is fixed under paragraph (1) as the date of perfection against a judicial lien creditor not asserting rights under this Act. Perfection typically is effected by notice-filing, recordation, or delivery of unequivocal possession. See AS 45.09.302, 45.09.304, and 45.09.305 (security interest in personal property perfected by notice-filing or delivery of possession to transferee); 4 American Law of Property §§ 17.10-17.12 (1952) (recordation of transfer or delivery of possession to grantee required for perfection against bona fide purchaser from grantor). The provision for postponing the time a transfer is made until its perfection is an adaptation of § 548(d)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code. When no steps are taken to perfect a transfer that applicable law permits to be perfected, the transfer is deemed by paragraph (2) to be perfected immediately before the filing of an action to avoid it; without such a provision to cover that eventuality, an unperfected transfer would arguably be immune to attack. Some transfers -- *e.g.*, an assignment of a bank account, creation of a security interest in money, or execution of a marital or premarital agreement for the disposition of property owned by the parties to the agreement -- may not be amenable to perfection as against a bona fide purchaser or judicial lien creditor. When a transfer is not perfectible as provided in paragraph (1), the transfer occurs for the purpose of this Act when the transferor effectively parts with an interest in the asset as provided in AS 45.41.110(12), *infra*.

(2) Paragraph (4) requires the transferor to have rights in the asset transferred before the transfer is made for the purpose of this section. This provision makes clear that its purpose may not be circumvented by notice-filing or recordation of a document evidencing an interest in an asset to be acquired in the future. *Cf.* Bankruptcy Code § 547(e); AS 45.09.203(a)(3).

(3) Paragraph (5) is new. It is intended to resolve uncertainty arising from Rubin v. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., 661 F.2d 979, 989-91, 997 (2d Cir.1981), insofar as that case holds that an obligation of guaranty may be deemed to be incurred when advances covered by the guaranty are made rather than when the guaranty first became effective between the parties. Compare Rosenberg, Intercorporate Guaranties and the Law of Fraudulent Conveyances: Lender Beware, 125 U.Pa.L.Rev. 235, 256-57 (1976).

An obligation may be avoided as fraudulent under this Act if it is incurred under the circumstances specified in AS 34.41.030(a) or 34.41.040(a). The debtor may receive reasonably equivalent value in exchange for an obligation incurred even though the benefit to the debtor is indirect. See Rubin v. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., 661 F.2d at 991-92; Williams v. Twin City Co., 251 F.2d 678, 681 (9th Cir. 1958); Rosenberg, *supra* at 243-46.

Sec. 34.41.060. This section sets out the remedies available to creditors. The listing is not exclusive.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) This section is derived from §§ 9 and 10 of the 1918 Act. Section 9 of that Act specified the remedies of creditors whose claims have matured, and § 10 enumerated the remedies available to creditors whose claims have not matured. A creditor holding an unmatured claim may be denied the right to receive payment for the proceeds of a sale on execution until the claim has matured, but the proceeds may be deposited in court or in an interest-bearing account pending the maturity of the creditor's claim. The remedies specified in this section are not exclusive.

(2) The availability of an attachment or other provisional remedy has been restricted by amendments of statutes and rules of procedure to reflect views of the United States Supreme Court expressed in Sniadach v. Family Finance Corp. of Bay View, 395 U.S. 337 (1969), and its progeny. This judicial development and the procedural changes that followed in its wake do not preclude resort to attachment by a creditor in seeking avoidance of a fraudulent transfer or obligation. See, *e.g.*, Britton v. Howard Sav. Bank, 727 F.2d 315, 317-20 (3d Cir.1984); Computer Sciences Corp. v. Sci-Tek Inc., 367 A.2d 658, 661 (Del. Super. 1976); Great Lakes Carbon Corp. v. Fontana, 54 A.D.2d 548, 387 N.Y.S.2d 115 (1st Dep't 1976). Paragraph (a)(2) continues the authorization for the use of attachment contained in § 9(b) of the 1918 Act, or of a similar provisional remedy, when the state's procedure provides therefor, subject to the constraints imposed by the due process clauses of the United States and state constitutions.

(3) Subsections (a) and (b) of § 10 of the 1918 Act authorized the court, in an action on a fraudulent transfer or obligation, to restrain the defendant from

disposing of the defendant's property, to appoint a receiver to take charge of the property, or to make any order the circumstances may require. Section 10, however, applied only to a creditor whose claim was unmatured. There is no reason to restrict the availability of these remedies to such a creditor, and the courts have not so restricted them. See, *e.g.*, Lipskey v. Voloshen, 155 Md. 139, 143-45, 141 Atl. 402, 404-05(1928) (judgment creditor granted injunction against disposition of property by transferee, but appointment of receiver denied for lack of sufficient showing of need for such relief); Matthews v. Schusheim, 36 Misc.2d 918, 922-23, 235 N.Y.S.2d 973, 976-77, 991-92 (Sup.Ct. 1962) (injunction and appointment of receiver granted to holder of claims for fraud, breach of contract, and alimony arrearages, whether creditor's claim was mature said to be immaterial); Oliphant v. Moore, 155 Tenn. 359, 362-63, 293 S.W. 541, 542 (1927) (tort creditor granted injunction restraining alleged tort feasor's disposition of property).

(4) As under the 1918 Act, a creditor is not required to obtain a judgment against the debtor-transferor or to have a matured claim in order to proceed under subsection (a). See Sec. 34.41.110(3) & (4), *infra*; American Surety Co. v. Conner, 251 N.Y. 1, 166 N.E. 783, 65 A.L.R. 244 (1929); 1 G. Glenn, Fraudulent Conveyances and Preferences 129 (Rev.ed. 1940).

(5) The provision in subsection (b) for a creditor to levy execution on a fraudulently transferred asset continues the availability of a remedy provided in § 9(b) of the 1918 Act. See *e.g.*, Doland v. Burns Lbr. Co., 156 Minn. 238, 194 N.W. 636 (1923); Montana Ass'n of Credit Management v. Hergert, 181 Mont. 442, 449, 453, 593 P.2d 1059, 1063, 1065 (1979); Corbett v. Hunter, 292 Pa.Super. 123, 128, 436 A.2d 1036, 1038 (1981); see also American Surety Co. v. Conner, 251 N.Y. 1, 6, 166 N.E. 783, 784, 65 A.L.R. 244, 247 (1929) ("In such circumstances he [the creditor] might find it necessary to indemnify the sheriff and, when the seizure was erroneous, assumed the risk of error"); McLaughlin, Application of the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act, 46 Harv.L. Rev. 404, 441-42 (1933).

(6) The remedies specified in this section, like those enumerated in §§ 9 and 10 of the 1918 Act, are cumulative. Lind v. O. N. Johnson Co., 204 Minn. 30, 40, 282 N.W 661, 667, 119 A.L.R. 940 (1939) (Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act held not to impair or limit availability of the "old practice" of obtaining judgment and execution returned unsatisfied before proceeding in equity to set aside a transfer); Conemaugh Iron Works Co. v. Delano Coal Co., Inc., 298 Pa. 182, 186, 148 A. 94, 95 (1929) (Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act held to give an "additional optional remedy" and not to "deprive a creditor of the right, as formerly, to work out his remedy at law"); 1 G. Glenn, Fraudulent Conveyances and Preferences 120, 130, 150 (Rev.ed. 1940).

Sec. 34.41.070. This section sets out the defenses available to, the potential liability of, and protections available for, a transferee.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) Subsection (a) states the rule that applies when the transferee establishes a complete defense to the action for avoidance based on Sec. 34.41.030(a)(1). The subsection is an adaptation of the exception stated in § 9 of the 1918 Act. The person who invokes this defense carries the burden of establishing good faith and the reasonable equivalence of the consideration exchanged. Chorost v. Grand Rapids Factory Showrooms, Inc., 77 F.Supp. 276, 280 (D.N.J. 1948), affd 172 F.2d 327, 329 (3d Cir. 1949).

(2) Subsection (b) is derived from § 550(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. The value of the asset transferred is limited to the value of the leviable interest of the transferor, exclusive of any interest encumbered by a valid lien. See Sec. 34.41.-110(2), *infra*.

The requirement of § 550(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code that a transferee be "without knowledge of the voidability of the transfer" in order to be protected has been omitted as inappropriate. Knowledge of the facts rendering the transfer voidable would be inconsistent with the good faith that is required of a protected transferee. Knowledge of the voidability of a transfer would seem to involve a legal conclusion. Determination of the voidability of the transfer ought not to require the court to inquire into the legal sophistication of the transferee.

(3) Subsection (c) is new. The measure of the recovery of a defrauded creditor against a fraudulent transferee is usually limited to the value of the asset transferred at the time of the transfer. See, *e.g.*, United States v. Fetnon, 640 F.2d 609, 611 (5th Cir. 1981); Hamilton Nat'l Bank of Boston v. Halstead, 134 N.Y. 520, 31 N.E. 900 (1892); *cf.* Buffum v. Peter Barceloux Co., 289 U.S. 227 (1932) (transferee's objection to trial court's award of highest value of asset between the date of the transfer and the date of the decree of avoidance rejected because an award measured by value as of time of the transfer plus interest from that date would have been larger). The premise of subsection (c) is that changes in value of the asset transferred that occur after the transfer should ordinarily not affect the amount of the creditor's recovery. Circumstances may require a departure from that measure of the recovery, however, as the cases decided under the 1918 Act and other laws derived from the Statute of 13 Elizabeth illustrate. Thus, if the value of the asset at the time of levy and sale to enforce the judgment of the creditor has been enhanced by improvements of the asset transferred or discharge of liens on the property, a good faith transferee should be reimbursed for the outlay for such a purpose to the extent the sale proceeds were increased thereby. See Bankruptcy Code § 550(d); Janson v. Schier, 375 A.2d 1159,1160 (N.H. 1977), Anno. 8 A.L.R. 527 (1920). If the value of the asset has been diminished by severance and disposition of timber or minerals or fixtures, the transferee should be liable for the amount of the resulting reduction. See Damazo v. Wahby, 269 Md. 252, 257, 305 A.2d 138, 142 (1973). If the transferee

has collected rents, harvested crops, or derived other income from the use or occupancy of the asset after the transfer, the liability of the transferee should be limited in any event to the net income after deduction of the expense incurred in earning the income. Anno., 60 A.L.R.2d 593 (1958). On the other hand, adjustment for the equities does not warrant an award to the creditor of consequential damages alleged to accrue from mismanagement of the asset after the transfer.

(4) Subsection (d) is an adaption of § 548(c) of the Bankruptcy Code. An insider who receives property or an obligation from an insolvent debtor as security for or in satisfaction of an antecedent debt of the transferor or obligor is not a good faith transferee or obligee if the insider has reasonable cause to believe that the debtor was insolvent at the time the transfer was made or the obligation was incurred.

(5) Paragraph (e)(1) rejects the rule adopted in Darby v. Atkinson (*In re* Farris), 415 F.Supp. 33, 39-41 (W.D.Okla. 1976) that termination of a lease on default in accordance with its terms and applicable law may constitute a fraudulent transfer. Paragraph (e)(2) protects a transferee who acquires a debtor's interest in an asset as a result of the enforcement of a secured creditor's rights pursuant to and in compliance with the provisions of Part 5 of Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code (AS 45.09.501 - 45.09.507). *Cf.* Calaiaro v. Pittsburgh Nat'l Bank (*In re* Ewing), 33 B.R. 288, 9 C.B.C.2d 526, CCH B.L.R. ¶ 69,460 (Bk.W.D.Pa. 1983) (sale of pledged stock held subject to avoidance as fraudulent transfer in 548 of the Bankruptcy Code), rev'd, 36 B.R. 476 (W.D.Pa. 1984) (transfer held not voidable because deemed to have occurred more than one year before bankruptcy petition filed). Although a secured creditor may enforce rights in collateral without a sale under AS 45.09.502 or 45.09.505, the creditor must proceed in good faith (AS 45.09.103) and in a "commercially reasonable" manner. The "commercially reasonable" constraint is explicit in AS 45.09.502(b) and is implicit in AS 45.09.505. See 2 G. Gilmore, Security Interests in Personal Property 1224-27 (1965).

(6) Subsection (f) provides additional defenses against the avoidance of a preferential transfer to an insider under Sec. 34.41.040(b).

Paragraph (f)(1) is adapted from § 547(c)(4) of the Bankruptcy Code, which permits a preferred creditor to set off the amount of new value subsequently advanced against the recovery of a voidable preference by a trustee in bankruptcy to the debtor without security. The new value may consist not only of money, goods, or services delivered on unsecured credit but also of the release of a valid lien. See *e.g.*, *In re* Ira Haupt & Co., 424 F.2d 722, 124 (2d Cir. 1970); Baranow v. Gibraltor Factors Corp. (*In re* Hygrade Envelope Co.), 393 F.2d 60, 65-67 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 393 U.S. 837 (1968); *In re* John Morrow & Co., 134 F. 686, 688 (S.D.Ohio 1901). It does not include an obligation substituted for a prior obligation. If the insider receiving the preference thereafter extends new credit to the debtor but also

takes security from the debtor, the injury to the other creditors resulting from the preference remains undiminished by the new credit. On the other hand, if a lien taken to secure the new credit is itself voidable by a judicial lien creditor of the debtor, the new value received by the debtor may appropriately be treated as unsecured and applied to reduce the liability of the insider for the preferential transfer.

Paragraph (f)(2) is derived from § 547(c)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, which excepts certain payments made in the ordinary course of business or financial affairs from avoidance by the trustee in bankruptcy as preferential transfers. Whether a transfer was in the "ordinary course" requires a consideration of the pattern of payments or secured transactions engaged in by the debtor and the insider prior to the transfer challenged under Sec. 34.41.040(b). See Tait & Williams, Bankruptcy Preference Laws: The Scope of Section 547(c)(2), 99 Banking L.J. 55, 63-66 (1982). The defense provided by paragraph (f)(2) is available, irrespective of whether the debtor or the insider or both are engaged in business, but the prior conduct or practice of both the debtor and the insider-transferee is relevant.

Paragraph (f)(3) is new and reflects a policy judgment that an insider who has previously extended credit to a debtor should not be deterred from extending further credit to the debtor in a good faith effort to save the debtor from a forced liquidation in bankruptcy or otherwise. A similar rationale has sustained the taking of security from an insolvent debtor for an advance to enable the debtor to stave off bankruptcy and extricate itself from financial stringency. Blackman v. Bechtel, 80 F.2d 505, 508-09 (8th Cir. 1935); Olive v. Tyler (*In re* Chelan Land Co.), 257 F. 497, 5 A.L.R. 561 (9th Cir. 1919); *In re* Robin Bros. Bakeries. Inc., 22 F.S. 662, 663-64 (N.D.III. 1937); see Dean v. Davis, 242 U.S. 438, 444 (1917). The amount of the present value given, the size of the antecedent debt secured, and the likelihood of success for the rehabilitative effort are relevant considerations in determining whether the transfer was in good faith.

Sec. 34.41.080. This section makes it clear that failure to take action within the statutory time limits bars the right of action.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) This section is new. Its purpose is to make clear that lapse of the statutory periods prescribed by the section bars the right and not merely the remedy. See Restatement of Conflict of Laws 2d § 143 Comments (b) & (c) (1971). The section rejects the rule applied in United States v. Gleneagles Inv. Co., 565 F.S. 556, 583 (M.D.Pa. 1983) (state statute of limitations held not to apply to action by United States based on Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act).

(2) Statutes of limitations applicable to the avoidance of fraudulent transfers and obligations vary widely from state to state and are frequently subject to

uncertainties in their application. See Hesson, The Statute of Limitations in Actions to Set Aside Fraudulent Conveyances and in Actions Against Directors by Creditors of Corporations, 32 Cornell L.Q. 222 (1946); Annos., 76 A.L.R. 864 (1932), 128 A.L.R. 1289 (1940), 133 A.L.R. 1311 (1941), 14 A.L.R.2d 598 (1950), and 100 A.L.R.2d 1094 (1965). Together with Sec. 34.41.050, this section should mitigate the uncertainty and diversity that have characterized the decisions applying statutes of limitations of actions to fraudulent transfers and obligations. The periods prescribed apply, whether the action under this Act is brought by the creditor defrauded or by a purchaser at a sale on execution levied pursuant to Sec. 34.41.060(b) and whether the action is brought against the original transferee or subsequent transferee. The prescription of statutory periods of limitation does not preclude the barring of an avoidance action for laches. See Sec. 34.41.090 and the accompanying comment, *infra*.

Sec. 34.41.090. This section provides that other applicable principles of law supplement the provisions of this chapter.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

This section is derived from § 11 of the 1918 Act and § 1-103 of the Uniform Commercial Code (AS 45.01.103). The section adds a reference to "laches" in recognition of the particular appropriateness of the application of this equitable doctrine to an untimely action to avoid a fraudulent transfer. See Louis Dreyfus Corp. v. Butler, 496 F.2d 806, 808 (6th Cir. 1974) (action to avoid transfers to debtor's wife when debtor was engaged in speculative business held to be barred by laches or applicable statutes of limitations); Cooch v. Grier, 30 Del.Ch. 255, 265-66, 59 A.2d 282, 287-88 (1948) (action under the Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act held barred by laches when the creditor was chargeable with inexcusable delay and the defendant was prejudiced by the delay).

Sec. 34.41.100. This section is the standard statement of the purpose of a uniform law and serves as a guide to courts that may be interpreting the law.

Sec. 34.41.110. This section sets out the definitions for the chapter.

OFFICIAL COMMENTARY

(1) The definition of "affiliate" is derived from § 101(2) of the Bankruptcy Code.

(2) The definition of "asset" is substantially to the same effect as the definition of "assets" in § 1 of the 1918 Act. The definition in this Act, unlike that in the earlier Act, does not, however, require a determination that the property is liable for the debts of the debtor. Thus, an unliquidated claim for damages resulting from personal

injury or a contingent claim of a surety for reimbursement, contribution, or subrogation may be counted as an asset for the purpose of determining whether the holder of the claim is solvent as a debtor under Sec. 34.41.010, although applicable law may not allow such an asset to be levied on and sold by a creditor. *Cf.* Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co. v. Goldman (*In re* Ollag Construction Equipment Corp.), 578 F.2d 904, 907-09 (2d Cir.1978).

Subparagraphs (2)(A) - (C) provide clarification by excluding from the term not only generally exempt property but also an interest in a tenancy by the entirety in many states and an interest that is generally beyond reach by unsecured creditors because subject to a valid lien. This Act, like its predecessor and the Statute of 13 Elizabeth, declares rights and provides remedies for unsecured creditors against transfers that impede them in the collection of their claims. The laws protecting valid liens against impairment by levying creditors, exemption statutes, and the rules restricting leviability of interest in entireties property are limitations on the rights and remedies of unsecured creditors, and it is therefore appropriate to exclude property interests that are beyond the reach of unsecured creditors from the definition of "asset" for the purposes of this Act.

A creditor of a joint tenant or tenant in common may ordinarily collect a judgment by process against the tenant's interest, and in some states a creditor of a tenant by the entirety may likewise collect a judgment by process against the tenant's interest. See 2 American Law of Property 10, 22, 28-32 (1952); Craig, An Analysis of Estates by the Entirety in Bankruptcy, 98 Am.Bankr. L.J. 255, 258-59 (1974). The leviable interest of such a tenant is included as an asset under this Act.

The definition of "assets" in the 1918 Act excluded property that is exempt from liability for debts. The definition did not, however, exclude all property that can not be reached by a creditor through judicial proceedings to collect a debt. Thus, it included the interest of a tenant by the entirety although in nearly half the states such an interest can not be subjected to liability for a debt unless it is an obligation owned jointly by the debtor with the debtor's cotenant by the entirety. See 2 American Law of Property 29 (1952); Craig, An Analysis of Estates by the Entirety in Bankruptcy, 48 Am.Bankr.L.J. 255, 258 (1974). The definition in this Act requires exclusion of interests in property held by tenants by the entirety that are not subject to collection process by a creditor without a right to proceed against both tenants by the entirety as joint debtors.

The reference to "generally exempt" property in subparagraph (2)(B) recognizes that all exemptions are subject to exceptions. Creditors having special rights against generally exempt property typically include claimants for alimony, taxes, wages, the purchase price of the property, and labor or materials that improve the property. See Uniform Exemptions Act § 10 and the accompanying Comment. The fact that a particular creditor may reach generally exempt property by resorting to

judicial process does not warrant its inclusion as an asset in determining whether the debtor is insolvent.

Since this Act is not an exclusive law on the subject of voidable transfers and obligations (see comment (8) to Sec. 34.41.030, *supra*), it does not preclude the holder of a claim that may be collected by process against property generally exempt as to other creditors from obtaining relief from a transfer of such property that hinders, delays, or defrauds the holder of such a claim. Likewise the holder of an unsecured claim enforceable against tenants by the entirety is not precluded by the Act from pursuing a remedy against a transfer of property held by the entirety that hinders, delays, or defrauds the holder of such a claim.

Nonbankruptcy law is the law of a state or federal law that is not part of the Bankruptcy Code, Title 11 of the United States Code. The definition of an "asset" thus does not include property that would be subject to administration for the benefit of creditors under the Bankruptcy Code unless it is subject under other applicable law, state or federal, to process for the collection of a creditor's claim against a single debtor.

(3) The definition of "claim" is derived from § 101(4) of the Bankruptcy Code. Since the purpose of this Act is primarily to protect unsecured creditors against transfers and obligations injurious to their rights, the words "claim" and "debt" as used in the Act generally have reference to an unsecured claim and debt. As the context may indicate, however, usage of the terms is not so restricted. See, *e.g.* paragraphs (1)(A)(ii) and (8) of this section.

(4) The definition of "creditor" in combination with the definition of "claim" has substantially the same effect as the definition of "creditor" under § 1 of the 1918 Act. As under that Act, the holder of an unliquidated tort claim or a contingent claim may be a creditor protected by this Act.

(5) The definition of "debt" is derived from § 101(11) of the Bankruptcy Code.

(6) The definition of "debtor" is new.

(7) The definition of "insider" is derived from § 101(28) of the Bankruptcy Code. The definition has been restricted in clauses (A)(iii), (B)(v), and (C)(iv) to make clear that a partner is not an insider of an individual, corporation, or partnership if any of these latter three persons is only a limited partner. The definition of "insider" in the Bankruptcy Code does not purport to make a limited partner an insider of the partners or of the partnership with which the limited partner is associated, but it is susceptible of a contrary interpretation and one which would extend unduly the scope of the defined relationship when the limited partner is not a person in control of the partnership. The definition of "insider" in this Act also

differs from the definition in the Bankruptcy Code in omitting the reference in 11 U.S.C. 101(28)(D) to an elected official or relative of such an official as an insider of a municipality. As in the Bankruptcy Code (see 11 U.S.C. 102 (3)), the word "includes" is not limiting, however. See also AS 01.10.040(b). Thus, a court may find a person living with an individual for an extended time in the same household or as a permanent companion to have the kind of close relationship intended to be covered by the term "insider." Likewise, a trust may be found to be an insider of a beneficiary.

(8) The definition of "lien" is derived from paragraphs (30), (31), (43), and (45) of § 101 of the Bankruptcy Code, which define "judicial lien," "lien," "security interest," and "statutory lien" respectively.

(9) The definition of "person" is adapted from paragraphs (28) and (30) of § 1-201 of the Uniform Commercial Code (AS 45.01.201(29) and (31) in the Alaska Statutes), defining "organization" and "person" respectively, and has been modified to incorporate by reference those items already provided for in AS 01.10.060.

(10) The definition of "property" is derived from § 1-201(33) of the Uniform Probate Code (AS 13.06.050(33) in the Alaska Statutes). Property includes both real and personal property, whether tangible or intangible, and any interest in property, whether legal or equitable.

(11) The definition of "relative" is derived from § 101(37) of the Bankruptcy Code but is explicit in its references to the spouse of a debtor in view of uncertainty as to whether the common law determines degrees of relationship by affinity.

(12) The definition of "transfer" is derived principally from § 101(48) of the Bankruptcy Code. The definition of "conveyance" in § 1 of the 1918 Act was similarly comprehensive and the references in this Act to "payment of money, release, lease, and the creation of a lien or incumbrance" are derived from the 1918 Act. While the definition in the 1918 Act did not explicitly refer to an involuntary transfer, the decisions under that Act were generally consistent with an interpretation that covered such a transfer. See, *e.g.* Hearn 45 St. Corp. v. Jano, 283 N.Y. 139, 27 N.E.2d 814, 128 A.L.R. 1285 (1940) (execution and foreclosure sales); Lefkowitz v. Finkelstein Trading Corp., 14 F.Supp. 898, 899 (S.D.N.Y. 1936) (execution sale); Langan v. First Trust & Deposit Co., 277 App.Div. 1090, 101 N.Y.S.2d 36 (4th Dept. 1950), aff'd 302 N.Y. 932, 100 N.E.2d 189 (1951) (mortgage foreclosure); Catabene v. Wallner, 16 N.J.Super. 597, 602, 85 A.2d 300, 302 (1951) (mortgage foreclosure).

(13) The definition of "valid lien" is new. A valid lien includes an equitable lien that may not be defeated by a judicial lien creditor. See, *e.g.*, Pearlman v. Reliance Insurance Co., 371 U.S. 132, 136 (1962) (upholding a surety's equitable lien in respect to a fund owing a bankrupt contractor).

Sec. 34.41.120. The short title by which the chapter may be cited.

Sec. 2. Repeals the existing Alaska law on fraudulent conveyances generally (AS 34.40).

If I may be of further assistance, please advise.

DRD:pl
94-052.plm