"Financial Distress and Bank
Restructuring of Small to Medium Size UK
Companies"
and
"Bankruptcy Resolution in Japan"

Noriyuki Yanagawa RIETI and University of Tokyo

It has shown how banks restructure distressed firms: UK evidence

Two important aspects

Difference of Procedure

US system: Court-supervised system VS

UK system: Contract-driven system

Debt Structure
 Concentration VS Dispersion

Important point

Difference of Legal system
or Bankruptcy Procedure

Interaction

Choice of Debt Structure

- Although the source of credit can be dispersed, the liquidation rights are extremely concentrated.
- Banks do not act softly in debt renegotiation, they are very tough.
- No creditors runs
- Evidence about lazy banking is mix.

Xu (2002)

- There have been few econometric analyses about Japanese bankruptcy procedure.
 - ⇒The results of this paper is important and interesting.
- Now Japanese legal rules are changing Introduction of Civil Rehabilitation Law Revision of Corporate Reorganization Law

Xu (2002)

 Most firms experience senior management turnover and asset restructurings prior to bankruptcy filings.

Priority of claims is less violated.

 Bankruptcy process became quick under Civil Rehabilitation Law.

Comments

- Relation between bankruptcy rules and choice of debt structure is an important and interesting point.
- For decreasing bad loans, UK system might be attractive even in Japan.
- Debt restructuring before bankruptcy procedure is relatively difficult in Japan.

Comments

 Japan uses court-supervised bankruptcy process, and after bankruptcy is much different from before bankruptcy.

(different from UK system)

 Since bankruptcy process is costly, bankruptcy rules usually work just as a threat and private debt restructure or private resolution process is important.

Comments

- Thus, companies which did not bankrupt would be interesting samples to consider bankruptcy rules.
- If bankruptcy rules mainly work as a threat, what is optimal rules? Or we should use UK rule?