

D R A F T  
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

# ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ACT

---

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

---

February 25 – 26, 2011 Committee Meeting Draft

*With Prefatory Note and Comments*

Copyright © 2010  
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

---

*The ideas and conclusions set forth in this draft, including the proposed statutory language and any comments or reporter's notes, have not been passed upon by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or the Drafting Committee. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Conference and its Commissioners and the Drafting Committee and its Members and Reporter. Proposed statutory language may not be used to ascertain the intent or meaning of any promulgated final statutory proposal.*

February 4, 2011

### **DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON AN ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ACT**

The Committee appointed by and representing the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in drafting this Act consists of the following individuals:

MICHAEL B. GETTY, 430 Cove Towers Dr., #503, Naples, FL 34110. *Chair*

LEVI J. BENTON, 1001 Texas Ave., Suite 1400, Houston, TX 77002

CAROLINE N. BROWN, University of North Carolina School of Law, CB #3380, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3380

ROBERT BUTKIN, University of Tulsa College of Law, 3120 E. 4<sup>th</sup> Pl., Tulsa, OK 74104

SIDNEY S. EAGLES, P.O. Box 27525, Raleigh, NC 27611

BARRY H. EVENCHICK, 5 Becker Farm Rd., Roseland, NJ 07068

DON HOLLADAY, 204 N. Robinson Ave., Suite 1550, Oklahoma City, OK 73102

PETER F. LANGROCK, P.O. Drawer 351, Middlebury, VT 05753-0351

STEVEN N. LEITESS, 10451 Mill Run Cir., Suite 1000, Baltimore, MD 21117

JOHN T. MCGARVEY, 601 W. Main St., Louisville, KY 40202

LANE SHETTERLY, 189 S.W. Academy St., P.O. Box 105, Dallas, OR 97338

JOAN ZELDON, District of Columbia Superior Court, 515 St., N.W., Room 219, Washington, DC 20001

JOHN L. CARROLL, Cumberland School of Law, Samford University, 800 Lakeshore Dr., Birmingham, AL 35229, *Reporter*

### **EX OFFICIO**

ROBERT A. STEIN, University of Minnesota Law School, 229 19th Avenue S., Minneapolis, MN 55455, *President*

BRIAN K. FLOWERS, Council of the District of Columbia, 1350 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004, *Division Chair*

### **AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR**

STEVEN M. RICHMAN, P.O. Box 5203, Princeton, NJ 08543-5203, *ABA Advisor*

### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

JOHN A. SEBERT, 111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010, Chicago, IL 60602, *Executive Director*

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:  
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS  
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
312/450-6600  
[www.nccusl.org](http://www.nccusl.org)

# **ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ACT**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Prefatory Note .....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. ....	2
SECTION 2. [DEFINITIONS]. ....	2
SECTION 3. ASSET FREEZING ORDER ISSUED WITH NOTICE .....	2
SECTION 4. ASSET FREEZING ORDER ISSUED WITHOUT NOTICE .....	4
SECTION 5. OBLIGATIONS OF NON-PARTIES SERVED WITH AN ASSET FREEZING ORDER. ....	5
SECTION 6. SECURITY. ....	5
SECTION 7. RECOGNITION OF ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ISSUED BY OTHER COURTS. ....	6
SECTION 8. ENFORCEMENT OF ASSET FREEZING ORDERS .....	8
SECTION 9. ....	8

# ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ACT

## Prefatory Note

For decades, courts in the other common law jurisdictions of the world have issued asset freezing orders. In the words of a leading English Civil Procedure text:

A freezing injunction is an in personam order compelling a defendant to refrain from dealing with his assets and imposing collateral restraint on non-parties such as the defendant's bank. The function of such an injunction is to preserve assets from dissipation pending final execution against the defendant,<sup>1</sup>

While asset freezing orders are, by their very nature, extraordinary remedies, they are considered by courts in other common law jurisdictions to be valuable procedural tools for use in an appropriate case. Their value is magnified in the modern world of technology where assets can be transferred by the simple stroke of a computer key. There is no codified procedure for the issuance and enforcement of asset freezing orders by courts in the United States. This act is designed to remedy that deficiency.

Because of the extraordinary nature and potentially harmful effects of an asset freezing order, it is important that there be rigorous standards which must be met before such an order can be issued. Those standards appear in Sections 3, 4 and 6. The standards contained in those sections borrow heavily from the procedural protections found in two sources - the already existing law relating to asset freezing orders in England and Canada and the already existing law in the United States relating to the issuance of Temporary Restraining Orders and Preliminary Injunctions.

Since asset freezing orders also impact non-parties, it is important that the obligations of non-parties be set out with specificity. Those obligations are set out in Section 5.

Lastly, the act must contain a mechanism for recognition and enforcement of asset freezing orders issued by other states and from courts outside the United States. Those mechanisms appear in Sections 7 and 8. The recognition and enforcement mechanism borrows heavily from the Uniform Foreign Country Money Judgments Recognition Act.

---

<sup>1</sup> Neil Andrews, English Civil Procedure ¶ 17.06 (2003)

# ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ACT

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.** This [act] may be cited as the Asset Freezing Orders

Act.

**SECTION 2. [DEFINITIONS].** As used in this [act]:

(1) “Asset” means anything that may be the subject of ownership whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, legal or equitable or any interest therein.

(2) “Asset freezing order” means an in personam order restraining or enjoining a party from directly or indirectly by any means whatsoever:

(A) selling, removing, dissipating, alienating, transferring, assigning, encumbering, or similarly dealing with the assets of that party, wherever situated;

(B) instructing, requesting, counseling, demanding, or encouraging any other person to do so; and

(C) facilitating, assisting in, aiding, abetting or participating in any of the acts the effect of which is to do so.

(3) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, a federally recognized Indian tribe or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(4) “Party” means any entity who brings a suit (action) or against whom a suit (action) is brought whether or not service has been made or notice given.

### SECTION 3. ASSET FREEZING ORDER ISSUED WITH NOTICE.

(a) A court may issue an asset freezing order upon motion if the court finds that:

(1) there is a substantial likelihood that the party seeking the asset freezing order

1 will prevail on the merits of the action;

2 (2) there is a substantial likelihood that the assets of the party against whom the  
3 order is sought will be dissipated and the moving party will be unable to receive satisfaction of a  
4 judgment in the action if the order is not granted;

5 (3) any harm the party against whom the order is sought may suffer  
6 through having to comply with the order is clearly outweighed by the risk of injustice to  
7 the moving party if the order is not issued; and

8 (4) the order if issued would not be adverse to the public interest.

9 (b) An asset freezing order shall be served in compliance with [cite applicable rules or  
10 statutes of this state for service of injunctions].

11 (c) The party against whom an asset freezing order is issued may be relieved of the  
12 obligations imposed under the order by posting a bond in the amount of the damages sought.

13 (d) The party against whom an asset freezing order is issued may apply for an order, on at  
14 least twenty-four hour notice to the party who has obtained the order, specifying the amount of  
15 funds which that party is entitled to spend on ordinary living and/or business expenses and legal  
16 advice and representation.

17 (e) An asset freezing order remains in effect until vacated by the court, dissolved by  
18 agreement of the parties, resolved by application of law or until a judgment entered is satisfied.

### 19 **Comment**

20 Sections 3(a) - (d) mirror the standard for the issuance of a preliminary injunction under  
21 currently existing law. All of the requirements of those sections must be met before asset  
22 freezing order can be entered. Sections 3(f) - (g) provide a mechanism for a party against who an  
23 asset freezing order has been entered to have full or partial relief from the order.







1 in an amount the court considers proper to pay for costs and damages sustained by the party  
2 against whom the order has been issued if the order is later found to have been improvidently  
3 granted.

4 (b) The party against whom an asset freezing order has been issued shall indemnify a  
5 non-party for the reasonable costs of compliance with the order or compensate for any loss  
6 caused by the order whether or not the motion for the asset freezing order was properly granted.  
7 However, if the order is later found to have been improvidently granted, the court may order  
8 reimbursements from the party on whose behalf an asset freezing order has been entered.

#### 9 **Comment**

10 This section provides for security for a party against whom an asset freezing order has  
11 been entered and any non-party served with the order for damages sustained as the result of an  
12 order later found to have been improvidently granted. Section 6(b) also requires a party who has  
13 obtained an asset freezing order to indemnify a non-party for the reasonable costs of compliance.  
14  
15

### 16 **SECTION 7. RECOGNITION OF ASSET FREEZING ORDERS ISSUED BY** 17 **OTHER COURTS.**

18 (a) A court of this state shall recognize an asset freezing order in another state unless:

19 (1) recognition would violate the public policy of this state; or

20 (2) it was issued without notice and the issuing court did not comply with Section  
21 4 of this act.

22 (b) A court of this state may not recognize an asset freezing order issued by a court  
23 outside the United States if:

24 (1) the asset freezing order was rendered under a judicial system that does not  
25 provide impartial tribunals or procedures compatible with the requirements of due process of  
26 law;

1 (2) the issuing court did not have personal jurisdiction over the party against  
2 whom the order was issued; or

3 (3) the order was issued without notice to the party against whom the order was  
4 issued and the issuing court did not comply with Section 4 of this act.

5 (c) A court of this state need not recognize an asset freezing order issued by a court  
6 outside the United States if:

7 (1) the party against whom an asset freezing order has been entered in the  
8 proceeding outside the United States did not receive notice of the proceeding in sufficient time to  
9 allow the order to be modified or dissolved and the interest of justice requires a hearing to  
10 determine this issue:

11 (2) the order was obtained by fraud;

12 (3) the claim for relief is repugnant to the public policy of this state or the United  
13 States;

14 (4) the proceeding in the court outside of the United States was contrary to an  
15 agreement between the parties under which the dispute in question was to be determined;

16 (5) the order was issued in circumstances that raise substantial doubt about the  
17 integrity of the issuing court with respect to the order; or

18 (6) the specific proceedings in the court outside the United States was leading to  
19 the issuance of the order were not compatible with the requirements of due process of law.

20 (d) A party resisting recognition of an asset freezing order outside the United States has  
21 the burden of establishing that a ground for non-recognition stated in subsection (b) or (c) exists.

## 22 **Comment**

23 This section concerns the recognition of asset freezing orders by courts other than the  
24 court that issued the order. Because asset freezing orders are not final judgments, there is a lack

1 of uniformity in the present law concerning their recognition. Section 7(a) relates to the  
2 recognition of asset freezing orders issued by courts in other states and 7(b) - (d) relates to the  
3 recognition of asset freezing orders issued by courts outside the United States.  
4

5  
6 **SECTION 8. ENFORCEMENT OF ASSET FREEZING ORDERS.** An asset  
7 freezing order issued or recognized by a court of this state is presumed to be valid and  
8 enforceable and entitled to full faith and credit in the same manner as a judgment.

9 **Comment**

10 Some courts have refused to recognize and enforce asset freezing orders because they are  
11 not final. This section read in conjunction with Section 7 will require that an appropriately issued  
12 or recognized asset freezing order like a judgment.  
13

14  
15 **SECTION 9.** This act does not apply to actions against consumer debtors or in domestic  
16 relations cases or similar matters.

17 ***Legislative Note:*** Language to be added by the drafting committee.