

# Re: New Horizon Health Limited [2025] CIGC (FSD) 84

---

August 2025

**Court:** Grand Court (Cayman Islands)

**Subject:** Winding-up, whether to appoint provisional liquidators or a restructuring officer, relevance of powers to be exercised by office holder to the appropriate appointment, sanction of engagement of attorneys

**Judge:** Asif J

## Summary

The Court provided further clarification of the circumstances in which provisional liquidators (PLs) may still be appointed despite the introduction of the restructuring officer (RO) regime.

The petitioner, a Hong Kong-listed company, faced a number of unresolved accounting issues which had resulted in the removal of one director and suspended trading and risked potential de-listing.

The company presented a winding up petition, on the just and equitable basis, and applied for the appointment of PLs, who would be able to continue the ongoing investigations into the management of the company and also attempt to achieve a rescue or restructuring, so as to allow the company to continue or its business to continue in operation. There was no restructuring plan.

The Court sanctioned the appointment of PLs, but declined to sanction the engagement of counsel, solicitors or attorneys.

This decision underscores that the RO regime has not displaced the PL jurisdiction, particularly where wrongdoing is suspected and operational stabilisation is required.

## Reasons for decision

The Court held that the powers of a RO would not be sufficiently broad for the company's needs in the circumstances and that the additional powers of a PL make the appointment preferable. It concluded that there was good reason to appoint PLs and that it was "appropriate to do so" within the jurisdiction in s 104(3) of the Companies Act where the application is made by the company.

The Court also considered concerns raised in prior Hong Kong proceedings about two of the three proposed liquidators but found no professional sanctions and approved their appointment, noting that any future challenge could be brought separately. Asif J also referred to two judgments where the Court preferred to appoint PLs: *Kingkey* (unreported, 12/04/24) and *Oakwise* (unreported, 16/12/24)

Following *Re UCF Fund* [2011] 1 CILR 305, the Court declined to approve the appointment of attorneys. Such approval would be premature before the proposed attorneys had been identified and their terms of engagement finalised, so that the Court could then perform its proper function of ensuring those attorneys were suitable and not conflicted, and that their terms of engagement were reasonably acceptable.

Regulatory | Real estate | Private client and trusts | Insolvency and restructuring | Dispute resolution | Corporate | Banking and finance

For more information please contact:

**Justina Stewart**

Partner // Cayman

**t:**+1 345 914 9622 // **e:**Justina.Stewart@collascrill.com**Rocco Cecere**

Partner // Cayman

**t:**+1 345 914 9630 // **e:**rocco.cecere@collascrill.com**Matthew Dors**

Partner // Cayman

**t:**+1 345 914 9631 // **e:**matthew.dors@collascrill.com**Zachary Hoskin**

Partner // Cayman

**t:**+1 345 914 9663 // **e:**zachary.hoskin@collascrill.com**Michael Adkins**

Partner // Guernsey

**t:**+44 (0) 1481 734 231 // **e:**michael.adkins@collascrill.com**David O'Hanlon**

Partner // Guernsey

**t:**+44 (0) 1481 734259 // **e:**david.ohanlon@collascrill.com

Regulatory | Real estate | Private client and trusts | Insolvency and restructuring | Dispute resolution | Corporate | Banking and finance

This note is a summary of the subject and is provided for information only. It does not purport to give specific legal advice, and before acting, further advice should always be sought. Whilst every care has been taken in producing this note neither the author nor Collas Crill shall be liable for any errors, misprint or misinterpretation of any of the matters set out in it. All copyright in this material belongs to Collas Crill.