

## IFC Review - Due Diligence For Asset Recovery

## recunical Articles

Comment Latest Articles Trusts & Estate Planning Asset Protection Citizenship and Residency Due Diligence International Tax Planning Tax Treaties Banking Foundations Funds Hedge Funds and Alternative Investments Insurance Islamic Finance Philanthropy Regulation Technology United Kingdom United States of America Asia Europe South America

the fraud feasor without 3<sup>rd</sup> party liability and minus the estimate costs of collection?

What is the size of the claim looking at all of the investors in the scheme, minus payouts. US\$50 Million invested, minus US\$30 Million in payouts is not a US\$50 Million case for recovery but a US\$20 Million. Subtracting an estimate of the cost and duration of the fraud feasor's life style and the recovery may lose another US\$7 million – leaving an estimated recovery from the fraud feasor of US\$13 million.

Is the case to be litigated in a court of a competent jurisdiction where the costs of litigation are low or high, slow or fast? The costs of a thorough initial investigation and litigation to freeze assets must be estimated. Does the fact pattern support asset freezing exercises that be undertaken quickly in multiple jurisdictions to freeze those known assets? What is the size of this asset pool? Overlook substantial pockets of the fraud feasor's assets and they will mount a well funded defense and the recovery litigation costs will soar.

Can the victims afford, or are they willing to afford, the estimated costs of a proper recovery? If unable or unwilling will the victims entertain and bear the costs of third party litigation funding? While many litigation teams can and do participate on a percentage of recovery, not all of their fees will be contingent or wait the one to three years it takes recover and distribute assets.

The team must understand how information has been sought, harvested and intended to be used. One must be able to parse the difference between, information, intelligence, and evidence. All may be valuable but only some can be used in court. The defining cull, intelligence versus evidence, has much to do with how that information was discovered and harvested. One may possess fruit from a poisoned tree, and if one does it is best not to deliver your poisoned fruit into the hands of the opposition in front of a judge.

*Here you go My Lord, the fruit might look a bit dodgy, but I assure you it is easy to swallow.* 

It might be surprising to many that the fraud feasor may not play by the rules, no Marquess of Queensberry rules in this fight. When given an opening they will not only punch below the belt, but accuse you of standing too tall and manipulating the position of the belt. Any error in your facts, any error in your investigation and evidence gathering, and of the most microscopic of your case's short comings and the opposition will hit at the blemish until it is an opening and festering wound.

Have other efforts of recovery been initiated? Sincere but incompetent recovery efforts can burden a subsequent competent recovery team with legacy issues that often add additional layers of complexity that would not have otherwise existed.

If a judgment has been obtained, what was the nature of the litigation? Will the nature of the litigation allow the judgment to be domesticated in other jurisdictions? Dealing on the surface of the requirements of Common Law, Civil Code, Sharia Law and the many blends of law and local customs one can see where procedure in one jurisdiction is sufficient to obtain a judgment becomes insufficient in another for domestication of that judgment. For example, even between common law jurisdictions – if the defendant was served but chose not to mount a defence and the plaintiff obtained a default judgment – the fact that the defendant chose not to litigate may bar the domestication of the judgment in other jurisdictions.

They are so many variables and so many imponderables in asset recovery. Even after a careful and thoughtful assessment much, may arise that is new. In one case, a news story on the fraudster, obviously a criminal, triggered the state's forfeiture department into action. The state determined that the funds she had amassed were the result of a fraud and the state moved in and has seized the assets we had identified and recovered as the proceeds of a crime, and denied the pool of victims a recovery. They were twice victimised.

The due diligence research required in asset recovery is real, significant, and short cuts and assumptive leaps will lead to error and the wasting of time and money. Authentic asset recovery is not easy, it is very hard, it is not for every attorney or receiver, as the profession becomes ever more specialised.

You need to be logged in to view this article

You are currently not logged in: to log in please enter your username and password in the login



Register now to receive the Free IFC Review Email Services

Register now to receive a free trial and any of our regular email services including; monthly e-journal, weekly news mailer, industry events update and workinwealth- our soon to be launched industry Job board. section of this page. If you are already logged in and see this message, please go to Account Settings and purchase a new subscription. Articles which are displayed free for a limited time still require login for print functionality to work

## Subscribe now or try our free online trial for three months

To get access to this article, and receive a subscription to our yearly article go to our <u>secure signup</u> page.

To recieve a three month free subscription to the online site, sign up here.

© IFC Media Limited 2014

About us | Contact | Advertise