



**Neutral Citation Number: [2026] CIGC (FSD) 3**

**IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**

**CAUSE NO. FSD 256 OF 2024 (DDJ)**

**IN THE MATTER OF SECTIONS 94 AND 159 THE COMPANIES ACT (2023 REVISION)**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF ORDER 102 RULE 18 OF THE GRAND COURT RULES 1995**

**AND IN THE MATTER OF CT ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP LIMITED**

<b>Before:</b>	The Hon. Justice David Doyle
<b>Appearances:</b>	Sean-Anna Thompson of Conyers Dill & Pearman LLP
<b>Heard:</b>	15 January 2026
<b>Ex tempore judgment delivered:</b>	15 January 2026
<b>Draft transcript circulated:</b>	15 January 2026
<b>Transcript Approved:</b>	20 January 2026

*Refusal to determine an application for a dissolution order on the papers*

*260115 CT Environmental Group Limited – FSD 256 of 2024 (DDJ) - Judgment*

**JUDGMENT**

**Refusal to determine the matter on the papers**

1. In this case counsel for Martin Trott and Owen Walker as Joint Official Liquidators (“JOLs”) of CT Environmental Group Limited (in official liquidation) (the “Company”) by letter dated 7 January 2026 sought to have the matter determined on the papers, on the basis that it was not anticipated that anyone would appear to oppose the dissolution application.
2. The letter did not refer to Order 22 of the Companies Winding Up Rules (2023 Consolidation) (“CWR”). In particular Order 22 rule 1 (2)(a) refers to notification of the date upon which the official liquidator’s application for an order for dissolution “will be heard by the Court.” Order 22 rule 1(3) refers to the official liquidator publishing a notice of a hearing “at least 14 days prior to the date of the hearing.” Order 22 plainly envisages a hearing before the court. Order 22 presently includes no reference to applications for dissolution orders being dealt with on the papers.
3. There was no reference to B1 of the FSD Guide but it does not in any event assist. It is headed *B1 Interlocutory Applications: FSD Proceedings*. An application for a dissolution order does not appear to be an “interlocutory” application, although I have heard no argument on that. In any event B1.1(b) contemplates the written consent of all interested parties to the application being disposed of on the papers. No written consents were filed in this case.
4. The matter therefore remained listed for hearing.
5. Furthermore, I note that by email dated 28 October 2025 notice of the date of the dissolution hearing was provided to all known creditors of the Company and to the Hong Kong lawyers for the Petitioner (Mr Gu Yaokun). The email attached the JOLs’ Final Report dated 30 September 2025 and the Summons dated 24 October 2025 which referred to a hearing on 15 January 2026 at 10am with the estimated length of the hearing specified as 30 minutes.

6. The JOLs at section 10 of this Final Report deal with notice of the dissolution hearing.
7. At 10.1, it is indicated that the dissolution application will be “heard by the Grand Court on 15 January 2025” (an error for 2026) at 10am Cayman time. The Summons specified the correct year.
8. At 10.2 it is expressly stated that:

“... It is noted that in accordance with Order 22, Rule 1(2) of the CWR any creditor may appear at the Hearing and be heard on the application. Any stakeholder who intends to appear to be heard on the Dissolution is requested to provide notice of their intention to appear and an indication of the position to be taken no later than 10 business days prior to the hearing of the Dissolution Application.”

(That would have been around 30 December 2025).
9. The JOLs then add at 10.3:

“If no stakeholder indicates their objection to the Dissenters Application being granted before 11 November 2025, the JOLs may ask the Court to make an order dissolving the Company administratively, i.e. without the need for the JOLs legal counsel to appear at the hearing.”
10. The JOLs make no reference to the jurisdiction of the court to determine dissolution applications administratively without a hearing and Order 22 on its face appears to suggest that the application must “be heard by the court”.
11. It is difficult to understand why in such circumstances the JOLs thought it sensible or appropriate to request that their Summons of 24 October 2025 be dealt with on the papers rather than at the hearing on 15 January 2026 of which they had given notice to others.
12. It may be that a Judge of the Grand Court has an inherent discretion to determine matters on the papers. I was not however addressed on such and even if it existed I would not have exercised it in the circumstances of this case as notice of the hearing had been given and stakeholders advised that they could attend the hearing.

Determination of the Summons

13. By Summons dated 24 October 2025, the JOLs sought an order that the Company be dissolved and ancillary relief in respect of the presentation of files, books and records and dispensation from advertising and the holding of annual meetings.
14. Turning now to the merits of the Summons I have considered the consolidated hearing and authorities bundle which contains the Summons, the affidavit evidence in support and the draft order. I have also considered the concise and helpful skeleton argument dated 7 January 2026 which was not included in the hearing bundle but provided separately by way of an attachment to an email. In future it would be helpful if skeleton arguments were also included in the bundle made available to the court for pre-hearing reading.
15. I am grateful to Sean-Anna Thompson, who appeared for the JOLs this morning, for her assistance to the court.
16. I am satisfied that the affairs of the Company have been completely wound up, the JOLs have published their final report (and such report contained notice of the date of the hearing and a statement that any creditor may appear and be heard).
17. I am also satisfied that advertisement can and should be dispensed with. I am satisfied that the expense of publishing the notice in a newspaper would be disproportionate and is unlikely to serve any useful purpose. Notice has been given of the hearing by way of email and no one has attended to oppose the Summons. I therefore dispense with advertisement (pursuant to CWR Order 1 rule 4 (1B)).
18. I am also content to make the orders as requested in respect of preservation of files, books and records for the period of three years (pursuant to CWR Order 26 rules 2 and 3).
19. I also dispense with the convening of annual meetings of creditors and contributories (pursuant to CWR Order 8 rule 2). There were and are no matters which required or require the taking of resolutions by creditors or contributories at annual meetings. The holding of such meetings would have served no substantive purpose and would have given rise to unnecessary costs.

**The Order**

20. I am content to make an order substantively in terms of the draft, such draft to include the amendments I specified during my exchanges with counsel.
21. The following order was made:

**“IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Company be dissolved.
2. The JOLs’ liquidation files be preserved for a period of three years, after which time the JOLs be at liberty to destroy such liquidation files.
3. The Company’s books and records be preserved by the JOLs for at least three years from the date of the close of liquidation, after which time the JOLs be at liberty to destroy them.
4. The requirement to advertise the hearing of the dissolution application be dispensed with.
5. The requirement to hold annual meetings be dispensed with.”

---

**THE HON. JUSTICE DAVID DOYLE**  
**JUDGE OF THE GRAND COURT**

*260115 CT Environmental Group Limited – FSD 256 of 2024 (DDJ) - Judgment*