CHAPTER 5

Commercial Code— Letters of Credit
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Introduction

ARTICLE 5 deals principally with the Commercial Letter of Credit issued by a financer of a sales transaction to the seller agreeing to accept drafts or pay the purchase price upon receipt of the documents which represent the goods. Thus the seller has the assurance of payment from the issuing financial institution in place of the promise of the individual buyer. The buyer makes an arrangement with the issuer of the letter for repayment, in return for the documents, and the seller can usually obtain payment upon shipment of the goods by having a draft backed by a letter of credit discounted with his bank.

Most international sales transactions are financed by the letter of credit device issued by the larger national banks with foreign departments. When a South Carolina bank receives a request from its customer for the issuance of a letter of credit, the usual practice is to forward the application to such a bank which actually issues a letter to the seller. Thus most of the letter of credit practice and the precedence setting case decisions have occurred in the states where such banks are located, principally New York. These case decisions plus the “Uniform Customs and Practices for Commercial Documentary Credits”, issued by the International Chamber of Commerce and adopted by American banks in 1952 as a statement of practice, represent the principal source of the law governing letters of credit prior to the drafting of Article 5 of the Code.

The letter of credit seems to be used with increasing frequency in financing domestic transactions. With the codification of the law of letters of credit by Article 5 of the Code, it is expected that the increased degree of certainty and uniformity of law will accelerate this trend.

There are no South Carolina cases dealing with the commercial letter of credit. The letter of guaranty and the “traveler’s letter of credit”, whereby a bank promises to reimburse those who make advances to the holder, is the closest analogy found in the South Carolina decisions. The only statutory treatment of this subject is found in the NIL, SC Code Sections 8‑993 and 8‑994 dealing with the “virtual acceptance” which is a rough substitute for the letter of credit but which is now an almost obsolete practice whereby a bank may accept a draft by a separate instrument. (See Code section 3‑410(1) which would repeal this provision by requiring an acceptance to be written on the face of a draft.) The analysis of Article 5, therefore, is necessarily limited to general statements of explanations of the rules expressed therein with occasional reference to decisions in other jurisdictions and to the “Uniform Customs and Practices for Commercial Documentary Credits”.

CROSS REFERENCES

Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, adequate compliance with commercial contract, see Section 36‑7‑509.

**SECTION 36‑5‑101.** Short title.

 This chapter may be cited as Uniform Commercial Code—Letters of Credit.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑101; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

The Official Comment to the original Section 5‑101 was a remarkably brief inaugural address. Noting that letters of credit had not been the subject of statutory enactment and that the law concerning them had been developed in the cases, the Comment stated that Article 5 was intended “within its limited scope” to set an independent theoretical frame for the further development of letters of credit. That statement addressed accurately conditions as they existed when the statement was made, nearly half a century ago. Since Article 5 was originally drafted, the use of letters of credit has expanded and developed, and the case law concerning these developments is, in some respects, discordant.

Revision of Article 5 therefore has required reappraisal both of the statutory goals and of the extent to which particular statutory provisions further or adversely affect achievement of those goals.

The statutory goal of Article 5 was originally stated to be: (1) to set a substantive theoretical frame that describes the function and legal nature of letters of credit; and (2) to preserve procedural flexibility in order to accommodate further development of the efficient use of letters of credit. A letter of credit is an idiosyncratic form of undertaking that supports performance of an obligation incurred in a separate financial, mercantile, or other transaction or arrangement. The objectives of the original and revised Article 5 are best achieved (1) by defining the peculiar characteristics of a letter of credit that distinguish it and the legal consequences of its use from other forms of assurance such as secondary guarantees, performance bonds, and insurance policies, and from ordinary contracts, fiduciary engagements, and escrow arrangements; and (2) by preserving flexibility through variation by agreement in order to respond to and accommodate developments in custom and usage that are not inconsistent with the essential definitions and substantive mandates of the statute. No statute can, however, prescribe the manner in which such substantive rights and duties are to be enforced or imposed without risking stultification of wholesome developments in the letter of credit mechanism. Letter of credit law should remain responsive to commercial reality and in particular to the customs and expectations of the international banking and mercantile community. Courts should read the terms of this article in a manner consistent with these customs and expectations.

The subject matter in Article 5, letters of credit, may also be governed by an international convention that is now being drafted by UNCITRAL, the draft Convention on Independent Guarantees and Standby Letters of Credit. The Uniform Customs and Practice is an international body of trade practice that is commonly adopted by international and domestic letters of credit and as such is the “law of the transaction” by agreement of the parties. Article 5 is consistent with and was influenced by the rules in the existing version of the UCP. In addition to the UCP and the international convention, other bodies of law apply to letters of credit. For example, the federal bankruptcy law applies to letters of credit with respect to applicants and beneficiaries that are in bankruptcy; regulations of the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency lay out requirements for banks that issue letters of credit and describe how letters of credit are to be treated for calculating asset risk and for the purpose of loan limitations. In addition there is an array of anti‑boycott and other similar laws that may affect the issuance and performance of letters of credit. All of these laws are beyond the scope of Article 5, but in certain circumstances they will override Article 5.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

[No comment.]

CROSS REFERENCES

Definition and operation of acceptance, see Section 36‑3‑410.

RESEARCH REFERENCES

Forms

Am. Jur. Pl. & Pr. Forms Uniform Commercial Code Section 5:1 , Introductory Comments.

Treatises and Practice Aids

6 Causes of Action 337, Cause of Action by Beneficiary Against Bank for Wrongful Dishonor of Draft or Demand for Payment Under Letter of Credit.

LAW REVIEW AND JOURNAL COMMENTARIES

Letters of Credit: Their Use in Domestic Financing. 22 S.C. L. Rev. 381.

**SECTION 36‑5‑102.** Definitions.

 (a) In this chapter:

 (1) “Adviser” means a person who, at the request of the issuer, a confirmer, or another adviser, notifies or requests another adviser to notify the beneficiary that a letter of credit has been issued, confirmed, or amended.

 (2) “Applicant” means a person at whose request or for whose account a letter of credit is issued. The term includes a person who requests an issuer to issue a letter of credit on behalf of another if the person making the request undertakes an obligation to reimburse the issuer.

 (3) “Beneficiary” means a person who under the terms of a letter of credit is entitled to have its complying presentation honored. The term includes a person to whom drawing rights have been transferred under a transferable letter of credit.

 (4) “Confirmer” means a nominated person who undertakes, at the request or with the consent of the issuer, to honor a presentation under a letter of credit issued by another.

 (5) “Dishonor” of a letter of credit means failure timely to honor or to take an interim action, such as acceptance of a draft, that may be required by the letter of credit.

 (6) “Document” means a draft or other demand, document of title, investment security, certificate, invoice, or other record, statement, or representation of fact, law, right, or opinion (i) which is presented in a written or other medium permitted by the letter of credit or, unless prohibited by the letter of credit, by the standard practice referred to in Section 36‑5‑108(e) and (ii) which is capable of being examined for compliance with the terms and conditions of the letter of credit. A document may not be oral.

 (7) “Good faith” means honesty in fact in the conduct or transaction concerned.

 (8) “Honor” of a letter of credit means performance of the issuer’s undertaking in the letter of credit to pay or deliver an item of value. Unless the letter of credit otherwise provides, ‘honor’ occurs

 (i) upon payment,

 (ii) if the letter of credit provides for acceptance, upon acceptance of a draft and, at maturity, its payment, or

 (iii) if the letter of credit provides for incurring a deferred obligation, upon incurring the obligation and, at maturity, its performance.

 (9) “Issuer” means a bank or other person that issues a letter of credit, but does not include an individual who makes an engagement for personal, family, or household purposes.

 (10) “Letter of credit” means a definite undertaking that satisfies the requirements of Section 36‑5‑104 by an issuer to a beneficiary at the request or for the account of an applicant or, in the case of a financial institution, to itself or for its own account, to honor a documentary presentation by payment or delivery of an item of value.

 (11) “Nominated person” means a person whom the issuer (i) designates or authorizes to pay, accept, negotiate, or otherwise give value under a letter of credit and (ii) undertakes by agreement or custom and practice to reimburse.

 (12) “Presentation” means delivery of a document to an issuer or nominated person for honor or giving of value under a letter of credit.

 (13) “Presenter” means a person making a presentation as or on behalf of a beneficiary or nominated person.

 (14) “Record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium, or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

 (15) “Successor of a beneficiary” means a person who succeeds to substantially all of the rights of a beneficiary by operation of law, including a corporation with or into which the beneficiary has been merged or consolidated, an administrator, executor, personal representative, trustee in bankruptcy, debtor in possession, liquidator, and receiver.

 (b) Definitions in other chapters applying to this chapter and the sections in which they appear are:

 “Accept” or “Acceptance” Section 36‑3‑409

 “Value” Sections 36‑3‑303, 36‑4‑211

 (c) Chapter 1 contains certain additional general definitions and principles of construction and interpretation applicable throughout this chapter.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑102; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Since no one can be a confirmer unless that person is a nominated person as defined in Section 5‑102(a)(11), those who agree to “confirm” without the designation or authorization of the issuer are not confirmers under Article 5. Nonetheless, the undertakings to the beneficiary of such persons may be enforceable by the beneficiary as letters of credit issued by the “confirmer” for its own account or as guarantees or contracts outside of Article 5.

2. The definition of “document” contemplates and facilitates the growing recognition of electronic and other nonpaper media as “documents,” however, for the time being, data in those media constitute documents only in certain circumstances. For example, a facsimile received by an issuer would be a document only if the letter of credit explicitly permitted it, if the standard practice authorized it and the letter did not prohibit it, or the agreement of the issuer and beneficiary permitted it. The fact that data transmitted in a nonpaper (unwritten) medium can be recorded on paper by a recipient’s computer printer, facsimile machine, or the like does not under current practice render the data so transmitted a “document.” A facsimile or S.W.I.F.T. message received directly by the issuer is in an electronic medium when it crosses the boundary of the issuer’s place of business. One wishing to make a presentation by facsimile (an electronic medium) will have to procure the explicit agreement of the issuer (assuming that the standard practice does not authorize it). Where electronic transmissions are authorized neither by the letter of credit nor by the practice, the beneficiary may transmit the data electronically to its agent who may be able to put it in written form and make a conforming presentation.

3. “Good faith” continues in revised Article 5 to be defined as “honesty in fact.” “Observance of reasonable standards of fair dealing” has not been added to the definition. The narrower definition of “honesty in fact” reinforces the “independence principle” in the treatment of “fraud,” “strict compliance,” “preclusion,” and other tests affecting the performance of obligations that are unique to letters of credit. This narrower definition—which does not include “fair dealing”—is appropriate to the decision to honor or dishonor a presentation of documents specified in a letter of credit. The narrower definition is also appropriate for other parts of revised Article 5 where greater certainty of obligations is necessary and is consistent with the goals of speed and low cost. It is important that U.S. letters of credit have continuing vitality and competitiveness in international transactions.

For example, it would be inconsistent with the “independence” principle if any of the following occurred: (i) the beneficiary’s failure to adhere to the standard of “fair dealing” in the underlying transaction or otherwise in presenting documents were to provide applicants and issuers with an “unfairness” defense to dishonor even when the documents complied with the terms of the letter of credit; (ii) the issuer’s obligation to honor in “strict compliance in accordance with standard practice” were changed to “reasonable compliance” by use of the “fair dealing” standard, or (iii) the preclusion against the issuer (Section 5‑108(d)) were modified under the “fair dealing” standard to enable the issuer later to raise additional deficiencies in the presentation. The rights and obligations arising from presentation, honor, dishonor and reimbursement, are independent and strict, and thus “honesty in fact” is an appropriate standard.

The contract between the applicant and beneficiary is not governed by Article 5, but by applicable contract law, such as Article 2 or the general law of contracts. “Good faith” in that contract is defined by other law, such as Section 2‑103(1)(b) or Restatement of Contracts 2d, Section 205, which incorporate the principle of “fair dealing” in most cases, or a State’s common law or other statutory provisions that may apply to that contract.

The contract between the applicant and the issuer (sometimes called the “reimbursement” agreement) is governed in part by this article (e.g., Sections 5‑108(i), 5‑111(b), and 5‑103(c)) and partly by other law (e.g., the general law of contracts). The definition of good faith in Section 5‑102(a)(7) applies only to the extent that the reimbursement contract is governed by provisions in this article; for other purposes good faith is defined by other law.

4. Payment and acceptance are familiar modes of honor. A third mode of honor, incurring an unconditional obligation, has legal effects similar to an acceptance of a time draft but does not technically constitute an acceptance. The practice of making letters of credit available by “deferred payment undertaking” as now provided in UCP 500 has grown up in other countries and spread to the United States. The definition of “honor” will accommodate that practice.

5. The exclusion of consumers from the definition of “issuer” is to keep creditors from using a letter of credit in consumer transactions in which the consumer might be made the issuer and the creditor would be the beneficiary. If that transaction were recognized under Article 5, the effect would be to leave the consumer without defenses against the creditor. That outcome would violate the policy behind the Federal Trade Commission Rule in 16 CFR Part 433. In a consumer transaction, an individual cannot be an issuer where that person would otherwise be either the principal debtor or a guarantor.

6. The label on a document is not conclusive; certain documents labelled “guarantees” in accordance with European (and occasionally, American) practice are letters of credit. On the other hand, even documents that are labelled “letter of credit” may not constitute letters of credit under the definition in Section 5‑102(a). When a document labelled a letter of credit requires the issuer to pay not upon the presentation of documents, but upon the determination of an extrinsic fact such as applicant’s failure to perform a construction contract, and where that condition appears on its face to be fundamental and would, if ignored, leave no obligation to the issuer under the document labelled letter of credit, the issuer’s undertaking is not a letter of credit. It is probably some form of suretyship or other contractual arrangement and may be enforceable as such. See Sections 5‑102(a)(10) and 5‑103(d). Therefore, undertakings whose fundamental term requires an issuer to look beyond documents and beyond conventional reference to the clock, calendar, and practices concerning the form of various documents are not governed by Article 5. Although Section 5‑108(g) recognizes that certain nondocumentary conditions can be included in a letter of credit without denying the undertaking the status of letter of credit, that section does not apply to cases where the nondocumentary condition is fundamental to the issuer’s obligation. The rules in Sections 5‑102(a)(10), 5‑103(d), and 5‑108(g) approve the conclusion in Wichita Eagle & Beacon Publishing Co. v. Pacific Nat. Bank, 493 F.2d 1285 (9th Cir. 1974).

The adjective “definite” is taken from the UCP. It approves cases that deny letter of credit status to documents that are unduly vague or incomplete. See, e.g., Transparent Products Corp. v. Paysaver Credit Union, 864 F.2d 60 (7th Cir. 1988). Note, however, that no particular phrase or label is necessary to establish a letter of credit. It is sufficient if the undertaking of the issuer shows that it is intended to be a letter of credit. In most cases the parties’ intention will be indicated by a label on the undertaking itself indicating that it is a “letter of credit,” but no such language is necessary.

A financial institution may be both the issuer and the applicant or the issuer and the beneficiary. Such letters are sometimes issued by a bank in support of the bank’s own lease obligations or on behalf of one of its divisions as an applicant or to one of its divisions as beneficiary, such as an overseas branch. Because wide use of letters of credit in which the issuer and the applicant or the issuer and the beneficiary are the same would endanger the unique status of letters of credit, only financial institutions are authorized to issue them.

In almost all cases the ultimate performance of the issuer under a letter of credit is the payment of money. In rare cases the issuer’s obligation is to deliver stock certificates or the like. The definition of letter of credit in Section 5‑102(a)(10) contemplates those cases.

7. Under the UCP any bank is a nominated bank where the letter of credit is “freely negotiable.” A letter of credit might also nominate by the following: “We hereby engage with the drawer, indorsers, and bona fide holders of drafts drawn under and in compliance with the terms of this credit that the same will be duly honored on due presentation” or “available with any bank by negotiation.” A restricted negotiation credit might be “available with x bank by negotiation” or the like.

Several legal consequences may attach to the status of nominated person. First, when the issuer nominates a person, it is authorizing that person to pay or give value and is authorizing the beneficiary to make presentation to that person. Unless the letter of credit provides otherwise, the beneficiary need not present the documents to the issuer before the letter of credit expires; it need only present those documents to the nominated person. Secondly, a nominated person that gives value in good faith has a right to payment from the issuer despite fraud. Section 5‑109(a)(1).

8. A “record” must be in or capable of being converted to a perceivable form. For example, an electronic message recorded in a computer memory that could be printed from that memory could constitute a record. Similarly, a tape recording of an oral conversation could be a record.

9. Absent a specific agreement to the contrary, documents of a beneficiary delivered to an issuer or nominated person are considered to be presented under the letter of credit to which they refer, and any payment or value given for them is considered to be made under that letter of credit. As the court held in Alaska Textile Co. v. Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., 982 F. 2d 813, 820 (2d Cir. 1992), it takes a “significant showing” to make the presentation of a beneficiary’s documents for “collection only” or otherwise outside letter of credit law and practice.

10. Although a successor of a beneficiary is one who succeeds “by operation of law,” some of the successions contemplated by Section 5‑102(a)(15) will have resulted from voluntary action of the beneficiary such as merger of a corporation. Any merger makes the successor corporation the “successor of a beneficiary” even though the transfer occurs partly by operation of law and partly by the voluntary action of the parties. The definition excludes certain transfers, where no part of the transfer is “by operation of law”—such as the sale of assets by one company to another.

11. “Draft” in Article 5 does not have the same meaning it has in Article 3. For example, a document may be a draft under Article 5 even though it would not be a negotiable instrument, and therefore would not qualify as a draft under Section 3‑104(e).

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Section 36‑5‑102(1), “Scope,” has been moved to Section 36‑5‑103(a). The content of former Section 36‑5‑102(2) has been omitted as redundant with Section 36‑5‑103(a) and certain definitions.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑102. This Section replaces the definitions appearing in former Section 36‑5‑103 and adds new definitions, including express incorporation of certain aspects of standard letter of credit practice. Accordingly, a number of the definitions appearing here represent new law, as is discussed in what follows.

“Adviser.” This definition clarifies that found in former Section 36‑5‑103(1)(e) under the rubric “advising bank.” The current definition clarifies that (1) the adviser may be a person other than a bank, (2) the adviser performs only on request of another appropriate person, and (3) the adviser’s role includes confirmations and amendments as well as issuance. The role of the adviser is described in Section 36‑5‑107.

“Applicant.” This appellation is new, replacing the former concept of “customer” found at Section 36‑5‑102(1)(g). The principle function of this definition is to identify who undertakes the duty of reimbursement to the issuer. The terminology is broadened to make clear that issuers are not limited to banks and that third parties for whose benefit application is made are not limited to banks’ customers.

“Beneficiary.” This term was formerly defined at Section 36‑5‑103(1)(d). The principle meaning remains the same, that is, the person intended to benefit from a draw under a letter of credit. Under the former definition, however, “beneficiary” was a person entitled “to draw or demand payment” while under the definition of this section it is a person “entitled to have its complying presentation honored.” This change shifts the emphasis from one in a position to make a demand to one entitled to honor. This shift is reflected throughout revised Article 5.

The current definition also clarifies that transferees of drawing rights under transferrable letters of credit are “beneficiaries” for purposes of the Article.

The current definition retains the emphasis under former law that the terms of letters of credit (rather than facts extrinsic to such terms) control the identity of beneficiaries.

“Confirmer.” This definition appeared in former Section 36‑5‑103(1)(f) under the rubric “confirming bank.” While the present definition is basically similar to that which it replaces, several changes of detail are made. First, the current definition is does not limit confirmers to banks. Second, the current definition clarifies that a person’s posture as “confirmer” must relate to some act of the issuer, either request or consent. In this respect, see Official Comment 1 to this section. Third, by its reference to “nominated person” (see Section 36‑5‑103(a)(10)), this section limits confirmers to persons who undertake to give value or to reimburse, but not those engaging that another bank would honor.

The role of the confirmer is described in Section 36‑5‑107.

“Dishonor.” This term was not expressly defined in the prior version of Article 5. That version referred to “honor” as defined in Section 36‑1‑201(21) (“to pay or to accept and pay, or where a credit so engages to purchase or discount a draft complying with the terms of the credit”) and presumably used “dishonor” in the obverse. The current definition similarly defines “dishonor” as the obverse of “honor” (as now defined in Section 35‑5‑102(a)(8); see below), effecting changes of detail discussed below, and adds as an event of dishonor the failure to honor timely interim actions required by the letter of credit.

“Document.” This clarifies the definition of “document” previously appearing at Section 36‑5‑103(1)(b) by giving express scope to the use of electronic or other media (“presented in a written or other medium”) if permitted either expressly by a letter of credit, or by standard practice unless excluded by terms of the letter of credit, but excluding oral “documents.” See Official Comment 2 to this Section.

The former statutory concepts of “documentary demand” and “documentary draft” that appeared in Section 36‑5‑103( 1)(b) have been omitted from the 1995 Official Text, presumably subsumed by this definition and the definition of “record” at Section 36‑5‑(a)(14).

“Good faith.” Good faith was not defined in former Article 5. Presumably that Article relied upon the general definition found at Section 36‑1‑201(19), “honesty in fact in the conduct of the transaction concerned.” The Article 2 definition of good faith in the case of a merchant found at Section 36‑2‑103(b), “honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade,” might also have been deemed applicable. The present definition clarifies that good faith is limited to the former. Commercial standards are incorporated in revised Article 5 to an extent as standard practice. See, e.g., Section 36‑5‑108(e). This narrow definition of good faith, including its relationship to the independence principle and the related omission of “fair dealing,” is discussed in detail in Official Comment 3 to this Section.

“Honor.” This definition clarifies a concept appearing, but not defined, at Section 36‑5‑103(1)(a) of prior law. Presumably the general definition found at Section 1‑201(21) (“to pay or to accept and pay, or where a credit so engages to purchase or discount a draft complying with the terms of the credit”) would have been applicable at prior law and is now displaced. The present definition expands the concept of “honor” expressly to include incurring a deferred, unconditional obligation and delivery of an item of value. See Official Comment 4 to this Section. For purposes of Article 5, the meaning of “value” is borrowed from Sections 36‑3‑303 and 36‑4‑211 (see Section 36‑5‑102(b)). This expanded concept of “honor” is also reflected in the definition of “letter of credit” in Section 36‑5‑102(a)(10).

“Issuer.” Under prior law, this definition was found at Section 36‑5‑103(1)(c) (“a bank or other person issuing a credit”). The present definition clarifies that consumer transactions are not letter of credit transactions. For a description of the purpose and effect of this clarification, see Official Comment 5 to this section.

“Letter of credit.” This concept appeared at Section 36‑103(a)(1) of prior law, which gave it the same meaning as “credit.” The present definition clarifies former law in several important ways. These include express incorporation of the standard‑practice concept of “definiteness” (excluding vague documents from the definition), the conclusive operation of the definition (so that a document is a letter of credit upon meeting the definition, regardless of how it characterizes itself), the concept of disregard of facts extrinsic to the face of the letter of credit, and the possibility of two‑party letters of credit (pursuant to which a financial institution may be both applicant and issuer). These and other clarifications are discussed in detail in Official Comment 6 to this Section.

“Nominated person.” This term was not defined at former law. The present definition incorporates a standard‑practice concept of convenience whereby a bank local to a beneficiary is “nominated” as described in the text of the statute to perform, very generally speaking, the role of issuer. This has a number of effects, including in particular reduction of the beneficiary’s risk of loss or misdelivery of presentation documents. For a description of the concept and a discussion of its effects see Official Comment 7 to this Section.

The role of the nominated person is described in Section 36‑5‑107.

“Presentation.” This term was not defined under former law but its substance was included in Section 36‑5‑112(3) (definition of “presenter”), as “presenting a draft or demand for payment for honor under a credit.” (Under former law, “credit” was synonymous with “letter of credit”; see former Section 35‑5‑103(1)(a)). The current definition makes clear that what is presented must be a document, that presentation must be made to either an issuer or nominated person, and that the objective of presentation may be either “honor or giving of value.”

“Presenter.” This term was defined under former law at Section 36‑5‑112(3) as “any person presenting a draft or demand for payment for honor under a credit even though that person is a confirming bank or other correspondent which is acting under an issuer’s authorization.”

“Record.” This term was not defined under former law, although its substance was found at Section 36‑5‑102(1)(b), which required that documentary drafts or presentations be paper. Present law does not require the use of paper; see the definition of “document”; at Section 36‑5‑102(a)(6). The former statutory concepts of “documentary draft” and “documentary demand,” presumably subsumed by this definition and the definition of “document,” have been omitted from the 1995 Official Text.

“Successor of a beneficiary.” Former law did not deal expressly with the effect of a change of the jural personality of the beneficiary. Present law deals with it expressly in Section 36‑5‑113. See Official Comment 10.

Former Section 36‑5‑103(2), referencing definitions of “notation of credit” and “presenter” elsewhere in Article 5 has been omitted from the 1995 Official Text as “not applicable.”

Former Section 36‑5‑103(3) referenced definitions of “accept” and “acceptance.” These now appear at Section 36‑3‑410. See also Section 36‑5‑102(b).

The definition of “contract for sale” found in former law has been omitted as inapplicable.

The former reference to the definition of “draft” in Section 36‑3‑104 has been omitted. Under present law, a draft is a “document” as defined in this Section. The Official Comment observes that, under revised Article 5, a draft need not include a negotiable document, as required by former Section 36‑3‑104.

The former references to definitions of “holder in due course,” “midnight deadline” and “security” have been omitted from the 1995 Official Text as inapplicable.

The reference in Section 36‑5‑102(c) to definitions and principles found in Uniform Commercial Code Chapter 1 is preserved from former Section 36‑5‑103(4).

CROSS REFERENCES

Advice of credit and confirmation, error in statement of terms, see Section 36‑5‑107.

Course of dealing and usage of trade, see Section 36‑1‑303.

Definitions, see Section 36‑9‑102.

Duty of collecting bank, see Section 36‑4‑202.

General definitions and principles of interpretation, see Section 36‑1‑201 et seq.

“Letter of credit,” “bankers’ credit” and “confirmed credit” with reference to sales of goods, see Section 36‑2‑325.

Payor bank’s responsibility for late return of item, see Section 36‑4‑302.

Privilege of presenting bank to deal with goods and security interest for expenses, see Section 36‑4‑504.

Purposes and rules of construction, see Section 36‑1‑103.

Responsibility of presenting bank for documents and goods, see Section 36‑4‑503.

Supplementary general principles of law applicable, see Section 36‑1‑103.

Time and effect of establishment of credit, see Section 36‑5‑106.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10 to 191.30.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 182.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 381.

LAW REVIEW AND JOURNAL COMMENTARIES

Letters of Credit: Their Use in Domestic Financing. 22 S.C. L. Rev. 381.

**SECTION 36‑5‑103.** Scope.

 (a) This chapter applies to letters of credit and to certain rights and obligations arising out of transactions involving letters of credit.

 (b) The statement of a rule in this chapter does not by itself require, imply, or negate application of the same or a different rule to a situation not provided for, or to a person not specified, in this chapter.

 (c) With the exception of this subsection, subsections (a) and (d), Sections 36‑5‑102(a)(9) and (10), 36‑5‑106(d), and 36‑5‑114(d), and except to the extent prohibited in Sections 36‑1‑302 and 36‑5‑117(d), the effect of this chapter may be varied by agreement or by a provision stated or incorporated by reference in an undertaking. A term in an agreement or undertaking generally excusing liability or generally limiting remedies for failure to perform obligations is not sufficient to vary obligations prescribed by this chapter.

 (d) Rights and obligations of an issuer to a beneficiary or a nominated person under a letter of credit are independent of the existence, performance, or nonperformance of a contract or arrangement out of which the letter of credit arises or which underlies it, including contracts or arrangements between the issuer and the applicant and between the applicant and the beneficiary.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑103; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15; 2014 Act No. 213 (S.343), Section 30, eff October 1, 2014.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Sections 5‑102(a)(10) and 5‑103 are the principal limits on the scope of Article 5. Many undertakings in commerce and contract are similar, but not identical to the letter of credit. Principal among those are “secondary,” “accessory,” or “suretyship” guarantees. Although the word “guarantee” is sometimes used to describe an independent obligation like that of the issuer of a letter of credit (most often in the case of European bank undertakings but occasionally in the case of undertakings of American banks), in the United States the word “guarantee” is more typically used to describe a suretyship transaction in which the “guarantor” is only secondarily liable and has the right to assert the underlying debtor’s defenses. This article does not apply to secondary or accessory guarantees and it is important to recognize the distinction between letters of credit and those guarantees. It is often a defense to a secondary or accessory guarantor’s liability that the underlying debt has been discharged or that the debtor has other defenses to the underlying liability. In letter of credit law, on the other hand, the independence principle recognized throughout Article 5 states that the issuer’s liability is independent of the underlying obligation. That the beneficiary may have breached the underlying contract and thus have given a good defense on that contract to the applicant against the beneficiary is no defense for the issuer’s refusal to honor. Only staunch recognition of this principle by the issuers and the courts will give letters of credit the continuing vitality that arises from the certainty and speed of payment under letters of credit. To that end, it is important that the law not carry into letter of credit transactions rules that properly apply only to secondary guarantees or to other forms of engagement.

2. Like all of the provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code, Article 5 is supplemented by Section 1‑103 and, through it, by many rules of statutory and common law. Because this article is quite short and has no rules on many issues that will affect liability with respect to a letter of credit transaction, law beyond Article 5 will often determine rights and liabilities in letter of credit transactions. Even within letter of credit law, the article is far from comprehensive; it deals only with “certain” rights of the parties. Particularly with respect to the standards of performance that are set out in Section 5‑108, it is appropriate for the parties and the courts to turn to customs and practice such as the Uniform Customs and Practice for Documentary Credits, currently published by the International Chamber of Commerce as I.C.C. Pub. No. 500 (hereafter UCP). Many letters of credit specifically adopt the UCP as applicable to the particular transaction. Where the UCP are adopted but conflict with Article 5 and except where variation is prohibited, the UCP terms are permissible contractual modifications under Sections 1‑102(3) and 5‑103(c). See Section 5‑116(c). Normally Article 5 should not be considered to conflict with practice except when a rule explicitly stated in the UCP or other practice is different from a rule explicitly stated in Article 5.

Except by choosing the law of a jurisdiction that has not adopted the Uniform Commercial Code, it is not possible entirely to escape the Uniform Commercial Code. Since incorporation of the UCP avoids only “conflicting” Article 5 rules, parties who do not wish to be governed by the nonconflicting provisions of Article 5 must normally either adopt the law of a jurisdiction other than a State of the United States or state explicitly the rule that is to govern. When rules of custom and practice are incorporated by reference, they are considered to be explicit terms of the agreement or undertaking.

Neither the obligation of an issuer under Section 5‑108 nor that of an adviser under Section 5‑107 is an obligation of the kind that is invariable under Section 1‑102(3). Section 5‑103(c) and Comment 1 to Section 5‑108 make it clear that the applicant and the issuer may agree to almost any provision establishing the obligations of the issuer to the applicant. The last sentence of subsection (c) limits the power of the issuer to achieve that result by a nonnegotiated disclaimer or limitation of remedy.

What the issuer could achieve by an explicit agreement with its applicant or by a term that explicitly defines its duty, it cannot accomplish by a general disclaimer. The restriction on disclaimers in the last sentence of subsection (c) is based more on procedural than on substantive unfairness. Where, for example, the reimbursement agreement provides explicitly that the issuer need not examine any documents, the applicant understands the risk it has undertaken. A term in a reimbursement agreement which states generally that an issuer will not be liable unless it has acted in “bad faith” or committed “gross negligence” is ineffective under Section 5‑103(c). On the other hand, less general terms such as terms that permit issuer reliance on an oral or electronic message believed in good faith to have been received from the applicant or terms that entitle an issuer to reimbursement when it honors a “substantially” though not “strictly” complying presentation, are effective. In each case the question is whether the disclaimer or limitation is sufficiently clear and explicit in reallocating a liability or risk that is allocated differently under a variable Article 5 provision.

Of course, no term in a letter of credit, whether incorporated by reference to practice rules or stated specifically, can free an issuer from a conflicting contractual obligation to its applicant. If, for example, an issuer promised its applicant that it would pay only against an inspection certificate of a particular company but failed to require such a certificate in its letter of credit or made the requirement only a nondocumentary condition that had to be disregarded, the issuer might be obliged to pay the beneficiary even though its payment might violate its contract with its applicant.

3. Parties should generally avoid modifying the definitions in Section 5‑102. The effect of such an agreement is almost inevitably unclear. To say that something is a “guarantee” in the typical domestic transaction is to say that the parties intend that particular legal rules apply to it. By acknowledging that something is a guarantee, but asserting that it is to be treated as a “letter of credit,” the parties leave a court uncertain about where the rules on guarantees stop and those concerning letters of credit begin.

4. Section 5‑102(2) and (3) of Article 5 are omitted as unneeded; the omission does not change the law.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑103. This Section replaces material appearing in former Sections 36‑5‑102(1) and (3) (the first sentence of subsection (3) has been omitted).

Section 36‑5‑103(a), together with the definitions found in Section 36‑5‑102, replace former Sections 36‑5‑102(1) and (2), clarifying that a credit must conform to the definition of letter of credit at Section 36‑5‑102(a)(10) in order to come within this Chapter, regardless of how the credit characterizes itself.

The definition of “letter of credit” is, accordingly, jurisdictional in the sense of governing the scope of revised Article 5. Despite the general permission granted by Section 36‑1‑102(3) [see now Section 36‑1‑302] to vary UCC terms by private agreement, Official Comment 2 to that Section provides that this flexibility does not extend to varying statutory definitions of scope. The definition of “letter of credit” comes within that limitation.

Subsection (d) of this Section brings into the Chapter as an express provision the independence principle, that rights and obligations under a letter of credit are independent of rights and obligations arising elsewhere, including the underlying transaction.

The first sentence of former Section 36‑5‑102(3) has been omitted from the 1995 Official Text as unneeded, and the Official Comment to this Section observes that its omission does not change the law. The balance of former Section 36‑5‑102(3) now appears at Section 36‑5‑103(b).

Editor’s Note

2014 Act No. 213, Section 51, provides as follows:

“SECTION 51. This act becomes effective on October 1, 2014. It applies to transactions entered into and events occurring after that date.”

Effect of Amendment

2014 Act No. 213, Section 30, in subsection (c), substituted “36‑1‑302” for “36‑1‑102(3)”.

CROSS REFERENCES

Purposes and rules of construction, see Section 36‑1‑103.

Supplementary general principles of law applicable, see Section 36‑1‑103.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 177, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 370, 372 to 376.

LAW REVIEW AND JOURNAL COMMENTARIES

Letters of Credit: Their Use in Domestic Financing. 22 S.C. L. Rev. 381.

**SECTION 36‑5‑104.** Formal requirements.

 A letter of credit, confirmation, advice, transfer, amendment, or cancellation may be issued in any form that is a record and is authenticated (i) by a signature or (ii) in accordance with the agreement of the parties or the standard practice referred to in Section 36‑5‑108(e).

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑104; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Neither Section 5‑104 nor the definition of letter of credit in Section 5‑102(a)(10) requires inclusion of all the terms that are normally contained in a letter of credit in order for an undertaking to be recognized as a letter of credit under Article 5. For example, a letter of credit will typically specify the amount available, the expiration date, the place where presentation should be made, and the documents that must be presented to entitle a person to honor. Undertakings that have the formalities required by Section 5‑104 and meet the conditions specified in Section 5‑102(a)(10) will be recognized as letters of credit even though they omit one or more of the items usually contained in a letter of credit.

2. The authentication specified in this section is authentication only of the identity of the issuer, confirmer, or adviser.

An authentication agreement may be by system rule, by standard practice, or by direct agreement between the parties. The reference to practice is intended to incorporate future developments in the UCP and other practice rules as well as those that may arise spontaneously in commercial practice.

3. Many banking transactions, including the issuance of many letters of credit, are now conducted mostly by electronic means. For example, S.W.I.F.T. is currently used to transmit letters of credit from issuing to advising banks. The letter of credit text so transmitted may be printed at the advising bank, stamped “original” and provided to the beneficiary in that form. The printed document may then be used as a way of controlling and recording payments and of recording and authorizing assignments of proceeds or transfers of rights under the letter of credit. Nothing in this section should be construed to conflict with that practice.

To be a record sufficient to serve as a letter of credit or other undertaking under this section, data must have a durability consistent with that function. Because consideration is not required for a binding letter of credit or similar undertaking (Section 5‑105) yet those undertakings are to be strictly construed (Section 5‑108), parties to a letter of credit transaction are especially dependent on the continued availability of the terms and conditions of the letter of credit or other undertaking. By declining to specify any particular medium in which the letter of credit must be established or communicated, Section 5‑104 leaves room for future developments.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑104. This Section replaces part of the material appearing in former Sections 36‑5‑104. The balance appears in Section 36‑5‑102(6) (definition of “document”) and (14) (definition of “record”).

Traditionally, letters of credit were documentary, in the sense of being signed papers. Section 36‑5‑104, establishing formal requirements for a letter of credit, substitutes the concept of “record” for that of “document” found in former law. “Record” is not limited to paper and indeed is very broadly defined, clearly giving scope for electronic records and further developments; see Section 36‑5‑102(14). Similarly, the requirement for a “signature” has been expanded to include any authentication agreed by the parties or congruent with standard practice. “Document” itself is broadly defined to include electronic transmissions and other forms of communication; see Section 36‑5‑103(6) and the Official and South Carolina Reporters’ Comments thereto.

CROSS REFERENCES

Modification, rescission, and waiver, see Section 36‑2‑209.

Supplementary general principles of law applicable, see Section 36‑1‑103.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 177, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 370, 372 to 376.

**SECTION 36‑5‑105.** Consideration.

 Consideration is not required to issue, amend, transfer, or cancel a letter of credit, advice, or confirmation.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑105; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

It is not to be expected that any issuer will issue its letter of credit without some form of remuneration. But it is not expected that the beneficiary will know what the issuer’s remuneration was or whether in fact there was any identifiable remuneration in a given case. And it might be difficult for the beneficiary to prove the issuer’s remuneration. This section dispenses with this proof and is consistent with the position of Lord Mansfield in Pillans v. Van Mierop, 97 Eng.Rep. 1035 (K.B. 1765) in making consideration irrelevant.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑105. Although the wording is slightly different from former Section 36‑5‑105, no change in the law is intended.

CROSS REFERENCES

Letter of credit in contract for sale of goods, see Section 36‑2‑325.

Waiver or renunciation of claim or right after breach, without consideration, see Section 36‑1‑306.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 177, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 370, 372 to 376.

**SECTION 36‑5‑106.** Issuance, amendment, cancellation, and duration.

 (a) A letter of credit is issued and becomes enforceable according to its terms against the issuer when the issuer sends or otherwise transmits it to the person requested to advise or to the beneficiary. A letter of credit is revocable only if it so provides.

 (b) After a letter of credit is issued, rights and obligations of a beneficiary, applicant, confirmer, and issuer are not affected by an amendment or cancellation to which that person has not consented except to the extent the letter of credit provides that it is revocable or that the issuer may amend or cancel the letter of credit without that consent.

 (c) If there is no stated expiration date or other provision that determines its duration, a letter of credit expires one year after its stated date of issuance or, if none is stated, after the date on which it is issued.

 (d) A letter of credit that states that it is perpetual expires five years after its stated date of issuance, or if none is stated, after the date on which it is issued.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑106; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. This section adopts the position taken by several courts, namely that letters of credit that are silent as to revocability are irrevocable. See, e. g., Weyerhaeuser Co. v. First Nat. Bank, 27 UCC Rep. Serv. 777 (S.D. Iowa 1979); West Va. Hous. Dev. Fund v. Sroka, 415 F. Supp. 1107 (W.D. Pa. 1976). This is the position of the current UCP (500). Given the usual commercial understanding and purpose of letters of credit, revocable letters of credit offer unhappy possibilities for misleading the parties who deal with them.

2. A person can consent to an amendment by implication. For example, a beneficiary that tenders documents for honor that conform to an amended letter of credit but not to the original letter of credit has probably consented to the amendment. By the same token an applicant that has procured the issuance of a transferable letter of credit has consented to its transfer and to performance under the letter of credit by a person to whom the beneficiary’s rights are duly transferred. If some, but not all of the persons involved in a letter of credit transaction consent to performance that does not strictly conform to the original letter of credit, those persons assume the risk that other nonconsenting persons may insist on strict compliance with the original letter of credit. Under subsection (b) those not consenting are not bound. For example, an issuer might agree to amend its letter of credit or honor documents presented after the expiration date in the belief that the applicant has consented or will consent to the amendment or will waive presentation after the original expiration date. If that belief is mistaken, the issuer is bound to the beneficiary by the terms of the letter of credit as amended or waived, even though it may be unable to recover from the applicant.

In general, the rights of a recognized transferee beneficiary cannot be altered without the transferee’s consent, but the same is not true of the rights of assignees of proceeds from the beneficiary. When the beneficiary makes a complete transfer of its interest that is effective under the terms for transfer established by the issuer, adviser, or other party controlling transfers, the beneficiary no longer has an interest in the letter of credit, and the transferee steps into the shoes of the beneficiary as the one with rights under the letter of credit. Section 5‑102(a)(3). When there is a partial transfer, both the original beneficiary and the transferee beneficiary have an interest in performance of the letter of credit and each expects that its rights will not be altered by amendment unless it consents.

The assignee of proceeds under a letter of credit from the beneficiary enjoys no such expectation. Notwithstanding an assignee’s notice to the issuer of the assignment of proceeds, the assignee is not a person protected by subsection (b). An assignee of proceeds should understand that its rights can be changed or completely extinguished by amendment or cancellation of the letter of credit. An assignee’s claim is precarious, for it depends entirely upon the continued existence of the letter of credit and upon the beneficiary’s preparation and presentation of documents that would entitle the beneficiary to honor under Section 5‑108.

3. The issuer’s right to cancel a revocable letter of credit does not free it from a duty to reimburse a nominated person who has honored, accepted, or undertaken a deferred obligation prior to receiving notice of the amendment or cancellation. Compare UCP Article 8.

4. Although all letters of credit should specify the date on which the issuer’s engagement expires, the failure to specify an expiration date does not invalidate the letter of credit, or diminish or relieve the obligation of any party with respect to the letter of credit. A letter of credit that may be revoked or terminated at the discretion of the issuer by notice to the beneficiary is not “perpetual.”

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑106. The material formerly found at Section 36‑5‑106(1) is now found at Section 36‑5‑106(a). That formerly found at Sections 36‑5‑106(2), (3) and (4) is now found at Section 36‑5‑106(b). Sections 36‑5‑106(c) and (d) are new as statutory provisions, although time limits on letters of credit were previously implied.

Section 36‑5‑106 represents several significant changes from prior law.

1. Revocability. Standard practice as reflected in UCP 500 presumes that letters of credit silent on the topic are irrevocable. Section 36‑5‑106(a) follows this presumption, altering former law which left the issue for court resolution.

2. Enforceability. Under former law, a letter of credit was “established” as to the “customer” when “sent” either to the customer or the beneficiary. It was established as to the beneficiary when received. Because “sent” means placed in the mail or transmitted by other means, under former law a letter of credit could be established as to the customer but cancelled before receipt by the beneficiary. This possibility is eliminated by the revision, which makes a letter of credit enforceable (and irrevocable unless termed revocable) when sent to the beneficiary.

3. Amendment. The concept of former Section 36‑5‑106(2), limiting amendment of an issued letter of credit, is retained in Section 36‑5‑106(b), but the wording is modified to reflect the single act of sending as triggering enforceability to both applicant and beneficiary.

Section 36‑5‑106(b) also clarifies that, in cases in which there is a confirmer, the confirmer’s consent is also necessary to amend a letter of credit.

Former Section 36‑5‑106(4) provided reimbursement rights to parties honoring letters of credit despite amendments of which they had no notice. This provision is subsumed (and rights to reimbursement retained) by the requirement of Section 36‑5‑106(b) that parties are not bound by amendments to which they do not consent.

4. Writings. The effects of former Section 36‑5‑106 were tied to writings by the definition of “letter of credit” and the concept of “authorized written advice.” Section 36‑5‑106 in its present form, employing the phrase “sends or otherwise transmits,” eliminates this reliance on writings. The former concept of “authorized written advice” is dropped in light of the concept of “record” in Section 36‑5‑104, which eliminates any meaningful distinction between an advice and the letter of credit itself.

CROSS REFERENCES

Letter of credit in contract for sale of goods, see Section 36‑2‑325.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 177, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 370, 372 to 376.

NOTES OF DECISIONS

Amendment 1

1. Amendment

A party who established a letter of credit consented only to the original letter of credit, which did not provide for beneficiary to reinstate it some 3 weeks after its discharge. Beneficiary’s return of some funds it withdrew cannot be considered to have obligated the bank to honor the later draft under the letter of credit, since when rights are established under an irrevocable letter of credit, any modification to allow return of funds and reinstatement of payment obligations after statutory discharge requires the consent of all the parties because any such new letter of credit even if it was under the terms of the original would impose new, albeit similar, obligations. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149.

Under this section [Section 36‑5‑106(2)] once rights are established under an irrevocable letter of credit, all parties to letter must consent to any modification to allow return of funds and reinstatement of payment obligations after letter has been statutorily discharged pursuant to beneficiary’s draft for entire amount of letter; thus, where beneficiary of letter of credit erroneously issued draft for entire amount of letter, and then attempted to restore letter by sending check to bank in amount of funds overdrawn, bank’s cashing of check did not effectively reinstate letter of credit since there was no evidence that buyer of letter consented to either modification of original letter of credit or creation of new one. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149.

**SECTION 36‑5‑107.** Confirmer, nominated person, and adviser.

 (a) A confirmer is directly obligated on a letter of credit and has the rights and obligations of an issuer to the extent of its confirmation. The confirmer also has rights against and obligations to the issuer as if the issuer were an applicant and the confirmer had issued the letter of credit at the request and for the account of the issuer.

 (b) A nominated person who is not a confirmer is not obligated to honor or otherwise give value for a presentation.

 (c) A person requested to advise may decline to act as an adviser. An adviser that is not a confirmer is not obligated to honor or give value for a presentation. An adviser undertakes to the issuer and to the beneficiary accurately to advise the terms of the letter of credit, confirmation, amendment, or advice received by that person and undertakes to the beneficiary to check the apparent authenticity of the request to advise. Even if the advice is inaccurate, the letter of credit, confirmation, or amendment is enforceable as issued.

 (d) A person who notifies a transferee beneficiary of the terms of a letter of credit, confirmation, amendment, or advice has the rights and obligations of an adviser under subsection (c). The terms in the notice to the transferee beneficiary may differ from the terms in any notice to the transferor beneficiary to the extent permitted by the letter of credit, confirmation, amendment, or advice received by the person who so notifies.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑107; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. A confirmer has the rights and obligations identified in Section 5‑108. Accordingly, unless the context otherwise requires, the terms “confirmer” and “confirmation” should be read into this article wherever the terms “issuer” and “ letter of credit” appear.

A confirmer that has paid in accordance with the terms and conditions of the letter of credit is entitled to reimbursement by the issuer even if the beneficiary committed fraud (see Section 5‑109(a)(1)(ii)) and, in that sense, has greater rights against the issuer than the beneficiary has. To be entitled to reimbursement from the issuer under the typical confirmed letter of credit, the confirmer must submit conforming documents, but the confirmer’s presentation to the issuer need not be made before the expiration date of the letter of credit.

A letter of credit confirmation has been analogized to a guarantee of issuer performance, to a parallel letter of credit issued by the confirmer for the account of the issuer or the letter of credit applicant or both, and to a back‑to‑back letter of credit in which the confirmer is a kind of beneficiary of the original issuer’s letter of credit. Like letter of credit undertakings, confirmations are both unique and flexible, so that no one of these analogies is perfect, but unless otherwise indicated in the letter of credit or confirmation, a confirmer should be viewed by the letter of credit issuer and the beneficiary as an issuer of a parallel letter of credit for the account of the original letter of credit issuer. Absent a direct agreement between the applicant and a confirmer, normally the obligations of a confirmer are to the issuer not the applicant, but the applicant might have a right to injunction against a confirmer under Section 5‑109 or warranty claim under Section 5‑110, and either might have claims against the other under Section 5‑117.

2. No one has a duty to advise until that person agrees to be an adviser or undertakes to act in accordance with the instructions of the issuer. Except where there is a prior agreement to serve or where the silence of the adviser would be an acceptance of an offer to contract, a person’s failure to respond to a request to advise a letter of credit does not in and of itself create any liability, nor does it establish a relationship of issuer and adviser between the two. Since there is no duty to advise a letter of credit in the absence of a prior agreement, there can be no duty to advise it timely or at any particular time. When the adviser manifests its agreement to advise by actually doing so (as is normally the case), the adviser cannot have violated any duty to advise in a timely way. This analysis is consistent with the result of Sound of Market Street v. Continental Bank International, 819 F.2d 384 (3d Cir. 1987) which held that there is no such duty. This section takes no position on the reasoning of that case, but does not overrule the result. By advising or agreeing to advise a letter of credit, the adviser assumes a duty to the issuer and to the beneficiary accurately to report what it has received from the issuer, but, beyond determining the apparent authenticity of the letter, an adviser has no duty to investigate the accuracy of the message it has received from the issuer. “Checking” the apparent authenticity of the request to advise means only that the prospective adviser must attempt to authenticate the message (e.g., by “testing” the telex that comes from the purported issuer), and if it is unable to authenticate the message must report that fact to the issuer and, if it chooses to advise the message, to the beneficiary. By proper agreement, an adviser may disclaim its obligation under this section.

3. An issuer may issue a letter of credit which the adviser may advise with different terms. The issuer may then believe that it has undertaken a certain engagement, yet the text in the hands of the beneficiary will contain different terms, and the beneficiary would not be entitled to honor if the documents it submitted did not comply with the terms of the letter of credit as originally issued. On the other hand, if the adviser also confirmed the letter of credit, then as a confirmer it will be independently liable on the letter of credit as advised and confirmed. If in that situation the beneficiary’s ultimate presentation entitled it to honor under the terms of the confirmation but not under those in the original letter of credit, the confirmer would have to honor but might not be entitled to reimbursement from the issuer.

4. When the issuer nominates another person to “pay,” “negotiate,” or otherwise to take up the documents and give value, there can be confusion about the legal status of the nominated person. In rare cases the person might actually be an agent of the issuer and its act might be the act of the issuer itself. In most cases the nominated person is not an agent of the issuer and has no authority to act on the issuer’s behalf. Its “nomination” allows the beneficiary to present to it and earns it certain rights to payment under Section 5‑109 that others do not enjoy. For example, when an issuer issues a “freely negotiable credit,” it contemplates that banks or others might take up documents under that credit and advance value against them, and it is agreeing to pay those persons but only if the presentation to the issuer made by the nominated person complies with the credit. Usually there will be no agreement to pay, negotiate, or to serve in any other capacity by the nominated person, therefore the nominated person will have the right to decline to take the documents. It may return them or agree merely to act as a forwarding agent for the documents but without giving value against them or taking any responsibility for their conformity to the letter of credit.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑107. Section 36‑5‑107 addresses concepts similar to those of former Section 36‑5‑107 but reorganizes the text and shifts the organizing emphasis from the concepts of advice and confirmation to the roles of confirmer (revised from the former concept of “confirming bank”), nominated person (a new concept) and adviser (revised from the former concept of “advising bank”).

The material formerly found at Section 36‑5‑107(1) is now found at Section 36‑5‑107(c). That found at Section 36‑5‑107(2) is now at Section 36‑5‑107(a) That found at Section 36‑5‑107(3) is now included in Section 36‑5‑107(a). Former Section 36‑5‑107(4), allocating to the customer (absent contrary agreement) all risk of transmission, translation and interpretation of communications relating to letters of credit, has been omitted. Adviser. Former Section 36‑5‑107(1) limited the adviser function to banks. Current Section 36‑5‑107(c) and the definition of “adviser” at Section 36‑5‑102(A)(1) extend the function to any person.

The current Section adds a new undertaking of advisers, running to issuers and beneficiaries, to “check the apparent authenticity” of requests to advise.

The adviser’s former duty to notify of issuance is expanded to “advise the terms of the letter of credit, confirmation, amendment, or advice received”.

Former rules of freedom from obligation to honor, accuracy of advice, and enforceability despite inaccurate advice are retained.

Current Section 36‑5‑107(c) clarifies that a person is not bound to accept the role of adviser.

Current Section 36‑5‑107(d) imposes the status of adviser on a person notifying a transferee beneficiary of the terms of a letter of credit, confirmation, amendment or advice.

Confirmer. Former Section 36‑5‑107(2) limited the confirmer function to banks. Current Section 36‑5‑107(a) and the definition found at Section 36‑5‑107(a)(4) extend the function to any person. The former rule that a confirmer becomes directly liable, with the duties of an issuer on a letter of credit (see Section 36‑5‑108), is retained. Current Section 36‑5‑107(a) clarifies that a confirmer honoring a letter of credit in accordance with its terms has rights against the issuer (including reimbursement) upon presenting confirming documents to the issuer, as if the issuer were an applicant. The status of confirmers is discussed in detail in the Official Comment.

Nominated person. This is a new term, defined at Section 36‑5‑102(a)(11). Under this newly‑codified concept, a beneficiary may make a presentation to a nominated person, and that person (unless also a confirmer) may perform or not within its own discretion. Should it perform, it is entitled to reimbursement by the issuer.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10, 191.20.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 179, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 376, 380.

RESEARCH REFERENCES

Forms

Am. Jur. Pl. & Pr. Forms Uniform Commercial Code Section 5:2 , Introductory Comments.

**SECTION 36‑5‑108.** Issuer ‘ s rights and obligations.

 (a) Except as otherwise provided in Section 36‑5‑109, an issuer shall honor a presentation that, as determined by the standard practice referred to in subsection (e), appears on its face strictly to comply with the terms and conditions of the letter of credit. Except as otherwise provided in Section 36‑5‑113 and unless otherwise agreed with the applicant, an issuer shall dishonor a presentation that does not appear so to comply.

 (b) An issuer has a reasonable time after presentation, but not beyond the end of the seventh business day of the issuer after the day of its receipt of documents:

 (1) to honor,

 (2) if the letter of credit provides for honor to be completed more than seven business days after presentation, to accept a draft or incur a deferred obligation, or

 (3) to give notice to the presenter of discrepancies in the presentation.

 (c) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d), an issuer is precluded from asserting as a basis for dishonor any discrepancy if timely notice is not given, or any discrepancy not stated in the notice if timely notice is given.

 (d) Failure to give the notice specified in subsection (b) or to mention fraud, forgery, or expiration in the notice does not preclude the issuer from asserting as a basis for dishonor fraud or forgery as described in Section 36‑5‑109(a) or expiration of the letter of credit before presentation.

 (e) An issuer shall observe standard practice of financial institutions that regularly issue letters of credit. Determination of the issuer’s observance of the standard practice is a matter of interpretation for the court. The court shall offer the parties a reasonable opportunity to present evidence of the standard practice.

 (f) An issuer is not responsible for:

 (1) the performance or nonperformance of the underlying contract, arrangement, or transaction,

 (2) an act or omission of others, or

 (3) observance or knowledge of the usage of a particular trade other than the standard practice referred to in subsection (e).

 (g) If an undertaking constituting a letter of credit under Section 36‑5‑102(a)(10) contains nondocumentary conditions, an issuer shall disregard the nondocumentary conditions and treat them as if they were not stated.

 (h) An issuer that has dishonored a presentation shall return the documents or hold them at the disposal of, and send advice to that effect to, the presenter.

 (i) An issuer that has honored a presentation as permitted or required by this chapter:

 (1) is entitled to be reimbursed by the applicant in immediately available funds not later than the date of its payment of funds;

 (2) takes the documents free of claims of the beneficiary or presenter;

 (3) is precluded from asserting a right of recourse on a draft under Sections 36‑3‑414 and 36‑3‑415;

 (4) except as otherwise provided in Sections 36‑5‑110 and 36‑5‑117, is precluded from restitution of money paid or other value given by mistake to the extent the mistake concerns discrepancies in the documents or tender which are apparent on the face of the presentation; and

 (5) is discharged to the extent of its performance under the letter of credit unless the issuer honored a presentation in which a required signature of a beneficiary was forged.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑108; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. This section combines some of the duties previously included in Sections 5‑114 and 5‑109. Because a confirmer has the rights and duties of an issuer, this section applies equally to a confirmer and an issuer. See Section 5‑107(a).

The standard of strict compliance governs the issuer’s obligation to the beneficiary and to the applicant. By requiring that a “presentation” appear strictly to comply, the section requires not only that the documents themselves appear on their face strictly to comply, but also that the other terms of the letter of credit such as those dealing with the time and place of presentation are strictly complied with. Typically, a letter of credit will provide that presentation is timely if made to the issuer, confirmer, or any other nominated person prior to expiration of the letter of credit. Accordingly, a nominated person that has honored a demand or otherwise given value before expiration will have a right to reimbursement from the issuer even though presentation to the issuer is made after the expiration of the letter of credit. Conversely, where the beneficiary negotiates documents to one who is not a nominated person, the beneficiary or that person acting on behalf of the beneficiary must make presentation to a nominated person, confirmer, or issuer prior to the expiration date.

This section does not impose a bifurcated standard under which an issuer’s right to reimbursement might be broader than a beneficiary’s right to honor. However, the explicit deference to standard practice in Section 5‑108(a) and (e) and elsewhere expands issuers’ rights of reimbursement where that practice so provides. Also, issuers can and often do contract with their applicants for expanded rights of reimbursement. Where that is done, the beneficiary will have to meet a more stringent standard of compliance as to the issuer than the issuer will have to meet as to the applicant. Similarly, a nominated person may have reimbursement and other rights against the issuer based on this article, the UCP, bank‑to‑bank reimbursement rules, or other agreement or undertaking of the issuer. These rights may allow the nominated person to recover from the issuer even when the nominated person would have no right to obtain honor under the letter of credit.

The section adopts strict compliance, rather than the standard that commentators have called “substantial compliance,” the standard arguably applied in Banco Espaqol de Credito v. State Street Bank and Trust Company, 385 F.2d 230 (1st Cir. 1967) and Flagship Cruises Ltd. v. New England Merchants Nat. Bank, 569 F.2d 699 (1st Cir. 1978). Strict compliance does not mean slavish conformity to the terms of the letter of credit. For example, standard practice (what issuers do) may recognize certain presentations as complying that an unschooled layman would regard as discrepant. By adopting standard practice as a way of measuring strict compliance, this article indorses the conclusion of the court in New Braunfels Nat. Bank v. Odiorne, 780 S.W.2d 313 (Tex.Ct.App. 1989) (beneficiary could collect when draft requested payment on ‘Letter of Credit No. 86‑122‑5’ and letter of credit specified ‘Letter of Credit No. 86‑122‑S’ holding strict compliance does not demand oppressive perfectionism). The section also indorses the result in Tosco Corp. v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., 723 F.2d 1242 (6th Cir. 1983). The letter of credit in that case called for “drafts Drawn under Bank of Clarksville Letter of Credit Number 105.” The draft presented stated “drawn under Bank of Clarksville, Clarksville, Tennessee letter of Credit No. 105.” The court correctly found that despite the change of upper case “L” to a lower case “l” and the use of the word “No.” instead of “Number,” and despite the addition of the words “Clarksville, Tennessee,” the presentation conformed. Similarly a document addressed by a foreign person to General Motors as “Jeneral Motors” would strictly conform in the absence of other defects.

Identifying and determining compliance with standard practice are matters of interpretation for the court, not for the jury. As with similar rules in Sections 4A‑202(c) and 2‑302, it is hoped that there will be more consistency in the outcomes and speedier resolution of disputes if the responsibility for determining the nature and scope of standard practice is granted to the court, not to a jury. Granting the court authority to make these decisions will also encourage the salutary practice of courts’ granting summary judgment in circumstances where there are no significant factual disputes. The statute encourages outcomes such as American Coleman Co. v. Intrawest Bank, 887 F.2d 1382 (10th Cir. 1989), where summary judgment was granted.

In some circumstances standards may be established between the issuer and the applicant by agreement or by custom that would free the issuer from liability that it might otherwise have. For example, an applicant might agree that the issuer would have no duty whatsoever to examine documents on certain presentations (e.g., those below a certain dollar amount). Where the transaction depended upon the issuer’s payment in a very short time period (e.g., on the same day or within a few hours of presentation), the issuer and the applicant might agree to reduce the issuer’s responsibility for failure to discover discrepancies. By the same token, an agreement between the applicant and the issuer might permit the issuer to examine documents exclusively by electronic or electro‑optical means. Neither those agreements nor others like them explicitly made by issuers and applicants violate the terms of Section 5‑108(a) or (b) or Section 5‑103(c).

2. Section 5‑108(a) balances the need of the issuer for time to examine the documents against the possibility that the examiner (at the urging of the applicant or for fear that it will not be reimbursed) will take excessive time to search for defects. What is a “reasonable time” is not extended to accommodate an issuer’s procuring a waiver from the applicant. See Article 14c of the UCP.

Under both the UCC and the UCP the issuer has a reasonable time to honor or give notice. The outside limit of that time is measured in business days under the UCC and in banking days under the UCP, a difference that will rarely be significant. Neither business nor banking days are defined in Article 5, but a court may find useful analogies in Regulation CC, 12 CFR 229.2, in state law outside of the Uniform Commercial Code, and in Article 4.

Examiners must note that the seven‑day period is not a safe harbor. The time within which the issuer must give notice is the lesser of a reasonable time or seven business days. Where there are few documents (as, for example, with the mine run standby letter of credit), the reasonable time would be less than seven days. If more than a reasonable time is consumed in examination, no timely notice is possible. What is a “reasonable time” is to be determined by examining the behavior of those in the business of examining documents, mostly banks. Absent prior agreement of the issuer, one could not expect a bank issuer to examine documents while the beneficiary waited in the lobby if the normal practice was to give the documents to a person who had the opportunity to examine those together with many others in an orderly process. That the applicant has not yet paid the issuer or that the applicant’s account with the issuer is insufficient to cover the amount of the draft is not a basis for extension of the time period.

This section does not preclude the issuer from contacting the applicant during its examination; however, the decision to honor rests with the issuer, and it has no duty to seek a waiver from the applicant or to notify the applicant of receipt of the documents. If the issuer dishonors a conforming presentation, the beneficiary will be entitled to the remedies under Section 5‑111, irrespective of the applicant’s views.

Even though the person to whom presentation is made cannot conduct a reasonable examination of documents within the time after presentation and before the expiration date, presentation establishes the parties’ rights. The beneficiary’s right to honor or the issuer’s right to dishonor arises upon presentation at the place provided in the letter of credit even though it might take the person to whom presentation has been made several days to determine whether honor or dishonor is the proper course. The issuer’s time for honor or giving notice of dishonor may be extended or shortened by a term in the letter of credit. The time for the issuer’s performance may be otherwise modified or waived in accordance with Section 5‑106.

The issuer’s time to inspect runs from the time of its “receipt of documents.” Documents are considered to be received only when they are received at the place specified for presentation by the issuer or other party to whom presentation is made.

Failure of the issuer to act within the time permitted by subsection (b) constitutes dishonor. Because of the preclusion in subsection (c) and the liability that the issuer may incur under Section 5‑111 for wrongful dishonor, the effect of such a silent dishonor may ultimately be the same as though the issuer had honored, i.e., it may owe damages in the amount drawn but unpaid under the letter of credit.

3. The requirement that the issuer send notice of the discrepancies or be precluded from asserting discrepancies is new to Article 5. It is taken from the similar provision in the UCP and is intended to promote certainty and finality.

The section thus substitutes a strict preclusion principle for the doctrines of waiver and estoppel that might otherwise apply under Section 1‑103. It rejects the reasoning in Flagship Cruises Ltd. v. New England Merchants’ Nat. Bank, 569 F.2d 699 (1st Cir. 1978) and Wing On Bank Ltd. v. American Nat. Bank & Trust Co., 457 F.2d 328 (5th Cir. 1972) where the issuer was held to be estopped only if the beneficiary relied on the issuer’s failure to give notice.

Assume, for example, that the beneficiary presented documents to the issuer shortly before the letter of credit expired, in circumstances in which the beneficiary could not have cured any discrepancy before expiration. Under the reasoning of Flagship and Wing On, the beneficiary’s inability to cure, even if it had received notice, would absolve the issuer of its failure to give notice. The virtue of the preclusion obligation adopted in this section is that it forecloses litigation about reliance and detriment.

Even though issuers typically give notice of the discrepancy of tardy presentation when presentation is made after the expiration of a credit, they are not required to give that notice and the section permits them to raise late presentation as a defect despite their failure to give that notice.

4. To act within a reasonable time, the issuer must normally give notice without delay after the examining party makes its decision. If the examiner decides to dishonor on the first day, it would be obliged to notify the beneficiary shortly thereafter, perhaps on the same business day. This rule accepts the reasoning in cases such as Datapoint Corp. v. M & I Bank, 665 F. Supp. 722 (W.D. Wis. 1987) and Esso Petroleum Canada, Div. of Imperial Oil, Ltd. v. Security Pacific Bank, 710 F. Supp. 275 (D. Ore. 1989).

The section deprives the examining party of the right simply to sit on a presentation that is made within seven days of expiration. The section requires the examiner to examine the documents and make a decision and, having made a decision to dishonor, to communicate promptly with the presenter. Nevertheless, a beneficiary who presents documents shortly before the expiration of a letter of credit runs the risk that it will never have the opportunity to cure any discrepancies.

5. Confirmers, other nominated persons, and collecting banks acting for beneficiaries can be presenters and, when so, are entitled to the notice provided in subsection (b). Even nominated persons who have honored or given value against an earlier presentation of the beneficiary and are themselves seeking reimbursement or honor need notice of discrepancies in the hope that they may be able to procure complying documents. The issuer has the obligations imposed by this section whether the issuer’s performance is characterized as “reimbursement” of a nominated person or as “honor.”

6. In many cases a letter of credit authorizes presentation by the beneficiary to someone other than the issuer. Sometimes that person is identified as a “payor” or “paying bank,” or as an “acceptor” or “accepting bank,” in other cases as a “negotiating bank,” and in other cases there will be no specific designation. The section does not impose any duties on a person other than the issuer or confirmer, however a nominated person or other person may have liability under this article or at common law if it fails to perform an express or implied agreement with the beneficiary.

7. The issuer’s obligation to honor runs not only to the beneficiary but also to the applicant. It is possible that an applicant who has made a favorable contract with the beneficiary will be injured by the issuer’s wrongful dishonor. Except to the extent that the contract between the issuer and the applicant limits that liability, the issuer will have liability to the applicant for wrongful dishonor under Section 5‑111 as a matter of contract law. A good faith extension of the time in Section 5‑108(b) by agreement between the issuer and beneficiary binds the applicant even if the applicant is not consulted or does not consent to the extension.

The issuer’s obligation to dishonor when there is no apparent compliance with the letter of credit runs only to the applicant. No other party to the transaction can complain if the applicant waives compliance with terms or conditions of the letter of credit or agrees to a less stringent standard for compliance than that supplied by this article. Except as otherwise agreed with the applicant, an issuer may dishonor a noncomplying presentation despite an applicant’s waiver.

Waiver of discrepancies by an issuer or an applicant in one or more presentations does not waive similar discrepancies in a future presentation. Neither the issuer nor the beneficiary can reasonably rely upon honor over past waivers as a basis for concluding that a future defective presentation will justify honor. The reasoning of Courtaulds of North America Inc. v. North Carolina Nat. Bank, 528 F.2d 802 (4th Cir. 1975) is accepted and that expressed in Schweibish v. Pontchartrain State Bank, 389 So.2d 731 (La.App. 1980) and Titanium Metals Corp. v. Space Metals, Inc., 529 P.2d 431 (Utah 1974) is rejected.

8. The standard practice referred to in subsection (e) includes (i) international practice set forth in or referenced by the Uniform Customs and Practice, (ii) other practice rules published by associations of financial institutions, and (iii) local and regional practice. It is possible that standard practice will vary from one place to another. Where there are conflicting practices, the parties should indicate which practice governs their rights. A practice may be overridden by agreement or course of dealing. See Section 1‑205(4).

9. The responsibility of the issuer under a letter of credit is to examine documents and to make a prompt decision to honor or dishonor based upon that examination. Nondocumentary conditions have no place in this regime and are better accommodated under contract or suretyship law and practice. In requiring that nondocumentary conditions in letters of credit be ignored as surplusage, Article 5 remains aligned with the UCP (see UCP 500 Article 13c), approves cases like Pringle‑Associated Mortgage Corp. v. Southern National Bank, 571 F.2d 871, 874 (5th Cir. 1978), and rejects the reasoning in cases such as Sherwood & Roberts, Inc. v. First Security Bank, 682 P.2d 149 (Mont. 1984).

Subsection (g) recognizes that letters of credit sometimes contain nondocumentary terms or conditions. Conditions such as a term prohibiting “shipment on vessels more than 15 years old,” are to be disregarded and treated as surplusage. Similarly, a requirement that there be an award by a “duly appointed arbitrator” would not require the issuer to determine whether the arbitrator had been “duly appointed.” Likewise a term in a standby letter of credit that provided for differing forms of certification depending upon the particular type of default does not oblige the issuer independently to determine which kind of default has occurred. These conditions must be disregarded by the issuer. Where the nondocumentary conditions are central and fundamental to the issuer’s obligation (as for example a condition that would require the issuer to determine in fact whether the beneficiary had performed the underlying contract or whether the applicant had defaulted) their inclusion may remove the undertaking from the scope of Article 5 entirely. See Section 5‑102(a)(10) and Comment 6 to Section 5‑102.

Subsection (g) would not permit the beneficiary or the issuer to disregard terms in the letter of credit such as place, time, and mode of presentation. The rule in subsection (g) is intended to prevent an issuer from deciding or even investigating extrinsic facts, but not from consulting the clock, the calendar, the relevant law and practice, or its own general knowledge of documentation or transactions of the type underlying a particular letter of credit.

Even though nondocumentary conditions must be disregarded in determining compliance of a presentation (and thus in determining the issuer’s duty to the beneficiary), an issuer that has promised its applicant that it will honor only on the occurrence of those nondocumentary conditions may have liability to its applicant for disregarding the conditions.

10. Subsection (f) condones an issuer’s ignorance of “any usage of a particular trade”; that trade is the trade of the applicant, beneficiary, or others who may be involved in the underlying transaction. The issuer is expected to know usage that is commonly encountered in the course of document examination. For example, an issuer should know the common usage with respect to documents in the maritime shipping trade but would not be expected to understand synonyms used in a particular trade for product descriptions appearing in a letter of credit or an invoice.

11. Where the issuer’s performance is the delivery of an item of value other than money, the applicant’s reimbursement obligation would be to make the “item of value” available to the issuer.

12. An issuer is entitled to reimbursement from the applicant after honor of a forged or fraudulent drawing if honor was permitted under Section 5‑109(a).

13. The last clause of Section 5‑108(i)(5) deals with a special case in which the fraud is not committed by the beneficiary, but is committed by a stranger to the transaction who forges the beneficiary’s signature. If the issuer pays against documents on which a required signature of the beneficiary is forged, it remains liable to the true beneficiary.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

Former Section 5‑108, “Notation credit; exhaustion of credit,” has been omitted as obsolete.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑108. This Section replaces former Sections 36‑5‑109(1) and (2), and moves to this location the material formerly found at Sections 36‑5‑114(1) (duty to honor despite underlying contract, now found at Section 36‑5‑108(a)), 36‑5‑114(3) (issuer’s right to reimbursement, now found at Section 36‑5‑108(i)), 36‑5‑112(1) (time allowed for inspection, now found at 36‑5‑108(b) and (c)) and 36‑5‑112(2) (disposition of dishonored documents, now found at Section 36‑5‑108(h)).

The matters addressed in this Section are substantially clarified, and a number of changes are made in the law.

Standard of compliance. Under former Section 36‑5‑109, some courts read the issuer’s duty of inspection of presented documents as one of substantial compliance. This Section clarifies that the standard is one of “strict compliance.” See Section 36‑5‑108(a) (“an issuer . . . shall honor a presentation that . . . appears on its face strictly to comply” with the terms of its letter of credit and “shall dishonor a presentation that does not appear so to comply.”). Time to honor or give notice. Former Section 36‑5‑112(1) permitted honor to be deferred until the third “banking day” following presentation (unless otherwise agreed). The current Section requires honor within a “reasonable time” no later than the seventh business day following presentation, unless otherwise agreed. See Section 36‑5‑108(b).

Notice of discrepancies. A dishonoring issuer must notify the presenter of discrepancies and do so timely according to the rules of Section 36‑5‑108(b). Failure to notify timely of a discrepancy prevents reliance on such discrepancy as a reason for dishonor. See Section 36‑5‑108(c). This provision, new to Article 5, is congruent with standard practice under UCP 500. See Official Comment 3 to this Section. Failure to give notice of discrepancies does not preclude the issuer from asserting fraud, forgery or expiration of a letter of credit as a justification for dishonor. See Section 36‑5‑108(d).

Standard practice. Former Section 36‑5‑109(3), which relieved nonbank issuers of knowledge of standard practice, has been omitted, replaced by Section 36‑5‑108(e), which requires all issuers to observe standard practice of financial institutions that regularly issue letters of credit. What constitutes standard practice is determined by the court following an evidentiary hearing. The incorporation of standard practice in this Section is a major change in Article 5.

Independence principle; nondocumentary conditions. Sections 36‑5‑108(f) and (g) codify the independence principle, implied under former law, that rights and obligations under a letter of credit are limited to those arising under the credit itself, and are independent of matters relating to the underlying contract. Pursuant to this principle, nondocumentary conditions appearing in letters of credit are to be ignored by the issuer. Similarly, the issuer is required to honor a conforming presentation despite breach of the underlying contract by the beneficiary.

Instruments titled “letter of credit” but including mandatory nondocumentary conditions of a nature which for some reason cannot be ignored, are not letters of credit under Article 5 but may be guarantees or suretyships.

Right to reimbursement. Under Section 36‑5‑108(I)(1), the issuer’s right to reimbursement under a letter of credit accrues not later than the date on which value is given in connection with an appropriate honor of the credit. This alters the rule of former Section 36‑5‑114(3), which appeared to permit the parties to vary the issuer’s right by agreement.

CROSS REFERENCES

Duty of collecting bank, see Section 36‑4‑202.

Payor bank’s responsibility for late return of item, see Section 36‑4‑302.

Privilege of presenting bank to deal with goods and security interest for expenses, see Section 36‑4‑504.

Responsibility of presenting bank for documents and goods, see Section 36‑4‑503.
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NOTES OF DECISIONS

Dishonor 1

1. Dishonor

Bank properly honored beneficiary’s draft for entire amount of letter of credit pursuant to its statutory obligation under former Section 36‑5‑114(1) to honor facially complying drafts; thus, notwithstanding beneficiary’s attempt to reinstate letter properly discharged by returning portion of funds, bank’s dishonor of subsequent draft in amount beneficiary had attempted to return did not violate that letter. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149. Banks And Banking 191.10; Banks And Banking 191.15

**SECTION 36‑5‑109.** Fraud and forgery.

 (a) If a presentation is made that appears on its face strictly to comply with the terms and conditions of the letter of credit, but a required document is forged or materially fraudulent, or honor of the presentation would facilitate a material fraud by the beneficiary on the issuer or applicant:

 (1) the issuer shall honor the presentation, if honor is demanded by (i) a nominated person who has given value in good faith and without notice of forgery or material fraud, (ii) a confirmer who has honored its confirmation in good faith, (iii) a holder in due course of a draft drawn under the letter of credit which was taken after acceptance by the issuer or nominated person, or (iv) an assignee of the issuer’s or nominated person’s deferred obligation that was taken for value and without notice of forgery or material fraud after the obligation was incurred by the issuer or nominated person; and

 (2) the issuer, acting in good faith, may honor or dishonor the presentation in any other case.

 (b) If an applicant claims that a required document is forged or materially fraudulent or that honor of the presentation would facilitate a material fraud by the beneficiary on the issuer or applicant, a court of competent jurisdiction may temporarily or permanently enjoin the issuer from honoring a presentation or grant similar relief against the issuer or other persons only if the court finds that:

 (1) the relief is not prohibited under the law applicable to an accepted draft or deferred obligation incurred by the issuer;

 (2) a beneficiary, issuer, or nominated person who may be adversely affected is adequately protected against loss that it may suffer because the relief is granted;

 (3) all of the conditions to entitle a person to the relief under the law of this State have been met; and

 (4) on the basis of the information submitted to the court, the applicant is more likely than not to succeed under its claim of forgery or material fraud and the person demanding honor does not qualify for protection under subsection (a)(1).

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑109; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. This recodification makes clear that fraud must be found either in the documents or must have been committed by the beneficiary on the issuer or applicant. See Cromwell v. Commerce & Energy Bank, 464 So.2d 721 (La. 1985).

Secondly, it makes clear that fraud must be “material.” Necessarily courts must decide the breadth and width of “materiality.” The use of the word requires that the fraudulent aspect of a document be material to a purchaser of that document or that the fraudulent act be significant to the participants in the underlying transaction. Assume, for example, that the beneficiary has a contract to deliver 1,000 barrels of salad oil. Knowing that it has delivered only 998, the beneficiary nevertheless submits an invoice showing 1,000 barrels. If two barrels in a 1,000 barrel shipment would be an insubstantial and immaterial breach of the underlying contract, the beneficiary’s act, though possibly fraudulent, is not materially so and would not justify an injunction. Conversely, the knowing submission of those invoices upon delivery of only five barrels would be materially fraudulent. The courts must examine the underlying transaction when there is an allegation of material fraud, for only by examining that transaction can one determine whether a document is fraudulent or the beneficiary has committed fraud and, if so, whether the fraud was material.

Material fraud by the beneficiary occurs only when the beneficiary has no colorable right to expect honor and where there is no basis in fact to support such a right to honor. The section indorses articulations such as those stated in Intraworld Indus. v. Girard Trust Bank, 336 A.2d 316 (Pa. 1975), Roman Ceramics Corp. v. People’s Nat. Bank, 714 F.2d 1207 (3d Cir. 1983), and similar decisions and embraces certain decisions under Section 5‑114 that relied upon the phrase “fraud in the transaction.” Some of these decisions have been summarized as follows in Ground Air Transfer v. Westate’s Airlines, 899 F.2d 1269, 1272‑73 (1st Cir. 1990):

We have said throughout that courts may not “normally” issue an injunction because of an important exception to the general “no injunction” rule. The exception, as we also explained in Itek, 730 F.2d at 24‑25, concerns “fraud” so serious as to make it obviously pointless and unjust to permit the beneficiary to obtain the money. Where the circumstances “plainly” show that the underlying contract forbids the beneficiary to call a letter of credit, Itek, 730 F.2d at 24; where they show that the contract deprives the beneficiary of even a “colorable” right to do so, id., at 25; where the contract and circumstances reveal that the beneficiary’s demand for payment has “absolutely no basis in fact,” id.; see Dynamics Corp. of America, 356 F. Supp. at 999; where the beneficiary’s conduct has “so vitiated the entire transaction that the legitimate purposes of the independence of the issuer’s obligation would no longer be served,” Itek, 730 F.2d at 25 (quoting Roman Ceramics Corp. v. Peoples National Bank, 714 F.2d 1207, 1212 n.12, 1215 (3d Cir. 1983) (quoting Intraworld Indus., 336 A.2d at 324‑25)); then a court may enjoin payment.

2. Subsection (a)(2) makes clear that the issuer may honor in the face of the applicant’s claim of fraud. The subsection also makes clear what was not stated in former Section 5‑114, that the issuer may dishonor and defend that dishonor by showing fraud or forgery of the kind stated in subsection (a). Because issuers may be liable for wrongful dishonor if they are unable to prove forgery or material fraud, presumably most issuers will choose to honor despite applicant’s claims of fraud or forgery unless the applicant procures an injunction. Merely because the issuer has a right to dishonor and to defend that dishonor by showing forgery or material fraud does not mean it has a duty to the applicant to dishonor. The applicant’s normal recourse is to procure an injunction, if the applicant is unable to procure an injunction, it will have a claim against the issuer only in the rare case in which it can show that the issuer did not honor in good faith.

3. Whether a beneficiary can commit fraud by presenting a draft under a clean letter of credit (one calling only for a draft and no other documents) has been much debated. Under the current formulation it would be possible but difficult for there to be fraud in such a presentation. If the applicant were able to show that the beneficiary were committing material fraud on the applicant in the underlying transaction, then payment would facilitate a material fraud by the beneficiary on the applicant and honor could be enjoined. The courts should be skeptical of claims of fraud by one who has signed a “suicide” or clean credit and thus granted a beneficiary the right to draw by mere presentation of a draft.

4. The standard for injunctive relief is high, and the burden remains on the applicant to show, by evidence and not by mere allegation, that such relief is warranted. Some courts have enjoined payments on letters of credit on insufficient showing by the applicant. For example, in Griffin Cos. v. First Nat. Bank, 374 N.W.2d 768 (Minn.App. 1985), the court enjoined payment under a standby letter of credit, basing its decision on plaintiff’s allegation, rather than competent evidence, of fraud.

There are at least two ways to prohibit injunctions against honor under this section after acceptance of a draft by the issuer. First is to define honor (see Section 5‑102(a)(8)) in the particular letter of credit to occur upon acceptance and without regard to later payment of the acceptance. Second is explicitly to agree that the applicant has no right to an injunction after acceptance—whether or not the acceptance constitutes honor.

5. Although the statute deals principally with injunctions against honor, it also cautions against granting “similar relief” and the same principles apply when the applicant or issuer attempts to achieve the same legal outcome by injunction against presentation (see Ground Air Transfer Inc. v. Westates Airlines, Inc., 899 F.2d 1269 (1st Cir. 1990)), interpleader, declaratory judgment, or attachment. These attempts should face the same obstacles that face efforts to enjoin the issuer from paying. Expanded use of any of these devices could threaten the independence principle just as much as injunctions against honor. For that reason courts should have the same hostility to them and place the same restrictions on their use as would be applied to injunctions against honor. Courts should not allow the “sacred cow of equity to trample the tender vines of letter of credit law.”

6. Section 5‑109(a)(1) also protects specified third parties against the risk of fraud. By issuing a letter of credit that nominates a person to negotiate or pay, the issuer (ultimately the applicant) induces that nominated person to give value and thereby assumes the risk that a draft drawn under the letter of credit will be transferred to one with a status like that of a holder in due course who deserves to be protected against a fraud defense.

7. The “loss” to be protected against—by bond or otherwise under subSection (b)(2)—includes incidental damages. Among those are legal fees that might be incurred by the beneficiary or issuer in defending against an injunction action.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑109. This Section clarifies the rules of former Sections 36‑5‑114(2)(a) and (b).

The present section narrows the fraud exception to the general rule that issuers may not look behind the face of presented documents. Section 36‑5‑114(2) permitted issuers to dishonor based on forged or “fraudulent” documents included in a presentation, under the current section the fraud must be “material.” For an amplification of “material,” see Official Comment 1 to this Section.

The present Section continues the rule of former Section 36‑5‑114(2) that despite forgery or fraud, a compliant presentation from one who has given value without notice must be honored. Otherwise, the issuer has the option of honoring or not but, whereas under former law the option arose “where a document of title . . . is forged or fraudulent or there is fraud in the transaction” current law limits the option not to honor to cases where a required document “is forged or materially fraudulent, or honor . . . would facilitate a material fraud by the beneficiary on issuer or applicant.” The issuer’s express option to dishonor is a clarification from former law.

Section 36‑5‑109(b), describing the relief available to an applicant claiming forgery or fraud, did not appear in the former version of Article 5.
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NOTES OF DECISIONS

Injunctive relief 2

Investigation required 1

1. Investigation required

Bank wrongfully dishonored draft where, although bank’s obligation stemmed from letter of credit rather than underlying transaction, when bank received notice that ticket sales had been made by transferee of travel agency, bank, before dishonoring draft on grounds of fraud, was obligated by underlying contract to determine whether corporation presenting draft had colorable or plausible basis for calling letter or was acting to defeat letter’s legitimate purpose; simple investigation would have revealed that corporation’s actions were not intentionally deceptive, egregious, or in contravention of purpose of letter of credit, but instead, prompted by colorable claim consistent with very purpose of letter of credit. Airline Reporting Corp. v. First Nat. Bank of Holly Hill (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1987) 832 F.2d 823.

2. Injunctive relief

Borrower did not show that it was more likely than not to succeed on claim of material fraud in underlying real estate transaction, and preliminary injunction enjoining issuing bank for borrower’s letter of credit from honoring demand on letter from beneficiary thus was inappropriate, where borrower admitted that it had defaulted on underlying loan obligation to beneficiary and letter of credit by its terms permitted beneficiary to make demand for amount due to beneficiary from borrower. Hook Point, LLC v. Branch Banking and Trust Co. (S.C. 2012) 397 S.C. 507, 725 S.E.2d 681, rehearing denied. Banks and Banking 191.30

**SECTION 36‑5‑110.** Warranties.

 (a) If its presentation is honored, the beneficiary warrants:

 (1) to the issuer, any other person to whom presentation is made, and the applicant that there is no fraud or forgery of the kind described in Section 36‑5‑109(a); and

 (2) to the applicant that the drawing does not violate any agreement between the applicant and beneficiary or any other agreement intended by them to be augmented by the letter of credit.

 (b) The warranties in subsection (a) are in addition to warranties arising under Chapters 3, 4, 7, and 8 because of the presentation or transfer of documents covered by any of those chapters.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑110; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Since the warranties in subsection (a) are not given unless a letter of credit has been honored, no breach of warranty under this subsection can be a defense to dishonor by the issuer. Any defense must be based on Section 5‑108 or 5‑109 and not on this section. Also, breach of the warranties by the beneficiary in subsection (a) cannot excuse the applicant’s duty to reimburse.

2. The warranty in Section 5‑110(a)(2) assumes that payment under the letter of credit is final. It does not run to the issuer, only to the applicant. In most cases the applicant will have a direct cause of action for breach of the underlying contract. This warranty has primary application in standby letters of credit or other circumstances where the applicant is not a party to an underlying contract with the beneficiary. It is not a warranty that the statements made on the presentation of the documents presented are truthful nor is it a warranty that the documents strictly comply under Section 5‑108(a). It is a warranty that the beneficiary has performed all the acts expressly and implicitly necessary under any underlying agreement to entitle the beneficiary to honor. If, for example, an underlying sales contract authorized the beneficiary to draw only upon “due performance” and the beneficiary drew even though it had breached the underlying contract by delivering defective goods, honor of its draw would break the warranty. By the same token, if the underlying contract authorized the beneficiary to draw only upon actual default or upon its or a third party’s determination of default by the applicant and if the beneficiary drew in violation of its authorization, then upon honor of its draw the warranty would be breached. In many cases, therefore, the documents presented to the issuer will contain inaccurate statements (concerning the goods delivered or concerning default or other matters), but the breach of warranty arises not because the statements are untrue but because the beneficiary’s drawing violated its express or implied obligations in the underlying transaction.

3. The damages for breach of warranty are not specified in Section 5‑111. Courts may find damage analogies in Section 2‑714 in Article 2 and in warranty decisions under Articles 3 and 4.

Unlike wrongful dishonor cases—where the damages usually equal the amount of the draw—the damages for breach of warranty will often be much less than the amount of the draw, sometimes zero. Assume a seller entitled to draw only on proper performance of its sales contract. Assume it breaches the sales contract in a way that gives the buyer a right to damages but no right to reject. The applicant’s damages for breach of the warranty in subsection (a)(2) are limited to the damages it could recover for breach of the contract of sale. Alternatively assume an underlying agreement that authorizes a beneficiary to draw only the “amount in default.” Assume a default of $200,000 and a draw of $500,000. The damages for breach of warranty would be no more than $300,000.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

Former Section 5‑110, “Availability of credit in portions; presenter’s reservation of lien or claim,” has been omitted as covered in definitions and comments.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑110. Sections 36‑5‑110(a) and (b) replace former Sections 36‑5‑111(1) and (2), respectively.

This Section clarifies the ambiguities of former law concerning whether a presenting beneficiary warranted conditions of the underlying contract, other aspects of the scope of the warranty, to whom the warranty was addressed, and the relationship between warranties and defenses.

Time warranties arise. Under this Section, warranties do not arise until a presentation is honored, so that breach of warranty under this Section is not a basis for dishonor.

To whom warranties run. The warranty of no fraud or forgery found in Section 36‑5‑110(a)(1) is made to the issuer or any oTher recipient of presentation, and to the applicant. The warranty of compliance with the agreement between applicant and beneficiary found in Section 36‑5‑110(a)(2) runs only to the applicant.

No substitution for other UCC warranties. Subsection (b) clarifies that the warranties of this Section are in addition to, not in substitution for, other UCC warranties.

CROSS REFERENCES

Warranties of collecting bank as to documents of title, see Section 36‑7‑508.

Warranties of customer and collecting bank on transfer or presentment of items, see Section 36‑4‑207.

Warranties of person negotiating or transferring document of title, see Section 36‑7‑507.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10, 191.20.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 179, 181.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 376, 380.

RESEARCH REFERENCES

Forms

Am. Jur. Pl. & Pr. Forms Uniform Commercial Code Section 5:16 , Introductory Comments.

NOTES OF DECISIONS

Extent of warranty 1

Restitution 2

Unjust enrichment 3

1. Extent of warranty

Under this section [former Section 36‑5‑111] beneficiary of letter of credit, in transferring or presenting a documentary draft for payment, warrants that “the necessary conditions of the credit have been complied with,” under which language beneficiary only warrants that its draft complies with terms of letter of credit, and not that any statements made by beneficiary to comply with letter are truthful, unless truthfulness is explicitly within terms of letter. Therefore, the bank does not have a defense to beneficiary’s claim for restitution. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149.

When drawing on credit, extent of obligations under former Section 36‑5‑111(1) with respect to presenting documentary draft for payment is that beneficiary of letter of credit only warrants to terms of letter; thus, beneficiary only promises that bank will not be failing in its duty to its customer by paying on draft. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149. Banks And Banking 191.10

2. Restitution

Notwithstanding that bank correctly honored beneficiary’s draft on letter of credit, beneficiary was entitled to restitution of funds it had sent to bank in attempt to restore letter of credit after beneficiary had erroneously issued draft for entire amount of letter; beneficiary fulfilled its presentment warranty under former Section 36‑5‑111(1) by drawing on credit in accordance with terms of letter of credit, and thus beneficiary, and not bank, had right to amount returned by beneficiary’s check, which amount unjustly enriched bank when it cashed check, applied proceeds to liability to which it was exposed, and refused to return money under beneficiary’s expressed conditions. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149. Banks And Banking 191.10; Implied And Constructive Contracts 3

3. Unjust enrichment

Beneficiary did not breach its warranty so as preclude restitution of funds it had given the bank subject to the conditions that beneficiary had access to them as if under the letter of credit discharged by the initial complying draft, and even if beneficiary was held to breach its warranty, the coincidental discharge of the letter of credit notwithstanding, the bank’s resort to self‑help and forcing beneficiary’s warranty resulted in the bank’s unjust enrichment when it refused to honor beneficiary’s subsequent facially complying draft in accordance with the conditions under which beneficiary returned the erroneous access of money to the bank. Amwest Sur. Ins. Co. v. Republic Nat. Bank (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1992) 977 F.2d 122, certiorari denied 113 S.Ct. 1582, 507 U.S. 985, 123 L.Ed.2d 149. Banks And Banking 191.10; Implied And Constructive Contracts 3

**SECTION 36‑5‑111.** Remedies.

 (a) If an issuer wrongfully dishonors or repudiates its obligation to pay money under a letter of credit before presentation, the beneficiary, successor, or nominated person presenting on its own behalf may recover from the issuer the amount that is the subject of the dishonor or repudiation. If the issuer’s obligation under the letter of credit is not for the payment of money, the claimant may obtain specific performance or, at the claimant’s election, recover an amount equal to the value of performance from the issuer. In either case, the claimant may also recover incidental but not consequential damages. The claimant is not obligated to take action to avoid damages that might be due from the issuer under this subsection. If, although not obligated to do so, the claimant avoids damages, the claimant’s recovery from the issuer must be reduced by the amount of damages avoided. The issuer has the burden of proving the amount of damages avoided. In the case of repudiation the claimant need not present any document.

 (b) If an issuer wrongfully dishonors a draft or demand presented under a letter of credit or honors a draft or demand in breach of its obligation to the applicant, the applicant may recover damages resulting from the breach, including incidental but not consequential damages, less any amount saved as a result of the breach.

 (c) If an adviser or nominated person other than a confirmer breaches an obligation under this chapter or an issuer breaches an obligation not covered in subsection (a) or (b), a person to whom the obligation is owed may recover damages resulting from the breach, including incidental but not consequential damages, less any amount saved as a result of the breach. To the extent of the confirmation, a confirmer has the liability of an issuer specified in this subsection and subsections (a) and (b).

 (d) An issuer, nominated person, or adviser who is found liable under subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall pay interest on the amount owed thereunder from the date of wrongful dishonor or other appropriate date.

 (e) Reasonable attorney’s fees and other expenses of litigation must be awarded to the prevailing party in an action in which a remedy is sought under this chapter.

 (f) Damages that would otherwise be payable by a party for breach of an obligation under this chapter may be liquidated by agreement or undertaking, but only in an amount or by a formula that is reasonable in light of the harm anticipated.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑111; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. The right to specific performance is new. The express limitation on the duty of the beneficiary to mitigate damages adopts the position of certain courts and commentators. Because the letter of credit depends upon speed and certainty of payment, it is important that the issuer not be given an incentive to dishonor. The issuer might have an incentive to dishonor if it could rely on the burden of mitigation falling on the beneficiary, (to sell goods and sue only for the difference between the price of the goods sold and the amount due under the letter of credit). Under the scheme contemplated by Section 5‑111(a), the beneficiary would present the documents to the issuer. If the issuer wrongfully dishonored, the beneficiary would have no further duty to the issuer with respect to the goods covered by documents that the issuer dishonored and returned. The issuer thus takes the risk that the beneficiary will let the goods rot or be destroyed. Of course the beneficiary may have a duty of mitigation to the applicant arising from the underlying agreement, but the issuer would not have the right to assert that duty by way of defense or setoff. See Section 5‑117(d). If the beneficiary sells the goods covered by dishonored documents or if the beneficiary sells a draft after acceptance but before dishonor by the issuer, the net amount so gained should be subtracted from the amount of the beneficiary’s damages—at least where the damage claim against the issuer equals or exceeds the damage suffered by the beneficiary. If, on the other hand, the beneficiary suffers damages in an underlying transaction in an amount that exceeds the amount of the wrongfully dishonored demand (e.g., where the letter of credit does not cover 100 percent of the underlying obligation), the damages avoided should not necessarily be deducted from the beneficiary’s claim against the issuer. In such a case, the damages would be the lesser of (i) the amount recoverable in the absence of mitigation (that is, the amount that is subject to the dishonor or repudiation plus any incidental damages) and (ii) the damages remaining after deduction for the amount of damages actually avoided.

A beneficiary need not present documents as a condition of suit for anticipatory repudiation, but if a beneficiary could never have obtained documents necessary for a presentation conforming to the letter of credit, the beneficiary cannot recover for anticipatory repudiation of the letter of credit. Doelger v. Battery Park Bank, 201 A.D. 515, 194 N.Y.S. 582 (1922) and Decor by Nikkei Int’l, Inc. v. Federal Republic of Nigeria, 497 F.Supp. 893 (S.D.N.Y. 1980), aff’d, 647 F.2d 300 (2d Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 454 U. S. 1148 (1982). The last sentence of subsection (c) does not expand the liability of a confirmer to persons to whom the confirmer would not otherwise be liable under Section 5‑107.

Almost all letters of credit, including those that call for an acceptance, are “obligations to pay money” as that term is used in Section 5‑111(a).

2. What damages “result” from improper honor is for the courts to decide. Even though an issuer pays a beneficiary in violation of Section 5‑108(a) or of its contract with the applicant, it may have no liability to an applicant. If the underlying contract has been fully performed, the applicant may not have been damaged by the issuer’s breach. Such a case would occur when A contracts for goods at $100 per ton, but, upon delivery, the market value of conforming goods has decreased to $25 per ton. If the issuer pays over discrepancies, there should be no recovery by A for the price differential if the issuer’s breach did not alter the applicant’s obligation under the underlying contract, i.e., to pay $100 per ton for goods now worth $25 per ton. On the other hand, if the applicant intends to resell the goods and must itself satisfy the strict compliance requirements under a second letter of credit in connection with its sale, the applicant may be damaged by the issuer’s payment despite discrepancies because the applicant itself may then be unable to procure honor on the letter of credit where it is the beneficiary, and may be unable to mitigate its damages by enforcing its rights against others in the underlying transaction. Note that an issuer found liable to its applicant may have recourse under Section 5‑117 by subrogation to the applicant’s claim against the beneficiary or other persons.

One who inaccurately advises a letter of credit breaches its obligation to the beneficiary, but may cause no damage. If the beneficiary knows the terms of the letter of credit and understands the advice to be inaccurate, the beneficiary will have suffered no damage as a result of the adviser’s breach.

3. Since the confirmer has the rights and duties of an issuer, in general it has an issuer’s liability, see subsection (c). The confirmer is usually a confirming bank. A confirming bank often also plays the role of an adviser. If it breaks its obligation to the beneficiary, the confirming bank may have liability as an issuer or, depending upon the obligation that was broken, as an adviser. For example, a wrongful dishonor would give it liability as an issuer under Section 5‑111(a). On the other hand a confirming bank that broke its obligation to advise the credit but did not commit wrongful dishonor would be treated under Section 5‑111(c).

4. Consequential damages for breach of obligations under this article are excluded in the belief that these damages can best be avoided by the beneficiary or the applicant and out of the fear that imposing consequential damages on issuers would raise the cost of the letter of credit to a level that might render it uneconomic. A fortiori punitive and exemplary damages are excluded, however, this section does not bar recovery of consequential or even punitive damages for breach of statutory or common law duties arising outside of this article.

5. The section does not specify a rate of interest. It leaves the setting of the rate to the court. It would be appropriate for a court to use the rate that would normally apply in that court in other situations where interest is imposed by law.

6. The court must award attorney’s fees to the prevailing party, whether that party is an applicant, a beneficiary, an issuer, a nominated person, or adviser. Since the issuer may be entitled to recover its legal fees and costs from the applicant under the reimbursement agreement, allowing the issuer to recover those fees from a losing beneficiary may also protect the applicant against undeserved losses. The party entitled to attorneys’ fees has been described as the “prevailing party.” Sometimes it will be unclear which party “prevailed,” for example, where there are multiple issues and one party wins on some and the other party wins on others. Determining which is the prevailing party is in the discretion of the court. Subsection (e) authorizes attorney’s fees in all actions where a remedy is sought “under this article.” It applies even when the remedy might be an injunction under Section 5‑109 or when the claimed remedy is otherwise outside of Section 5‑111. Neither an issuer nor a confirmer should be treated as a “losing” party when an injunction is granted to the applicant over the objection of the issuer or confirmer; accordingly neither should be liable for fees and expenses in that case.

“Expenses of litigation” is intended to be broader than “costs.” For example, expense of litigation would include travel expenses of witnesses, fees for expert witnesses, and expenses associated with taking depositions.

7. For the purposes of Section 5‑111(f) “harm anticipated” must be anticipated at the time when the agreement that includes the liquidated damage clause is executed or at the time when the undertaking that includes the clause is issued. See Section 2A‑504.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Section 36‑5‑111, “Warranties on transfer and presentment,” has been moved to Section 36‑5‑110.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑111. This Section replaces and makes substantial changes in former Sections 36‑5‑115.

Section 36‑5‑111(a) continues the former rule that the beneficiary’s basic remedy for wrongful dishonor is specific performance, but eliminates the requirement of mitigation, on the one hand, and expressly renders consequential damages unavailable, on the other. The latter has been described as the “greatest benefit of Revised Article 5 to issuers”. Scott E. Nutter and Bryan T. Pratt, A Practitioner’s Guide to Revised Articles 5 and 8 of the Uniform Commercial Code, 63 Mo. L. Rev. 325 (1998).

Section 36‑5‑111(b) expressly renders consequential damages unavailable to an applicant injured by wrongful dishonor, but does not excuse applicants from mitigation.

Section 36‑5‑111(c) treats confirmers, to the extent of confirmation as issuers are treated under subsections (a) and (b).

Sections 36‑5‑111(d) and (e) require the payment of pre‑judgment interest, expenses, and attorneys’ fees to prevailing plaintiffs. These provisions are intended to encourage issuers to honor, furthering policies of certainty and performance under letters of credit. At the same time, they effect “true” specific performance by making the injured plaintiff whole.

Section 36‑5‑111(f), also new, codifies limited enforceability of liquidated damages. Under former law, the applicability of common law contract liquidated damages rules was ambiguous in the letter of credit context due to the absence of contractual duties between issuer and beneficiary.

CROSS REFERENCES

Anticipatory repudiation of contract for sale of goods, see Section 36‑2‑610.

Holder in due course of commercial paper, see Section 36‑3‑302.

Liberal administration of remedies provided by this code, see Section 36‑1‑305.

Manner of negotiating document of title, see Section 36‑7‑501.

Modification or revocation of credit, see Section 36‑5‑106.

Remedies of seller, see Sections 36‑2‑702 et seq.

Retraction of anticipatory repudiation of contract for sale of goods, see Section 36‑2‑611.

Seller’s incidental damages, see Section 36‑2‑710.

Seller’s resale including contract for resale, see Section 36‑2‑706.

Seller’s right to identify goods to contract notwithstanding breach or to salvage unfinished goods, see Section 36‑2‑704.

Seller’s stoppage of delivery in transit or otherwise, see Section 36‑2‑705.

What constitutes, and rights of, person in position of seller of goods, see Section 36‑2‑707.
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NOTES OF DECISIONS

Damages 1

1. Damages

Bank’s improper dishonor of draft entitled corporation which presented draft to recover from bank face amount of its draft, together with incidental damages and interests, to extent of claims outstanding against travel agency for ticket sales. [Decided under former 36‑9‑115.] Airline Reporting Corp. v. First Nat. Bank of Holly Hill (C.A.4 (S.C.) 1987) 832 F.2d 823.

**SECTION 36‑5‑112.** Transfer of letter of credit.

 (a) Except as otherwise provided in Section 36‑5‑113, unless a letter of credit provides that it is transferable, the right of a beneficiary to draw or otherwise demand performance under a letter of credit may not be transferred.

 (b) Even if a letter of credit provides that it is transferable, the issuer may refuse to recognize or carry out a transfer if:

 (1) the transfer would violate applicable law; or

 (2) the transferor or transferee has failed to comply with any requirement stated in the letter of credit or any other requirement relating to transfer imposed by the issuer which is within the standard practice referred to in Section 36‑5‑108(e) or is otherwise reasonable under the circumstances.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑112; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. In order to protect the applicant’s reliance on the designated beneficiary, letter of credit law traditionally has forbidden the beneficiary to convey to third parties its right to draw or demand payment under the letter of credit. Subsection (a) codifies that rule. The term “transfer” refers to the beneficiary’s conveyance of that right. Absent incorporation of the UCP (which make elaborate provision for partial transfer of a commercial letter of credit) or similar trade practice and absent other express indication in the letter of credit that the term is used to mean something else, a term in the letter of credit indicating that the beneficiary has the right to transfer should be taken to mean that the beneficiary may convey to a third party its right to draw or demand payment. Even in that case, the issuer or other person controlling the transfer may make the beneficiary’s right to transfer subject to conditions, such as timely notification, payment of a fee, delivery of the letter of credit to the issuer or other person controlling the transfer, or execution of appropriate forms to document the transfer. A nominated person who is not a confirmer has no obligation to recognize a transfer.

The power to establish “requirements” does not include the right absolutely to refuse to recognize transfers under a transferable letter of credit. An issuer who wishes to retain the right to deny all transfers should not issue transferable letters of credit or should incorporate the UCP. By stating its requirements in the letter of credit an issuer may impose any requirement without regard to its conformity to practice or reasonableness. Transfer requirements of issuers and nominated persons must be made known to potential transferors and transferees to enable those parties to comply with the requirements. A common method of making such requirements known is to use a form that indicates the information that must be provided and the instructions that must be given to enable the issuer or nominated person to comply with a request to transfer.

2. The issuance of a transferable letter of credit with the concurrence of the applicant is ipso facto an agreement by the issuer and applicant to permit a beneficiary to transfer its drawing right and permit a nominated person to recognize and carry out that transfer without further notice to them. In international commerce, transferable letters of credit are often issued under circumstances in which a nominated person or adviser is expected to facilitate the transfer from the original beneficiary to a transferee and to deal with that transferee. In those circumstances it is the responsibility of the nominated person or adviser to establish procedures satisfactory to protect itself against double presentation or dispute about the right to draw under the letter of credit. Commonly such a person will control the transfer by requiring that the original letter of credit be given to it or by causing a paper copy marked as an original to be issued where the original letter of credit was electronic. By keeping possession of the original letter of credit the nominated person or adviser can minimize or entirely exclude the possibility that the original beneficiary could properly procure payment from another bank. If the letter of credit requires presentation of the original letter of credit itself, no other payment could be procured. In addition to imposing whatever requirements it considers appropriate to protect itself against double payment the person that is facilitating the transfer has a right to charge an appropriate fee for its activity.

“Transfer” of a letter of credit should be distinguished from “assignment of proceeds.” The former is analogous to a novation or a substitution of beneficiaries. It contemplates not merely payment to but also performance by the transferee. For example, under the typical terms of transfer for a commercial letter of credit, a transferee could comply with a letter of credit transferred to it by signing and presenting its own draft and invoice. An assignee of proceeds, on the other hand, is wholly dependent on the presentation of a draft and invoice signed by the beneficiary.

By agreeing to the issuance of a transferable letter of credit, which is not qualified or limited, the applicant may lose control over the identity of the person whose performance will earn payment under the letter of credit.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Sections 36‑5‑112(1) and (2), “Time allowed for honor or rejection,” has been moved to Section 36‑5‑108, and that of former Section 36‑5‑112(3) has been moved to Section 36‑5‑102(a)(12).

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑112.

Under former law, transfers of letter of credit rights were treated in a single section, Section 36‑5‑116 (repealed). The 2001 Revision repeals Section 36‑5‑116 and separates transfers into three categories, each with its own section. Assignment of drawing rights is the subject of Section 36‑5‑112. Transfers by operation of law (that is, other than by assignment) are the subject of Section 36‑5‑113. Assignment of the proceeds of a letter of credit is the subject of Section 36‑5‑114.

This Section retains the basic rule of former law, that rights under a letter of credit are nontransferable unless so provided by terms. See Section 36‑5‑112(a). This rule is made subject, however, to exceptions found in Section 36‑5‑113 (transfers by operation of law) and to the right of the issuer to refuse transfer as described in new Section 36‑5‑112(b).

Transfer or assignment of the right to draw under a letter of credit is treated differently than an assignment of proceeds. The latter is addressed in Section 36‑5‑114.
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**SECTION 36‑5‑113.** Transfer by operation of law.

 (a) A successor of a beneficiary may consent to amendments, sign and present documents, and receive payment or other items of value in the name of the beneficiary without disclosing its status as a successor.

 (b) A successor of a beneficiary may consent to amendments, sign and present documents, and receive payment or other items of value in its own name as the disclosed successor of the beneficiary. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (e), an issuer shall recognize a disclosed successor of a beneficiary as beneficiary in full substitution for its predecessor upon compliance with the requirements for recognition by the issuer of a transfer of drawing rights by operation of law under the standard practice referred to in Section 36‑5‑108(e) or, in the absence of such a practice, compliance with other reasonable procedures sufficient to protect the issuer.

 (c) An issuer is not obliged to determine whether a purported successor is a successor of a beneficiary or whether the signature of a purported successor is genuine or authorized.

 (d) Honor of a purported successor’s apparently complying presentation under subsection (a) or (b) has the consequences specified in Section 36‑5‑108(i) even if the purported successor is not the successor of a beneficiary. Documents signed in the name of the beneficiary or of a disclosed successor by a person who is neither the beneficiary nor the successor of the beneficiary are forged documents for the purposes of Section 36‑5‑109.

 (e) An issuer whose rights of reimbursement are not covered by subsection (d) or substantially similar law and any confirmer or nominated person may decline to recognize a presentation under subsection (b).

 (f) A beneficiary whose name is changed after the issuance of a letter of credit has the same rights and obligations as a successor of a beneficiary under this section.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑113; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

This section affirms the result in Pastor v. Nat. Republic Bank of Chicago, 76 Ill.2d 139, 390 N.E.2d 894 (Ill. 1979) and Federal Deposit Insurance Co. v. Bank of Boulder, 911 F.2d 1466 (10th Cir. 1990).

An issuer’s requirements for recognition of a successor’s status might include presentation of a certificate of merger, a court order appointing a bankruptcy trustee or receiver, a certificate of appointment as bankruptcy trustee, or the like. The issuer is entitled to rely upon such documents which on their face demonstrate that presentation is made by a successor of a beneficiary. It is not obliged to make an independent investigation to determine the fact of succession.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Sections 36‑5‑113, “Indemnities,” has been omitted as redundant with other contract law.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑113.

This section had no counterpart in former law. Under former law, transfers of letter of credit rights were treated in a single section, Section 36‑5‑116 (repealed). The 2001 Revision separates transfers into three categories, each with its own section. Assignment of drawing rights is the subject of Section 36‑5‑112. Transfers by operation of law (that is, other than by assignment) are the subject of Section 36‑5‑113. Assignment of the proceeds of a letter of credit is the subject of Section 36‑5‑114.

For purposes of this Section, “successor of a beneficiary” is defined at Section 36‑5‑102(a)(15) to include, among other things, a corporation into which the beneficiary has been merged or consolidated, and successors under various equitable structures, such as a trustee in bankruptcy. Section 36‑5‑113(f) extends this definition, in effect, to include beneficiaries that change names after issuance of a letter of credit.

The interests balanced by this Section are protection of issuers versus the rights of successors. Accordingly, this Section establishes successors’ rights to act in the names of their predecessors and protects issuers for honoring such presentations, or to act in their own names, subject to the rules for recognition of transfer of drawing rights; see Subsection (b).

Subsections (b) and (c) relieve the issuer of any duty to look behind a purported assignment. As the Official Comment observes, “The issuer is entitled to rely upon . . . documents which on their face demonstrate that presentation is made by a successor of a beneficiary.” The issuer is not required to ascertain the genuineness of successors’ purported signatures. Forged signatures (as described in Subsection (d)) are governed by Section 36‑5‑109.

The policy basis of this Section is to promote honor, with an objective of speed and certainty in the functioning of letters of credit.

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10, 191.20.

WESTLAW Topic No. 52.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 179, 181.
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**SECTION 36‑5‑114.** Assignment of proceeds.

 (a) In this section, “proceeds of a letter of credit” means the cash, check, accepted draft, or other item of value paid or delivered upon honor or giving of value by the issuer or person under the letter of credit. The term does not include a beneficiary’s drawing rights or documents presented by the beneficiary.

 (b) A beneficiary may assign its right to part or all of the proceeds of a letter of credit. The beneficiary may do so before presentation as a present assignment of its right to receive proceeds contingent upon its compliance with the terms and conditions of the letter of credit.

 (c) An issuer or nominated person need not recognize an assignment of proceeds of a letter of credit until it consents to the assignment.

 (d) An issuer or nominated person has no obligation to give or withhold its consent to an assignment of proceeds of a letter of credit, but consent may not be unreasonably withheld if the assignee possesses and exhibits the letter of credit and presentation of the letter of credit is a condition to honor.

 (e) Rights of a transferee beneficiary or nominated person are independent of the beneficiary’s assignment of the proceeds of a letter of credit and are superior to the assignee’s right to the proceeds.

 (f) Neither the rights recognized by this section between an assignee and an issuer, transferee beneficiary, or nominated person nor the issuer’s or nominated person’s payment of proceeds to an assignee or a third person affect the rights between the assignee and any person other than the issuer, transferee beneficiary, or nominated person. The mode of creating and perfecting a security interest in or granting an assignment of a beneficiary’s rights to proceeds is governed by Chapter 9 or other law. Against persons other than the issuer, transferee beneficiary, or nominated person, the rights and obligations arising upon the creation of a security interest or other assignment of a beneficiary’s right to proceeds and its perfection are governed by Chapter 9 or other law.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑114; 1966 (54) 2716; 1991 Act No. 161, Section 2(B); 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Subsection (b) expressly validates the beneficiary’s present assignment of letter of credit proceeds if made after the credit is established but before the proceeds are realized. This section adopts the prevailing usage—”assignment of proceeds”—to an assignee. That terminology carries with it no implication, however, that an assignee acquires no interest until the proceeds are paid by the issuer. For example, an “assignment of the right to proceeds” of a letter of credit for purposes of security that meets the requirements of Section 9‑203(b) would constitute the present creation of a security interest in a “letter‑of‑credit right.” This security interest can be perfected by control (Section 9‑107). Although subsection (a) explains the meaning of “‘proceeds’ of a letter of credit,” it should be emphasized that those proceeds also may be Article 9 proceeds of other collateral. For example, if a seller of inventory receives a letter of credit to support the account that arises upon the sale, payments made under the letter of credit are Article 9 proceeds of the inventory, account, and any document of title covering the inventory. Thus, the secured party who had a perfected security interest in that inventory, account, or document has a perfected security interest in the proceeds collected under the letter of credit, so long as they are identifiable cash proceeds (Section 9‑3315(a),(d)). This perfection is continuous, regardless of whether the secured party perfected a security interest in the right to letter of credit proceeds.

2. An assignee’s rights to enforce an assignment of proceeds against an issuer and the priority of the assignee’s rights against a nominated person or transferee beneficiary are governed by Article 5. Those rights and that priority are stated in subsections (c), (d), and (e). Note also that Section 4‑210 gives first priority to a collecting bank that has given value for a documentary draft.

3. By requiring that an issuer or nominated person consent to the assignment of proceeds of a letter of credit, subsections (c) and (d) follow more closely recognized national and international letter of credit practices than did prior law. In most circumstances, it has always been advisable for the assignee to obtain the consent of the issuer in order better to safeguard its right to the proceeds. When notice of an assignment has been received, issuers normally have required signatures on a consent form. This practice is reflected in the revision. By unconditionally consenting to such an assignment, the issuer or nominated person becomes bound, subject to the rights of the superior parties specified in subsection (e), to pay to the assignee the assigned letter of credit proceeds that the issuer or nominated person would otherwise pay to the beneficiary or another assignee.

Where the letter of credit must be presented as a condition to honor and the assignee holds and exhibits the letter of credit to the issuer or nominated person, the risk to the issuer or nominated person of having to pay twice is minimized. In such a situation, subsection (d) provides that the issuer or nominated person may not unreasonably withhold its consent to the assignment.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Sections 36‑5‑114, “Issuer’s duty and privilege to honor; right to proceeds,” has been moved to a number of locations. Former Section 36‑5‑114(1) is now found at Section 36‑5‑108(a); former Section 36‑5‑114(2) is now at Section 36‑5‑109 (a); former Section 36‑5‑114(3) is now at Section 36‑5‑108(i); and former Sections 36‑5‑114(4) and (5), which were optional, have been omitted from the 2001 Revision.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑114.

This section replaces the content of former Sections 36‑5‑116(2) and (3), conforming the statute to existing practice and international law.

Under former law, transfers of letter of credit rights were treated in a single section, Section 36‑5‑116 (repealed). The 2001 Revision separates transfers into three categories, each with its own section. Assignment of drawing rights is the subject of Section 36‑5‑112. Transfers by operation of law are the subject of Section 36‑5‑113. Assignment of the proceeds of a letter of credit is the subject of Section 36‑5‑114. In particular, the 2001 Revision threats transfers of letters of credit, and therefore of drawing rights, distinctly from assignments of proceeds, a distinction that was not clear under former law. See Section 36‑5‑114(a).

“Proceeds of a letter of credit” was not defined under former law. Under the 2001 Revision it is defined at Section 36‑5‑114(a) to refer to value received upon honor or giving of value under a letter of credit. The issue addressed in this Section is, therefore, to whom the issuer or nominated person must deliver value upon honor or giving of value, regardless of who makes presentation.

Subsection (b) preserves the former rule that a beneficiary may assign the rights to post‑honor proceeds of even a nontransferable letter of credit. The applicant has no standing to object to an assignment of proceeds under this Section.

While the beneficiary may assign proceeds, Subsections (c) and (d) provide that an issuer (or similarly‑treated nominated person) is not obligated to consent to assignment. The only statutory exception is where presentation is a condition of honor and the assignee “possesses and exhibits the letter of credit,” in which case consent to the assignment may not unreasonably be withheld. See Section 36‑5‑114(d).

The just‑described exception largely preserves the former statutory rule, found at Section 36‑5‑116(2) (repealed), that a beneficiary’s right to proceeds was assignable by delivery of the letter of credit to an assignee. As to assignees to whom a letter of credit is not delivered, former Article 5 was silent. The 2001 Revision deals with such assignees by borrowing from practice and codifying the consent requirement. See Section 36‑5‑114(c).

Even where assignment is consented to, drawing rights are not conveyed to the assignee. The rights of a transferee beneficiary, or of a nominated person who has not consented to assignment, trump the rights of a proceeds assignee. See Section 36‑5‑114(e). This places the proceeds assignee (often a secured party) at risk of, for example, amendment of the credit, presentation to a nominated person that has not consented to assignment of proceeds, or cancellation of the letter of credit.

Relationship of this Section to Article 9. Under former law, a beneficiary’s delivery of a letter of credit both assigned the right to receive proceeds and perfected a security interest in them. See Section 36‑5‑116(2)(a) (repealed). Article 5 no longer addresses perfection. This Section (replacing former Section 36‑5‑116) controls the relative rights and obligations of issuers, nominated persons, beneficiaries, and transferee beneficiaries. It therefore addresses to whom proceeds shall be delivered, but not rights in proceeds once delivered. The creation and perfection of security interests in proceeds, and the relative rights of persons other than issuers, nominated persons and transferee beneficiaries once proceeds are delivered, are controlled by Article 9 (or, if a letter of credit is not in writing, by other law). See Section 36‑5‑114(f). See also Sections 36‑9‑102(A)(51) (definition of “letter‑of‑credit rights”); 36‑9‑107 (control of letter‑of‑credit rights); 36‑9‑312(b)(2) and 36‑9‑314(a) (perfection of security interests in letter‑of‑credit rights); and 36‑9‑329 (priority of security interests in letter‑of‑credit rights).

CROSS REFERENCES

Assignment of rights under contract for sale of goods, see Section 36‑2‑210.
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**SECTION 36‑5‑115.** Statute of limitations.

 An action to enforce a right or obligation arising under this chapter must be commenced within one year after the expiration date of the relevant letter of credit or one year after the claim for relief cause of action accrues, whichever occurs later. A claim for relief cause of action accrues when the breach occurs, regardless of the aggrieved party’s lack of knowledge of the breach.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑115; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. This section is based upon Sections 4‑111 and 2‑725(2).

2. This section applies to all claims for which there are remedies under Section 5‑111 and to other claims made under this article, such as claims for breach of warranty under Section 5‑110. Because it covers all claims under Section 5‑111, the statute of limitations applies not only to wrongful dishonor claims against the issuer but also to claims between the issuer and the applicant arising from the reimbursement agreement. These might be for reimbursement (issuer v. applicant) or for breach of the reimbursement contract by wrongful honor (applicant v. issuer).

3. The statute of limitations, like the rest of the statute, applies only to a letter of credit issued on or after the effective date and only to transactions, events, obligations, or duties arising out of or associated with such a letter. If a letter of credit was issued before the effective date and an obligation on that letter of credit was breached after the effective date, the complaining party could bring its suit within the time that would have been permitted prior to the adoption of Section 5‑115 and would not be limited by the terms of Section 5‑115.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Sections 36‑5‑115, “Remedy for improper dishonor or anticipatory repudiation,” has been moved to Section 36‑5‑111.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑115.

This section had no counterpart in former law, which subjected letter of credit actions to the general three‑year contracts statute of limitationsfound at Section 15‑3‑530(1). The limitations period prescribed by this section is effective for letters of credit issued on or after the effective date of the 2001 Revision.
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**SECTION 36‑5‑116.** Choice of law and forum.

 (a) The liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser for action or omission is governed by the law of the jurisdiction chosen by an agreement in the form of a record signed or otherwise authenticated by the affected parties in the manner provided in Section 36‑5‑104 or by a provision in the person’s letter of credit, confirmation, or other undertaking. The jurisdiction whose law is chosen need not bear any relation to the transaction.

 (b) Unless subsection (a) applies, the liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser for action or omission is governed by the law of the jurisdiction in which the person is located. The person is considered to be located at the address indicated in the person’s undertaking. If more than one address is indicated, the person is considered to be located at the address from which the person’s undertaking was issued. For the purpose of jurisdiction, choice of law, and recognition of interbranch letters of credit, but not enforcement of a judgment, all branches of a bank are considered separate juridical entities and a bank is considered to be located at the place where its relevant branch is considered to be located under this subsection.

 (c) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser is governed by any rules of custom or practice, such as the Uniform Customs and Practice for Documentary Credits, to which the letter of credit, confirmation, or other undertaking is expressly made subject. If (i) this chapter would govern the liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser under subsection (a) or (b), (ii) the relevant undertaking incorporates rules of custom or practice, and (iii) there is conflict between this chapter and those rules as applied to that undertaking, those rules govern except to the extent of any conflict with the nonvariable provisions specified in Section 36‑5‑103(c).

 (d) If there is conflict between this chapter and Chapters 3, 4, 4A, or 9, this chapter governs.

 (e) The forum for settling disputes arising out of an undertaking within this chapter may be chosen in the manner and with the binding effect that governing law may be chosen in accordance with subsection (a).

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑116; 1966 (54) 2716; 1988 Act No. 494, Section 4; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 13; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. Although it would be possible for the parties to agree otherwise, the law normally chosen by agreement under subsection (a) and that provided in the absence of agreement under subsection (b) is the substantive law of a particular jurisdiction not including the choice of law principles of that jurisdiction. Thus, two parties, an issuer and an applicant, both located in Oklahoma might choose the law of New York. Unless they agree otherwise, the section anticipates that they wish the substantive law of New York to apply to their transaction and they do not intend that a New York choice of law principle might direct a court to Oklahoma law. By the same token, the liability of an issuer located in New York is governed by New York substantive law—in the absence of agreement—even in circumstances in which choice of law principles found in the common law of New York might direct one to the law of another State. Subsection (b) states the relevant choice of law principles and it should not be subordinated to some other choice of law rule. Within the States of the United States renvoi will not be a problem once every jurisdiction has enacted Section 5‑116 because every jurisdiction will then have the same choice of law rule and in a particular case all choice of law rules will point to the same substantive law.

Subsection (b) does not state a choice of law rule for the “liability of an applicant.” However, subsection (b) does state a choice of law rule for the liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser, and since some of the issues in suits by applicants against those persons involve the “liability of an issuer, nominated person, or adviser,” subsection (b) states the choice of law rule for those issues. Because an issuer may have liability to a confirmer both as an issuer (Section 5‑108(a), Comment 5 to Section 5‑108) and as an applicant (Section 5‑107(a), Comment 1 to Section 5‑107, Section 5‑108(i)), subsection (b) may state the choice of law rule for some but not all of the issuer’s liability in a suit by a confirmer.

2. Because the confirmer or other nominated person may choose different law from that chosen by the issuer or may be located in a different jurisdiction and fail to choose law, it is possible that a confirmer or nominated person may be obligated to pay (under their law) but will not be entitled to payment from the issuer (under its law). Similarly, the rights of an unreimbursed issuer, confirmer, or nominated person against a beneficiary under Section 5‑109, 5‑110, or 5‑117, will not necessarily be governed by the same law that applies to the issuer’s or confirmer’s obligation upon presentation. Because the UCP and other practice are incorporated in most international letters of credit, disputes arising from different legal obligations to honor have not been frequent. Since Section 5‑108 incorporates standard practice, these problems should be further minimized—at least to the extent that the same practice is and continues to be widely followed.

3. This section does not permit what is now authorized by the nonuniform Section 5‑102(4) in New York. Under the current law in New York a letter of credit that incorporates the UCP is not governed in any respect by Article 5. Under revised Section 5‑116 letters of credit that incorporate the UCP or similar practice will still be subject to Article 5 in certain respects. First, incorporation of the UCP or other practice does not override the nonvariable terms of Article 5. Second, where there is no conflict between Article 5 and the relevant provision of the UCP or other practice, both apply. Third, practice provisions incorporated in a letter of credit will not be effective if they fail to comply with Section 5‑103(c). Assume, for example, that a practice provision purported to free a party from any liability unless it were “grossly negligent” or that the practice generally limited the remedies that one party might have against another. Depending upon the circumstances, that disclaimer or limitation of liability might be ineffective because of Section 5‑103(c).

Even though Article 5 is generally consistent with UCP 500, it is not necessarily consistent with other rules or with versions of the UCP that may be adopted after Article 5’s revision, or with other practices that may develop. Rules of practice incorporated in the letter of credit or other undertaking are those in effect when the letter of credit or other undertaking is issued. Except in the unusual cases discussed in the immediately preceding paragraph, practice adopted in a letter of credit will override the rules of Article 5 and the parties to letter of credit transactions must be familiar with practice (such as future versions of the UCP) that is explicitly adopted in letters of credit.

4. In several ways Article 5 conflicts with and overrides similar matters governed by Articles 3 and 4. For example, “draft” is more broadly defined in letter of credit practice than under Section 3‑104. The time allowed for honor and the required notification of reasons for dishonor are different in letter of credit practice than in the handling of documentary and other drafts under Articles 3 and 4.

5. Subsection (e) must be read in conjunction with existing law governing subject matter jurisdiction. If the local law restricts a court to certain subject matter jurisdiction not including letter of credit disputes, subsection (e) does not authorize parties to choose that forum. For example, the parties’ agreement under Section 5‑116(e) would not confer jurisdiction on a probate court to decide a letter of credit case.

If the parties choose a forum under subsection (e) and if—because of other law—that forum will not take jurisdiction, the parties’ agreement or undertaking should then be construed (for the purpose of forum selection) as though it did not contain a clause choosing a particular forum. That result is necessary to avoid sentencing the parties to eternal purgatory where neither the chosen State nor the State which would have jurisdiction but for the clause will take jurisdiction—the former in disregard of the clause and the latter in honor of the clause.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Section 36‑5‑116(1), “Transfer and assignment,” has been moved to Section 36‑5‑112, and that of former Sections 36‑5‑116(2) and (3) have been moved to Section 36‑5‑114.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑116.

This Section had no counterpart in the previous version of Article 5, which left choice of law to Section 36‑1‑105(1) [see now Section 36‑1‑301]. That Section validates the parties’ agreed designations so long as they bear a “reasonable relation” to the transaction. In the absence of agreement, Section 36‑1‑106(1) defaults to South Carolina law if the transaction bears a reasonable relation to this State. Otherwise, general choice of law rules would govern.

The 2001 Revision substantially changes the choice of law rules, and adds choice of forum rules.

Section 36‑5‑116(a) provides that, subject to a statute of frauds, parties have complete freedom in choice of governing law, regardless of relation to the transaction.

In the absence of agreement, Subsection (b) defaults choice of law to the location of the issuer, nominated person or adviser whose liability is being litigated.

Subsection (c) permits parties to choose custom and practice by reference in a letter of credit, subject to nonvariable provisions of Article 5; see Section 36‑5‑103(c).

Section 36‑105 has been revised to accommodate the new law in this Section.

Subsection (e) permits parties to choose a forum, with effect similar to that of choice of law.
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**SECTION 36‑5‑117.** Subrogation of issuer, applicant, and nominated person.

 (a) An issuer that honors a beneficiary’s presentation is subrogated to the rights of the beneficiary to the same extent as if the issuer were a secondary obligor of the underlying obligation owed to the beneficiary and of the applicant to the same extent as if the issuer were the secondary obligor of the underlying obligation owed to the applicant.

 (b) An applicant that reimburses an issuer is subrogated to the rights of the issuer against any beneficiary, presenter, or nominated person to the same extent as if the applicant were the secondary obligor of the obligations owed to the issuer and has the rights of subrogation of the issuer to the rights of the beneficiary stated in subsection (a).

 (c) A nominated person who pays or gives value against a draft or demand presented under a letter of credit is subrogated to the rights of:

 (1) the issuer against the applicant to the same extent as if the nominated person were a secondary obligor of the obligation owed to the issuer by the applicant;

 (2) the beneficiary to the same extent as if the nominated person were a secondary obligor of the underlying obligation owed to the beneficiary; and

 (3) the applicant to same extent as if the nominated person were a secondary obligor of the underlying obligation owed to the applicant.

 (d) Notwithstanding any agreement or term to the contrary, the rights of subrogation stated in subsections (a) and (b) do not arise until the issuer honors the letter of credit or otherwise pays and the rights in subsection (c) do not arise until the nominated person pays or otherwise gives value. Until then, the issuer, nominated person, and the applicant do not derive under this section present or prospective rights forming the basis of a claim, defense, or excuse.

HISTORY: 1962 Code Section 10.5‑117; 1966 (54) 2716; 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

1. By itself this section does not grant any right of subrogation. It grants only the right that would exist if the person seeking subrogation “were a secondary obligor.” (The term “secondary obligor” refers to a surety, guarantor, or other person against whom or whose property an obligee has recourse with respect to the obligation of a third party. See Restatement of the Law Third, Suretyship Section 1 (1995).) If the secondary obligor would not have a right to subrogation in the circumstances in which one is claimed under this section, none is granted by this section. In effect, the section does no more than to remove an impediment that some courts have found to subrogation because they conclude that the issuer’s or other claimant’s rights are “independent” of the underlying obligation. If, for example, a secondary obligor would not have a subrogation right because its payment did not fully satisfy the underlying obligation, none would be available under this section. The section indorses the position of Judge Becker in Tudor Development Group, Inc. v. United States Fidelity and Guaranty, 968 F.2d 357 (3rd Cir. 1991).

2. To preserve the independence of the letter of credit obligation and to insure that subrogation not be used as an offensive weapon by an issuer or others, the admonition in subsection (d) must be carefully observed. Only one who has completed its performance in a letter of credit transaction can have a right to subrogation. For example, an issuer may not dishonor and then defend its dishonor or assert a setoff on the ground that it is subrogated to another person’s rights. Nor may the issuer complain after honor that its subrogation rights have been impaired by any good faith dealings between the beneficiary and the applicant or any other person. Assume, for example, that the beneficiary under a standby letter of credit is a mortgagee. If the mortgagee were obliged to issue a release of the mortgage upon payment of the underlying debt (by the issuer under the letter of credit), that release might impair the issuer’s rights of subrogation, but the beneficiary would have no liability to the issuer for having granted that release.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The content of former Section 36‑5‑117, “Insolvency of bank holding funds for documentary credit,” has been omitted from the 2001 Revision as being addressed by law other than Article 5.

The provisions of this Section are identical to those of the 1995 Official Text of Uniform Commercial Code Section 5‑117.

This Section had no counterpart in the previous version of Article 5, which left the issuer of subrogation to case law.

A party that has given value under a letter of credit but has neither been reimbursed nor has a fraud or forgery action against the beneficiary for breach of warranty must look to subrogation. While there are no reported South Carolina decisions on point, decisions in other jurisdictions sometimes denied issuers the right of subrogation, based on the independence principle—that is, that rights under a letter of credit are independent of the underlying transaction. Issuers are not “secondary obligors”—guarantors—of transactions underlying letters of credit.

This Section creates an exception to the independence principle by putting issuers that have honored beneficiaries’ presentations into the posture of secondary obligors solely for purposes of subrogation. See Section 36‑5‑117(a). Subsection (d) emphasizes the narrowness of the incursion on the independence principle by providing that subrogation rights cannot arise until honor or value has been given, agreements to the contrary notwithstanding.

This Section also clarifies the subrogation rights of reimbursing applicants (Subsection (b)) and nominated persons (Subsection (c)).

LIBRARY REFERENCES

Banks and Banking 191.10, 191.30.

Subrogation 4.

WESTLAW Topic Nos. 52, 366.

C.J.S. Banks and Banking Sections 175 to 177, 181 to 182.

C.J.S. Bills and Notes; Letters of Credit Sections 341 to 366, 368 to 381.

C.J.S. Subrogation Sections 29 to 30.

RESEARCH REFERENCES

Treatises and Practice Aids

6 Causes of Action 337, Cause of Action by Beneficiary Against Bank for Wrongful Dishonor of Draft or Demand for Payment Under Letter of Credit.

**SECTION 36‑5‑118.** Security interest of issuer or nominated person.

 (a) An issuer or nominated person has a security interest in a document presented under a letter of credit and any identifiable proceeds of the collateral to the extent that the issuer or nominated person honors or gives value for the presentation.

 (b) Subject to subsection (c), as long as and to the extent that an issuer or nominated person has not been reimbursed or has not otherwise recovered the value given with respect to a security interest in a document under subsection (a), the security interest continues and is subject to Chapter 9, but:

 (1) a security agreement is not necessary to make the security interest enforceable under Section 36‑9‑203(b)(3);

 (2) if the document is presented in a medium other than a written or other tangible medium, the security interest is perfected; and

 (3) if the document is presented in a written or other tangible medium and is not a certificated security, chattel paper, a document of title, an instrument, or a letter of credit, so long as the debtor does not have possession of the document, the security interest is perfected and has priority over a conflicting security interest in the document.

HISTORY: 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

None.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

When an issuer or nominated person honors or gives value for documents presented under a letterof credit, Section 36‑5‑118(a) grants the issuer or nominated person a security interest in the documents. Under subsection (b) this security interest continues until the issuer or nominated person has been reimbursed for the value given under the letter of credit.

Although the security interest is generally subject to Article 9, subsection (b)(1) provides that a security agreement is not necessary to render the security interest enforceable under Section 36‑9‑203. Subsection (b)(2) provides that if the document is presented in a medium other than a written or tangible medium, the security interest is automatically perfected. See Section 36‑9‑309(8) (a security interest of an issuer or nominated person under Section 36‑5‑118 is perfected when it attaches). Subsection (b)(3) provides that if the document is in writing or another tangible medium and is not a certificated security, chattel paper, document of title, instrument, or letter of credit, the issuer’s or nominated person’s security interest is automatically perfected and has priority over conflicting security interests so long as the debtor does not obtain possession of the document. See Section 36‑9‑322(f)(3) (general priority rules of Article 9 do not apply to an issuer’s or nominated person’s security interest under Section 36‑5‑118). If the document is in a tangible medium and constitutes a form of Article 9 collateral listed above, the issuer or nominated person’s security interest is subject to the perfection and priority rules of Article 9.

Definitional Cross References:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| “Certificated security” | Section 36‑8‑102(a)(4) |
| “Chattel paper” | Section 36‑9‑102(a)(11) |
| “Debtor” | Section 36‑9‑102(a)(28) |
| “Document” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(6) |
| “Document of title” | Sections 36‑7‑102(1)(e) and 36‑1‑201(15) |
| “Honor” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(8) |
| “Instrument” | Section 36‑9‑102(a)(47) |
| “Issuer” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(9) |
| “Letter of Credit” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(10) |
| “Nominated person” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(11) |
| “Presentation” | Section 36‑5‑102(a)(12) |
| “Security agreement” | Section 36‑9‑102(a)(73) |
| “Security interest” | Section 36‑1‑201(37) [see now Section 36‑1‑203] |
| “Value” | Sections 36‑5‑102(b), 36‑3‑303, 36‑4‑208 and 36‑4‑209. |

**SECTION 36‑5‑119.** Transition.

 (a) This chapter takes effect July 1, 2001.

 (b) This chapter applies to a letter of credit that is issued on or after the effective date of this chapter. This chapter does not apply to a transaction, event, obligation, or duty arising out of or associated with a letter of credit that was issued before the effective date of this chapter.

 (c) A transaction arising out of or associated with a letter of credit that was issued before the effective date of this chapter and the rights, obligations, and interests flowing from that transaction are governed by any statute or other law amended or repealed by this chapter as if repeal or amendment had not occurred and may be terminated, completed, consummated, or enforced under that statute or other law.

HISTORY: 2001 Act No. 67, Section 15.

OFFICIAL COMMENT

None.

SOUTH CAROLINA REPORTER’S COMMENT

The effective date of this Act is July 1, 2001. This Act repeals Code of Laws of South Carolina (1976) Title 36, Chapter 5 in its entirety.

This chapter applies to a letter of credit that is issued on or after July 1, 2001. It does not apply to a transaction, event, obligation or duty arising out of or associated with a letter of credit that was issued before July 1, 2001.

A transaction arising out of or associated with a letter of credit that was issued before the effective date of this Act and the rights, obligations, and interests flowing from that transaction are governed by any statute or other law amended or repealed by this Act as if repeal or amendment had not occurred and may be terminated, completed, consummated, or enforced under that statute or other law.”