

AMERICAN BANKRUPTCY INSTITUTE JOURNAL

March 2012 • The Essential Resource for Today's Busy Insolvency Professional • Vol. XXXI, No. 2

Fourth Circuit Declines to Adopt Blanket Rule against Nonconsensual Nondebtor Releases

Written by:

Jason W. Harbour
Hunton & Williams LLP; Richmond, Va.
jharbour@hunton.com

Tara L. Elgie
Hunton & Williams LLP; Richmond, Va.
telgie@hunton.com

A three-judge panel of the Fourth Circuit recently held that although bankruptcy courts may authorize nonconsensual nondebtor releases under appropriate facts and circumstances, bankruptcy courts must make specific factual findings and explain why such findings support the releases.¹

Bankruptcy Court Proceedings

National Heritage Foundation (NHF), the debtor, is a nonprofit public charity that administers and maintains Donor-Advised Funds. NHF filed for bankruptcy protection in 2009 after a Texas state court entered judgment

About the Authors

Jason Harbour is a partner and Tara Elgie is an associate in the Richmond, Va., office of Hunton & Williams LLP in its Bankruptcy, Restructuring and Creditors' Rights Group.



Tara L. Elgie



Jason W. Harbour

against it in an amount in excess of \$6 million and a subsequent turnover order, which resulted in a freeze on NHF's operating account.²

NHF's proposed reorganization plan included a broad, nonconsensual third-party release, indemnification and exculpation provisions (the "third-party releases").³ The third-party releases

generally applied to the debtor, the committee, members of the committee, officers, directors and professionals. The plan released those parties from claims arising before and through the effective date of the plan, and related to or arising out of the operation of the debtor's business or the chapter 11 case. The released parties made no monetary contribution toward plan distributions, and the plan contained no opt-in or opt-out provisions.⁴

Certain creditors and the U.S. Trustee⁵ objected to the proposed plan,

³ Fourth Amended and Restated Plan of Reorganization of the Debtor, No. 09-10525-SSM, filed Oct. 13, 2009 (D.I. 665), at §§ 7.19, 7.20 and 7.21. *Id.* at § 7.19.

⁴ Objections were filed by the U.S. Trustee (D.I. 548), Larry Renick (D.I. 562), Highbourne Foundation, Townsley Foundation, and the Dodie Anderson Foundation (D.I. 584, 585, 648, 649, 650, 651), John Goodson (D.I. 608), and Scott Simpson and Deanna Nord Noge (D.I. 596).

¹ *Behrmann v. National Heritage Foundation Inc.*, 663 F.3d 704 (4th Cir. 2011) (*Behrmann*).

² Third Amended and Restated Disclosure Statement in Support of Fourth Amended and Restated Plan of Reorganization of the Debtor, No. 09-10525-SSM, filed Sept. 4, 2009 (D.I. 578), at § 4.2.

continued on page 66

Get to Know ABIWorld

New Design Unveiled for Online Bookstore

ABI recently launched its newly redesigned online bookstore at bookstore.abi.org. The new format makes it easier than ever to view and purchase ABI publications. Now, before buying a book, purchasers will be able to review the table of contents and a sample chapter. In addition, many of ABI's publications are available in e-book format on the Kindle and Nook and can be purchased directly from the new ABI Bookstore with a click of a button. It has never been easier to access the wealth of information in ABI's publications.

Visit the new ABI Bookstore today at bookstore.abi.org and purchase new titles, such as *Best of ABI 2011: The Year in Business Bankruptcy* and *The Year in Consumer Bankruptcy* (must-have reference books for all practitioners) or the new *Trade Creditor Remedies Manual: Trade Creditors' Rights*. ■

The screenshot shows the ABI Bookstore website interface. At the top, there's a navigation bar with links for Home, Catalog, Ordering, Contact, and Get Alerts! Below that, the main header reads 'abi BOOKSTORE'. A large featured book cover is displayed: 'Best of ABI 2011: The Year in Business Bankruptcy'. Below the featured book, there are sections for 'Bundles' and 'Categories'. The 'Bundles' section shows four options: 'Best of ABI Bundle', 'Small Business Bundle', 'Corporate Bundle', and 'Consumer Bundle'. The 'Categories' section lists various topics like 'Business Reorganization', 'Consumer Bankruptcy', 'General Bankruptcy', 'International', 'Practice and Procedure', 'Professional Retention and Payment', 'Small Business', and 'Specialty Areas in Bankruptcy'. On the right side, there's a 'Publishing Partner' section for CRC (Dorland Rescigno) and a 'Books on Kindle' button.

ON THE INSIDE: SUCCESSOR LIABILITY • NEW VALUE • MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE SETTLEMENT • ANNUAL SPRING MEETING PREVIEW AND AGENDA

In This Issue

Conference/Event Schedule	4
Benchnotes	6
Legislative Highlights	8
Legislative Update	10
Bankruptcy Crossword	60
ABC Update	62
Endowment Report	64
Annual Spring Meeting	84
Inside ABI	88

Features

Fourth Circuit Declines to Adopt Blanket Rule against Nonconsensual Nondebtor Releases by Jason W. Harbour and Tara L. Elgie	cover
At the Intersection of Successor Liability and the Bankruptcy Code by Michael Busenkell and Ryan Cicoski	22
Delaware Court Rules Petition Date Fixes Amount of Defendant's Subsequent New Value by Jeffrey R. Waxman	30
Friedman's Improperly Adds Requirement that New-Value Analysis Closes at Petition Date by Joseph L. Steinfeld, Jr. and Kara E. Casteel	42
Disappointed Bidders Don't Have Standing to Appeal an Order Approving a Sale of Assets by Michael J. Lichtenstein	52

Columns

Affairs of State	12
Claims Bar Dates and Confirmation Orders: Can't We All Just Get Along? by Karen Cordry	
Consumer Corner	14
First Circuit BAP Set to Interpret <i>Schwab</i> by David G. Baker	
Turnaround Topics	16
Chapter 11 on Decline? Changes Are Here to Stay by Jim Fleet	
On Our Watch	18
\$25 Billion Mortgage Servicer Settlement: Implications for USTP and Bankruptcy System by Clifford J. White III and Ramona D. Elliott	
Practice & Procedure	20
Ponzi Schemes: Standing and Defenses by William L. Medford and Mugdha S. Kelkar	
Financial Statements	24
The Anatomy of a Double-Dip by Mark P. Kronfeld	
Intensive Care	26
PCO Appointment: Whose Facts? The Case for Ombudsman Appointment by Jerry Seelig and David Hoffman	
Last in Line	28
Recovery of LBO Fraudulent Transfers: Can § 546(e) Be Circumvented? by Deborah L. Thorne	
Lien on Me	32
Chicago Real Estate Cases Foreshadow <i>Radlax's</i> Impact on Lien-Stripping Cramdowns by Adam D. Wolper	
News at 11	34
Mandatory Prerequisites to Chapter 11 Relief under § 365(o) by David L. Barrack, David B. Schwartz, David Charne and Camisha L. Simmons	
On the Edge	36
When Contracts Spontaneously Multiply: Bifurcation and Integration Issues under § 365 by Gregory G. Hesse and Cameron W. Kinvig	
Dicta	38
It's Still Cheating, Even if You Don't Get Caught by Hon. Alan S. Trust and Bryan J. Hall	
Consumer Point/Counterpoint	40
Should 401(k) Account Funds Be Considered Income at Time of Deposit? by David P. Eron and Brian A. Rookard	
Problems in the Code	44
Impracticality of Bankruptcy Rule 2002(a)(2) by Christopher A. Ward	
The International Scene	46
The New German Insolvency Code: Decoding Improvements and Remaining Risks by Dr. Leo Plank, Dr. Bernd Meyer-Löwy and Carl Pickerill	
Student Gallery	48
Reducing the Life Sentence of Student Loans by Madeleine Patton and Brandon Howard	
Building Blocks	50
Preparing to Vote on a Chapter 11 Plan: Solicitation, Balloting and Tabulation by Kate Logan	
Suggested Reading	54
Best of ABI 2011: <i>The Year in Consumer Bankruptcy</i> and <i>The Year in Business Bankruptcy</i> Reviewed by Ryan J. Dattilo and Steven R. Schwartz	
Value & Cents I	56
Valuation of Closely Held Debtor Corporation Stock by Robert F. Reilly	
Value & Cents II	58
Cramdown Interest Rates under Chapter 11 by Daniel R. Van Vleet	

Delaware Court Rules Petition Date Fixes Amount of Defendant's Subsequent New Value

Written by:

Jeffrey R. Waxman
Morris James LLP, Wilmington, Del.
jwaxman@morrisjames.com

Editor's Note: For another viewpoint on this case, see the feature on page 42.

The U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware in *Friedman's Inc. v. Roth Staffing Companies LP* (In re *Friedman's Inc.*) recently held that a preference defendant may use subsequent new value, even where the debtor paid for such new value after the petition date.¹ Judge **Christopher S. Sontchi**'s decision is consistent with applicable case law and appropriately respects the legal significance of the petition date.



Jeffrey R. Waxman

The facts and issues of the case were "narrow and straightforward": During the preference period, the debtor paid approximately \$82,000 to the defendant, and the defendant provided approximately

\$100,000 of employment services to the debtor, which remained unpaid on the petition date. The debtor was granted a motion for authority to pay certain pre-petition wages, compensation and employee benefits pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a) and 363(b). The debtor thereupon remitted payment of approximately \$72,000 to the defendant. About one year later, the debtor commenced the adversary proceeding seeking to avoid the \$82,000 of preference period payments. After the defendant asserted the subsequent new value defense, the plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment claiming that the defendant was not entitled to subsequent new value for services provided pre-petition, but paid after the petition date pursuant to the court order. The court denied the plaintiff's motion, holding that the bankruptcy filing "fixes" the preference analysis as of the petition date and therefore the debtor's post-petition payment on account of the defendant's subsequent new value did not affect the preference analysis.

¹ 2011 WL 5975283 (Bankr. D. Del. Nov. 30, 2011).

About the Author

Jeffrey Waxman is a partner in the Bankruptcy and Creditors' Rights Department at Morris James LLP in its Wilmington, Del., office.

The court addressed the basic provisions of a preference claim, the subsequent new value defense and the legal basis for granting the wage motion in accordance with the doctrine of necessity before analyzing the parties' plain-meaning arguments, which focused on whether the word "debtor" in 11 U.S.C. § 547(c)(4) referred only to the pre-petition entity or the post-petition entity. The court rejected both parties' "plain-meaning" arguments because it found that both were premised on the fallacious assumption that the debtor and debtor in possession are separate entities. The court found that the "debtor" is a corporate entity existing both pre- and post-petition

Feature

by considering the following statement: "Willie Mays is a person that has been elected into the Hall of Fame.' Did Willie Mays come into existence the moment he was elected to the Hall of Fame... Of course not. Did Willie Mays cease to exist upon election into the Hall of Fame... Of course not. Under the rules of English grammar and syntax, the phrase 'that has been elected' in this example is not a temporal restriction. Rather, it is an adjective that sets forth what it is that makes the particular person or thing of interest to the reader. If one is interested in great baseball players it is significant to know that Willie Mays is in the Hall of Fame. If one is interested with bankruptcy it is significant to know whether the company has actually filed bankruptcy."

The court then evaluated the parties' position on the petition date. While acknowledging that the court of appeals did not address the narrow issue before the court, Judge Sontchi found that the Third Circuit's analysis in *New York City Shoes*² compelled the conclusion that the "fixed" approach is correct. In *New York*

² *New York City Shoes Inc. v. Bentley Int'l Inc.*, 880 F.2d 679 (3d Cir. 1989).

City Shoes, the Third Circuit held that "the subsequent new value defense under section 547(c)(4) has three elements: (1) the creditor must have received a transfer that is otherwise voidable as a preference under section 547(b); (2) after receiving the preferential transfer, the preferred creditor must advance 'new value' to the debtor on an unsecured basis; and (3) the debtor must not have fully compensated the creditor for the 'new value' as of the date that it filed the bankruptcy petition."³ While many courts outside of the Third Circuit have dropped the language "as of the date that it...filed its bankruptcy petition," the Third Circuit reiterated its holding in *New York City Shoes*.⁴

The court stated that its ruling is "consistent with the purpose of the preference law—to reduce damaging, pre-petition opt-out behavior and to level the prebankruptcy playing field for all creditors. Once the bankruptcy is filed, preference law becomes unnecessary as the

automatic stay steps in to stop the race to the assets and the supervision of the case by the court, among other things, ensures that similar claims receive similar treatment."⁵ Disparate treatment occurs only with court approval.

Arguably, the Third Circuit's language in *New York City Shoes* and *Winstar* was dicta. One can also argue that *Friedman's* is inconsistent⁶ with the holding of *Pillowtex*, wherein the District of Delaware held that defendants can assert the subsequent new-value defense through paid or unpaid new value under § 547(c)(4) so long as the payments on account of that new value are not otherwise unavoidable.⁷ It cannot be argued that *Friedman's* is inconsistent with the

³ 2011 WL 5975283 at *4 (quoting *New York City Shoes*) (emphasis in *Friedman's*).

⁴ 2011 WL 5975293 at *4, n. 22 (citing *Schubert v. Lucent Techs Inc.* (In re *Winstar Comm'n Inc.*), 554 F.3d 382, 402 (3d Cir. 2009)).

⁵ 2011 WL 5975283 at *4.

⁶ The two decisions are not inconsistent. *Friedman's* never addressed the broader issue of whether new value had to remain unpaid, but whether such new value had to remain unpaid as of the petition date. A subsequent decision by Judge Sontchi in *Burich v. Revchem Composites Inc.* (In re *Sterra Concrete Design Inc.*), 2012 WL 12734 (Bankr. D. Del. Jan. 4, 2012), which cites the *Friedman's* decision, ruled that the defendant was entitled to assert paid and unpaid subsequent new value.

⁷ *Wahski v. Ann. & Eplid* (In re *Pillowtex Corp.*), 416 B.R. 123 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009).

most basic of bankruptcy tenets: The petition date is a bright line dividing those matters occurring pre-petition from those occurring post-petition,⁸ and what happens after the parties' rights have become fixed is legally irrelevant with respect to preference actions.

Further, *Friedman's* does not result in "double-dipping" as critical vendors do not receive two times the benefit. All they receive is the right to full and immediate payment of their claims, usually in exchange for an agreement to continue to provide the post-petition debtor with pre-petition credit terms. Absent the *Friedman's* result, once a debtor's need for a particular vendor has waned, the trustee could seek to recover all of the value of the debtor's post-petition payment by filing an avoidance action against that vendor (who would be precluded from asserting the subsequent new-value defense to the extent such new value was paid in accordance with the court's order). Trade creditors familiar with the implications of accepting a post-petition payment on account of pre-petition claims may be dissuaded from

⁸ See, e.g., *Everett v. Judson*, 228 U.S. 474, 479 (1913) ("We think that the purpose of the law was to fix the line of cleavage with reference to the condition of the bankrupt estate as of the time at which the petition is filed"). See also *In the Matter of Wiltse Bros. Corp.*, 361 F.2d 295, 299 (6th Cir. 1966).

becoming critical vendors at all. Had the court granted the plaintiff's motion, the costs of the *Friedman's* decision may have been borne by future debtors as critical vendors may have elected not to provide debtors with favorable trade terms (or to deal with them post-petition at all) because they might have been just as well served—if not better served—by not becoming critical vendors in the first instance and requiring all debtors agree to the payment terms the vendor required. Those future vendors would still be able to use their subsequent new value as a defense and get a distribution on account of their claims, albeit in the same percentage and at the same time as other unsecured creditors.

Ultimately, the court did not deny the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment based on the policy implications of disallowing the critical vendor's right to assert its subsequent new value. Instead, the court's decision was based on one of bankruptcy's oldest and broadest rules, which remains as correct today as it was when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1924: The petition date separates "the old situation from the new in the debtor's affairs."⁹ ■

⁹ See *White v. Stump*, 266 U.S. 310, 313 (1924).

SAVE THE DATE
FOR ABI
INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY
PROGRAMS

International Insolvency Symposium
Rome, ITALY
October 18
2012

International Insolvency Symposium
Mexico City, MEXICO
November 8
2012

30
AMERICAN
BANKRUPTCY
INSTITUTE



Insolvency Conference

24th Annual
Insolvency
Conference
May 18-20, 2012

To register visit calbf.org





THE WESTIN
MISSION HILLS
RESORT & SPA
RANCHO MIRAGE, CA







- Bankruptcy Education
- Receivership Education

- Chapter 7 & 13 Special Program
- Young Insolvency Professionals