

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,

Debtors

Case No. 19-23649 (RDD)

Chapter 11

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.

Jointly Administered

Plaintiffs,

v.

Adv. Case No. 21-07005-rdd

AIG SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY (F/K/A
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL SPECIALTY LINES
INSURANCE COMPANY), et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THE
ARBITRATION INSURERS' JOINT MOTION TO STAY
THE CLAIMS AGAINST THEM IN THE ADVERSARY
PROCEEDING IN FAVOR OF ARBITRATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
BACKGROUND	4
A. The Chapter 11 Proceedings	4
B. The Proposed Plan of Reorganization.....	5
C. The Adversary Proceeding.....	6
D. The Arbitration Policies	7
ARGUMENT	9
I. Plaintiffs Bear a Heavy Burden to Demonstrate Why the Strong Federal Policy Favoring Arbitration Embodied by the FAA Must Yield to the Bankruptcy Code.	9
II. Plaintiffs' Claims Against the Arbitration Insurers Are Subject to Mandatory, Binding Arbitration.....	12
A. The Parties Agreed to Arbitrate.	12
B. Plaintiffs' Claims Fall within the Policies' Arbitration Provisions.	14
III. The Mandatory Arbitration Provisions Must Be Enforced Because Their Enforcement Would Not Conflict With the Bankruptcy Code.....	16
CONCLUSION.....	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Alfa Laval U.S. Treasury Inc. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.</i> , 857 F. Supp. 2d 404 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	10, 15
<i>In re Am. Exp. Financial Advisors Secs. Litig.</i> , 672 F.3d 113 (2d Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>Associated Brick Mason Contractors of Greater N.Y., Inc. v. Harrington</i> , 820 F.2d 31 (2d Cir. 1987).....	12
<i>Brownstone Inv. Grp. v. Levey</i> , 514 F. Supp. 2d 536 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).....	9, 10
<i>In re Cardali</i> , No. 10-3531 (SHL), 2010 WL 4791801 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Nov. 18, 2010).....	11, 17
<i>Cargill Int’l S.A. v. M/T Pavel Dybenko</i> , 991 F.2d 1012 (2d Cir. 1993).....	9
<i>In re Century 21 Dep’t Stores, LLC</i> , Case No. 20-01222 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y., Feb. 18, 2021)	3, 17, 20, 21
<i>Century Indem. Co. v. Clearwater Ins. Co.</i> , 06 CIV 0424 SAS, 2007 WL 1599157 (S.D.N.Y. June 4, 2007)	15
<i>State of West Virginia ex rel. Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., et al. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.</i> , Case No. 1:01-cv-00557 (S.D.W. Va., filed June 21, 2001)	4
<i>In re Dayton Title Agency, Inc.</i> , 264 B.R. 880 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 2000).....	22
<i>DeWitt Rehab. & Nursing Ctr., Inc. v. Columbia Cas. Co.</i> , 464 B.R. 587 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	16, 17, 19, 22
<i>In re Donington, Karcher, Salmond, Ronan & Rainone, P.A.</i> , 194 B.R. 750 (D.N.J. 1996)	19
<i>In re Gulf USA Corp.</i> , Nos. 95-6039, 93-02987, 1995 WL 653383 (Bankr. D. Idaho Oct. 25, 1995).....	22
<i>In re Hagerstown Fiber Ltd. P’ship</i> , 277 B.R. 181 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	9, 11, 21
<i>Hays & Co. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.</i> , 885 F.2d 1149 (3d Cir. 1989).....	12

<i>In re John A. Rocco Co.,</i> No. 12-01277 (NLW), 2015 WL 1727474 (Bankr. D.N.J. Apr. 13, 2015)	19
<i>Kerusa Co. LLC v. W10Z/515 Real Estate Ltd. P'ship,</i> No. 04 Civ. 708 (GEL), 2004 WL 1048239 (S.D.N.Y. May 7, 2004)	17
<i>In re Lawrence Grp., Inc.,</i> 285 B.R. 784 (N.D.N.Y. 2002)	20, 22
<i>In re Lenders Abstract & Settlement Serv. Inc.,</i> 493 B.R. 385 (E.D.N.Y. 2013)	19
<i>Little Rest Twelve, Inc. v. Visan,</i> 458 B.R. 44 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	20
<i>Maryland Casualty Co. v. Aselco, Inc.,</i> 223 B.R. 217 (D. Kan. 1998)	22
<i>MBNA Am. Bank, N.A. v. Hill,</i> 436 F.3d 104 (2d Cir. 2006)	3, 9, 10, 16, 21
<i>McCowan v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.,</i> 908 F.2d 1099 (2d Cir. 1990)	14
<i>In re MF Global Holdings Ltd.,</i> 571 B.R. 80 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.,</i> 473 U.S. 614	9
<i>Mt. McKinley Ins. Co. v. Corning Inc.,</i> 399 F.3d 436 (2d Cir. 2005)	17, 19, 22
<i>In re N.Y. Skyline, Inc.,</i> 512 B.R. 159 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)	17
<i>Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa. v. BMC Stock Holdings, Inc.,</i> 796 F. App'x. 45 (2d Cir. 2019)	10, 14
<i>In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation,</i> Case No. 17-md-02804, MDL No. 2804 (N.D. Ohio)	6
<i>Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipeline Co.,</i> 458 U.S. 50 (1982)	16
<i>In re Orion Pictures Corp.,</i> 4 F.3d 1095 (2d Cir. 1993)	3, 19

<i>In re R.I. Lithograph Corp.</i> , 60 B.R. 199 (Bankr. D. R.I. 1986).....	22
<i>Raytheon Co. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.</i> , 306 F. Supp. 2d 346 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).....	15
<i>In re Residential Cap.</i> , 15-cv-2712 (JPO), 2015 WL 9302834 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2015).....	17
<i>In re Residential Cap., LLC</i> , 563 B.R. 756 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Shearson/Am. Exp., Inc. v. McMahon</i> , 482 U.S. 220 (1987).....	1-2
<i>Smith/Enron Cogeneration Ltd. P’ship, Inc. v. Smith Cogeneration Int’l, Inc.</i> , 198 F.3d 88 (2d Cir. 1999).....	10
<i>In re Stone & Webster, Inc.</i> , 367 B.R. 523 (Bankr. D. Del. 2007)	19, 22
<i>In re U.S. Lines, Inc.</i> , 197 F.3d 631 (2d Cir. 1999).....	11, 17, 19
<i>VAC Service Corp. v. Service Merchandise Co.</i> , 929 F. Supp. 143 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).....	12, 15
<i>In re Winimo Realty Corp.</i> , 270 B.R. 108 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2001).....	9, 11
Statutes	
9 U.S.C. § 3.....	1, 10
Other Authorities	
Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7012.....	1

The undersigned Defendant Insurers (“Arbitration Insurers”) respectfully submit this memorandum of law in support of their joint motion to stay the claims against them in this adversary proceeding in favor of arbitration (“Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration”) under the arbitration provisions in their respective insurance policies (“Arbitration Policies”), pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”), 9 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.*, § 201 *et seq.*, and the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards (“Convention”).¹

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The broad and mandatory arbitration provisions in the Arbitration Policies preclude Plaintiffs from litigating coverage claims against the Arbitration Insurers through this adversary proceeding. Plaintiffs’ claims arise under contracts antecedent to the Debtors’ chapter 11 petition, they are based on state (and foreign) law, not bankruptcy law, and as the massive plan of reorganization filed just weeks ago confirms, the Debtors’ reorganization does not depend on the outcome of the disputed coverage claims. In these circumstances, the FAA requires the Court to enforce the agreements to arbitrate in the Arbitration Policies.

Under the FAA, a court “shall” stay the litigation of an arbitrable matter. 9 U.S.C. § 3. The FAA embodies a strong federal policy in favor of enforcing arbitration provisions, particularly those in contracts, like many of the Arbitration Policies, which are international and fall under the Convention, implicating matters of foreign commerce. This federal mandate is no less binding in bankruptcy court. Plaintiffs therefore are bound by the agreements to arbitrate, unless they can meet the formidable burden of demonstrating that their enforcement would be contrary to Congressional intent, as expressed in the Bankruptcy Code. *See Shearson/Am. Exp., Inc. v.*

¹ The Arbitration Insurers do not consent to entry of final orders or judgment by the Bankruptcy Court. *See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7012.*

McMahon, 482 U.S. 220, 226-27 (1987); *In re Residential Cap., LLC*, 563 B.R. 756, 767 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016) (“*ResCap*”).

As this Court and the Second Circuit have directed, if: (1) the parties have agreed to arbitrate; and (2) the arbitration provision covers plaintiff’s claim; then (3) the court must enforce the agreement to arbitrate unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that arbitration of the claim would irreconcilably conflict with the Bankruptcy Code. Here, the Arbitration Policies contain binding agreements to arbitrate, which cover the disputes that Plaintiffs assert in the adversary proceeding. And, as reflected in the Debtors’ proposed Plan itself, and the negotiations that preceded it, neither the viability nor the success of the Debtors’ reorganization in any way depends on the outcome of Plaintiffs’ claims, creating no conflict between the FAA and the Bankruptcy Code.

This Court and many others have held that arbitration provisions like those at issue here encompass the very kind of coverage disputes in this adversary proceeding, and it is well-established that any doubts on that score must be resolved in favor of arbitration. In *ResCap*, and *In re MF Global Holdings Ltd.*, 571 B.R. 80 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2017) (“*MF Global*”), Judges Lane and Glenn each examined arbitration provisions similar, if not identical, to most of the arbitration provisions in the Arbitration Policies, which typically mandate arbitration of any dispute “arising out of,” “arising under” and/or “related to” the Arbitration Policies. Each recognized that plaintiffs could not escape the “broad scope” of those provisions. *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 770; *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 92-94. The result here should be no different.

This leaves the question whether enforcement of the Arbitration Insurers’ bargained-for rights to arbitrate the Debtors’ insurance coverage claims would conflict with the Bankruptcy Code in the context of these chapter 11 proceedings. When conducting that analysis, courts examine whether the proceeding giving rise to potential arbitration is a core proceeding under the

Bankruptcy Code. “Bankruptcy courts generally do not have discretion to refuse to compel arbitration of ‘non-core’ bankruptcy matters,” and even in core proceedings, arbitration provisions must be enforced unless enforcement would cause an “inherent[] conflict” between the Bankruptcy Code and the FAA. *MBNA Am. Bank, N.A. v. Hill*, 436 F.3d 104, 108 (2d Cir. 2006).

To determine whether claims arising under a contract are core, courts consider (1) whether the contract is antecedent to the reorganization petition; and (2) the degree to which the proceeding is independent of the reorganization. It cannot be disputed that the Arbitration Policies are antecedent to the reorganization petition. The adversary proceeding also is entirely independent of the reorganization. The Debtors’ recently-filed plan and disclosure statement make crystal clear that the Debtors’ ability to complete their reorganization successfully does not in any way depend on the outcome of this adversary proceeding. Any recovery of insurance funds in the adversary proceeding would do nothing more than augment the assets of the estate, to be distributed over time through a variety of trusts. As this Court and the Second Circuit have emphasized time and again, augmentation of the estate’s assets is an insufficient reason to conclude that contract claims are core proceedings. *See, e.g., In re Orion Pictures Corp.*, 4 F.3d 1095, 1102 (2d Cir. 1993); Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Remand, Exhibit A (Transcript of Proceedings) at 20-21, *In re Century 21 Dep’t Stores, LLC*, Case No. 20-01222, (Bankr. S.D.N.Y., Feb. 18, 2021), Dkt. No. 92-1 (“*Century 21, Tr.*”) attached hereto as Exhibit B; *MF Global*, 571 B.R. 80 at 94.

Under materially indistinguishable circumstances, the *ResCap* and *MF Global* courts concluded they were required to enforce the arbitration provisions in debtors’ liability insurance contracts. This Court should do the same.

BACKGROUND

A. The Chapter 11 Proceedings

Purdue Pharma, L.P. and certain affiliated entities (“Debtors”) commenced a voluntary bankruptcy proceeding under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on September 15, 2019. The Debtors initiated these bankruptcy proceedings to shield themselves and their owners from thousands of federal and state civil lawsuits seeking to hold the Debtors’ accountable for alleged misconduct in the marketing and sale of opioids (“Opioid Claims”). *See* Adversary Complaint ¶ 5; Dkt. No. 2488, Disclosure Statement for the Chapter 11 Plan, at 3.

The first Opioid Claims were filed in or around 2001. *See, e.g., State of West Virginia ex rel. Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., et al. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.*, Case No. 1:01-cv-00557 (S.D.W. Va., filed June 21, 2001). In 2007, certain of the Debtors pled guilty to felony misbranding of OxyContin, with the intent to defraud or mislead, in violation of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Dkt. No. 17, Debtors’ Informational Brief, at 32-34. In or around 2016, a second wave of cases and investigations ensued, including civil and criminal investigations by the Department of Justice. *See* Disclosure Statement for Chapter 11 Plan, at 36. Before filing for bankruptcy, the Debtors were named in nearly 3,000 opioids lawsuits. *See* Adversary Complaint ¶ 5; Debtors’ Complaint for Injunctive Relief ¶ 17; *State of West Virginia ex rel. Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., et al. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al.*, Case No. 1:01-cv-00557 (S.D.W. Va., filed June 21, 2001). In 2020, certain of the Debtors pled guilty to conspiracy to defraud the United States and to violate the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and conspiracy to violate the Federal Anti-Kickback Statute. *See* Dkt. No. 2004, Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105 and Fed R. Bankr. P. 9019 Authorizing and Approving Settlements between the Debtors and the United States; Dkt. No. 1828, Motion of Debtors Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105 and Fed R. Bankr. P. 9019 Authorizing and Approving Settlements between the Debtors and the United States ¶¶ 20-22; *id.* at Exhibit B (Plea Agreement).

B. The Proposed Plan of Reorganization

On March 15, 2021, the Debtors filed a Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization (“Plan”) and Disclosure Statement for the Chapter 11 Plan (“Disclosure Statement”). The Plan provides for the allocation of the Debtors’ assets, and a \$4.5 billion contribution from the Sackler family. *See* Dkt. No. 2488, Disclosure Statement, at 2, 12. Trusts that will receive cash distributions over a period of time will be established for the benefit of certain groups of creditors. *See id.* The Debtors estimate that a total of \$5 billion in cash will be provided to the trusts, with an additional \$700 million to \$750 million to make payments directly to qualified personal injury claimants. *See id.* at 2. In addition to these cash assets directed to the creditor trusts, \$200 million and substantially all of the Debtors’ non-cash assets will be transferred to a new Delaware LLC, which will be operated for the benefit of two newly-established national opioid abatement trusts, the National Opioid Abatement Trust and the Tribe Trust. *Id.* at 6.

The viability of the Plan does not depend on any insurance recoveries. The Plan contemplates that the Debtors’ insurance rights and assets related to the policies at issue in the adversary proceeding will be transferred to a Master Disbursement Trust (“MDT”), which shall be empowered to initiate, prosecute, defend, and resolve all legal actions in connection with the Debtors’ insurance rights. Dkt. 2487, Plan, Sections 5.6(b), 5.6(h). The MDT is a parent trust that will be funded by certain of the Debtors’ assets and a multi-billion dollar payment by the Sackler family, and that, in turn, will fund the other trusts. *See id.*, Sections 5.2, 5.6(b), 5.6(h). Up to \$450 million of any insurance proceeds recovered by the MDT under the policies at issue in the adversary proceeding will be disbursed by the MDT for the benefit of personal injury claimants via disbursement to the “PI Trust.” *Id.*, Section 5.2(d)(i)(D). Notably, the MDT will provide up to \$400 million in funding for the PI Trust even if no insurance recoveries are realized. *See id.*, Section 5.2(d)(i)(D). If, on the other hand, insurance proceeds exceed \$450 million, they will be distributed

among creditors in accordance with a predetermined “MDT Priority Waterfall” upon the MTD’s dissolution. *Id.*, Section 5.6(k). In its extensive discussion of “risk factors to be considered prior to voting,” the Disclosure Statement does not even mention the insurance claims being asserted in the adversary proceeding. *See* Dkt. No. 2488, Disclosure Statement, at 180-88.

C. The Adversary Proceeding

Certain of the Debtors and their creditors, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors² and the Ad Hoc Committee of Government and Other Contingent Litigation Claimants³ (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), filed this adversary proceeding against approximately 30 domestic and foreign insurance companies on January 29, 2021—fifteen months after the Debtors filed for bankruptcy, and only six weeks before the Debtors filed their proposed Plan. Plaintiffs seek insurance coverage for the Debtors’ liability for the Opioid Claims, and allege that the Debtors are entitled to indemnification for damages and associated defense costs. Adversary Complaint ¶¶ 5, 63, 66-68.

The Complaint contains a single count for declaratory judgment under approximately 80 different pre-petition liability insurance policies issued over a period of 17 years, from 2001 through 2018. *See* Adversary Complaint, Exhibit A; *see also* Adversary Complaint ¶ 63. The Complaint alleges that the Insurers are “obligated . . . to provide coverage in full to the Debtors for the Debtors’

² The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors includes Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association; CVS Caremark Part D Services L.L.C. and Caremark PCS Health, L.L.C.; Ryan Hampton; Cheryl Juare; LTS Lohmann Therapy Systems, Corp.; Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation; Walter Lee Salmons; Kara Trainor; West Boca Medical Center; Cameron County, Texas; the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes; and Thornton Township, Illinois High School District No. 205.

³ The Ad Hoc Committee consists of ten States; the court-appointed Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee in the multi-district litigation captioned *In re National Prescription Opiate Litigation*, Case No. 17-md-02804, MDL No. 2804 (N.D. Ohio); six political subdivisions of States; and one federally recognized American Indian nation.

liability” for the Opioid Claims, “subject only to applicable attachment points, limits of liability, and policy triggers (e.g., whether it is occurrence-based or claims-made), and applicable law.” Adversary Complaint ¶¶ 68, 79. Without calculation or explanation, the Complaint baldly asserts that “[c]overage under the Debtors’ Insurance Policies is subject to limits of liability, where applicable, of at least \$3.3 billion.” Adversary Complaint ¶ 6.

D. The Arbitration Policies

The Complaint omits that the insurance policies issued by the Arbitration Insurers contain mandatory arbitration provisions. These arbitration provisions generally require that all disputes concerning those policies must be resolved by arbitration. For example, multiple Arbitration Insurers issued policies under what is known as the Bermuda Form. Those policies, which include, but are not limited to, policies issued by Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd. and XL Bermuda Ltd., provide:

Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Acts of 1950, 1975, and 1979

E.g., Declaration of Daren McNally in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A (Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd. Policy No. PRA-1031/5); Declaration of Richard Geddes in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A (XL Bermuda Ltd. Policy No. XLUMB-00342). The policy issued by Starr Excess Liability Insurance International Limited under policy number 201012 provides:

Any and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity, and whether between the Company and the Insured or any person or entity deriving rights through or asserting rights on behalf of the Insured, shall be finally and fully determined in Bermuda under the provisions of The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993

Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration,
Exhibit B (Starr Excess Liability Insurance International Limited Policy No. 201012, IV.B.(1)(a)).

Allied World issued policies under the numbers C001210/002 – 005, all of which provide that:

Any and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity, shall be fully determined in Hamilton, Bermuda under the provision of The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993 . . .

Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration,
Exhibits B, C, D, E (Allied World Assurance Company, Ltd. Policy Nos. C001210/002 – 005).

TIG Specialty Insurance Company (“TIG”) issued a policy under the number XLX 38822826,
which provides that:

Any dispute arising under this policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented, by a Board composed of three arbitrators ...

Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of
Arbitration, Exhibit A.⁴ The other policies issued by the Arbitration Insurers named in the
Complaint contain similar broad and binding arbitration provisions. *See* Chart of
Arbitration Provisions, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

The parties to the Arbitration policies chose arbitration with experts in insurance as
decision-makers, selected the forum, designated protocols, and identified and agreed upon
choice of law. Those bargained-for provisions were essential elements of the contracts, and
an important factor in determining the premium charged to Debtors.

⁴ TIG, The Purdue Frederick Company, Inc., and Debtors Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Pharma Inc., and Purdue Pharmaceuticals L.P. already are parties to an arbitration proceeding pending in London in connection with the parties’ respective rights and obligations under the policy issued by TIG. *See* TIG’s Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay, Dkt. No 712-1.

ARGUMENT

I. PLAINTIFFS BEAR A HEAVY BURDEN TO DEMONSTRATE WHY THE STRONG FEDERAL POLICY FAVORING ARBITRATION EMBODIED BY THE FAA MUST YIELD TO THE BANKRUPTCY CODE.

Under the FAA, “written agreements to arbitrate ‘shall be valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.’” *MBNA*, 436 F.3d at 107-08 (quoting 9 U.S.C. § 2). The FAA thus “establishes a ‘federal policy favoring arbitration agreements,’ and mandates the enforcement of contractual arbitration provisions.” *Id.* at 107 (citing *Moses H. Cone Mem’l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.*, 460 U.S. 1, 24 (1983)); *see also Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 614, 631(1985) (FAA codifies an “emphatic federal policy in favor of arbitral dispute resolution”). The federal policy favoring enforcement of arbitration provisions is both “liberal” and “strong.” *See, e.g., Brownstone Inv. Grp. v. Levey*, 514 F. Supp. 2d 536, 549 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) (“Through the [FAA], Congress has declared a strong federal policy favoring arbitration.”); *In re Hagerstown Fiber Ltd. P’ship*, 277 B.R. 181, 197 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002) (same); *In re Winimo Realty Corp.*, 270 B.R. 108, 117 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2001) (“The FAA thus establishes a federal policy favoring arbitration and requiring that federal courts rigorously enforce agreements to arbitrate”) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

Under the New York Convention, and Chapter 2 of the FAA, which implements the Convention, “that federal policy applies with special force in the field of international commerce.” *Mitsubishi Motors*, 473 U.S. at 631. The policies of fifteen Arbitration Insurers fall under the Convention and are governed by Article 2 of the FAA, because they are commercial contracts between entities that are citizens of two different signatories to the Convention that contain written

agreements to arbitrate.⁵

“[U]pon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or proceeding is referable to arbitration under” an agreement to arbitrate covered by the FAA, a court “shall on application of one of the parties stay the trial of the action until such arbitration has been had in accordance with the terms of the agreement.” 9 U.S.C. § 3. In light of the strong federal policy favoring enforcement of agreements to arbitrate, “any doubts concerning the scope of arbitrable issues should be resolved in favor of arbitration, whether the problem at hand is the construction of the contract language itself or an allegation of waiver, delay, or a like defense to arbitrability.” *Brownstone*, 514 F. Supp. at 549 (citations omitted); *Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.* 796 F. App’x. 45, 48 (2d Cir. 2019); *Alfa Laval U.S. Treasury Inc. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 404, 409 (S.D.N.Y. 2012); *see also In re Am. Exp. Financial Advisors Secs. Litig.*, 672 F.3d 113, 128 (2d Cir. 2011) (federal policy requires that arbitration clauses be construed “as broadly as possible”).

The Second Circuit has recognized that in the event of a dispute that presents a fundamental conflict between the FAA and the Bankruptcy Code, a bankruptcy court may have discretion to decline to enforce an arbitration provision. *MBNA*, 436 F.3d at 108. Bankruptcy courts considering whether such a fundamental conflict exists first analyze whether the dispute is a core bankruptcy proceeding. “Bankruptcy courts generally do not have discretion to refuse to compel arbitration of ‘non-core’ bankruptcy matters, or matters that are simply ‘related to’ bankruptcy cases.” *Id.* (citing *In re Crysen/Montenay Energy Co.*, 226 F.3d 160, 166 (2d Cir.2000)). And “even as to core

⁵ *See Smith/Enron Cogeneration Ltd. P’ship, Inc. v. Smith Cogeneration Int’l, Inc.*, 198 F.3d 88, 92 (2d Cir. 1999). “[A] district court’s scope of inquiry in considering a petition to compel arbitration under Chapter Two of the FAA is ‘very limited.’” *Id.* (citing *Ledee v. Ceramiche Ragno*, 684 F.2d 184, 186 (1st Cir. 1982)); *see also Cargill Int’l S.A. v. M/T Pavel Dybenko*, 991 F.2d 1012, 1018 (2d Cir. 1993).

proceedings, the bankruptcy court will not have discretion to override an arbitration agreement unless it finds that the proceedings are based on provisions of the Bankruptcy Code that ‘inherently conflict’ with the Arbitration Act or that arbitration of the claim would ‘necessarily jeopardize’ the objectives of the Bankruptcy Code.” *Id.* (citing *In re U.S. Lines, Inc.*, 197 F.3d 631, 640 (2d Cir. 1999)); *see also Hagerstown*, 277 B.R. at 200-01 (even as to a core claim, an “arbitration clause should be enforced unless doing so would seriously jeopardize the objectives of the Code”) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

“In assessing whether it has discretion to refuse arbitration, the bankruptcy court applies a four-part test: ‘(1) did the parties agree to arbitrate; (2) does the dispute fall within their arbitration clause; (3) if federal statutory claims are raised, did Congress intend those claims to be arbitrable; and (4) if the court concludes that some but not all of the claims are arbitrable, should it stay the non-arbitrable claims pending the conclusion of the arbitration?’” *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 767 (citing *In re Cardali*, No. 10-3531 (SHL), 2010 WL 4791801, at *5 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Nov. 18, 2010)). Some bankruptcy courts formulate the standard slightly differently, asking first “whether the proceeding at issue is core or non-core,” because if the proceeding is non-core “the bankruptcy court generally does not have discretion” to deny arbitration. *Id.* at 768 n.12. If the proceeding is core, the question becomes “whether any underlying purpose of the Bankruptcy Code would be adversely affected by enforcing [the] arbitration clause.” *Id.* (quoting *In re Winimo*, 270 B.R. at 118). Plaintiffs, as the parties opposing arbitration, bear the burden of proving that the Arbitration Insurers’ right to mandatory arbitration under the Arbitration Policies, the FAA and the Convention, can be overcome because of an irreconcilable conflict with the Bankruptcy Code. *See ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 767; *Hagerstown*, 277 B.R. at 198 (“Like any statutory directive, the [FAA’s] mandate may be overridden by a contrary congressional command . . . The party opposing arbitration bears the

burden of demonstrating that ‘Congress intended to preclude a waiver of judicial remedies for the statutory rights at issue.’”) (internal citations omitted); *Hays & Co. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.*, 885 F.2d 1149, 1156 (3d Cir. 1989) (“[T]he district court lacked the authority and discretion to deny enforcement of the arbitration clause unless” the plaintiff “had met its burden of showing” that the “Bankruptcy Code conflicts with the enforcement of an arbitration clause,” which the plaintiff had not.)

Under either formulation of the standard, the Adversary Complaint’s claims against the Arbitration Insurers must be arbitrated, because the parties agreed to arbitrate, the claims fall within the scope of the parties’ mandatory arbitration provisions, they are non-core claims, there are no federal claims, there are no non-arbitrable claims, and arbitration would not in any way be inconsistent with the Bankruptcy Code and the proposed Plan.

II. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS AGAINST THE ARBITRATION INSURERS ARE SUBJECT TO MANDATORY, BINDING ARBITRATION.

A. The Parties Agreed to Arbitrate.

The threshold inquiry of any motion to enforce an arbitration provision is “whether there was an agreement to arbitrate the claims asserted” in the complaint. *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 91. The question whether the parties have agreed to arbitrate is an issue of contract law for judicial determination. *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 768.

There can be no dispute that the Arbitration Insurers and the Debtors agreed to arbitrate. The existence of arbitration clauses in insurance contracts itself shows that the parties agreed to arbitrate. *See id*; *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 91-92; *VAC Service Corp. v. Service Merchandise Co.*, 929 F. Supp. 143, 145 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (“[W]here a contract contains an arbitration clause, there is a presumption of arbitrability that is overcome only by a definitive showing that the dispute in question is outside the arbitration clause.”); *Associated Brick Mason Contractors of Greater N.Y.*,

Inc. v. Harrington, 820 F.2d 31, 35 (2d Cir. 1987) (“The existence of an arbitration clause in the Agreement raises a presumption of arbitrability” of the dispute.). In *ResCap*, for example, the arbitration clauses provided: “Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Acts of 1996” 563 B.R. at 769. The court concluded that the clause was “a broad provision to send disputes about the policies to arbitration” that manifested the parties’ agreement to arbitrate. *Id.*

The Arbitration Insurers’ policies generally contain the same or similar broad and binding arbitration provisions as were at issue in *ResCap*. The policies conforming to the Bermuda form provide that “[a]ny dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Acts of 1950, 1975, and 1979” *E.g.*, Declaration of Richard Geddes in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A (XL Bermuda Ltd. Policy No. XLUMB-00342); *see also* Exhibit A, Chart of Arbitration Provisions. Other policies provide, for example, that “[a]ny and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy . . . shall be finally and fully determined in Hamilton, Bermuda under the provisions of The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993” Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits B, C, D, E (Allied World Assurance Company, Ltd. Policy Nos. C001210/002 – 005). All of the Arbitration Insurers’ policies contain arbitration provisions. *See* Exhibit A, Chart of Arbitration Provisions. As in *ResCap*, the broad arbitration provisions in the Arbitration Insurers’ policies unequivocally show that the parties here agreed to arbitrate.

B. Plaintiffs' Claims Fall within the Policies' Arbitration Provisions.

The second preliminary inquiry is whether the arbitration clause “covers the dispute at issue.” *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 769. In making this determination, “courts consider whether the arbitration clause is ‘narrow’ or ‘broad’ in light of the allegations of the complaint.” *Id.* “[I]f the clause is broad, arbitrability will be presumed.” *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 92. In light of the policy favoring arbitration, “any doubts concerning the scope of arbitrable issues should be resolved in favor of arbitration.” *Id.*; *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 766; *Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.*, 796 F. App’x. at 48.

The arbitration provisions in the Arbitration Policies plainly cover this adversary proceeding. The majority of the Arbitration Policies use the same or similar phrasing in their arbitration clauses. *See, e.g.*, Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits B, C, D, E (Allied World Assurance Company, Ltd. Policy Nos. C001210/002 – 005) (requiring that “[a]ny and all disputes arising under or relating to this policy” be arbitrated in Bermuda); Declaration of Richard Geddes in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A (XL Bermuda Ltd. Policy No. XLUMB-00342) (requiring that “[a]ny dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof” be arbitrated in London); Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit B (Starr Excess Liability Insurance International Limited Policy No. 201012) (requiring that “[a]ny and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity” be arbitrated in Bermuda).

The Arbitration Policies use the same language that other courts have deemed sufficiently broad to apply to similar coverage disputes. *See ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 769-70; *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 91-92; *see also McCowan v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 908 F.2d 1099, 1106 (2d Cir. 1990) (holding arbitration clause requiring “any controversy . . . arising out of or relating to this contract or the

breach thereof shall be settled by arbitration” encompassed dispute, and reversing judgment denying motion for a stay pending arbitration). In *ResCap*, the Court held that the language in the arbitration clauses of the policies at issue— “[a]ny dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy”— was “exceedingly broad” and covered the adversary proceeding against the insurers. *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 769. Similarly, in *MF Global*, the Court determined that the parties had agreed to arbitrate and that the arbitration provisions in the Bermuda policies at issue (which are identical to those at issue here in all material respects) were broad. 571 B.R. at 91-92.⁶

The case law uniformly holds that insureds that agree to arbitrate coverage disputes are bound by those agreements, which compels the same result here. *E.g. MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 91-92; *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 769-70; *VAC*, 929 F. Supp. at 145-46; *Raytheon Co. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.*, 306 F. Supp. 2d 346, 358 (S.D.N.Y. 2004); *Alfa*, 857 F. Supp. at 414; *Century Indem. Co.*, 2007 WL 1599157, at *3.

⁶ Two of the Arbitration Policies contain slightly different language. They mandate arbitration “[i]n the event of a disagreement as to the interpretation of ... [the] policy.” Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A (AIG Specialty Insurance Company Policy No. 267-47-08); Declaration of Monica T. Sullivan in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits A, B (Evanston Insurance Company Policy No. XO-GA-1138-00). These arbitration provisions also apply because, according to Plaintiffs, *see* Adversary Complaint ¶ 65, Plaintiffs’ claims turn on the disputed interpretation of several provisions of the Arbitration Policies. *See Century Indem. Co. v. Clearwater Ins. Co.*, 06 CIV 0424 SAS, 2007 WL 1599157, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 4, 2007) (holding that clause providing for arbitration of any “irreconcilable difference of opinion. . . as to the interpretation of this Contract” required arbitration of coverage dispute); *Alfa Laval U.S. Treas. Inc. v. Nat’l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.*, 857 F. Supp. 2d 404, 406 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (compelling arbitration of coverage dispute where arbitration clause provided for arbitration of disputes reading the “interpretation of the Indemnity Agreement.”).

III. THE MANDATORY ARBITRATION PROVISIONS MUST BE ENFORCED BECAUSE THEIR ENFORCEMENT WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH THE BANKRUPTCY CODE.

Because the Arbitration Policies contain binding arbitration provisions that apply to the claims asserted, the Court next must examine whether enforcement of those bargained-for arbitration rights would conflict irreconcilably with the Bankruptcy Code. The “principal inquiry” in making that determination is “whether the claims asserted are core or non-core in the bankruptcy.” *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 770. This is the “principal” inquiry because if the claims are non-core, the arbitration provisions must be enforced without further analysis. It may not be the only inquiry in all cases because even if claims are deemed core, arbitration is still required unless the plaintiff makes the additional showing that arbitration would create a serious conflict with the Bankruptcy Code in the context of the given bankruptcy proceedings. *MBNA Am. Bank*, 436 F.3d at 108. In this case, however, Plaintiffs have argued only that their insurance claims are core bankruptcy claims, Adversary Complaint ¶ 51, without further demonstrating how arbitration would conflict with the Code in this particular proceeding. But Plaintiffs are mistaken; their claims are not core bankruptcy claims, and must be arbitrated.⁷

The Supreme Court addressed the core vs. non-core distinction in *Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipeline Co.*, observing that “the restructuring of debtor-credit relations, which is at the core of the federal bankruptcy power, must be distinguished from the adjudication of state-created private rights, such as the right to recover contract damages.” 458 U.S. 50, 71 (1982). “The principal holding of *Marathon* is that Congress has minimal authority to

⁷ As demonstrated below, the proposed reorganization is entirely independent of the resolution of Plaintiffs’ insurance claims, and arbitrating them would create no conflict with the Bankruptcy Code under any circumstances. Accordingly, even if the Court were to deem the claims to be core, it should still stay the proceeding pending arbitration, because Plaintiffs cannot establish that arbitration in this situation would create a meaningful conflict with the Code.

control the manner in which a right created by state law may be adjudicated as that right is independent of and antecedent to the reorganization petition that conferred jurisdiction upon the bankruptcy court.” *In re Cardali*, 2010 WL 4791801, at *7 (citing *U.S. Lines*, 197 F.3d at 637). “Therefore, under *Marathon*, whether a contract proceeding is core depends on (1) whether the contract is antecedent to the reorganization petition; and (2) the degree to which the proceeding is independent of the reorganization.” *Id.*; see also *In re Residential Cap.*, 15-cv-2712 (JPO), 2015 WL 9302834 at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2015) (quoting *Mt. McKinley Ins. Co. v. Corning Inc.*, 399 F.3d 436, 448 (2d Cir. 2005)); *Century 21*, Tr. at 19-20.

In other words, a “proceeding is encompassed within the bankruptcy court’s core . . . jurisdiction if it invokes a substantive right provided by title 11 or if it is a proceeding that, by its nature, could arise only in the context of a bankruptcy case. *Kerusa Co. LLC v. W10Z/515 Real Estate Ltd. P’ship*, No. 04 Civ. 708 (GEL), 2004 WL 1048239, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 7, 2004). “By contrast, a proceeding is non-core if it exists independently under state law and is merely ‘related to’ the bankruptcy case because of a conceivable effect upon the debtor’s estate.” *Id.* If the lawsuit is only “related to” to the Debtors’ bankruptcy cases, then it is “non-core.” *E.g., In re N.Y. Skyline, Inc.*, 512 B.R. 159, 172–73 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) (“As explained by the Supreme Court, ‘[t]he terms ‘non-core’ and ‘related’ are synonymous.’”) (quoting *Stern v. Marshall*, 131 S. Ct. 2594, 2605 (2011)).

The Arbitration Policies are all antecedent to the reorganization, see Adversary Complaint, Ex. A, and they are brought under state and other relevant law, not under the Bankruptcy Code. See *id.* ¶¶ 6-80. Where, as here, an antecedent contract claim “does not depend on bankruptcy laws for its existence and . . . could proceed in a court that lacks federal bankruptcy jurisdiction,” it typically is non-core. *DeWitt Rehab. & Nursing Ctr., Inc. v. Columbia Cas. Co.*, 464 B.R. 587, 591 (S.D.N.Y.

2012) (quoting *N. Am. Energy Conservation, Inc. v. Interstate Energy Res., Inc.*, Case No. 00-CV-4302 (SHS), 2000 WL 1514614, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 10, 2000)).

Critically, the Debtors' reorganization in no way depends on the outcome of this adversary proceeding. The Plan contemplates that the various creditor trusts will receive cash assets in excess of \$5.5 billion, and the two principal opioids abatement trusts also will receive all profits from the business that will emerge from the bankruptcy for years to come. Dkt. No. 2487, Plan, Section 5.2, 5.7; Dkt. No. 2488, Disclosure Statement, at 2, 6. While the Plan provides for the possibility of insurance recoveries through this proceeding, and while any such recoveries would supplement the many billions of dollars already being made available to creditors, the viability and success of the proposed reorganization do not hinge on the amount or timing of any potential insurance recoveries.

The Plan in fact allows for the possibility that the Debtors and creditors will recover absolutely nothing on their insurance claims. Under the Plan, up to \$450 million of any proceeds recovered by the MDT pursuant to the Debtors' insurance policies will be disbursed by the MDT to the PI Trust for the benefit of personal injury claimants. Dkt. No. 2487, Plan, Section 5.2(d)(i)(D). But even if there are no insurance recoveries, the PI Trust is entitled to \$400 million from the MDT generated from other sources, paid in scheduled installments at one-year intervals, from July 20, 2024 to July 20, 2026. *Id.*, Section 5.2(d)(i)(D). The effectiveness of the Plan is not made contingent on the amount or timing of insurance recoveries in any way, and the Disclosure Statement omits any discussion of insurance recoveries from its long list of potential risks to be considered prior to voting on the Plan. *See* Dkt. No. 2488, Disclosure Statement, at 180-88. Thus, the Debtors' proposed Plan itself belies the Complaint's assertion that potential insurance recoveries are such a substantial asset that their resolution would affect the "function of allocating and distributing" the Debtors' assets among creditors. *See* Adversary Complaint ¶ 51.

The Complaint also asserts that the adversary proceeding is core because “the proceeds from the disputed insurance coverage are, collectively, a very substantial asset of the Debtors’ estates.” *Id.* Even if this were true, it is irrelevant. It is well-established that claims are not transformed into core claims simply because they could affect the quantum of funds available to the estate. *See, e.g., Mt. McKinley Ins. Co.*, 399 F.3d at 449-50 (simply affecting assets of the estate is not sufficient to directly affect a core bankruptcy function); *DeWitt Rehab. & Nursing Ctr.*, 464 B.R. at 592 (although an insurance coverage dispute involved assets of the estate, it was not core because policies were not the only source of funds available to the estate and resolution was not necessary to effectuate equitable distribution of funds among other creditors); *In re Lenders Abstract & Settlement Serv. Inc.*, 493 B.R. 385, 394 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) (action to recover insurance proceeds is not rendered core “simply because it involves property of the estate”) (quoting *U.S. Lines*, 197 F.3d at 637); *In re John A. Rocco Co.*, No. 12-01277 (NLW), 2015 WL 1727474, at *6 (Bankr. D.N.J. Apr. 13, 2015) (“While the coverage determination will certainly impact the distribution ultimately received by creditors, it is well established that a claim’s potential ability to bring in assets to the estate is not relevant to the core determination.”); *In re Donington, Karcher, Salmond, Ronan & Rainone, P.A.*, 194 B.R. 750, 759 (D.N.J. 1996) (a proceeding is not core “merely because the resolution of the action results in more, or less, assets in the estate”) (quotations omitted); *In re Stone & Webster, Inc.*, 367 B.R. 523, 527 (Bankr. D. Del. 2007) (“The economic effect that a claim may have on the bankruptcy estate . . . has no bearing on the core/non-core dichotomy.”).

On the contrary, where, as here, “the insurance proceeds would only augment the assets of the estate for general distribution, the effect on the administration of the estate [is] insufficient to render the proceedings core.” *U.S. Lines*, 197 F.3d at 638; *see also Orion*, 4 F.3d at 1102 (any contract action to recover funds could presumably benefit the estate and “thus concern its

administration,” but that does not make such an action a core proceeding); *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 94-95 (potential augmentation of estate by insurance policy proceeds was insufficient to make coverage dispute core); *Little Rest Twelve, Inc. v. Visan*, 458 B.R. 44, 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (action involving debtor and non-creditor in which “‘the only relationship . . . to the bankruptcy proceeding [is] that determination of the action would affect the ultimate size of the estate’ is not a core proceeding”) (citation omitted); *In re Lawrence Grp., Inc.*, 285 B.R. 784, 787 (N.D.N.Y. 2002) (“policy would serve only to augment the assets of the estate for general distribution” and thus insurance coverage dispute was non-core).

This action thus stands in stark contrast to *U.S. Lines*, where proceeds under the insurance policies were the only source of funding to pay claimants, and the debtor had no assets with which to pay claims and then seek reimbursement. Multiple courts that have considered *U.S. Lines* have distinguished it on that very basis. In *Century 21*, *MF Global* and *ResCap*, each court emphasized that the insurance policies in *U.S. Lines* “represent[ed] the only potential source of cash available” to certain creditors. *Century 21*, Tr. at 21-22; *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 95; *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 772. As Judge Glenn explained in *MF Global*, the estate in that case had other assets (just as the Debtors here have billions of dollars available apart from insurance), and the insurance policy at issue was not the sole source of recovery for any creditor group (just as is the case here). *MF Global*, 571 B.R. at 95.

ResCap and *MF Global* are directly on point. In *ResCap*, representatives of the underlying claimants and the bankruptcy trustee brought an adversarial proceeding against certain insurers under contracts with mandatory arbitration provisions. Judge Lane noted that the claims related entirely to pre-petition contracts, and the allegation that the claims arose post-petition did not affect their non-core nature. He further explained that the claims were non-core because the Bankruptcy

Court was not “uniquely able to interpret and enforce” the provisions of the insurance policies at issue. 563 B.R. at 773 (citing *MBNA*, 436 F.3d at 109). Judge Lane also rejected the argument, made by plaintiffs here, that permitting arbitration would lead to piecemeal litigation. *See* Adversary Complaint ¶ 51; *ResCap*, 563 B.R. at 766-67 (“The Supreme Court has held that the Arbitration Act requires courts to ‘compel arbitration of pendant arbitrable claims when one of the parties files a motion to compel’ even when doing so would create ‘separate proceedings in different forums.’”) (quoting *Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Byrd*, 470 U.S. 213, 217 (1985)). Debtors agreed to arbitrate knowing there could be disputes with their different insurers. They cannot walk away from those agreements because of any purported inconvenience to them.

In *MF Global*, Judge Glenn stayed an adversarial coverage action based on an arbitration provision substantially identical to most of the arbitration provisions at issue here. 571 B.R. at 96-97. The Court determined that the parties had agreed to arbitrate, and that the arbitration provisions in the Bermuda policies at issue were broad. *Id.* at 90-91. The Court then concluded that the coverage dispute had “almost none of the hallmarks of a typical substantively core claim” as it was “entirely ‘based on the parties’ pre-petition relationship,” and the Plaintiffs were not asserting the claim based on any “rights created under the Bankruptcy Code.” *Id.* at 96 (citing *Hagerstown*, 277 B.R. at 203). The Court expressly rejected an argument that the coverage case was “a ‘core’ proceeding because the adjudication of this coverage dispute will have a significant bearing on the availability of estate assets.” *Id.* at 94. The Court held that sending the dispute to arbitration would not conflict with the Bankruptcy Code, and ordered the parties to arbitrate. *Id.* at 96-97.

In another very recent decision of this Court concerning non-insurance contract claims, Judge Chapman granted defendants’ motion for abstention and remanded an adversary proceeding to New York State Court. *Century 21*, Tr. at 36. The Court found that the adversary proceeding

concerned a “prepetition contract dispute that exists independent of the bankruptcy process” and the state law breach of contract claim “neither arises in the debtor's Chapter 11 case, nor arises under the Bankruptcy Code.” *Id.* at 23. Therefore, the Court held that the action was a non-core proceeding. *Id.* at 25-26.

Many other courts that have addressed the issue have held that insurance coverage actions are not core proceedings. *See, e.g., Mt. McKinley Ins. Co. v. Corning Inc.*, 399 F.3d 436, 450 (2d Cir. 2005) (adversary proceeding seeking declaratory judgment under insurance policy was non-core); *DeWitt Rehab. & Nursing Ctr. v. Columbia Cas. Co.*, 464 B.R. 587 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (same); *In re Stone*, 367 B.R. at 527 (same); *Maryland Casualty Co. v. Aselco, Inc.*, 223 B.R. 217, 220 (D. Kan. 1998) (same); *In re Gulf USA Corp.*, Nos. 95-6039, 93-02987, 1995 WL 653383, *1 (Bankr. D. Idaho Oct. 25, 1995) (same); *In re R.I. Lithograph Corp.*, 60 B.R. 199, 203-04 (Bankr. D. R.I. 1986) (adversary proceeding asserting breach of contract claim under insurance policy was non-core); *In re Lawrence Grp., Inc.*, 285 B.R. at 787 (same); *In re Dayton Title Agency, Inc.*, 264 B.R. 880, 884 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 2000) (adversary proceeding asserting breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and tortious bad faith was non-core).

In short, this adversary proceeding offers the Court no reason to override the FAA and the strong federal policy favoring the enforcement of agreements to arbitrate. Regardless of the merits of Plaintiffs’ claims against the Arbitration Insurers, they are not core bankruptcy claims: they are antecedent to the reorganization; they do not rest on bankruptcy law; and they exist independent of the Debtors’ reorganization. The Court therefore should enforce the arbitration agreements in the Arbitration Policies, and stay this non-core adversary proceeding against the Arbitration Insurers in favor of arbitration.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Arbitration Insurers respectfully request that the Court stay the claims against them in adversary proceeding in favor of arbitration, and grant such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York
April 5, 2021

**COUNSEL FOR ARBITRATION
INSURERS**

**WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
LLP**

/s/ Mitchell J. Auslander

Mitchell J. Auslander
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
787 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019-6099
(212) 728-8201
mauslander@willkie.com

Joseph G. Davis (*pro hac vice* pending)
1875 K. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1238
(202) 303-1131
jdavis@willkie.com

*Counsel for Defendants AIG Specialty
Insurance Company, American
International Reinsurance Company,
and New Hampshire Insurance
Company*

**ABRAMS, GORELICK,
FRIEDMAN & JACOBSON, LLP**

/s/ Michael E. Gorelick

Michael E. Gorelick
Thomas R. Maeglin
Abrams, Gorelick, Friedman &
Jacobson, LLP
1 Battery Park Plaza (4th floor)
New York, NY 10004
(212) 422-1200
mgorelick@agfjlaw.com
tmaeglin@agfjlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendant Liberty Mutual
Insurance Europe S.E.*

BATESCAREY LLP

/s/ Kent A. Wilson

Kent A. Wilson
Adam H. Fleischer
R. Patrick Bedell
Kristi S. Nolley
BatesCarey LLP
Suite 2400
191 N. Upper Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-762-3100
kwilson@batescarey.com

*Counsel for Defendants Chubb
European Group SE (formerly ACE
Insurance S.A.-N.V.), QBE UK Limited
(formerly QBE International Insurance
Company Limited), SR International
Business Company SE (formerly SR
International Business Insurance
Company Limited), Darag Insurance
UK Limited (formerly The Underwriter
Insurance Company Limited), Zurich
Specialties London Limited (formerly
Zurich Reinsurance (London) Limited)*

-- and ---

HURWITZ & FINE

Dan D. Kohane
Lee Siegel
Hurwitz & Fine
1200 Liberty Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 849-8900

IFRAH PLLC

/s/ George R. Calhoun, V
George R. Calhoun, V (*pro hac vice*)
IFRAH PLLC
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006-2004
(202) 524-4140 – Tel.
(202) 524-4141 – Fax
george@ifrahlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendants Ironshore
Specialty Insurance Company, formerly
known as TIG Specialty Insurance
Company, and Allied World Assurance
Company, Ltd.*

MORRISON MAHONEY, LLP

/s/ Arthur J. Liederman
Arthur J. Liederman
Nicole Battisti
Nicole Khalouian
Morrison Mahoney, LLP
88 Pine Street
New York, NY 10005
(212) 825-1212

*Counsel for Defendant HDI Global SE /
HDI Global SE – UK as successor to
Gerling Konzern General Insurance
Company UK Branch*

CLYDE & CO US LLP

/s/ Paul R. Koepff
Paul R. Koepff
Harris Wiener
Clyde & Co US LLP
The Chrysler Building
405 Lexington Ave., 16th Floor
New York, NY 10174
(212) 710-3900

--- and ---

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Tancred Schiavoni
Maria DiConza
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Times Square Tower
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
(212) 326-2000

*Counsel for Defendant
Arch Reinsurance Ltd*

DENTONS US LLP

/s/ Lauren Macksoud
Lauren Macksoud
Dentons US LLP
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
(212) 768-5347

Patrick Maxcy (*pro hac vice* pending)
Keith Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*
pending)
Dentons US LLP
233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 5900
Chicago, IL 60606-6361
(312) 876-2810

--- and ---

KENNEDYS

Richard Geddes
Kennedys
100 N Riverside Plaza, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 800-5036

*Counsel for Defendant
XL Bermuda Ltd.*

CLYDE & CO US LLP

/s/ Daren McNally

Daren McNally
Barbara Almeida
Harris Wiener
Matthew Gennaro
Clyde & Co US LLP
The Chrysler Building
405 Lexington Ave., 16th Floor
New York, NY 10174
(212) 710-3900

--- and ---

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Tancred Schiavoni
Maria DiConza
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Times Square Tower
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
(212) 326-2000

*Counsel for Chubb Bermuda Insurance
Ltd*

**NICOLAIDES FINK THORPE
MICHAELIDES SULLIVAN LLP**

/s/ Monica T. Sullivan

Monica T. Sullivan
Nicolaides Fink Thorpe Michaelides
Sullivan LLP
10 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 585-1400

Jodi S. Green
Nicolaidis Fink Thorpe Michaelides
Sullivan LLP
626 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1000
Los Angeles, California 90049
(213) 402-1248

--- and ---

GEOFFREY T. RAICHT, PC

Geoffrey T. Raicht
Geoffrey T. Raicht, PC
1 Kittle Road
Chappaqua, New York 10514
(917) 344-0036

*Counsel for Defendant Evanston
Insurance Company*

Exhibit A

to MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THE
ARBITRATION INSURERS' JOINT MOTION TO STAY THE CLAIMS AGAINST THEM
IN THE ADVERSARY PROCEEDING IN FAVOR OF ARBITRATION

Chart of Arbitration Provisions

Defendant Insurer	Policy Numbers	Arbitration Provisions – Key Language
AIG Specialty Insurance Company (successor to American International Specialty Lines Insurance Company)	267-47-08	“In the event of a disagreement as to the interpretation of this policy, the disagreement shall be submitted to binding arbitration before a panel of three (3) arbitrators. within thirty (30) days of a written request for arbitration by either you or us, each party will choose an arbitrator, such arbitrator shall, at the request of either party, be selected by the American Arbitration Association in accordance with its rules and procedures.” Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A.
Allied World Assurance Company, Ltd.	C001210/002 C001210/003 C001210/004 C001210/005	“Any and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity, shall be finally and fully determined in Hamilton, Bermuda under the provision of The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993 (exclusive of the Conciliation Part of such Act), as may be amended and supplemented, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows:” Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits B, C, D, E.
American International Reinsurance Company (successor to Starr Excess Liability Insurance International Limited)	201012	“Any and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity, and whether between the Company and the Insured or any person or entity deriving rights through or asserting rights on behalf of the Insured, shall be finally and fully determined in Bermuda under the provisions of The Bermuda International Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1993 (exclusive of the Conciliation Part of such Act), as may amended and supplemented, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows:” Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit B.
Arch Reinsurance Ltd.	B4-UFP-03233-01 B4-UFP-03233-02 B4-UFP-03233-03 UFP0018240-00	“Any and all disputes arising under or relating to this Policy, including its formation and validity, and whether between the Company and the Insured or any person or entity deriving rights through or asserting rights on behalf of the Insured, shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Act 1996 and/or any statutory modifications or amendments thereto, for the time being in force, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows:” Declaration of Paul R. Koepff in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits A, B, C, D.

Defendant Insurer	Policy Numbers	Arbitration Provisions – Key Language
Chubb Bermuda Insurance Ltd	PRA-1031/5	“Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Acts of 1950, 1975 and 1979 and/or any statutory modifications or amendments thereto, for the time being in force, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Daren McNally in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A.
Chubb European Group SE (f/k/a ACE Insurance S.A.-N.V.)	823/KE0002108	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Kent A. Wilson in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit E.
Darag Insurance UK Limited (f/k/a The Underwriter Insurance Company)	823/KE0002108	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Kent A. Wilson in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit E.
Evanston Insurance Company	XO-GA-1138-00	“In the event of a disagreement as to the interpretation of this policy, the disagreement shall be submitted to binding arbitration before a panel of three (3) arbitrators. within thirty (30) days of a written request for arbitration by either you or us, each party will choose an arbitrator, such arbitrator shall, at the request of either party, be selected by the American Arbitration Association in accordance with its rules and procedures. . . .” Declaration of Monica T. Sullivan in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits A, B.
HDI Global SE / HDI Global SE – UK (successor to Gerling Konzern General Insurance Company UK Branch)	823/KE9801816 823/KE9801818 823/KE9901926	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Arthur J. Liederman, Esq. in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits A, B, C.
Ironshore Specialty Insurance Company (f/k/a TIG Specialty Insurance Company)	XLX 38822826	“Any dispute arising under this policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of George R. Calhoun in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A.

Defendant Insurer	Policy Numbers	Arbitration Provisions – Key Language
Liberty Mutual Insurance Europe SE	823/KE9901928	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Michael E. Gorelick in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A.
New Hampshire Insurance Company	823/KE0002108	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows” Declaration of Mitchell J. Auslander in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit C.
QBE UK Limited (f/k/a QBE International Insurance Company Limited)	823/KE0002108	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Kent A. Wilson in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit E.
SR International Business Company SE (f/k/a SR International Business Insurance Company Limited)	823/KE9901927 823/KE0002108	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Kent A. Wilson in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits D, E.
XL Bermuda Ltd.	XLUMB-00342	“Any dispute, controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this Policy or the breach, termination or invalidity thereof shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the Arbitration Acts of 1950, 1975, and 1979 and/or any statutory modifications or amendments thereto, for the time being in force, by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Richard Geddes in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibit A.
Zurich Specialties London Limited (f/k/a Zurich Reinsurance (London) Limited)	823/KE9801815 823/KE9801817 823/KE9901925	“Any dispute arising under this Policy shall be finally and fully determined in London, England under the provisions of the English Arbitration Act of 1950, as amended and supplemented by a Board composed of three arbitrators to be selected for each controversy as follows: . . .” Declaration of Kent A. Wilson in Support of Joint Motion to Stay in Favor of Arbitration, Exhibits A, B, C.

Exhibit B

to MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THE
ARBITRATION INSURERS' JOINT MOTION TO STAY THE CLAIMS AGAINST THEM
IN THE ADVERSARY PROCEEDING IN FAVOR OF ARBITRATION

1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

3 Case No. 20-12097-scc

4 Adv. Case No. 20-01222-scc

5 - - - - - x

6 In the Matter of:

7

8 CENTURY 21 DEPARTMENT STORES LLC,

9

10 Debtor.

11 - - - - - x

12 CENTURY 21 DEPARTMENT STORES LLC, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 STARR SURPLUS LINES INSURANCE CO., et al.,

16 Defendants.

17 - - - - - x

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

United States Bankruptcy Court

One Bowling Green

New York, NY 10004

February 12, 2021

10:00 AM

B E F O R E :

HON SHELLEY C. CHAPMAN

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

ECRO: UNKNOWN

1 HEARING re Doc #469 First Interim Fee Application of
2 Proskauer Rose LLP, as Counsel to the Debtors

3
4 HEARING re Doc #468 First Interim Application of Stretto for
5 Allowance of Compensation

6
7 HEARING re Doc #462 Application for Interim Professional
8 Compensation for Lowenstein Sandler LLP, Creditor Comm Aty

9
10 HEARING re Doc #513 First Interim Fee Application Of
11 AlixPartners, LLP, Financial Advisor To The Official
12 Committee of Unsecured Creditors

13
14 HEARING re Doc #226 Acro Display LLCs Motion for Allowance
15 and Payment of Administrative Expense

16
17 HEARING re Adversary proceedings: 20-01222-scc Century 21
18 Department Stores LLC et al. v. Starr Surplus Lines
19 Insurance CO. et al. Status Conference

20
21
22
23
24
25 Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

1 A P P E A R A N C E S :

2

3 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

4 Attorneys for the Debtor

5 Eleven Times Square

6 New York, NY 10036

7

8 BY: MATTHEW SKRYNSKI (TELEPHONICALLY)

9 PETER YOUNG (TELEPHONICALLY)

10

11 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

12 Attorneys for the U.S. Trustee

13 201 Varick Street, Suite 1006

14 New York, NY 10014

15

16 BY: ANDREA SCHWARTZ (TELEPHONICALLY)

17

18 WHITE and WILLIAMS LLP

19 Attorneys for Acro Display LLC

20 7 Times Square

21 New York, NY 10036

22

23 BY: JAMES VANDERMARK (TELEPHONICALLY)

24

25

1 WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE & DORR LLP

2 Attorneys for Starr Surplus Lines Insurance Co., et al.

3 7 World Trade Center, 250 Greenwich Street

4 New York, NY 10007

5

6 BY: PHILIP ANKER (TELEPHONICALLY)

7

8 LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP

9 Attorneys for Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

10 One Lowenstein Drive

11 Roseland, NJ 07068

12

13 BY: BRENT WEISENBERG (TELEPHONICALLY)

14

15 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

16 Attorneys for JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.

17 One Federal Street

18 Boston, MA 02110

19

20 BY: JULIA FROST-DAVIES (TELEPHONICALLY)

21

22 ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:

23 DENISE MARTE

24 TRACY KLESTADT

25 BENJAMIN LOVELAND

1 MATTHEW BURKE
2 DANIELE SALVATORE
3 LAUREN LIFLAND
4 CYNTHIA BERNSTIEL
5 NICOLE KOZLOWSKI
6 JEFF MARWIL
7 BRIAN CASHMAN
8 JEFFREY COHEN
9 ROBERT KLAMSER
10 KATHRYN MCGLYNN
11 DAVID RILEY
12 KAITLYN SUNDT
13 VLADIMIR JELISAVCIC
14 TAL SINGER
15 PAUL ADAMS
16 JOHN JURELLER
17 ISABELLA STANKOWSKI-BOOKER
18 JOANNA YOUNG
19 EZRA HUSNEY
20 DENNIS T. D'ANTONIO
21 WILLIAM COONEY
22 TYLER FLYNN
23 C. RUSSELL
24 MICHAEL HYNES

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. This is Judge
3 Chapman. We're here this morning in the Century 21
4 Department Stores cases, Case No. 20-12907. If everybody
5 could please keep your phones on mute until you speak, I
6 would appreciate it. Thank you.

7 This hearing is being conducted entirely
8 telephonically via the Court Solutions platform and a
9 recording of the hearing is being made. No private
10 recordings of the hearing are permitted.

11 I have a long roster of those who have registered
12 to participate this morning. I appreciate that we have a
13 number of matters on the calendar this morning. Please
14 identify yourself for the record when you speak and identify
15 the party on whose behalf you're appearing and please do so
16 each time that you speak so that we can create an accurate
17 record.

18 All right. I did get an amended agenda sometime
19 recently, perhaps early this morning. Who would like to
20 start from the Proskauer firm?

21 MR. SKRZYNSKI: Good morning, Your Honor. This is
22 Matthew Skrzynski of Proskauer Rose on behalf of the
23 Debtors. That's correct, we sent over an amended agenda
24 this morning to Your Honor; it's found at Docket No. 632,
25 and it reflects updates to the status of discussions on fee

1 applications.

2 THE COURT: All right, very good.

3 MR. SKRZYNSKI: Before we proceed -- great.

4 THE COURT: Go ahead, go ahead.

5 MR. SKRZYNSKI: Before we get to the agenda, just
6 by way of quick update. As Your Honor may have seen, the
7 debtors filed a plan, a disclosure statement, and a motion
8 to approve solicitation procedures; those are Dockets 614,
9 615, and 616 respectively.

10 And if Your Honor is amenable to it, proposing to
11 begin with the agenda then at item 1, and after that,
12 counsel for the adversary proceeding can drop off.

13 THE COURT: Partially okay, but I'm going to mix
14 it up a little bit. I'd like to take the fee applications
15 first, so that those parties can drop off, particularly in
16 light of the fact that all outstanding issues on those have
17 been resolved. So if could please start with the fee
18 applications and go through those quickly and then I can
19 have those parties drop off, and then I'll turn to the
20 adversary proceeding.

21 MR. SKRZYNSKI: Sounds good. Thank you, Your
22 Honor. My colleague, Peter Young, will address the fee
23 applications.

24 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Good morning,
25 Mr. Young.

1 MR. YOUNG: Good morning, Judge Chapman. Hope
2 you're well.

3 I'm pleased to report, as Mr. Skrzynski said, that
4 each of the professionals subject to the order that we
5 delivered to chambers this morning, and that includes
6 Proskauer, Stretto, Lowenstein Sandler, and AlixPartners,
7 have reached agreements with the United States Trustee on
8 voluntary write-offs. Those write-offs, Your Honor, are all
9 reflected, both in the numbers and in the footnotes that
10 appear on Schedule A, the official form from the Southern
11 District for approving fee applications.

12 And unless Your Honor has questions -- and I
13 believe, by the way, to Your Honor's point, that each of the
14 professionals is represented on the call -- we ask that you
15 enter the order approving the fees as reduced by the
16 agreement with the United States Trustees.

17 THE COURT: In the interest of candor, I have not
18 had time to review the revised order that you submitted. I
19 would be grateful if you could put on the record what the
20 new numbers are; hopefully, you have that at your
21 fingertips.

22 MR. YOUNG: I do, Your Honor, and I'm happy to do
23 it.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, would you like me to --

1 THE COURT: You neglected to mention Weg & Myers.

2 MR. YOUNG: Yes. I'm sorry, Your Honor, I'm
3 getting a little feedback on the phone. I didn't hear the
4 question.

5 THE COURT: Yeah, I'm just trying to figure out
6 where that's coming from. If everybody could please keep
7 your phones on mute, other than Mr. Young, that would be
8 great. My question was about Weg & Myers.

9 MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

10 THE COURT: When you recited the fee applications,
11 you neglected to mention them. That's before me today as
12 well, yes?

13 MR. YOUNG: It is not, and I neglected
14 purposefully, Your Honor. Weg & Myers will file its final
15 fee application any day now and set it for hearing. As of
16 the December 30th closing on the insurance participation
17 interest sale, the fees and expenses of Weg & Myer are
18 picked up by the buyer of the insurance claim participation
19 interest, and Weg and Myer will no longer be engaged by the
20 estate.

21 And so, we'll submit a notice in connection with
22 their final fee application informing the Court and all
23 parties-in-interest in the case of that fact and seek
24 approval of final fees, but they will not be included as an
25 interim fee application party.

1 THE COURT: Okay. All right, great, that makes a
2 lot of sense. So if you could just run through the other
3 four, I would be grateful.

4 MR. YOUNG: Certainly, Your Honor, and in doing
5 that, would you like me just to run through what the write-
6 off amounts were or what the actual amounts were all across
7 the chart?

8 THE COURT: Yeah, just if you could run up what
9 the write-off amounts were, and then I'm just going to ask
10 Ms. Schwartz to confirm that she's in agreement with what
11 you put on the record.

12 MR. YOUNG: Oh, absolutely, absolutely. Just one
13 moment, Your Honor, I'm happy to do that. Okay.

14 As reflected on Schedule A in the order that we
15 submitted to chambers to resolve objections that the United
16 States Trustee raised informally: Stretto agreed to
17 voluntarily reduce its fees in the amount of \$645; Proskauer
18 agreed to voluntarily reduce its fees in the amount of
19 \$43,656.61, and also its expenses in the amount of
20 \$1,216.80; Lowenstein Sandler agreed to voluntarily reduce
21 its fees in the amount of \$27,000 even; and AlixPartners
22 agreed to voluntarily reduce its fees in the amount of
23 \$33,518 even.

24 Those are the aggregate write-offs, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right, thank you very much. And,

1 Ms. Schwartz, are you there?

2 MS. SCHWARTZ: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor.

3 Andrea Schwartz --

4 THE COURT: Good morning.

5 MS. SCHWARTZ: -- the United States Trustee. Your
6 Honor, those numbers are correct. All of the professionals
7 took our comments very seriously, and we agree with the
8 proposed reductions and they resolve all of our informal
9 objections.

10 THE COURT: All right, thank you so much. All
11 right, and thank you, Ms. Schwartz, as always for handling
12 these matters so efficiently. If no one else wishes to be
13 heard, I've reviewed the applications, the reductions sound
14 fine to me. After we conclude this hearing, I'll take a
15 look at the revised order and we'll get it on the docket by
16 the end of today.

17 All right, thank you very much for that.

18 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: And next up -- and I encourage
20 everybody to get a cup of coffee if you would like to get a
21 fresh one -- I'm going to read you a bench decision on the
22 insurer's motion to remand. Fair warning, it's going to
23 take a little while, and I'm going to get started.

24 All right. Before the Court is a motion to remand
25 filed by the defendants in Adversary Proceeding No. 20-1222,

1 collectively the defendants or the insurers.

2 By the motion, the defendants request that this
3 Court, one, abstain from hearing the adversary proceeding as
4 required by 28 U.S.C. Section 1334(c)(2); or, two, in the
5 alternative, (a) abstain from hearing the adversary
6 proceeding as permitted by 28 U.S.C. Section 1334(c)(1) or
7 (b), or (b) equitably remand the adversary proceeding to the
8 Supreme Court of the State of New York for the County of New
9 York, the State Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section
10 1452(b).

11 Century 21 Department Stores, LLC, or the debtor,
12 together with certain of its non-debtor affiliate plaintiffs
13 in the action, and joined by the Official Committee of
14 Unsecured Creditors, objects to the motion.

15 The Court has considered the motion, the
16 declaration filed in support of the motion, the debtors'
17 objection, the committee's joinder, the defendants' reply,
18 and the arguments of counsel at the hearing held before this
19 Court on December 16th, 2020.

20 In the interest of giving you a disposition today
21 without the additional passage of time, I'm going to read
22 this ruling into the record, but I do retain my right to
23 issue a more formal written decision if that should be
24 appropriate subsequent to delivering this bench decision.

25 First, let me turn to the background of this

1 adversary. While the Court assumes familiarity with the
2 background of these Chapter 11 cases and with this adversary
3 proceeding, the Court will provide a brief summary of
4 pertinent background facts for the purposes of this bench
5 ruling.

6 The debtor and several of its non-debtor
7 affiliates are named insured under various insurance
8 policies issued by the defendants. The insurance policies,
9 inter alia, provided property damage-based business
10 interruption coverage for the period from August 1st, 2019
11 to August 1st, 2020 in the aggregate amount of up the \$350
12 million, subject to the terms, conditions, limitations and
13 exclusions set forth in the insurance policies.

14 In mid-March 2020, with the onset of the COVID-19
15 pandemic and the various social distancing orders issued by
16 governmental authorities, the debtor closed its retail
17 locations. The debtor states that it has suffered
18 tremendous losses as a result of the store closures and
19 alleges that the insurers have not honored their obligations
20 under the insurance policies.

21 On July 8th, 2020, Century 21 Department Stores,
22 LLC and the other plaintiffs filed a Complaint against the
23 insurers in the State Court, hereinafter the insurance
24 actions, alleging that the insurers breached the relevant
25 insurance policies by failing to compensate the plaintiffs

1 for business losses sustained due to the effects of the
2 COVID-19 pandemic between March 2020 and May 31st, 2020.
3 Pursuant to the insurance action, the plaintiffs seek some
4 \$175 million in damages.

5 The debtor and certain of its affiliates filed
6 voluntary petitions for relief under Chapter 11 of the
7 Bankruptcy Code on September 10th, 2020. On September 11th,
8 2020, the debtor removed the insurance action from the State
9 Court State Court to the United States District Court for
10 the Southern District of New York, after which it was
11 transferred to this Court pursuant to the District Court's
12 standing order of reference.

13 Next, I will provide a summary of the arguments
14 that the parties to the adversary proceeding have advanced.
15 The debtor -- the defendants argue that the insurance action
16 is a prepetition contractual dispute, which should be
17 remanded back to the State Court where the action was filed
18 in July 2020 prior to the petition date. Specifically, the
19 defendants argue that mandatory extension applies here
20 because all of the elements of the statutory test have been
21 met; essentially, that the action is based on non-core state
22 law claims that can be timely adjudicated in the State
23 Court.

24 Alternatively, defendants submit that even if this
25 Court is not required to abstain from hearing the insurance

1 action, this Court should nonetheless elect to abstain or
2 equitably remand the action back to the State Court pursuant
3 to Section 1334(c)(1) or Section 1452(b) of Title 28, based
4 on the same factors that compel mandatory abstention, as
5 well as the predominance of state law issues in the
6 insurance action and its, quote/unquote, "tenuous at best
7 connection to the debtors' Chapter 11 case."

8 The debtor and the non-debtor plaintiffs oppose
9 the motion. They argue that mandatory abstention is not
10 required, and that permissive abstention is not warranted.
11 With respect to mandatory abstention, they assert that the
12 insurance action is a core proceeding which renders
13 mandatory extension inapplicable. Even assuming the
14 insurance action is not a core proceedings, plaintiffs argue
15 that the State Court cannot timely adjudicate the insurance
16 action in conjunction with the administration of the
17 debtors' bankruptcy estates in this Court, and as such,
18 mandatory extension would be improper.

19 With respect to permissive abstention, the
20 plaintiffs argue that it is, quote/unquote, "undeniable that
21 this Court is more competent to adjudicate the insurance
22 flaw issues presented and that the State Court has no
23 advantage over this Court since the State Court has not yet
24 determined which state's laws apply to the claims in the
25 insurance action." Plaintiffs request that the motion be

1 denied, and that the insurance action remain before this
2 Court.

3 I'll now go through the law with respect to
4 mandatory abstention. Pursuant to Section 1334(c) (2) of
5 Title 28, Bankruptcy Courts must abstain from hearing an
6 action when, quote: (1) the motion to abstain was timely;
7 (2) the action is based on a state law claim; (3) the action
8 is related to but not arising in a bankruptcy case or
9 arising under the Bankruptcy Code; (4) Section 1334 provides
10 the sole basis for federal jurisdiction; (5) the action is
11 commenced in State Court; and (6) the action can be timely
12 adjudicated in State Court. See 28 U.S.C. Section
13 1334(c) (2), In re. AOG Entertainment, Inc., 569 B.R. 563 at
14 572 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2017).

15 It is the opposing party's burden to show that
16 mandatory abstention should not apply. See Multibank, Inc.
17 v. Access Global Capital, LLC, 594 B.R. 618, 629 (Bankr.
18 S.D.N.Y. 2018). Quote, "In determining whether to abstain,
19 if the Court finds that any element of the test has not been
20 satisfied, then it must find that mandatory abstention is
21 improper." Smith v. McClesky, In re. Bay Vista of Virginia,
22 Inc., 394 B.R. 820 at 833 (Bankr. E.D. of Va. 2008).

23 Mandatory abstention, thus, is only required if
24 the Court finds that all six elements of Section 1334(c) (2)
25 are satisfied. There is little disagreement among the

1 parties regarding four of the six elements, specifically
2 that: (1) the motion to abstain was timely filed; (2) the
3 action is based on a state law claim; (3) Section 1334
4 provides the sole basis for federal jurisdiction; and (4)
5 the action was commenced in State Court.

6 Principally in dispute here are the third and
7 sixth elements of Section 1334(c)(2), to wit, whether the
8 action is related to but not arising in a bankruptcy case or
9 arising under the Bankruptcy Code, and whether the action
10 can be timely adjudicated in State Court. Accordingly, if
11 the Court finds that, one, the insurance action is related
12 to but not arising in the debtors' bankruptcy case and the
13 insurance action can be timely adjudicated in the State
14 Court, then Section 1334(c)(2) by its terms requires the
15 Court to abstain from hearing the insurance action.

16 First, I will address the issue of whether the
17 insurance action is related to but not arising in the
18 bankruptcy case or arising under the Bankruptcy Code.

19 Section 157(b)(1) of Title 28 provides that,
20 quote, "Bankruptcy judges may hear and determine all cases
21 under Title 11 and all core proceedings arising under Title
22 11 or arising in a case under Title 11, referred under
23 subsection (a) of this section, and may enter appropriate
24 orders and judgments subject to review under Section 158 of
25 this title."

1 Section 157 distinguishes core proceedings from
2 non-core proceedings, which the Bankruptcy Court may hear,
3 but for which the Bankruptcy Court is only empowered to
4 submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to
5 the District Court for de novo review. See Orion Pictures
6 Corporation v. Showtime Networks, In re. Orion Pictures
7 Corp., 4 F.3d 1095, 1100 to 1101, (2d Cir. 1993).

8 Abstention is only mandated with respect to non-
9 core matters, matters that are related to but do not arise
10 in a bankruptcy case or arise under the Bankruptcy Code. In
11 re. Petrie Retail, 304 F.3d, 223 at 231 (2d Cir. 2002).

12 Section 157(b)(2) provides a non-exhaustive list
13 of core proceedings, including: (a) matters concerning the
14 administration of the estate; and (o) other proceedings
15 affecting the liquidation of the assets of the estate or the
16 adjustment of the debtor-creditor relationship.

17 In assessing whether an adversary proceeding
18 involved in a contract dispute is a core proceeding, Courts
19 consider: (1) whether the contract is antecedent to the
20 reorganization petition, and (2) the degree to which the
21 proceeding is independent of the reorganization. In re. DPH
22 Holdings Corporation, 448 F.App'x 134 at 136 (2d Cir. 2011).
23 The Second Circuit has stated that a proceeding may be core
24 if the proceeding is, quote, "unique to or uniquely affected
25 by the bankruptcy proceeding," end quote, or the proceeding,

1 quote, "directly affects a core bankruptcy function," end
2 quote. In re. Petrie Retail, 304 F.3d at 229.

3 The debtors argue that the insurance action is a
4 core proceeding because, quote, "proceeds of the insurance
5 action are the largest asset in the debtors' estates and an
6 integral part of any type of resolution of the debtors'
7 Chapter 11 cases." The value of the insurance action is
8 crucial to a successful outcome in Chapter 11 cases since it
9 will pay the secured lenders' deficiency claims and provide
10 a portion of the recovery to the unsecured creditors.
11 Opposition brief at paragraph 24.

12 The insurers disagree stating that, quote, "The
13 mere assertion that an action would affect the ultimate size
14 of the estate does not establish core jurisdiction." Motion
15 at paragraph 30, citing Orion Pictures v. Showtime Networks.
16 Specifically, the insurers submit that courts in this
17 district have repeatedly held that insurance coverage
18 disputes, such as the insurance action, are non-core
19 matters. Opposition brief at paragraphs 28 to 31.

20 In Orion, the Second Circuit held that where the
21 outcome of a prepetition contract dispute would only augment
22 the assets of the estate for general distribution, the
23 effect on the administration of the estate was insufficient
24 to render the proceedings core. Orion, 4 F.3d at 1102.
25 Stated differently, an action is not a core proceeding where

1 the action's only relationship to the bankruptcy case is
2 that a recovery in such action would result in augmentation
3 of the bankruptcy estate. See Little Rest Twelve, Inc. v.
4 Visan, 458 B.R. 44 at 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).

5 The debtor and the committee argue that Orion is
6 distinguishable and that the Second Circuit's holding in
7 United States Lines v. American SS Owners' Mutual Protection
8 and Indemnity Association, In re. U.S. Lines, 197 F.3d 631
9 (2d Cir. 1999) supports a finding that, in circumstances
10 such as those present here, a dispute regarding a
11 prepetition insurance claim can be a core matter.

12 The insurers respond that the Second Circuit's
13 holding in U.S. Lines was a narrow one with facts readily
14 distinguishable from those here. As such, they argue the
15 holding in U.S. Lines does not mandate a finding here that
16 the insurance action is a core proceeding.

17 The Court agrees with the insurers. In U.S.
18 Lines, the Second Circuit determined that a dispute relating
19 to prepetition insurance contracts was a core proceeding,
20 nothing that, quote, "resolving disputes relating to major
21 insurance contracts are bound to have a significant impact
22 on the administration of the estate." In re. U.S. Lines,
23 197 F.3d at 638.

24 In contrast to the interest case, however, U.S.
25 Lines involved a third-party indemnity policy where the

1 insurance proceeds were, quote, "almost entirely earmarked
2 for paying the personal injury claimants and represented the
3 only potential source of cash available to that group of
4 creditors." Id at 637.

5 The insurance policies at issue in U.S. Lines
6 contained so-called pay first provisions that conditioned
7 recovery on the policies on the allowance and payment of
8 personal injury claims by the debtors, which payment
9 required the use of estate funds. The Second Circuit found
10 that under those circumstances, a declaratory judgment was
11 warranted in order to determine, among other things, when
12 the insurers' coverage obligations were triggered, and that
13 such determination was a core proceeding because it directly
14 impacted the Bankruptcy Court's core administrative function
15 of asset allocation among creditors. Id at 638, 639.

16 Here, the insurance coverage at issue and the
17 related facts are entirely distinguishable from U.S. Lines
18 and do not involve issues of equitable distribution among
19 creditors. Instead, any potential recovery in the insurance
20 action would only augment the debtors' estate for general
21 distribution. Funds recovered are not earmarked for
22 specific creditors.

23 The Court finds that the insurance action falls
24 under the Court's related-to jurisdiction. It is a
25 prepetition contract dispute that exists independent of the

1 bankruptcy process. The fact that some recovery in dispute
2 may flow to the bankruptcy estate is insufficient to render
3 it a core proceeding. The insurance action, a state law
4 breach of contract claim, could have and indeed was asserted
5 outside of the bankruptcy case and neither arises in the
6 debtors' Chapter 11 case, nor arises under the Bankruptcy
7 Code.

8 In addition, developments in the debtors' Chapter
9 11 cases after the motion was fully briefed compel the
10 conclusion that resolution of the insurance action will have
11 even less of an impact on the administration of the debtors'
12 estates than originally argued by the debtor because the
13 debtor has monetized its claims against the insurers.

14 On December 11, 2020, the debtors filed a motion,
15 the sale motion, for an order authorizing and approving, (1)
16 the sale of the debtors' interest in the insurance action,
17 the sale, and (2) the settlement of claims by and between
18 the debtors and the committee on the one hand and certain of
19 the debtors' affiliates and equity holders, collectively
20 defined in the sale motion as the Gindi parties; see Docket
21 No. 324.

22 The sale motion was approved by this Court by
23 order dated December 28th, 2020. The sale documents
24 memorializing the terms of the sale provide, inter alia, for
25 the Gindi parties purchase of the debtors' interest in the

1 insurance action for \$59 million in cash, which amount the
2 Court understands has already been paid to the estate. Only
3 if the outcome of the insurance action results in a total
4 recovery to the plaintiffs in excess of a \$75 million
5 threshold will any additional recovery inure to the debtor,
6 and such amounts would only be 10 percent of any total
7 recovery over such threshold.

8 In support of their request for authority to enter
9 into the sale documents, the debtors stated, quote, "that
10 they continue to believe that a sale of the insurance action
11 now is in the best interest of the debtors' estates in that
12 it: (a) maximizes the value of a contingent asset; (b)
13 provides means to satisfy the ABL facility and other secured
14 debts in full; (c) provides means to satisfy Chapter 11
15 administrative expenses and priority claims in full; and (d)
16 provides an immediate and meaningful distribution to the
17 debtors' general unsecured creditors, while at the same
18 time, preserving their ability without risk to the debtors
19 to receive additional consideration through the proceeds
20 sharing if the proceeds of the insurance action exceed a
21 threshold." Sale motion at paragraph 34.

22 Now that the Court has approved the sale, the bulk
23 of any recovery from the insurance action will inure to the
24 benefit of the non-debtors who own and control the action
25 going forward. As such, the debtors' argument that the

1 insurance action is a core proceeding because resolution of
2 the insurance action would monetize the debtors' largest
3 asset, i.e., the insurance claim, and thus augment the
4 debtors' estates rings somewhat hollow. Instead, the effect
5 on the administration of the debtors' estate, if any, will
6 be significant less than originally anticipated at the time
7 of removal of the insurance action to this Court and may
8 indeed be nothing at all.

9 During oral argument at the hearing on December
10 16th, 2020, in connection with the Court's approval of the
11 sale, debtors' counsel conceded that even assuming recovery
12 of the full proof of loss in the insurance action of \$175
13 million and leaving aside interest and damages for the
14 alleged breach of the covenant of good faith, any additional
15 potential recovery to the debtors' estate would likely reach
16 a maximum of \$10 million. December 16th, 2020 hearing
17 transcript at page 20, lines 4 to 9.

18 Accordingly, because resolution of the insurance
19 action, a prepetition contract action, based on state law
20 and existing independent of the debtors' bankruptcy
21 proceedings would only increase the assets of the debtors'
22 estate for general distribution and does not implicate any
23 core bankruptcy function.

24 This Court finds that the insurance action is a
25 non-core proceeding over which this Court has related-to

1 jurisdiction.

2 I'm going to pause for a moment. I'm about two-
3 thirds of the way there. I'll be back in a moment.

4 (Pause)

5 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to continue. Next,
6 the Court will address the issue of timely adjudication,
7 whether the insurance action can timely be adjudicated in
8 the State Court within the meaning of Section 1334(c)(2) of
9 Title 28.

10 In evaluating timely adjudication, Courts in this
11 circuit considering the following four factors as set forth
12 in Parmalat Capital Finance v. Bank of America, 639 F.3d 572
13 at 580 (2d Cir. 2011): (1) the backlog of the State Court's
14 calendar relative to the Federal Court's calendar; (2) the
15 complexity of the issues presented and the respective
16 expertise of each forum; (3) the status of the relevant
17 bankruptcy proceeding; and (4) whether the State Court
18 proceeding would prolong the administration of the estate.

19 Timeliness is informed, but not determined, by
20 speed. The Second Circuit has held that the inquiry, quote,
21 "does not turn exclusively on whether an action could be
22 adjudicated most quickly in State Court. It is, however,
23 informed by the comparative speeds of adjudication in the
24 federal and state forums." Parmalat v. Bank of America, 671
25 F.3d at 266.

1 Similarly, the Third Circuit has held that, quote,
2 "The question is not whether the action will be more quickly
3 adjudicated in the Bankruptcy Court than in State Court, but
4 rather whether the action can be timely adjudicated in the
5 State Court." In re. XI Technologies, 544 F.3d 196 at 218
6 (3d Cir. 2008).

7 The party opposing remand bears the burden of
8 demonstrating that the State Court cannot adjudicate the
9 claims in a timely manner. See BGC Partners, Inc. v. Avison
10 Young (Canada) 919 F. Supp. 2d 310 at 319, Note 66 (S.D.N.Y.
11 2013).

12 The debtors argue that the State Court faces a
13 significantly larger backlog in its calendar relative to
14 this Court's calendar, and that remand of the insurance
15 action to the State Court would prolong the administration
16 of the debtors' estates. The debtors emphasize the, quote,
17 "progress made in this Court over the past two months"
18 compared to the, quote, "inactivity during the prior two
19 months in the State Court and advocate for a one-stop-shop
20 resolution of the debtors' bankruptcy proceedings and the
21 insurance action in this Court." Opposition brief at
22 paragraphs 47 and 53; December 16th, 2020 hearing
23 transcript, page 28, lines 2 to 6.

24 In contrast, the insurers argue that the debtors'
25 emphasis on the faster forum is misplaced, and that the

1 importance of whether the State Court can timely adjudicate
2 the action, quote, "is diminished in a liquidation
3 scenario," such as here, where there is, quote, "no
4 administrative urgency in play." See insurers reply at
5 paragraph 40 to 42.

6 The Court has considered the Parmalat factors and
7 finds that: (1) the debtors have failed to demonstrate that
8 the State Court cannot timely adjudicate the insurance
9 action; and (2) the timeliness inquiry supports mandatory
10 abstention here. As the insurers point out, timely
11 adjudication does not necessarily mean the faster forum.

12 The District Court has noted that a State Court
13 may be a timely forum even if it requires longer to
14 adjudicate an action than a Federal Court, as long as the
15 relevant bankruptcy proceedings will not be hindered by the
16 relative delay. Post Investors, LLC v. Gribble, 2012 WL
17 4466619, *5 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 27, 2012).

18 With respect to the relative background of State
19 and Federal Court calendars, the Court acknowledges that the
20 COVID-19 pandemic has presented uncertainty for both State
21 and Federal Courts, and the Court makes no finding regarding
22 which Court would more swiftly adjudicate the insurance
23 action. While the debtors point to the activity in the
24 early months of the debtors' Chapter 11 cases, it bears
25 noting that the debtors fail to acknowledge the burgeoning

1 docket of the Bankruptcy Court and make no assumption about
2 the ability of this Court to resolve the insurance action
3 with greater speed than the State Court.

4 With respect to the complexity of the issues
5 presented and the relative expertise of each forum, this
6 factor also does not weigh heavily because both this Court
7 and the State Court are fully capable of adjudicating the
8 state law breach of contract claims at issue in the
9 insurance action. Instead, the Court will focus on whether
10 any delay would prolong the administration of the debtors'
11 Chapter 11 cases.

12 The Court finds that the administration of the
13 debtors' cases will not be lengthened by remand of the
14 insurance action for several reasons: first, the debtors are
15 selling their assets and informed the Court that they will
16 be filing, and indeed have filed, a plan of liquidation. As
17 such, the absence of the more traditional melting ice cube
18 concerns typically found in a reorganization case undercuts
19 the debtors' claimed need for a speedy adjudication of the
20 insurance action.

21 The timeliness required, as the insurers note, can
22 be, quote, "weighed relatively lightly in a liquidation
23 scenario" when there is no, quote, "administrative urgency
24 or plan of reorganization to facilitate." *Worldview*
25 *Entertainment Holdings v. Woodrow*, 611 B.R. 10 at 19

1 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) .

2 Further, as already discussed, the debtors have
3 sold their underlying claims in the insurance action, the
4 results that nearly -- that all or nearly all of the
5 recoveries obtained by plaintiffs in the insurance action
6 will inure to the benefit of the Gindi parties and not to
7 the debtors' estate. Thus, the sale further diminishes: (1)
8 the debtors' asserted connection between their bankruptcy
9 estates and the state law claims in the insurance action;
10 and (2) the debtors' claimed need for quick resolution of
11 the insurance action in order to timely administer their
12 Chapter 11 cases.

13 Moreover, the debtors' retention of upside
14 potential in the event that proceeds from the insurance
15 action exceed \$75 million will not interfere with the
16 administrative of and future closure of the debtors' cases
17 when warranted. As highlighted by counsel to the insurers
18 during oral argument, by the sale documents, the debtors
19 provided for the possibility that a plan of liquidation may
20 be confirmed in the Chapter 11 cases prior to resolution of
21 the insurance action; specifically, Section 8(a) of the
22 participation agreement for the sale of the debtors'
23 interest in the insurance action, which section is entitled,
24 assignment after emergence from bankruptcy, specifically
25 provides for the transfer of the insurance action to a post-

1 emergence litigation trust in the event of the closure of
2 the debtors' Chapter 11 case. See December 16th, 2020
3 hearing transcript, page 31, lines 10 to 32, citing to
4 Section 8(a) of the participation agreement, which was
5 annexed as Exhibit 1 to Exhibit A to the sale motion filed
6 at Docket No. 324.

7 Simply put, resolution and, indeed, closure of the
8 debtors' bankruptcy cases no longer depends on resolution of
9 the insurance action. Accordingly, the Court concludes that
10 the State Court can timely adjudicate the insurance action
11 within the meaning of Section 1334(c)(2) of Title 28.

12 With respect to the remaining four factors under
13 Section 1334(c)(2), the parties do not dispute they are
14 satisfied here. Accordingly, for all the foregoing reason,
15 the Court concludes that each of the requirements under
16 Section 1334(c)(2) for mandatory abstention has been met and
17 will remand the insurance action to the State Court.

18 Taking a breath before I turn to permissive
19 abstention.

20 All right. While the foregoing ruling ends the
21 inquiry, the Court will nonetheless discuss the insurers
22 request for permissive abstention or equitable remand,
23 assuming arguendo that mandatory abstention is not required.

24 Section 1334(c)(1) of Title 28 provides that
25 nothing prevents a Court, quote, "in the interest of justice

1 or in the interest of comity with state courts or respect
2 for state law from abstaining from hearing a particular
3 proceeding arising under Title 11 or arising in or related
4 to a case under Title 11." 28 U.S.C. Section 1334(c)(1).

5 Similarly, under Section 1452(b) of Title 28, the
6 Court, quote, "may remand such claim or cause of action on
7 any equitable ground." 28 U.S.C. Section 1452(b). Courts
8 employ the same tests for permissive abstention and
9 equitable remand. See CAMO-FI Master LDC v. U.S. Coal
10 Corp., 527 B.R. 138 at 143 (S.D.N.Y. 2015).

11 In determining whether to permissively abstain,
12 courts consider numerous factors, including: (1) the effect
13 or lack thereof on the efficient administration of the
14 estate if a Court recommends abstention; (2) the extent to
15 which state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues;
16 (3) the difficulty or unsettled nature of the applicable
17 law; (4) the presence of a related proceeding commenced in
18 state court or other non-bankruptcy court; (5) the
19 jurisdictional basis, if any, other than 28 U.S.C. Section
20 1334; (6) the degree of relatedness or remoteness of the
21 proceeding to the main bankruptcy case; (7) the substance,
22 rather than form, of an asserted core proceeding; (8) the
23 feasibility of severing state law claims from core
24 bankruptcy matters to allow judgments to be entered in State
25 Court with enforcement left to the Bankruptcy Court; (9) the

1 burden on the Court's docket; (10) the likelihood that the
2 commencement of the proceeding in a Bankruptcy Court
3 involves forum shopping by one of the parties; (11) the
4 existence of a right to jury trial; and (12) the presence in
5 the proceeding of non-debtor parties. See Deutsche Oel &
6 Gas settlement agreement v. Energy Capital Partners
7 Mezzanine Opportunities Fund A, LP, 2020 WL 5814233 at *12
8 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2020).

9 In essence, courts have a compelling reason to
10 permissively abstain when the relevant state action, quote,
11 "sounds in state law and bears a limited connection to the
12 debtors' bankruptcy case." Channel Bell Associates v. W.R.
13 Grace, 1992 WL 232085 at *8 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 1992).

14 Courts have held that the, "more substantial
15 factors to consider in determining whether to abstain from
16 hearing an action are: (1) the effect on the administration
17 of the estate; (2) whether the claim involves only state law
18 issues; and (3) whether the proceeding is core or non-core."
19 See Fruit of the Loom v. Magnetek, 407 B.R. 593 at 600
20 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009).

21 The decision whether or not to abstain is within
22 the Bankruptcy Court's sound discretion. In re. Nasser,
23 2020 WL 5985427 at *3 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Oct. 8, 2020). The
24 movant has the burden of showing that permissive abstention
25 is appropriate. In re. Tronox, 603 B.R. 712 at 726 (Bankr.

1 S.D.N.Y. 2019).

2 Assuming arguendo that mandatory abstention is not
3 required here, after considering each of the factors
4 identified by the District Court in Deutsche Oel & Gas, the
5 Court finds that an overwhelming majority of such factors
6 weigh in favor of permissive abstention and remanding the
7 insurance action to the State Court.

8 Specifically, the Court has focused on certain
9 factors identified as more substantial by the Bankruptcy
10 Court for the District of Delaware in Fruit of the Loom: the
11 effect on the administration of the estate if the Court
12 recommends abstention; whether the claim involves only state
13 law issues or to the extent to which state law issues
14 predominate; and whether the proceeding is core or non-core.

15 The Court has also considered the degree of
16 relatedness or remoteness of the proceeding to the main
17 bankruptcy case as highly relevant here.

18 With respect to the affect remand would have on
19 the efficient administration of the estates, the debtors
20 argue that adjudication in this Court would facilitate the
21 efficient administration of the debtors' estate, and I
22 quote, "distributions to general unsecured creditors hinge,
23 at least in part, on the resolution of the insurance action
24 as the insurance action is the largest asset to be monetized
25 in order to pay distributions to unsecured creditors."

1 Opposition brief at paragraph 65. However, as previously
2 noted, that is simply no longer the case.

3 Following the hearing on the motion to remand, the
4 Court approved the sale of the debtors' interest in the
5 insurance action and that sale has now closed. The debtors
6 have monetized this asset and payment for the asset has been
7 made to the estate. Distribution to general unsecured
8 creditors no longer largely hinges on the resolution of the
9 insurance action; in fact, the resolution of the insurance
10 action may have little impact on the administration of the
11 debtors' estate.

12 Second, regarding the extent to which state law
13 issues predominate over bankruptcy issues, this factor
14 heavily support permissive abstention here. The insurance
15 action is indisputably a state law cause of action commenced
16 prepetition in State Court and solely involves issues of
17 state law. As the insurers properly point out, there is no
18 question of bankruptcy law or any other federal law to
19 resolve. See insurer's reply at paragraph 47.

20 Finally, this Court has determined that the
21 insurance action is a non-core proceeding, which also weighs
22 in favor of remand. The Court does find that the insurers
23 have met their burden to demonstrate that permissive
24 abstention is warranted here in the event that mandatory
25 abstention would not apply.

1 Conclusion. For all of the foregoing reasons, the
2 Court concludes that all of the requirements under Section
3 1334(c)(2) of Title 28 for mandatory abstention have been
4 met and the motion to remand the insurance action to the
5 State Court is granted. Assuming arguendo that abstention
6 is not mandatorily required, the Court nonetheless
7 determines in the exercise of its discretion to abstain and
8 remand the insurance action pursuant to Section 1334(c)(1)
9 and 1452(b) of Title 28.

10 Parties are directed to submit an order consistent
11 with the foregoing bench decision.

12 Okay, that concludes the ruling. Is everybody
13 still there?

14 MR. ANKER: Yes, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Anker, how are you?

16 MR. ANKER: I am fine, Your Honor. Happy New
17 Year. I hope you are continuing to do well in these crazy
18 times.

19 THE COURT: We're doing well. I was thinking
20 about asking you all to join me on Zoom and I might have
21 delivered that opinion with a cat filter on my screen, but I
22 decided against that, so there you have it.

23 All right. So Mr. Anker, you'll reach out to the
24 folks at Proskauer. Please prepare an order, submit it,
25 we'll get it on the docket. Please indicate in the order

1 that for the reasons stated on the record and the motion is
2 granted and you should incorporate the transcript of the
3 ruling into the order. All right, any questions on the
4 adversary proceeding?

5 Okay. Well, hearing none, I would suggest that
6 anyone who has dialed in in order to listen to the adversary
7 proceeding, you're welcome to drop off. I'm going to take
8 about a two-minute break to drink some water and then we're
9 going to turn to the administrative claim issue.

10 Thank you all on the adversary proceeding. It's
11 at least good to hear Mr. Anker's voice on behalf of you
12 all.

13 MR. ANKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: I'll be back in about four minutes.

15 (Recess)

16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for waiting,
17 everyone. I see we've lost quite a few folks, but I see I
18 still have Mr. Vandermark and some folks from Proskauer. So
19 we're going to now turn to the Acro Display motion for
20 allowance and payment of an administrative expense claim. I
21 have the pleadings, and I am going to ask Mr. Vandermark.
22 Good morning.

23 MR. VANDERMARK: Good morning, Your Honor. James
24 Vandermark with White and Williams on behalf of Acro
25 Display.

1 THE COURT: All right. It's your motion, Mr.
2 Vandermark, you should assume that I've read everything
3 carefully, but I'm going to give you an opportunity to make
4 whatever presentation you'd like.

5 MR. VANDERMARK: Thank you, Your Honor. Your
6 Honor, as you've mentioned, you've read everything. The
7 significant sort of evidence in this case is presented in
8 the stipulation of fact, which is on the docket at no. 566.

9 Relative here, Your Honor, is the fact that Acro
10 Display is a small family-owned company that was defrauded
11 by the debtors in this case pursuant to UCC 2702(2), because
12 the debtors took the goods at issue in this case at a time
13 when the debtor -- or when the debtors were insolvent.

14 I don't think there's any dispute between the
15 parties that Acro Display timely and properly asserted a
16 reclamation demand pursuant to UCC 2702 as adopted in New
17 York, New Jersey and Florida, and as modified by Section 546
18 of the Bankruptcy Code.

19 For clarity of the record, the debtor in this case
20 admits that it was insolvent during the relevant periods,
21 the demand was timely made, the goods were identifiable, and
22 the goods were in the debtors' possession at the time the
23 demand was served.

24 What is in dispute in this case, Your Honor, is
25 whether the debtors can avoid paying for the use of goods

1 because of a floating lien held by the prepetition agent in
2 this case. Critical to addressing this issue is a
3 determination of the parties' interests in the reclamation
4 and let me start with the debtors in this case. When the
5 goods were delivered to the debtors, they held only the
6 feasible title interest in the reclamation goods at issue.
7 That title was subject to the obligation to pay for the
8 goods. They did not do so. Instead, they took possession
9 of these goods and Acro Display treated the defrauded seller
10 under UCC 2702(2), and that's clear under the relevant state
11 laws that are cited in our papers.

12 And I think it's significant that the Second
13 Circuit in the Koreag decision, and that's 961 F.2d 341, has
14 already addressed the effects of a reclamation demand under
15 UCC 2702(2) and its effect on the debtors' estate. In that
16 decision, the Second Circuit determined that a valid
17 reclamation demand removes the subject goods from the
18 debtors' estate, so it is our position that the reclamation
19 goods in this case are not part of the debtors' estate.

20 And so, the conclusion of that, Your Honor, is
21 that the debtors no held title or interest in the goods
22 after the reclamation demand was served.

23 The reverse of that, of course, is that Acro
24 Display held title to the reclamation goods. As a result of
25 the reclamation demand, it was the title owner of those

1 goods while the debtors used them during this case. And
2 that laud and novel sort of concept as far as Acro Display's
3 claim goes because the debtor is sort of the same thing as a
4 landlord-tenant case, which we reference in our raise of the
5 Koreag case where, you know, a debtor who occupies or uses
6 goods of another party has to pay for that use or occupancy
7 of those goods.

8 Let me turn to the prepetition agent's interest in
9 the goods. I mean, as probably aware, the parties motion
10 dispute from what interest the prepetition agent holds in
11 the goods at issue. Much like the debtors, our position is
12 that the prepetition agent holds no interest in those goods;
13 it was a defeasible interest under UCC 2702, and upon the
14 reclamation then, that was also reverted to the Acro
15 Display.

16 The very purpose of Section 2702 is to protect a
17 defrauded seller. As the Sixth Circuit noted in the
18 (indiscernible) case, allowing debtors to use reclamation
19 goods during a bankruptcy case without paying for that use
20 would allow the debtors to benefit from the fruits of their
21 fraud and defeat the very object and purpose of UCC 2702.

22 So allowing the debtors in this case to use the
23 goods, to pay other creditors for the benefit of the estate
24 without paying for that use is exactly what the
25 (indiscernible) decision is trying to address. However, as

1 we've laid out in our papers, even if the prepetition agent
2 lien attached and were not defeasible, it would not relieve
3 the debtors from their obligation to return the reclamation
4 goods to Acro Display. The debtors simply had no right to
5 use the reclamation goods during this case.

6 Even as the Circuit City Stores case, which the
7 debtors rely upon in their papers, addressed, that
8 administrative expense claim is appropriate where debtors
9 simply ignore the reclamation demand, and the result is a
10 benefit to the estate.

11 I think just for sort of a real short address on
12 sort of the cases relied upon by the debtors, I think
13 there's a clear distinction in some of the Southern District
14 cases we rely on, such as the Dana Corp. and Dairy Mart
15 cases.

16 First, the administrative claim asserted in those
17 cases is under 546 and not 503(b), so the Courts addressed
18 the right to administrative claim in those cases under 546
19 and didn't address 503(b).

20 Second, there's also no real dispute between the
21 parties as to the property rights and interest in those
22 cases. In fact, in the Dairy Mart case, it was agreed that
23 the lien creditor held a priority claim. There's no
24 discussion, sort of give the (sound glitch) those parties in
25 those cases. I think if you look at the (indiscernible) and

1 the Marigold Shoes case out of the Sixth Circuit where
2 property rights were at dispute, there's a much more in-
3 depth address. The Court addresses the property rights of
4 the parties much more in-depth, and it gets to the
5 conclusion that a seller holds title and the liens created
6 by the debtors were defeasible.

7 So here, Acro Display is contesting the debtors'
8 assertion that the prepetition agent has a lien on the
9 reclamation goods on that same principle.

10 Finally, I think the other distinguishing point
11 between Dana Corp. and Dairy Mart and with similar cases is
12 that the goods were sold and the cash used to pay for the
13 lenders' claims. In fact, I think it was in the Dana Corp.
14 case, Judge Lifland specifically states that it was the sale
15 of the goods that rendered the reclamation claim valueless.

16 Here, the goods were not sold by the debtors and
17 they weren't used to pay the prepetition agent. Rather,
18 they were used by the debtors just like any holdover tenant
19 uses an apartment, and when the debtors no longer had any
20 use for the reclamation goods, they were abandoned.

21 So I think those are sort of our reasons for why
22 we addressed the issues we did in our brief, and we would
23 assert that Acro Display is entitled to the administrative
24 claim based on the use, the value and benefit to the
25 debtors' estate during the period.

1 I think your Court will notice that the parties
2 address in their stipulation of facts in paragraph 17, the
3 period for the use, both prepetition and post-petition, and
4 it's Acro Display's contention that the debtors should pay
5 for the use -- the administrative claim that's recognized
6 there in the post-petition column.

7 THE COURT: Okay. Let me ask you one question,
8 Mr. Vandermark. You alluded or stated at the beginning of
9 your presentation what a devastating impact from an economic
10 standpoint the situation between Acro and Century 21 is, and
11 part of your request is for immediate payment of an allowed
12 administrative claim.

13 I'm not sure that you -- it's unclear to me, other
14 than the general desire of a creditor who wishes to be paid,
15 what there is in the record that supports an exception to
16 the usual rule that the administrative claim would be paid
17 under a confirmed plan.

18 MR. VANDERMARK: Yes, Your Honor. I think at this
19 point, Acro Display will agree to be paid in the normal
20 course of its administrative claim if granted.

21 THE COURT: Okay, that takes care of that issue.
22 All right. Did you have anything else, Mr. Vandermark?

23 MR. VANDERMARK: No, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Okay, all right. And who is going to
25 take this up on behalf of the debtor?

1 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, Peter Young on behalf of
2 Proskauer. Ms. Kweskin left me with this on her way out, so
3 I appreciate that, and I'll take it on her behalf.

4 THE COURT: Well, Ms. Kweskin did a great job
5 stewarding these cases through the beginning and we wish her
6 well. But in her stead, I'm now going to give you the hard
7 time that I would have given her.

8 MR. YOUNG: Of course, of course. Thank you, Your
9 Honor, I appreciate that.

10 THE COURT: Thank you for being, in advance, for
11 being a good sport, Mr. Young.

12 MR. YOUNG: Sure.

13 THE COURT: This is just a head scratcher to me.
14 It's \$133,000. There's unquestionably a benefit to Century
15 21. Acro asked for its stuff back; the debtor didn't give
16 Acro its stuff back. It used, you know, the shelving during
17 the liquidation sale. The lender hasn't asserted a lien;
18 the lender's been paid in full.

19 And here's one notable non-fact: the committee
20 hasn't objected to this. So I suppose you could say, well,
21 you know, Acro is an unsecured creditor, they're not going
22 to object to a claim by one of their own. But, you know, as
23 a fiduciary, the committee would assert an objection to the
24 allowance of an administrative claim that would take, you
25 know, recovery out of their pockets, and the committee

1 hasn't filed an objection here.

2 So I don't understand what the calculus was to
3 expend the resources to litigate this. I can't, you know, I
4 won't speculate about whether there could have been a
5 settlement at some discount, but we are where we are. And
6 you could probably guess where I'm going, but I'll
7 nonetheless give you an opportunity to try to do as good a
8 job as Ms. Kweskin would have done if she were here to argue
9 today.

10 MR. YOUNG: I appreciate that, Your Honor, and
11 thank you for your preview. I believe the committee
12 supports the debtors' position, but I won't speak for Mr.
13 Weisenberg, who I know is participating.

14 Your Honor, let me start by saying this: The
15 debtors appreciate the position in which Acro Display finds
16 itself and, indeed, the position in which all of the
17 creditors of the debtors find themselves. But if the Court
18 were to adopt the position taken today and in the papers by
19 Acro Display, Your Honor, it would mean that a prepetition
20 creditor whose reclamation claim was rendered valueless by
21 applicable statutes, who's unable to avail itself of a claim
22 under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, and with
23 which the debtors had zero post-petition transactions can
24 elevate its general unsecured claim to an administrative
25 expense of the debtors' estates to the detriment of the

1 debtors' other general unsecured creditors.

2 THE COURT: You've lost me. You lost me a couple
3 of moments ago.

4 MR. YOUNG: Sure.

5 THE COURT: Why don't they -- you're assuming the
6 conclusion that you want. I mean, they made a reclamation
7 demand, and at that point title reverted to the goods and
8 the debtor kept the shelving.

9 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, if I may. The title
10 didn't revert to the goods, right, and here's why. I think
11 that --

12 THE COURT: Then let me put it differently. The
13 debtors at that point were obligated to return the goods.

14 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, we weren't obligated on
15 account of the fact that title passed the moment that the
16 debtors took possession of those shelving units, and as soon
17 as title passed, they became immediately subject to our
18 senior lenders' liens. And so, Section 546 --

19 THE COURT: But the lender --

20 MR. YOUNG: Go ahead, I'm sorry.

21 THE COURT: The lender didn't assert the lien. I
22 mean --

23 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, the lender absolutely
24 asserted the lien. In fact, the stipulation of facts I
25 think Your Honor provides that we approached JPMorgan, we

1 said we have a one reclamation claim that was received in
2 these cases, in large part because, you know, we weren't
3 purchasing goods and inventory prior to the filing. We were
4 essentially self-liquidating, selling the assets of the
5 business.

6 We informed -- and this is included, Your Honor,
7 in the stipulation of facts at paragraph 15 -- I'm sorry, at
8 paragraph 13 -- that as soon as the liquidation sales
9 concluded -- in some cases, that was going to be 30 days
10 after the petition date, Your Honor might recall given the
11 store closing motion -- that Acro Display could, in fact,
12 come and reclaim those goods. But it took, you know, it
13 took that period for those goods to be reclaimed.

14 I think the problem here, Your Honor, for
15 Acro is this, that 546(c) and 2702 of the Uniform Commercial
16 Code render reclamation claims by suppliers of goods subject
17 to the prior lender in every case where the senior lender is
18 owed more than the amount of the reclamation claim.

19 Here, our senior lenders were --

20 THE COURT: I just don't understand.

21 MR. YOUNG: Sure.

22 THE COURT: I mean, didn't the agent tell the
23 debtors that Acro could retrieve its stuff?

24 MR. YOUNG: No, certainly not. And, Your Honor, I
25 think Ms. Frost-Davies is on the phone and willing to

1 support the argument of the debtors that they weren't
2 willing to release any bit of the collateral package that
3 they had securing their loan at that time. And like I said,
4 immediately upon the debtors' receipt of those goods and
5 taking title, they became subject to that lien. We couldn't
6 strip from the debtors' assets collateral that belonged to
7 our senior lender.

8 And I think, Your Honor, that, you know, it was in
9 Dana Corporation --

10 THE COURT: Could you look at the stipulation of
11 facts, paragraph 15?

12 MR. YOUNG: Yes. That was a time, Your Honor,
13 when -- yeah, so there were five stores at which the
14 shelving units were installed. There were two stores that
15 closed the doors within 30 days of the petition date; there
16 were three stores that closed the doors within, you know, 90
17 days of the petition date when all of the other stores
18 closed.

19 At the point at which the stores closed, Your
20 Honor, because the shelving unit was sort of custom to the
21 stores, those shelving units were of no value. So Hilco
22 Resale, who was, as you know --

23 THE COURT: Hold on, hold on. You can't -- you're
24 making that up. I mean, they issued a reclamation demand,
25 right.

1 MR. YOUNG: Right.

2 THE COURT: And then within two weeks or so, the
3 prepetition agent said Acro can get its stuff. And, you
4 know, I just, you know, the problem here is that -- and I'm
5 going to kind of cut to the chase. I mean, I just find this
6 -- the amount -- the opposition to this and the course of
7 conduct to be offensive and troubling. It's hyper-
8 technical. The creditors' committee, I mean, you can say
9 that they support your position; they didn't file anything.
10 The creditors' committee did not file an objection, so I'm
11 really not going to hear from them now to say that they're
12 down with this treatment.

13 It's pretty clear that the lender wasn't too
14 concerned about this. It is very troubling to me that you
15 would rely on the argument that there was no benefit to the
16 estate because you can't readily quantify it.

17 Let me distinguish between something that was, you
18 know, of no value to the estate. I mean, the classic debate
19 that you have in an administrative claim argument where
20 there was something that occurred or that existed post-
21 petition but there is no, quote/unquote, "benefit" and
22 people argue about the benefit.

23 So here, of course there was a benefit. This was
24 -- you know, you're not making the argument that this was,
25 you know, somewhere in some warehouse and it provided no

1 benefit; of course, it provided a benefit. And I just
2 simply do not understand -- and I'm tempted to ask -- you
3 know, what the amount of money that the debtors' estate has
4 spent litigating this. I just don't get it. I just don't
5 get it. You're not -- you know, there's no danger here in
6 this entirely fact-intensive backdrop for there to be a
7 concern that somehow this is going to change the law and
8 provide an avenue for unsecured creditors to convert their
9 claims into administrative expense claims. I just -- I'm
10 absolutely not seeing it.

11 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, I'm not sure about that
12 because I think what this does is -- if you are right and
13 certainly, you know, I hear you on that position, you're
14 essentially talking about elevating, I guess, under a
15 503(b)(1) claim to administrative expense status a claim
16 that has no post-petition transaction, right.

17 I mean, we can talk in a minute about the benefit
18 to the debtors' estates, which is the second element of it,
19 but a 503(b)(1) claim in the first instance requires a post-
20 petition transaction, right; this was stuff delivered to the
21 debtors all prepetition. And so, our problem here is that
22 if you treated anyone who delivered goods or inventory or
23 anything else to the debtors prepetition, then any creditor
24 who supplies any debtor with anything that the debtors use
25 in any capacity post-petition could give rise to an

1 administrative expense claim? I just don't think that's the
2 case. That can't be the standard because if it is --

3 THE COURT: Yeah. You know, you are shading the
4 facts to fit your argument. I think the facts here are
5 distinguishable. The flip side of it is that with your
6 reliance on the fact that the stuff -- I mean, what's a
7 reclamation claim? A reclamation claim always involves
8 stuff that arrives prepetition.

9 MR. YOUNG: Totally right, Your Honor, but in
10 recognition, right, that the fact that reclamation claims
11 are often defeated by the floating blanket liens that exist
12 in so many of these cases that you see. Congress enacted
13 503(b)(9) to address that issue. And if a creditor can
14 qualify for a 503(b)(9) claim, then that's some recourse
15 that takes them outside the purview of a reclamation demand
16 under either state law or 546(c).

17 THE COURT: But look, they made a -- they made a
18 reclamation demand. The lender said no problem. You said
19 too bad, you cannot --

20 MR. YOUNG: No, no, no, Your Honor, I'm sorry, let
21 me clear up the record. The lender did not say no problem.
22 The lender said absolutely not, those goods are subject to
23 our lien. It was only after the lender understood that
24 those goods were going to be abandoned in connection with
25 the store closings did we say to Acro, listen, we'll

1 organize with our landlords your ability to go and get that
2 stuff if you want it back.

3 Now, Acro, probably thinking that those --

4 THE COURT: Mr. Young.

5 MR. YOUNG: Sorry, Your Honor, go ahead.

6 THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to stop. I'm
7 going to ask you to stop, okay.

8 Mr. Weisenberg, you have your hand up.

9 MR. WEISENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. For the
10 record, this is Brent Weisenberg on behalf of the Official
11 Committee of Unsecured Creditors.

12 Your Honor, you mentioned the committees having
13 not filed a pleading either supportive of the debtor in this
14 case or otherwise. The reason we didn't file anything, Your
15 Honor, was precisely as you identified, which was the cost
16 benefit analysis of spending additional administrative fees
17 on this issue.

18 With that said, we were supportive of the debtor
19 holding our creditors --

20 THE COURT: Mr. Weisenberg, it doesn't work like
21 that. You don't get to, in this hearing, now say had you
22 filed an objection, you know -- you could of, without
23 breaking a sweat, filed a joinder. So I'm sorry, it doesn't
24 count, too little too late.

25 MR. WEISENBERG: Oh, Your Honor, I apologize. You

1 may be misunderstanding me. What I'm saying is that we were
2 supportive of the debtor holding a creditor to its burden,
3 but if Your Honor ultimately believes that the creditor
4 fulfilled its burden, then we are entirely supportive of a
5 creditor being paid what it's owed.

6 And so, I'm not belatedly trying to assert an
7 objection. What we're merely saying is, again, that if a
8 creditor can meet its burden of having an administrative
9 priority, you're exactly correct, Your Honor, that this is
10 relatively de minimis for this estate and, therefore, the
11 creditor should be paid what it's owed.

12 THE COURT: Okay. I'm not even going to respond.
13 That's just a statement of the law, so that's not
14 significant. Obviously, I would find -- obviously, there's
15 going to be a basis for finding that there's an
16 administrative claim, so I just don't even know what to say.

17 Does anyone -- someone else has their hand up.
18 Ms. Frost-Davies.

19 MS. FROST-DAVIES: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
20 Actually, I think we're still in the morning. Good morning,
21 Your Honor. Julia Frost-Davies on behalf of JPMorgan Chase.

22 Your Honor, I find myself in a bit of an awkward
23 spot because the issue is a 503(b)(9) administrative expense
24 issue, which is junior to my client's claims and, therefore,
25 I haven't weighed into this point.

1 The only thing I'd like to clarify, so it's not
2 misconstrued by counsel for Acro or otherwise, is that the
3 goods were subject to the prepetition agent's lien. From
4 our perspective, whether or not we, you know, asserted in
5 this connection, well, we weren't paid off, and the lenders
6 don't need to resort to that is a different issue.

7 But under 546(c) and the interim cash collateral
8 order, page 6, footnote 4, reclamation goods are expressly
9 not permitted liens. So I simply wanted to make that clear
10 as a matter of our law and so, to your point, Your Honor, as
11 to where there may be precedent. So with 503(b)(9), it's
12 junior to my clients. I don't have a dog in that hunt.

13 THE COURT: Thank you.

14 MR. YOUNG: Just to clarify, Your Honor -- it's
15 Peter Young again at Proskauer -- this wasn't asserted as a
16 503(b)(9) claim; it was asserted as a 503(b)(1)(A) claim.

17 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Vandermark, do you want to
18 reply to any of that?

19 MR. VANDERMARK: Just briefly, Your Honor. I
20 think what's really, I think, distinguishing here is that
21 counsel for the debtors does not address sort of the
22 property rights issues, neither in their papers or at
23 today's hearing, which I think is critical sort of, for Acro
24 Display's rights here and the continued use post-petition.

25 When they look at what is the post-petition

1 transaction, it's the continued use that wasn't permitted.
2 They sort of unlawfully used those, because they had the
3 obligation to return them and title verted to Acro Display,
4 so that's the basis for the transaction. And the benefit I
5 think has already been addressed; I won't go further on
6 that.

7 But I think that's all I have to respond to on
8 what's been addressed, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Young, do you want to
10 say anything else?

11 MR. YOUNG: I'm nervous, Your Honor, but I will
12 say this. If you're inclined to grant Acro -- and it sounds
13 like you are -- an administrative expense against the
14 estates under 503(b)(1)(A), I don't think that claim should
15 be in the amount reflected on Acro Display's invoices as the
16 price of the shelves.

17 Again, three of the stores in which the shelves
18 were installed ceased operating on October 7th, less than a
19 month after the petition date, and the other two stores in
20 which they were installed ceased operating on December 7th,
21 which was, you know, three months after the petition date.

22 And there's no evidence in the record, Your Honor,
23 that any of the debtors' sales of goods in this case were
24 attributable to the fact that the shelves provided by Acro
25 were the means by which the debtors displayed that

1 inventory. So if you're inclined to --

2 THE COURT: We really -- are we really going to do
3 this? You didn't make any argument about the amount. You
4 made the argument that it's not quantifiable. You really
5 want to have an evidentiary hearing on what was on the
6 shelves in each of the stores for what periods of time? Two
7 stores used these shelves for 87 days. three stores used the
8 shelves for 27 days; that's what the stipulation says.

9 MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, I'm happy to drop the
10 arguments in light of your comments.

11 THE COURT: Well, again, I just am perplexed by
12 this. As I've indicated I view the debtors' arguments as
13 hyper-technical and, frankly, inequitable. I think that the
14 debtors need to compensate Acro for their impermissible and
15 continued use of the reclamation goods, and that there's no
16 doubt that the reclamation goods -- use of the reclamation
17 goods meet the standard of being an actual and necessary
18 cost of operating the debtors' business in a way that
19 maximized the values of the debtors' estate.

20 I think the argument that there's not a
21 quantifiable benefit rings particularly hollow here, and
22 indeed, that this was custom shelving; it was used to
23 display and sell the debtors' goods during the liquidation
24 sales. If it was not going to provide any benefits, they
25 should have let Acro come and pick it up and they didn't do

1 that.

2 There seems to be a lot of emphasis on the fact
3 that there's no so-called post-petition transaction,
4 focusing on the fact that the shelving was installed in the
5 stores before the petition date. But again, I view this as
6 that argument is hyper-technical. It ignores the fact that
7 there are a number of ways to find the existence of post-
8 petition transaction.

9 First, you can look through the service of the
10 reclamation demand itself and the debtors' refusal to return
11 the reclamation goods, which I think can be characterized as
12 a post-petition transaction. And secondly, the debtors
13 continued use of the goods during the post-petition period
14 for the benefit of the estate itself can be considered a
15 post-petition transaction.

16 Mr. Vandermark, I think, addressed the other
17 arguments persuasively in the reply brief that was filed on
18 behalf of Acro. At the top, I did challenge Mr. Vandermark
19 to demonstrate the need for administrative expense claim now
20 and he's conceded that point, so that makes that easier.

21 And with respect to the amount, there was no in
22 the alternative argument that the amount was wrong or should
23 be subject to further dispute.

24 I do not think fundamentally that this is a good
25 use of estate funds to continue to litigate this matter, and

1 I think there's an ample basis to grant Acro's motion for
2 the allowance of the administrative expense claim in the
3 amount requested, and such claim should be payable pursuant
4 to the confirmed plan of liquidation.

5 So I'm going to ask you to submit an order
6 incorporating the record of this hearing and stating that
7 for the reasons set forth on the record, Acro's motion is
8 granted.

9 MR. VANDERMARK: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Young?

11 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. I think that
12 brings us to conclusion.

13 THE COURT: All right. Sorry to give you a hard
14 time, but...

15 MR. YOUNG: I've had hard times before, Your
16 Honor. I appreciate that, thank you.

17 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Okay. Well, we
18 did our best today to address everything that's pending. We
19 are very much looking forward to scheduling the disclosure
20 statement and plan hearing and moving these cases toward a
21 swift conclusion. All right?

22 I think that's all we have. Please everybody,
23 stay safe, Happy Valentine's Day, and we'll keep an eye out
24 for all of the orders. Thank you.

25 MR. VANDERMARK: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
2 11:30 AM)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

RULINGS

Page Line

Motion to Remand the Insurance Action to

The State Court is Granted

36

5

Acro Display LLCs Motion for Allowance and

Payment of Administrative Expense Granted

58

8

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Sonya Ledanski
Hyde

Digitally signed by Sonya Ledanski Hyde
DN: cn=Sonya Ledanski Hyde, o, ou,
email=digital@veritext.com, c=US
Date: 2021.02.15 16:28:52 -05'00'

Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Veritext Legal Solutions

330 Old Country Road

Suite 300

Mineola, NY 11501

Date: February 15, 2021

&	1334 13:4,6 16:3	2008 17:22 27:6	3
& 5:1,15 10:1,8 10:14,17 33:5 34:4	17:4,9,13,24 18:3 18:7,14 26:8 31:11,13,16,24 32:4,20 36:3,8	2009 33:20 201 4:13 2011 19:22 21:4 26:13 2012 28:16,17 2013 27:11 2015 32:10 2017 17:14 2018 17:18 2019 14:10 30:1 34:1 2020 13:19 14:11 14:14,21 15:2,2,7 15:8,18 23:14,23 25:10,16 27:22 31:2 33:7,8,23,23 2021 2:5 61:25 21 1:8,12 3:17 7:3 13:11 14:21 43:10 44:15 218 27:5 223 19:11 226 3:14 229 20:2 231 19:11 232085 33:13 24 20:11 250 5:3 266 26:25 27 28:17 56:8 27,000 11:21 2702 38:11,16 39:10,15 40:13,16 40:21 47:15 28 13:4,6,9 16:3 17:5,12 18:19 20:19 26:9 27:23 31:11,24 32:4,5,7 32:19 36:3,9 28th 23:23 2d 19:7,11,22 21:9 26:13 27:10	3 17:7 18:3 26:16 32:16 33:18,23 30 20:15 33:8 47:9 48:15 300 61:22 304 19:11 20:2 30th 10:16 31 20:19 31:3 33:13 310 27:10 319 27:10 31st 15:2 32 31:3 324 23:21 31:6 33,518 11:23 330 61:21 34 24:21 341 39:13 350 14:11 36 60:6 394 17:22 3d 27:6
0	134 19:22 136 19:22 138 32:10 143 32:10 1452 13:10 16:3 32:5,7 36:9 15 47:7 48:11 61:25 157 18:19 19:1,12 158 18:24 16th 13:19 25:10 25:16 27:22 31:2 17 43:2 175 15:4 25:12 19 14:14 15:2 28:20 29:25 196 27:5 197 21:8,23 1992 33:13,13 1993 19:7 1999 21:9 1st 14:10,11	2020 13:19 14:11 14:14,21 15:2,2,7 15:8,18 23:14,23 25:10,16 27:22 31:2 33:7,8,23,23 2021 2:5 61:25 21 1:8,12 3:17 7:3 13:11 14:21 43:10 44:15 218 27:5 223 19:11 226 3:14 229 20:2 231 19:11 232085 33:13 24 20:11 250 5:3 266 26:25 27 28:17 56:8 27,000 11:21 2702 38:11,16 39:10,15 40:13,16 40:21 47:15 28 13:4,6,9 16:3 17:5,12 18:19 20:19 26:9 27:23 31:11,24 32:4,5,7 32:19 36:3,9 28th 23:23 2d 19:7,11,22 21:9 26:13 27:10	4
02110 5:18 07068 5:11	2 13:4 17:4,7,13 17:24 18:2,7,14 19:12,20 23:17 26:8,14 27:23 28:9 30:10 31:11 31:13,16 32:14 33:17 36:3 38:11 39:10,15 20 25:17 20-01222 1:4 3:17 20-12097 1:3 20-1222 12:25 20-12907 7:4 2002 19:11	4 17:9 18:4 19:7 20:24 25:17 26:17 32:17 54:8 40 28:5 407 33:19 42 28:5 43,656.61 11:19 44 21:4 4466619 28:17 448 19:22 458 21:4 462 3:7 468 3:4 469 3:1 47 27:22 35:19	5
1	1 8:11 13:6 16:3 17:6 18:2,19 19:19 23:15 26:13 28:7 30:7 31:5,24 32:4,12 33:16 36:8 50:15,19 54:16 55:14 1,216.80 11:20 10 24:6 25:16 29:25 31:3 33:1 10004 2:3 10007 5:4 10014 4:14 10036 4:6,21 1006 4:13 1095 19:7 10:00 2:6 10th 15:7 11 14:2 15:6 16:7 18:21,22,22 20:7 20:8 23:6,9,14 24:14 28:24 29:11 30:12,20 31:2 32:3,4 33:3 1100 19:7 1101 19:7 1102 20:24 11501 61:23 11:30 59:2 11th 15:7 12 2:5 33:4,7 13 47:8 133,000 44:14	2	5 17:10 28:17 32:18 60:6

503 41:17,19 45:22 50:15,19 51:13,14 53:23 54:11,16,16 55:14	671 26:24	33:24 34:2,6,12 35:14,24,25 36:3 36:5 access 17:17 account 46:15 accurate 7:16 61:4 acknowledge 28:25 acknowledges 28:19 acro 3:14 4:19 37:19,24 38:9,15 39:9,23 40:2,14 41:4 42:7,23 43:4 43:10,19 44:15,16 44:21 45:15,19 47:11,15,23 49:3 51:25 52:3 54:2 54:23 55:3,12,15 55:24 56:14,25 57:18 60:7 acro's 58:1,7 action 13:13 15:3 15:8,15,17,21 16:1,2,6,12,14,16 16:25 17:1,6,7,7 17:10,11 18:3,5,8 18:9,11,13,15,17 20:3,5,7,13,18,25 21:2,16 22:20,23 23:3,10,16 24:1,3 24:10,20,23,24 25:1,2,7,12,19,19 25:24 26:7,21 27:2,4,15,21 28:2 28:9,14,23 29:2,9 29:14,20 30:3,5,9 30:11,15,21,23,25 31:9,10,17 32:6 33:10,16 34:7,23 34:24 35:5,9,10 35:15,15,21 36:4	36:8 60:5 action's 21:1 actions 14:24 activity 28:23 actual 11:6 56:17 adams 6:15 addition 23:8 additional 13:21 24:5,19 25:14 52:16 address 8:22 18:16 26:6 40:25 41:11,19 42:3 43:2 51:13 54:21 58:18 addressed 39:14 41:7,17 42:22 55:5,8 57:16 addresses 42:3 addressing 39:2 adjudicate 16:15 16:21 27:8 28:1,8 28:14,22 31:10 adjudicated 15:22 17:12 18:10,13 26:7,22 27:3,4 adjudicating 29:7 adjudication 26:6 26:10,23 28:11 29:19 34:20 adjustment 19:16 administer 30:11 administration 16:16 19:14 20:23 21:22 23:11 25:5 26:18 27:15 29:10 29:12 32:13 33:16 34:11,19,21 35:10 administrative 3:15 22:14 24:15 28:4 29:23 30:16 37:9,20 41:8,16 41:18 42:23 43:5
513 3:10	7 4:20 5:3 32:21		
527 32:10	712 33:25		
53 27:22	726 33:25		
544 27:5	75 24:4 30:15		
546 38:17 41:17	7th 55:18,20		
41:18 46:18 47:15	8		
51:16 54:7	8 30:21 31:4 32:22		
55 21:4	33:13,23 60:8		
563 17:13	820 17:22		
566 38:8	833 17:22		
569 17:13	87 56:7		
572 17:14 26:12	8th 14:21		
58 60:8	9		
580 26:13	9 25:17 32:25		
5814233 33:7	45:22 51:13,14		
59 24:1	53:23 54:11,16		
593 33:19	90 48:16		
594 17:17	919 27:10		
5985427 33:23	961 39:13		
6	a		
6 17:11 27:23	abandoned 42:20		
32:20 54:8	51:24		
600 33:19	ability 24:18 29:2		
603 33:25	52:1		
611 29:25	abl 24:13		
614 8:8	absence 29:17		
615 8:9	absolutely 11:12		
616 8:9	11:12 46:23 50:10		
618 17:17	51:22		
629 17:17	abstain 13:3,5		
631 21:8	15:25 16:1 17:5,6		
632 7:24	17:18 18:2,15		
637 22:4	32:11 33:10,15,21		
638 21:23 22:15	36:7		
639 22:15 26:12	abstaining 32:2		
645 11:17	abstention 16:4,9		
65 35:1	16:10,11,19 17:4		
66 27:10	17:16,20,23 19:8		
	28:10 31:16,19,22		
	31:23 32:8,14		

<p>43:12,16,20 44:24 45:24 49:19 50:9 50:15 51:1 52:16 53:8,16,23 55:13 57:19 58:2 60:8 admits 38:20 adopt 45:18 adopted 38:16 adv 1:4 advance 44:10 advanced 15:14 advantage 16:23 adversary 3:17 8:12,20 12:25 13:3,5,7 14:1,2 15:14 19:17 37:4 37:6,10 advisor 3:11 advocate 27:19 affect 20:13 34:18 affiliate 13:12 affiliates 14:7 15:5 23:19 afternoon 53:19 agenda 7:18,23 8:5,11 agent 39:1 40:10 40:12 41:1 42:8 42:17 47:22 49:3 agent's 40:8 54:3 aggregate 11:24 14:11 ago 46:3 agree 12:7 43:19 agreed 11:16,18 11:20,22 41:22 agreement 9:16 11:10 30:22 31:4 33:6 agreements 9:7 agrees 21:17 ahead 8:4,4 46:20 52:5</p>	<p>al 1:12,15 3:18,19 5:2 alia 14:9 23:24 alixpartners 3:11 9:6 11:21 alleged 25:14 alleges 14:19 alleging 14:24 allocation 22:15 allow 32:24 40:20 allowance 3:5,14 22:7 37:20 44:24 58:2 60:7 allowed 43:11 allowing 40:18,22 alluded 43:8 alternative 13:5 57:22 alternatively 15:24 amenable 8:10 amended 7:18,23 america 26:12,24 american 21:7 amount 11:17,18 11:19,21,22 14:11 24:1 47:18 49:6 50:3 55:15 56:3 57:21,22 58:3 amounts 11:6,6,9 24:6 ample 58:1 analysis 52:16 andrea 4:16 12:3 anker 5:6 36:14 36:15,16,23 37:13 anker's 37:11 annexed 31:5 antecedent 19:19 anticipated 25:6 aog 17:13 apartment 42:19</p>	<p>apologize 52:25 appear 9:10 appearing 7:15 applicable 32:16 45:21 application 3:1,4 3:7,10 10:15,22 10:25 applications 8:1 8:14,18,23 9:11 10:10 12:13 applies 15:19 apply 16:24 17:16 35:25 appreciate 7:6,12 44:3,9 45:10,15 58:16 approached 46:25 appropriate 13:24 18:23 33:25 41:8 approval 10:24 25:10 approve 8:8 approved 23:22 24:22 35:4 approving 9:11 9:15 23:15 argue 15:15,19 16:9,14,20 20:3 21:5,14 27:12,24 34:20 45:8 49:22 argued 23:12 arguendo 31:23 34:2 36:5 argument 24:25 25:9 30:18 48:1 49:15,19,24 51:4 56:3,4,20 57:6,22 arguments 13:18 15:13 56:10,12 57:17</p>	<p>arises 23:5,6 arising 17:8,9 18:8,9,12,17,18 18:21,22 32:3,3 arrives 51:8 aside 25:13 asked 44:15 asking 36:20 assert 16:11 42:23 44:23 46:21 53:6 asserted 23:4 30:8 32:22 38:15 41:16 44:17 46:24 54:4 54:15,16 assertion 20:13 42:8 assessing 19:17 asset 20:5 22:15 24:12 25:3 34:24 35:6,6 assets 19:15 20:22 25:21 29:15 47:4 48:6 assignment 30:24 associates 33:12 association 21:8 assume 38:2 assumes 14:1 assuming 16:13 25:11 31:23 34:2 36:5 46:5 assumption 29:1 attached 41:2 attorneys 4:4,12 4:19 5:2,9,16 attributable 55:24 aty 3:8 aug 33:13 augment 20:21 22:20 25:3 augmentation 21:2</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

august 14:10,11 authorities 14:16 authority 24:8 authorizing 23:15 avail 45:21 available 22:3 avenue 50:8 avison 27:9 avoid 38:25 aware 40:9 awkward 53:22	25:23 26:17 27:3 27:20 28:15 29:1 30:8,24 31:8 32:15,18,21,24,25 33:2,12,22 34:9 34:17 35:13,18 38:18 40:19 45:22 based 14:9 15:21 16:3 17:7 18:3 25:19 42:24 basis 17:10 18:4 32:19 53:15 55:4 58:1 bay 17:21 bears 27:7 28:24 33:11 beginning 43:8 44:5 behalf 7:15,22 37:11,24 43:25 44:1,3 52:10 53:21 57:18 belatedly 53:6 believe 9:13 24:10 45:11 believes 53:3 bell 33:12 belonged 48:6 bench 12:21 13:24 14:4 36:11 benefit 24:24 30:6 40:20,23 41:10 42:24 44:14 49:15 49:21,22,23 50:1 50:1,17 52:16 55:4 56:21 57:14 benefits 56:24 benjamin 5:25 bernstiel 6:4 best 16:6 24:11 58:18 bgc 27:9	bit 8:14 48:2 53:22 blanket 51:11 bockius 5:15 booker 6:17 boston 5:18 bound 21:21 bowling 2:2 breach 23:4 25:14 29:8 breached 14:24 break 37:8 breaking 52:23 breath 31:18 brent 5:13 52:10 brian 6:7 brief 14:3 20:11 20:19 27:21 35:1 42:22 57:17 briefed 23:9 briefly 54:19 brings 58:12 bulk 24:22 burden 17:15 27:7 33:1,24 35:23 53:2,4,8 burgeoning 28:25 burke 6:1 business 14:9 15:1 47:5 56:18 buyer 10:18	calendars 28:19 call 9:14 called 22:6 57:3 camo 32:9 canada 27:10 candor 9:17 capable 29:7 capacity 50:25 capital 17:17 26:12 33:6 care 43:21 carefully 38:3 case 1:3,4 7:4 10:23 16:7 17:8 18:8,12,18,22 19:10 21:1,24 23:5,6 29:18 31:2 32:4,21 33:12 34:17 35:2 38:7 38:11,12,19,24 39:2,4,19 40:1,4,5 40:18,19,22 41:5 41:6,22 42:1,14 47:17 51:2 52:14 55:23 cases 7:4 14:2 18:20 20:7,8 23:9 28:24 29:11,13 30:12,16,20 31:8 41:12,14,15,17,18 41:22,25 42:11 44:5 47:2,9 51:12 58:20 cash 22:3 24:1 42:12 54:7 cashman 6:7 cat 36:21 cause 32:6 35:15 ceased 55:18,20 center 5:3 century 1:8,12 3:17 7:3 13:11 14:21 43:10 44:14		
b					
b 2:21 13:7,7,10 16:3 18:19 19:12 24:12 32:5,7 36:9 41:17,19 45:22 50:15,19 51:13,14 53:23 54:11,16,16 55:14 b.r. 17:13,17,22 21:4 29:25 32:10 33:19,25 back 15:17 16:2 26:3 37:14 44:15 44:16 52:2 backdrop 50:6 background 13:25 14:2,4 28:18 backlog 26:13 27:13 bad 51:19 bank 5:16 26:12 26:24 bankr 17:14,17 17:22 33:20,23,25 bankruptcy 1:1 2:1,23 15:7 16:17 17:5,8,9 18:8,9,12 18:18,18,20 19:2 19:3,10,10,25 20:1 21:1,3 22:14 23:1,2,5,6 25:20					
	c	c 2:22 4:1 6:23 7:1 13:4,6 16:3 17:4 17:13,24 18:7,14 24:14 26:8 31:11 31:13,16,24 32:4 36:3,8 47:15 51:16 54:7 61:1,1 calculus 45:2 calendar 7:13 26:14,14 27:13,14			

certain 13:12 15:5 23:18 34:8	49:19 50:15,15,19 51:1,7,7,14 53:16 54:16,16 55:14 57:19 58:2,3	come 47:12 56:25 coming 10:6 comity 32:1 comm 3:8 commenced 17:11 18:5 32:17 35:15 commencement 33:2 comments 12:7 56:10 commercial 47:15 committee 3:12 5:9 13:13 21:5 23:18 44:19,23,25 45:11 49:8,10 52:11 committee's 13:17 committees 52:12 company 38:10 comparative 26:23 compared 27:18 compel 16:4 23:9 compelling 33:9 compensate 14:25 56:14 compensation 3:5 3:8 competent 16:21 complaint 14:22 complexity 26:15 29:4 conceded 25:11 57:20 concept 40:2 concern 50:7 concerned 49:14 concerning 19:13 concerns 29:18 conclude 12:14 concluded 47:9 59:1	concludes 31:9,15 36:2,12 conclusion 23:10 36:1 39:20 42:5 46:6 58:12,21 conclusions 19:4 conditioned 22:6 conditions 14:12 conduct 49:7 conducted 7:7 conference 3:19 confirm 11:10 confirmed 30:20 43:17 58:4 congress 51:12 conjunction 16:16 connection 10:21 16:7 25:10 30:8 33:11 51:24 54:5 consider 19:19 32:12 33:15 consideration 24:19 considered 13:15 28:6 34:15 57:14 considering 26:11 34:3 consistent 36:10 contained 22:6 contention 43:4 contesting 42:7 contingent 24:12 continue 24:10 26:5 57:25 continued 54:24 55:1 56:15 57:13 continuing 36:17 contract 19:18,19 20:21 22:25 23:4 25:19 29:8 contracts 21:19 21:21
certainly 11:4 47:24 50:13	claimants 22:2 claimed 29:19 30:10 claims 15:22 16:24 20:9 22:8 23:13,17 24:15 27:9 29:8 30:3,9 32:23 42:13 47:16 50:9,9 51:10 53:24 clarify 54:1,14 clarity 38:19 classic 49:18 clear 39:10 41:13 49:13 51:21 54:9 client's 53:24 clients 54:12 closed 14:16 35:5 48:15,16,18,19 closing 10:16 47:11 closings 51:25 closure 30:16 31:1 31:7 closures 14:18 coal 32:9 code 15:7 17:9 18:9,18 19:10 23:7 38:18 45:22 47:16 coffee 12:20 cohen 6:8 collateral 48:2,6 54:7 colleague 8:22 collectively 13:1 23:19 column 43:6		
certified 61:3 challenge 57:18 chambers 9:5 11:15 change 50:7 channel 33:12 chapman 2:22 7:3 9:1 chapter 14:2 15:6 16:7 20:7,8 23:6,8 24:14 28:24 29:11 30:12,20 31:2 characterized 57:11 chart 11:7 chase 5:16 49:5 53:21 cir 19:7,11,22 21:9 26:13 27:6 circuit 19:23 20:20 21:18 22:9 26:11,20 27:1 39:13,16 40:17 41:6 42:1 circuit's 21:6,12 circumstances 21:9 22:10 cited 39:11 citing 20:15 31:3 city 41:6 claim 10:18 17:7 18:3 21:11 23:4 25:3 32:6 33:17 34:12 37:9,20 40:3 41:8,16,18 41:23 42:15,24 43:5,12,16,20 44:22,24 45:20,21 45:24 47:1,18			

contractual 15:16	18:10,11,14,15	created 42:5	de 19:5 53:10
contrast 21:24	19:2,3,5 21:17	creditor 3:8 19:16	debate 49:18
27:24	22:23 23:22 24:2	41:23 43:14 44:21	debtor 1:10 4:4
control 24:24	24:22 25:7,24,25	45:20 50:23 51:13	13:11,12 14:6,6
convert 50:8	26:5,6,8,17,22	53:2,3,5,8,11	14:16,17 15:5,8
cooney 6:21	27:3,3,5,8,12,15	creditors 3:12 5:9	15:15 16:8,8
core 15:21 16:12	27:17,19,21 28:1	13:14 20:10 22:4	19:16 21:5 23:12
16:14 18:21 19:1	28:6,8,12,12,14	22:15,19,22 24:17	23:13 24:5 33:5
19:2,9,13,18,23	28:19,19,21,22	34:22,25 35:8	38:13,19 40:3,5
20:1,4,14,18,24	29:1,2,3,6,7,9,12	40:23 45:17 46:1	43:25 44:15 46:8
20:25 21:11,16,19	29:15 31:9,10,15	49:8,10 50:8	50:24 52:13,18
22:13,14 23:3	31:17,21,25 32:6	52:11,19	53:2
25:1,23,25 32:22	32:14,18,18,25,25	critical 39:2 54:23	debtors 3:2 7:23
32:23 33:18,18	33:2 34:4,5,7,8,10	crucial 20:8	8:7 13:16 16:7,17
34:14,14 35:21	34:11,15,20 35:4	cube 29:17	18:12 20:3,5,6
corp 19:7 32:10	35:16,20,22 36:2	cup 12:20	22:8,20 23:6,8,11
41:14 42:11,13	36:5,6,15,19	custom 48:20	23:14,16,18,19,25
corporation 19:6	37:14,16 38:1	56:22	24:9,11,17,18,24
19:22 48:9	42:3 43:1,7,21,24	cut 49:5	24:25 25:2,4,5,11
correct 7:23 12:6	44:4,10,13 45:17	cutler 5:1	25:15,20,21 27:12
53:9	46:2,5,12,19,21	cynthia 6:4	27:16,16,20,24
cost 52:15 56:18	47:20,22 48:10,23	d	28:7,23,24,25
counsel 3:2 8:12	49:2 51:3,17 52:4	d 7:1 24:15 33:20	29:10,13,14,19
13:18 25:11 30:17	52:6,20 53:12	60:1	30:2,7,8,10,13,16
54:2,21	54:13,17 55:9	dairy 41:14,22	30:18,22 31:2,8
count 52:24	56:2,11 58:10,13	42:11	33:12 34:19,21
country 61:21	58:17 60:6	damage 14:9	35:4,5,11 38:11
county 13:8	court's 15:11	damages 15:4	38:12,13,22,25
couple 46:2	22:14,24 25:10	25:13	39:4,5,15,18,19
course 39:23	26:13,14 27:14	dana 41:14 42:11	39:21 40:1,11,18
43:20 44:8,8 49:6	33:1,22	42:13 48:9	40:20,22 41:3,4,7
49:23 50:1	courts 17:5 19:18	danger 50:5	41:8,12 42:6,7,16
court 1:1 2:1 7:2,8	20:16 26:10 28:21	daniele 6:2	42:18,19,25 43:4
8:2,4,13,24 9:17	32:1,7,12 33:9,14	date 15:18 47:10	45:12,15,17,23,25
9:24 10:1,5,10,22	41:17	48:15,17 55:19,21	46:1,13,16 47:23
11:1,8,25 12:4,10	covenant 25:14	57:5 61:25	48:1,4,6 50:3,18
12:19,24 13:3,8,9	coverage 14:10	dated 23:23	50:21,23,24 54:21
13:15,19 14:1,3	20:17 22:12,16	david 6:11	55:23,25 56:12,14
14:23 15:9,9,9,11	covid 14:14 15:2	davies 5:20 47:25	56:18,19,23 57:10
15:17,23,25 16:1	28:20	53:18,19,21	57:12
16:2,15,17,21,22	crazy 36:17	day 10:15 58:23	debts 24:14
16:23,23 17:2,11	create 7:16	days 47:9 48:15	december 10:16
17:12,19,24 18:5		48:17 56:7,8	13:19 23:14,23

25:9,16 27:22 31:2 55:20 decided 36:22 decision 12:21 13:23,24 33:21 36:11 39:13,16 40:25 declaration 13:16 declaratory 22:10 defeasible 40:13 41:2 42:6 defeat 40:21 defeated 51:11 defendants 1:16 12:25 13:1,2,17 14:8 15:15,19,24 deficiency 20:9 defined 23:20 defrauded 38:10 39:9 40:17 degree 19:20 32:20 34:15 del 33:20 delaware 34:10 delay 28:16 29:10 delivered 9:5 36:21 39:5 50:20 50:22 delivering 13:24 demand 38:16,21 38:23 39:14,17,22 39:25 41:9 46:7 48:24 51:15,18 57:10 demonstrate 28:7 35:23 57:19 demonstrating 27:8 denied 17:1 denise 5:23 dennis 6:20 department 1:8 1:12 3:18 4:11 7:4	13:11 14:21 depends 31:8 depth 42:3,4 desire 43:14 determination 22:13 39:3 determine 18:20 22:11 determined 16:24 21:18 26:19 35:20 39:16 determines 36:7 determining 17:18 32:11 33:15 detriment 45:25 deutsche 33:5 34:4 devastating 43:9 developments 23:8 dialed 37:6 different 54:6 differently 20:25 46:12 difficulty 32:16 diminished 28:2 diminishes 30:7 directed 36:10 directly 20:1 22:13 disagree 20:12 disagreement 17:25 disclosure 8:7 58:19 discount 45:5 discretion 33:22 36:7 discuss 31:21 discussed 30:2 discussion 41:24 discussions 7:25	display 3:14 4:19 37:19,25 38:10,15 39:9,24 40:15 41:4 42:7,23 43:19 45:15,19 47:11 55:3 56:23 60:7 display's 40:2 43:4 54:24 55:15 displayed 55:25 disposition 13:20 dispute 15:16 18:6 19:18 20:21 21:10,18 22:25 23:1 31:13 38:14 38:24 40:10 41:20 42:2 57:23 disputes 20:18 21:20 distancing 14:15 distinction 41:13 distinguish 49:17 distinguishable 21:6,14 22:17 51:5 distinguishes 19:1 distinguishing 42:10 54:20 distribution 20:22 22:18,21 24:16 25:22 35:7 distributions 34:22,25 district 1:2 9:11 15:9,10,11 19:5 20:17 28:12 34:4 34:10 41:13 doc 3:1,4,7,10,14 docket 7:24 12:15 23:20 29:1 31:6 33:1 36:25 38:8 dockets 8:8	documents 23:23 24:9 30:18 dog 54:12 doing 11:4 36:19 doors 48:15,16 dorr 5:1 doubt 56:16 dph 19:21 drink 37:8 drive 5:10 drop 8:12,15,19 37:7 56:9 due 15:1 d'antonio 6:20 e e 2:21,21 4:1,1 7:1 7:1 60:1 61:1 e.d. 17:22 e.d.n.y. 33:23 early 7:19 28:24 earmarked 22:1 22:21 easier 57:20 economic 43:9 ecro 2:25 effect 20:23 25:4 32:12 33:16 34:11 39:15 effects 15:1 39:14 efficient 32:13 34:19,21 efficiently 12:12 either 51:16 52:13 elect 16:1 element 17:19 50:18 elements 15:20 17:24 18:1,7 elevate 45:24 elevating 50:14 eleven 4:5 emergence 30:24 31:1
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

emphasis 27:25 57:2 emphasize 27:16 employ 32:8 empowered 19:3 enacted 51:12 encourage 12:19 ends 31:20 energy 33:6 enforcement 32:25 engaged 10:19 enter 9:15 18:23 24:8 entered 32:24 entertainment 17:13 29:25 entirely 7:7 22:1 22:17 50:6 53:4 entitled 30:23 42:23 equitable 22:18 31:22 32:7,9 equitably 13:7 16:2 equity 23:19 essence 33:9 essentially 15:21 47:4 50:14 establish 20:14 estate 10:20 19:14 19:15 20:14,22,23 21:3,22 22:9,20 23:2 24:2 25:5,15 25:22 26:18 30:7 32:14 33:17 34:11 34:21 35:7,11 39:15,18,19 40:23 41:10 42:25 49:16 49:18 50:3 53:10 56:19 57:14,25 estates 16:17 20:5 23:12 24:11 25:4	27:16 30:9 34:19 45:25 50:18 55:14 et 1:12,15 3:18,19 5:2 evaluating 26:10 event 30:14 31:1 35:24 everybody 7:4 10:6 12:20 36:12 58:22 evidence 38:7 55:22 evidentiary 56:5 exactly 40:24 53:9 exceed 24:20 30:15 exception 43:15 excess 24:4 exclusions 14:13 exclusively 26:21 exercise 36:7 exhaustive 19:12 exhibit 31:5,5 exist 51:11 existed 49:20 existence 33:4 57:7 existing 25:20 exists 22:25 expend 45:3 expense 3:15 37:20 41:8 45:25 50:9,15 51:1 53:23 55:13 57:19 58:2 60:8 expenses 10:17 11:19 24:15 expertise 26:16 29:5 expressly 54:8 extension 15:19 16:13,18	extent 32:14 34:13 35:12 eye 58:23 ezra 6:19 f f 2:21 27:10 61:1 f.2d 39:13 f.3d 19:7,11 20:2 20:24 21:8,23 26:12,25 27:5 f.app'x 19:22 faces 27:12 facilitate 29:24 34:20 facility 24:13 fact 8:16 10:23 19:4 23:1 35:9 38:8,9 41:22 42:13 44:19 46:15 46:24 47:11 50:6 51:6,10 55:24 57:2,4,6 factor 29:6 35:13 factors 16:4 26:11 28:6 31:12 32:12 33:15 34:3,5,9 facts 14:4 21:13 22:17 43:2 46:24 47:7 48:11 51:4,4 fail 28:25 failed 28:7 failing 14:25 fair 12:22 faith 25:14 falls 22:23 familiarity 14:1 family 38:10 far 40:2 faster 27:25 28:11 favor 34:6 35:22 feasibility 32:23 feasible 39:6	february 2:5 61:25 federal 5:17 17:10 18:4 26:14,24 28:14,19,21 35:18 fee 3:1,10 7:25 8:14,17,22 9:11 10:10,15,22,25 feedback 10:3 fees 9:15 10:17,24 11:17,18,21,22 52:16 fi 32:9 fiduciary 44:23 figure 10:5 file 10:14 49:9,10 52:14 filed 8:7 12:25 13:16 14:22 15:5 15:17 18:2 23:14 29:16 31:5 45:1 52:13,22,23 57:17 filing 29:16 47:3 filter 36:21 final 10:14,22,24 finally 35:20 42:10 finance 26:12 financial 3:11 find 17:20 35:22 45:17 49:5 53:14 53:22 57:7 finding 21:9,15 28:21 53:15 findings 19:4 finds 17:19,24 18:11 22:23 25:24 28:7 29:12 34:5 45:15 fine 12:14 36:16 fingertips 9:21 firm 7:20
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[first - honor]

Page 9

first 3:1,4,10 8:15 13:25 18:16 22:6 29:14 41:16 50:19 57:9 fit 51:4 five 48:13 flaw 16:22 flip 51:5 floating 39:1 51:11 florida 38:17 flow 23:2 flynn 6:22 focus 29:9 focused 34:8 focusing 57:4 folks 36:24 37:17 37:18 following 26:11 35:3 footnote 54:8 footnotes 9:9 foregoing 31:14 31:20 36:1,11 61:3 form 9:10 32:22 formal 13:23 forth 14:13 26:11 58:7 forum 26:16 27:25 28:11,13 29:5 33:3 forums 26:24 forward 24:25 58:19 found 7:24 22:9 29:18 four 11:3 18:1 26:11 31:12 37:14 frankly 56:13 fraud 40:21 fresh 12:21	frost 5:20 47:25 53:18,19,21 fruit 33:19 34:10 fruits 40:20 fulfilled 53:4 full 24:14,15 25:12 44:18 fully 23:9 29:7 function 20:1 22:14 25:23 fund 33:7 fundamentally 57:24 funds 22:9,21 57:25 further 30:2,7 55:5 57:23 future 30:16	45:6 47:9 49:5,11 50:7 51:24 52:6,7 53:12,15 56:2,24 58:5 good 7:2,21 8:2,21 8:24 9:1 12:2,4 25:14 37:11,22,23 44:11 45:7 53:19 53:20 57:24 goods 38:12,21,22 38:25 39:5,6,8,9 39:17,19,21,24 40:1,6,7,9,11,12 40:19,23 41:4,5 42:9,12,15,16,20 46:7,10,13 47:3 47:12,13,16 48:4 50:22 51:22,24 54:3,8 55:23 56:15,16,17,23 57:11,13 governmental 14:16 grace 33:13 grant 55:12 58:1 granted 36:5 37:2 43:20 58:8 60:6,8 grateful 9:19 11:3 great 8:3 10:8 11:1 44:4 greater 29:3 green 2:2 greenwich 5:3 gribble 28:16 ground 32:7 group 22:3 guess 45:6 50:14	happy 9:22 11:13 36:16 56:9 58:23 hard 44:6 58:13 58:15 head 44:13 hear 10:3 18:20 19:2 37:11 49:11 50:13 heard 12:13 hearing 3:1,4,7,10 3:14,17 7:7,9,10 10:15 12:14 13:3 13:5,18 15:25 17:5 18:15 25:9 25:16 27:22 31:3 32:2 33:16 35:3 37:5 52:21 54:23 56:5 58:6,20 heavily 29:6 35:14 held 13:18 20:17 20:20 26:20 27:1 33:14 39:1,5,21 39:24 41:23 hereinafter 14:23 highlighted 30:17 highly 34:17 hilco 48:21 hindered 28:15 hinge 34:22 hinges 35:8 hold 48:23,23 holders 23:19 holding 21:6,13 21:15 52:19 53:2 holdings 19:22 29:25 holdover 42:18 holds 40:10,12 42:5 hollow 25:4 56:21 hon 2:22 honor 7:21,24 8:6 8:10,22 9:8,12,22
	g g 7:1 gas 33:6 34:4 general 20:22 22:20 24:17 25:22 34:22 35:7 43:14 45:24 46:1 getting 10:3 gindi 23:20,25 30:6 give 38:3 41:24 44:6,15 45:7 50:25 58:13 given 44:7 47:10 giving 13:20 glitch 41:24 global 17:17 go 8:4,4,18 17:3 46:20 52:1,5 55:5 goes 40:3 going 8:13 11:9 12:21,22,23 13:21 24:25 26:2,5 37:7 37:9,19,21 38:3 43:24 44:6,21	h hale 5:1 hand 23:18 52:8 53:17 handling 12:11	

[honor - join]

Page 10

9:25 10:2,14 11:4 11:13,24 12:2,6 12:18 36:14,16 37:13,23 38:5,6,9 38:24 39:20 43:18 43:23 44:1,9 45:10,14,19 46:9 46:14,23,25 47:6 47:10,14,24 48:8 48:12,20 50:11 51:9,20 52:5,9,12 52:15,25 53:3,9 53:19,21,22 54:10 54:14,19 55:8,11 55:22 56:9 58:9 58:11,16,25 honor's 9:13 honored 14:19 hope 9:1 36:17 hopefully 9:20 hunt 54:12 husney 6:19 hyde 3:25 61:3,8 hynes 6:24 hyper 49:7 56:13 57:6	impermissible 56:14 implicate 25:22 importance 28:1 improper 16:18 17:21 inactivity 27:18 inapplicable 16:13 inclined 55:12 56:1 included 10:24 47:6 includes 9:5 including 19:13 32:12 incorporate 37:2 incorporating 58:6 increase 25:21 indemnity 21:8,25 independent 19:21 22:25 25:20 indicate 36:25 indicated 56:12 indiscernible 40:18,25 41:25 indisputably 35:15 inequitable 56:13 informal 12:8 informally 11:16 informed 26:19 26:23 29:15 47:6 informing 10:22 injury 22:2,8 inquiry 26:20 28:9 31:21 insolvent 38:13,20 installed 48:14 55:18,20 57:4 instance 50:19	insufficient 20:23 23:2 insurance 1:15 3:19 5:2 10:16,18 14:7,8,13,20,23 14:25 15:3,8,15 15:25 16:6,12,14 16:15,21,25 17:1 18:11,13,15,17 20:3,4,7,17,18 21:11,16,19,21 22:1,5,16,19,23 23:3,10,16 24:1,3 24:10,20,23 25:1 25:2,3,7,12,18,24 26:7 27:14,21 28:8,22 29:2,9,14 29:20 30:3,5,9,11 30:14,21,23,25 31:9,10,17 34:7 34:23,24 35:5,9,9 35:14,21 36:4,8 60:5 insured 14:7 insurer's 12:22 35:19 insurers 13:1 14:19,23,24 20:12 20:16 21:12,17 22:12 23:13 27:24 28:4,10 29:21 30:17 31:21 35:17 35:22 integral 20:6 intensive 50:6 inter 14:9 23:24 interest 9:17 10:17,19,23 13:20 21:24 23:16,25 24:11 25:13 30:23 31:25 32:1 35:4 39:6,21 40:8,10 40:12,13 41:21	interests 39:3 interfere 30:15 interim 3:1,4,7,10 10:25 54:7 interruption 14:10 inure 24:5,23 30:6 inventory 47:3 50:22 56:1 investors 28:16 invoices 55:15 involve 22:18 involved 19:18 21:25 involves 33:3,17 34:12 35:16 51:7 isabella 6:17 issue 13:23 18:16 22:5,16 26:6 29:8 37:9 38:12 39:2,6 40:11 43:21 51:13 52:17 53:23,24 54:6 issued 14:8,15 48:24 issues 8:16 16:5 16:22 22:18 26:15 29:4 32:15,15 33:18 34:13,13 35:13,13,16 42:22 54:22 item 8:11
i			j
i.e. 25:3 ice 29:17 identifiable 38:21 identified 34:4,9 52:15 identify 7:14,14 ignore 41:9 ignores 57:6 immediate 24:16 43:11 immediately 46:17 48:4 impact 21:21 23:11 35:10 43:9 impacted 22:14			james 4:23 37:23 jeff 6:6 jeffrey 6:8 jelisavcic 6:13 jersey 38:17 joanna 6:18 job 44:4 45:8 john 6:16 join 36:20

joinder 13:17 52:23 joined 13:13 jp 5:16 jpmorgan 46:25 53:21 judge 2:23 7:2 9:1 42:14 judges 18:20 judgment 22:10 judgments 18:24 32:24 julia 5:20 53:21 july 14:21 15:18 junior 53:24 54:12 jureller 6:16 jurisdiction 17:10 18:4 20:14 22:24 26:1 jurisdictional 32:19 jury 33:4 justice 4:11 31:25	kozlowski 6:5 kweskin 44:2,4 45:8 l lack 32:13 laid 41:1 landlord 40:4 landlords 52:1 large 47:2 largely 35:8 larger 27:13 largest 20:5 25:2 34:24 late 52:24 laud 40:2 lauren 6:3 law 15:22 16:5 17:3,7 18:3 19:4 23:3 25:19 29:8 30:9 32:2,15,17 32:23 33:11,17 34:13,13 35:12,15 35:17,18,18 50:7 51:16 53:13 54:10 laws 16:24 39:11 ldc 32:9 leaving 25:13 ledanski 3:25 61:3 61:8 left 32:25 44:2 legal 61:20 lender 44:17 46:19,21,23 47:17 47:17 48:7 49:13 51:18,21,22,23 lender's 44:18 lenders 20:9 42:13 46:18 47:19 54:5 lengthened 29:13 lewis 5:15 lien 39:1 41:2,23 42:8 44:17 46:21	46:24 48:5 51:23 54:3 liens 42:5 46:18 51:11 54:9 lifland 6:3 42:14 light 8:16 56:10 lightly 29:22 likelihood 33:1 limitations 14:12 limited 33:11 line 60:4 lines 1:15 3:18 5:2 21:7,8,13,15,18 21:22,25 22:5,17 25:17 27:23 31:3 liquidating 47:4 liquidation 19:15 28:2 29:16,22 30:19 44:17 47:8 56:23 58:4 list 19:12 listen 37:6 51:25 litigate 45:3 57:25 litigating 50:4 litigation 31:1 little 8:14 10:3 12:23 17:25 21:3 35:10 52:24 llc 1:8,12 3:18 4:19 13:11 14:22 17:17 28:16 llcs 3:14 60:7 llp 3:2,8,11 4:3,18 5:1,8,15 loan 48:3 locations 14:17 long 7:11 28:14 longer 10:19 28:13 31:8 35:2,8 42:19 look 12:15 41:25 48:10 51:17 54:25 57:9	looking 58:19 loom 33:19 34:10 loss 25:12 losses 14:18 15:1 lost 37:17 46:2,2 lot 11:2 57:2 loveland 5:25 lowenstein 3:8 5:8 5:10 9:6 11:20 lp 33:7 m ma 5:18 magnetek 33:19 main 32:21 34:16 major 21:20 majority 34:5 making 48:24 49:24 mandate 21:15 mandated 19:8 mandatorily 36:6 mandatory 15:19 16:4,9,11,13,18 17:4,16,20,23 28:9 31:16,23 34:2 35:24 36:3 manner 27:9 march 14:14 15:2 marigold 42:1 mart 41:14,22 42:11 marte 5:23 marwil 6:6 master 32:9 matter 1:6 21:11 54:10 57:25 matters 7:13 12:12 19:9,13 20:19 32:24 matthew 4:8 6:1 7:22 maximized 56:19
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

maximizes 24:12	moment 11:13	need 29:19 30:10	52:22 53:7
maximum 25:16	26:2,3 46:15	54:6 56:14 57:19	objections 11:15
mcclesky 17:21	moments 46:3	neglected 10:1,11	12:9
mcglynn 6:10	monetize 25:2	10:13	objects 13:14
mean 28:11 40:9	monetized 23:13	neither 23:5 54:22	obligated 46:13
45:19 46:6,22	34:24 35:6	nervous 55:11	46:14
47:22 48:24 49:5	money 50:3	networks 19:6	obligation 39:7
49:8,18 50:17	month 55:19	20:15	41:3 55:3
51:6	months 27:17,19	new 1:2 2:3 4:6,14	obligations 14:19
meaning 26:8	28:24 55:21	4:21 5:4 9:20 13:8	22:12
31:11	morgan 5:15,16	13:8 15:10 36:16	obtained 30:5
meaningful 24:16	morning 7:2,3,12	38:16,17	obviously 53:14
means 24:13,14	7:13,19,21,24	nicole 6:5	53:14
55:25	8:24 9:1,5 12:2,4	nj 5:11	occupancy 40:6
meet 53:8 56:17	37:22,23 53:20,20	non 13:12 14:6	occupies 40:5
melting 29:17	motion 3:14 8:7	15:21 16:8 19:2,8	occurred 49:20
memorializing	12:22,24 13:2,14	19:12 20:18 24:24	oct 33:23
23:24	13:15,16 16:9,25	25:25 32:18 33:5	october 55:18
mention 10:1,11	17:6 18:2 20:14	33:18 34:14 35:21	oel 33:5 34:4
mentioned 38:6	23:9,14,15,20,22	44:19	offensive 49:7
52:12	24:21 31:5 35:3	normal 43:19	official 3:11 5:9
mere 20:13	36:4 37:1,19 38:1	notable 44:19	9:10 13:13 52:10
merely 53:7	40:9 47:11 58:1,7	note 27:10 29:21	offs 9:8,8 11:24
met 15:21 31:16	60:5,7	noted 28:12 35:2	oh 11:12 52:25
35:23 36:4	movant 33:24	40:17	okay 8:13 11:1,13
mezzanine 33:7	moving 58:20	notice 10:21 43:1	26:5 36:12 37:5
michael 6:24	multibank 17:16	noting 28:25	43:7,21,24 52:7
mid 14:14	mute 7:5 10:7	novel 40:2	53:12 54:17 58:17
million 14:12 15:4	mutual 21:7	novo 19:5	old 61:21
24:1,4 25:13,16	myer 10:17,19	number 7:13 57:7	onset 14:14
30:15	myers 10:1,8,14	numbers 9:9,20	operating 55:18
mineola 61:23	n	12:6	55:20 56:18
minimis 53:10	n 4:1 7:1 60:1	numerous 32:12	opinion 36:21
minute 37:8 50:17	61:1	ny 2:3 4:6,14,21	opportunities
minutes 37:14	n.a. 5:16	5:4 61:23	33:7
misconstrued	named 14:7	o	opportunity 38:3
54:2	narrow 21:13	o 2:21 7:1 19:14	45:7
misplaced 27:25	nasser 33:22	61:1	oppose 16:8
misunderstanding	nature 32:16	object 40:21	opposing 17:15
53:1	nearly 30:4,4	44:22	27:7
mix 8:13	necessarily 28:11	objected 44:20	opposition 20:11
modified 38:17	necessary 56:17	objection 13:17	20:19 27:21 35:1
		44:23 45:1 49:10	49:6

[oral - prepetition]

Page 13

<p>oral 25:9 30:18 order 9:4,15,18 11:14 12:15 15:12 22:11 23:15,23 30:11 34:25 36:10 36:24,25 37:3,6 54:8 58:5 orders 14:15 18:24 58:24 organize 52:1 originally 23:12 25:6 orion 19:5,6 20:15 20:20,24 21:5 outcome 20:8,21 24:3 outside 23:5 51:15 outstanding 8:16 overwhelming 34:5 owed 47:18 53:5 53:11 owned 38:10 owner 39:25 owners 21:7</p>	<p>parmalat 26:12 26:24 28:6 part 20:6 34:23 39:19 43:11 47:2 partially 8:13 participate 7:12 participating 45:13 participation 10:16,18 30:22 31:4 particular 32:2 particularly 8:15 56:21 parties 8:15,19 10:23 15:14 18:1 23:20,25 30:6 31:13 33:3,5 36:10 38:15 39:3 40:9 41:21,24 42:4 43:1 partners 27:9 33:6 party 7:15 10:25 21:25 27:7 40:6 party's 17:15 passage 13:21 passed 46:15,17 paul 6:15 pause 26:2,4 pay 20:9 22:6 34:25 39:7 40:6 40:23 42:12,17 43:4 payable 58:3 paying 22:2 38:25 40:19,24 payment 3:15 22:7,8 35:6 37:20 43:11 60:8 pending 58:18 people 49:22</p>	<p>percent 24:6 period 14:10 42:25 43:3 47:13 57:13 periods 38:20 56:6 permissive 16:10 16:19 31:18,22 32:8 33:24 34:6 35:14,23 permissively 32:11 33:10 permitted 7:10 13:6 54:9 55:1 perplexed 56:11 personal 22:2,8 perspective 54:4 persuasively 57:17 pertinent 14:4 peter 4:9 8:22 44:1 54:15 petition 15:18 19:20 43:3,6 45:23 47:10 48:15 48:17 49:21 50:16 50:20,25 54:24,25 55:19,21 57:3,5,8 57:12,13,15 petitions 15:6 petrie 19:11 20:2 philip 5:6 phone 10:3 47:25 phones 7:5 10:7 pick 56:25 picked 10:18 pickering 5:1 pictures 19:5,6 20:15 plaintiffs 1:13 13:12 14:22,25 15:3 16:8,14,20 16:25 24:4 30:5</p>	<p>plan 8:7 29:16,24 30:19 43:17 58:4 58:20 platform 7:8 play 28:4 pleading 52:13 pleadings 37:21 please 7:5,13,15 8:17 10:6 36:24 36:25 58:22 pleased 9:3 pockets 44:25 point 9:13 28:10 28:23 35:17 42:10 43:19 46:7,13 48:19 53:25 54:10 57:20 policies 14:8,8,13 14:20,25 22:5,7 policy 21:25 portion 20:10 position 39:18 40:11 45:12,15,16 45:18 49:9 50:13 possession 38:22 39:8 46:16 possibility 30:19 post 28:16 30:25 43:3,6 45:23 49:20 50:16,19,25 54:24,25 57:3,7 57:12,13,15 potential 22:3,19 25:15 30:14 precedent 54:11 precisely 52:15 predominance 16:5 predominate 32:15 34:14 35:13 prepare 36:24 prepetition 15:16 20:21 21:11,19</p>
<p>p</p>			
<p>p 4:1,1 7:1 package 48:2 page 25:17 27:23 31:3 54:8 60:4 paid 24:2 43:14 43:16,19 44:18 53:5,11 54:5 pandemic 14:15 15:2 28:20 papers 39:11 41:1 41:7 45:18 54:22 paragraph 20:11 20:15 24:21 28:5 35:1,19 43:2 47:7 47:8 48:11 paragraphs 20:19 27:22</p>			

22:25 25:19 35:16 39:1 40:8,10,12 41:1 42:8,17 43:3 45:19 49:3 50:21 50:23 51:8 54:3 presence 32:17 33:4 present 5:22 21:10 presentation 38:4 43:9 presented 16:22 26:15 28:20 29:5 38:7 preserving 24:18 pretty 49:13 prevents 31:25 preview 45:11 previously 35:1 price 55:16 principally 18:6 principle 42:9 prior 15:18 27:18 30:20 47:3,17 priority 24:15 41:23 53:9 private 7:9 probably 40:9 45:6 52:3 problem 47:14 49:4 50:21 51:18 51:21 procedures 8:8 proceed 8:3 proceeding 8:12 8:20 12:25 13:3,6 13:7 14:3 15:14 16:12 19:17,18,21 19:23,24,25,25 20:4,25 21:16,19 22:13 23:3 25:1 25:25 26:17,18 32:3,17,21,22	33:2,5,18 34:14 34:16 35:21 37:4 37:7,10 proceedings 3:17 16:14 18:21 19:1 19:2,13,14 20:24 25:21 27:20 28:15 59:1 61:4 proceeds 20:4 22:1 24:19,20 30:14 process 23:1 professional 3:7 professionals 9:4 9:14 12:6 progress 27:17 prolong 26:18 27:15 29:10 proof 25:12 properly 35:17 38:15 property 14:9 41:21 42:2,3 54:22 proposed 12:8 19:4 proposing 8:10 proskauer 3:2 4:3 7:20,22 9:6 11:17 36:24 37:18 44:2 54:15 protect 40:16 protection 21:7 provide 14:3 15:13 20:9 23:24 50:8 56:24 provided 14:9 30:19 49:25 50:1 55:24 provides 17:9 18:4,19 19:12 24:13,14,16 30:25 31:24 46:25	provisions 22:6 purchase 23:25 purchasing 47:3 purpose 40:16,21 purposefully 10:14 purposes 14:4 pursuant 13:9 15:3,11 16:2 17:4 36:8 38:11,16 58:3 purview 51:15 put 9:19 11:11 31:7 46:12	read 12:21 13:21 38:2,6 readily 21:13 49:16 real 41:11,20 really 49:11 54:20 56:2,2,4 reason 31:14 33:9 52:14 reasons 29:14 36:1 37:1 42:21 58:7 recall 47:10 receipt 48:4 receive 24:19 received 47:1 recess 37:15 recited 10:10 reclaim 47:12 reclaimed 47:13 reclamation 38:16 39:3,6,14,17,18 39:22,24,25 40:14 40:18 41:3,5,9 42:9,15,20 45:20 46:6 47:1,16,18 48:24 51:7,7,10 51:15,18 54:8 56:15,16,16 57:10 57:11 recognition 51:10 recognized 43:5 recommends 32:14 34:12 record 7:14,17 9:19 11:11 13:22 37:1 38:19 43:15 51:21 52:10 55:22 58:6,7 61:4 recording 7:9 recordings 7:10 recourse 51:14
		q	
		qualify 51:14 quantifiable 56:4 56:21 quantify 49:16 question 10:4,8 27:2 35:18 43:7 questions 9:12 37:3 quick 8:6 30:10 quickly 8:18 26:22 27:2 quite 37:17 quote 16:6,20 17:6,18 18:20 19:24,25 20:1,2,4 20:12 21:20 22:1 24:9 26:20 27:1 27:16,18 28:2,3 29:22,23 31:25 32:6 33:10 34:22 49:21	
		r	
		r 2:21 4:1 7:1 61:1 raise 40:4 raised 11:16 reach 25:15 36:23 reached 9:7	

recovered 22:21 recoveries 30:5 recovery 20:10 21:2 22:7,19 23:1 24:4,5,7,23 25:11 25:15 44:25 reduce 11:17,18 11:20,22 reduced 9:15 reductions 12:8 12:13 reference 15:12 40:4 referred 18:22 reflected 9:9 11:14 55:15 reflects 7:25 refusal 57:10 regarding 18:1 21:10 28:21 35:12 registered 7:11 related 17:8 18:8 18:11,17 19:9 22:17,24 25:25 32:3,17 relatedness 32:20 34:16 relating 21:18,20 relationship 19:16 21:1 relative 26:14 27:13 28:16,18 29:5 38:9 relatively 29:22 53:10 release 48:2 relevant 14:24 26:16 28:15 33:10 34:17 38:20 39:10 reliance 51:6 relied 41:12 relief 15:6	relieve 41:2 rely 41:7,14 49:15 remain 17:1 remaining 31:12 remand 12:22,24 13:7 16:2 27:7,14 29:13 31:17,22 32:6,9 34:18 35:3 35:22 36:4,8 60:5 remanded 15:17 remanding 34:6 remoteness 32:20 34:16 removal 25:7 removed 15:8 removes 39:17 render 20:24 23:2 47:16 rendered 42:15 45:20 renders 16:12 reorganization 19:20,21 29:18,24 repeatedly 20:17 reply 13:17 28:4 35:19 54:18 57:17 report 9:3 represented 9:14 22:2 request 13:2 16:25 24:8 31:22 43:11 requested 58:3 required 13:4 15:25 16:10 17:23 22:9 29:21 31:23 34:3 36:6 requirements 31:15 36:2 requires 18:14 28:13 50:19 resale 48:22	resolution 20:6 23:10 25:1,18 27:20 30:10,20 31:7,8 34:23 35:8 35:9 resolve 11:15 12:8 29:2 35:19 resolved 8:17 resolving 21:20 resort 54:6 resources 45:3 respect 16:11,19 17:3 19:8 28:18 29:4 31:12 32:1 34:18 57:21 respective 26:15 respectively 8:9 respond 21:12 53:12 55:7 rest 21:3 result 14:18 21:2 39:24 41:9 results 24:3 30:4 retail 14:16 19:11 20:2 retain 13:22 retention 30:13 retrieve 47:23 return 41:3 46:13 55:3 57:10 reverse 39:23 revert 46:10 reverted 40:14 46:7 review 9:18 18:24 19:5 reviewed 12:13 revised 9:18 12:15 right 7:18 8:2,24 9:24 11:1,25 12:10,11,17,24 13:22 31:20 33:4 36:23 37:3,16	38:1 41:4,18 43:22,24 46:10 48:25 49:1 50:12 50:16,20 51:9,10 55:9 58:10,13,17 58:21 rights 41:21 42:2 42:3 54:22,24 riley 6:11 rings 25:4 56:21 rise 50:25 risk 24:18 road 61:21 robert 6:9 rose 3:2 4:3 7:22 roseland 5:11 roster 7:11 rule 43:16 ruling 13:22 14:5 31:20 36:12 37:3 rulings 60:3 run 11:2,5,8 russell 6:23
			s s 4:1 7:1 s.d.n.y. 17:14,18 21:4 27:10 28:17 30:1 32:10 33:8 33:13 34:1 safe 58:23 sale 10:17 23:15 23:16,17,20,22,23 23:24 24:9,10,21 24:22 25:11 30:7 30:18,22 31:5 35:4,5 42:14 44:17 sales 47:8 55:23 56:24 salvatore 6:2 sandler 3:8 5:8 9:6 11:20

<p>satisfied 17:20,25 31:14 satisfy 24:13,14 saying 45:14 53:1 53:7 says 56:8 scc 1:3,4 3:17 scenario 28:3 29:23 schedule 9:10 11:14 scheduling 58:19 schwartz 4:16 11:10 12:1,2,3,5 12:11 scratcher 44:13 screen 36:21 second 19:23 20:20 21:6,12,18 22:9 26:20 35:12 39:12,16 41:20 50:18 secondly 57:12 section 13:4,6,9 16:3,3 17:4,9,12 17:24 18:3,7,14 18:19,23,24 19:1 19:12 26:8 30:21 30:23 31:4,11,13 31:16,24 32:4,5,7 32:19 36:2,8 38:17 40:16 45:22 46:18 secured 20:9 24:13 securing 48:3 see 17:12,16 19:5 21:3 23:20 27:9 28:4 31:2 32:9 33:5,19 35:19 37:17,17 51:12 seeing 50:10</p>	<p>seek 10:23 15:3 seen 8:6 self 47:4 sell 56:23 seller 39:9 40:17 42:5 selling 29:15 47:4 senior 46:18 47:17,19 48:7 sense 11:2 sent 7:23 sept 28:17 33:8 september 15:7,7 seriously 12:7 served 38:23 39:22 service 57:9 set 10:15 14:13 26:11 58:7 settlement 23:17 33:6 45:5 severing 32:23 shading 51:3 sharing 24:20 shelley 2:22 shelves 55:16,17 55:24 56:6,7,8 shelving 44:16 46:8,16 48:14,20 48:21 56:22 57:4 shoes 42:1 shop 27:19 shopping 33:3 short 41:11 show 17:15 showing 33:24 showtime 19:6 20:15 side 51:5 significant 21:21 25:6 38:7 39:12 53:14</p>	<p>significantly 27:13 similar 42:11 similarly 27:1 32:5 simply 31:7 35:2 41:4,9 50:2 54:9 singer 6:14 situation 43:10 six 17:24 18:1 sixth 18:7 40:17 42:1 size 20:13 skrynski 4:8 skrzynski 7:21,22 8:3,5,21 9:3 small 38:10 smith 17:21 social 14:15 sold 30:3 42:12,16 sole 17:10 18:4 solely 35:16 solicitation 8:8 solutions 7:8 61:20 somewhat 25:4 sonya 3:25 61:3,8 soon 46:16 47:8 sorry 10:2 46:20 47:7 51:20 52:5 52:23 58:13 sort 38:7 40:2,3 41:11,12,24 42:21 48:20 54:21,23 55:2 sound 12:13 33:22 41:24 sounds 8:21 33:11 55:12 source 22:3 southern 1:2 9:10 15:10 41:13</p>	<p>speak 7:5,14,16 45:12 specific 22:22 specifically 15:18 18:1 20:16 30:21 30:24 34:8 42:14 speculate 45:4 speed 26:20 29:3 speeds 26:23 speedy 29:19 spending 52:16 spent 50:4 sport 44:11 spot 53:23 square 4:5,20 ss 21:7 standard 51:2 56:17 standing 15:12 standpoint 43:10 stankowski 6:17 starr 1:15 3:18 5:2 start 7:20 8:17 39:4 45:14 started 12:23 state 13:8,9 14:23 15:8,9,17,21,22 16:2,5,15,22,23 17:7,11,12 18:3,5 18:10,13 23:3 25:19 26:8,13,17 26:22,24 27:3,5,8 27:12,15,19 28:1 28:8,12,18,20 29:3,7,8 30:9 31:10,17 32:1,2 32:15,18,23,24 33:10,11,17 34:7 34:12,13 35:12,15 35:16,17 36:5 39:10 51:16 60:6</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>state's 16:24</p> <p>stated 19:23 20:25 24:9 37:1 43:8</p> <p>statement 8:7 53:13 58:20</p> <p>states 1:1 2:1 4:11 9:7,16 11:16 12:5 14:17 15:9 21:7 42:14</p> <p>stating 20:12 58:6</p> <p>status 3:19 7:25 26:16 50:15</p> <p>statutes 45:21</p> <p>statutory 15:20</p> <p>stay 58:23</p> <p>stead 44:6</p> <p>stewarding 44:5</p> <p>stipulation 38:8 43:2 46:24 47:7 48:10 56:8</p> <p>stop 27:19 52:6,7</p> <p>store 14:18 47:11 51:25</p> <p>stores 1:8,12 3:18 7:4 13:11 14:21 41:6 48:13,14,16 48:17,19,21 55:17 55:19 56:6,7,7 57:5</p> <p>street 4:13 5:3,17</p> <p>stretto 3:4 9:6 11:16</p> <p>strip 48:6</p> <p>stuff 44:15,16 47:23 49:3 50:20 51:6,8 52:2</p> <p>subject 9:4 14:12 18:24 39:7,17 46:17 47:16 48:5 51:22 54:3 57:23</p> <p>submit 10:21 15:24 19:4 20:16 36:10,24 58:5</p>	<p>submitted 9:18 11:15</p> <p>subsection 18:23</p> <p>subsequent 13:24</p> <p>substance 32:21</p> <p>substantial 33:14 34:9</p> <p>successful 20:8</p> <p>suffered 14:17</p> <p>suggest 37:5</p> <p>suite 4:13 61:22</p> <p>summary 14:3 15:13</p> <p>sundt 6:12</p> <p>supp 27:10</p> <p>suppliers 47:16</p> <p>supplies 50:24</p> <p>support 13:16 24:8 35:14 48:1 49:9</p> <p>supportive 52:13 52:18 53:2,4</p> <p>supports 21:9 28:9 43:15 45:12</p> <p>suppose 44:20</p> <p>supreme 13:8</p> <p>sure 43:13 44:12 46:4 47:21 50:11</p> <p>surplus 1:15 3:18 5:2</p> <p>sustained 15:1</p> <p>sweat 52:23</p> <p>swift 58:21</p> <p>swiftly 28:22</p>	<p>talk 50:17</p> <p>talking 50:14</p> <p>technical 49:8 56:13 57:6</p> <p>technologies 27:5</p> <p>telephonically 4:8 4:9,16,23 5:6,13 5:20,22 7:8</p> <p>tell 47:22</p> <p>tempted 50:2</p> <p>tenant 40:4 42:18</p> <p>tenuous 16:6</p> <p>terms 14:12 18:14 23:24</p> <p>test 15:20 17:19</p> <p>tests 32:8</p> <p>thank 7:6 8:21,24 11:25 12:10,11,17 12:18 37:10,13,16 38:5 44:8,10 45:11 52:9 54:13 58:9,11,16,17,24 58:25</p> <p>thereof 32:13</p> <p>thing 40:3 54:1</p> <p>things 22:11</p> <p>think 38:14 39:12 41:11,12,25 42:10 42:13,21 43:1,18 46:10,25 47:14,25 48:8 50:12 51:1,4 53:20 54:20,20,23 55:5,7,14 56:13 56:20 57:11,16,24 58:1,11,22</p> <p>thinking 36:19 52:3</p> <p>third 18:6 21:25 27:1</p> <p>thirds 26:3</p> <p>three 48:16 55:17 55:21 56:7</p>	<p>threshold 24:5,7 24:21</p> <p>time 7:16 9:18 13:21 24:18 25:6 38:12,22 44:7 48:3,12 56:6 58:14</p> <p>timeliness 26:19 28:9 29:21</p> <p>timely 15:22 16:15 17:6,11 18:2,10,13 26:6,7 26:10 27:4,9 28:1 28:8,10,13 30:11 31:10 38:15,21</p> <p>times 4:5,20 36:18 58:15</p> <p>title 16:3 17:5 18:19,21,21,22,25 26:9 31:11,24 32:3,4,5 36:3,9 39:6,7,21,24,25 42:5 46:7,9,15,17 48:5 55:3</p> <p>today 10:11 12:16 13:20 45:9,18 58:18</p> <p>today's 54:23</p> <p>top 57:18</p> <p>total 24:3,6</p> <p>totally 51:9</p> <p>tracy 5:24</p> <p>trade 5:3</p> <p>traditional 29:17</p> <p>transaction 50:16 50:20 55:1,4 57:3 57:8,12,15</p> <p>transactions 45:23</p> <p>transcribed 3:25</p> <p>transcript 25:17 27:23 31:3 37:2 61:4</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[transfer - yeah]

Page 18

<p>transfer 30:25 transferred 15:11 treated 39:9 50:22 treatment 49:12 tremendous 14:18 trial 33:4 triggered 22:12 tronox 33:25 troubling 49:7,14 true 61:4 trust 31:1 trustee 4:12 9:7 11:16 12:5 trustees 9:16 try 45:7 trying 10:5 40:25 53:6 turn 8:19 13:25 26:21 31:18 37:9 37:19 40:8 twelve 21:3 two 13:4 26:2 27:17,18 37:8 48:14 49:2 55:19 56:6 tyler 6:22 type 20:6 typically 29:18</p>	<p>undercuts 29:18 underlying 30:3 understand 45:2 47:20 50:2 understands 24:2 understood 51:23 uniform 47:15 unique 19:24 uniquely 19:24 unit 48:20 united 1:1 2:1 4:11 9:7,16 11:15 12:5 15:9 21:7 units 46:16 48:14 48:21 unknown 2:25 unlawfully 55:2 unquestionably 44:14 unquote 16:6,20 49:21 unsecured 3:12 5:9 13:14 20:10 24:17 34:22,25 35:7 44:21 45:24 46:1 50:8 52:11 unsettled 32:16 update 8:6 updates 7:25 upside 30:13 urgency 28:4 29:23 use 22:9 38:25 40:6,18,19,22,24 41:5 42:20,24 43:3,5 50:24 54:24 55:1 56:15 56:16 57:13,25 uses 40:5 42:19 usual 43:16</p>	<p>v</p> <p>v 1:14 3:18 17:17 17:21 19:6 20:15 21:3,7 26:12,24 27:9 28:16 29:25 32:9 33:6,12,19 va 17:22 valentine's 58:23 valid 39:16 value 20:7 24:12 42:24 48:21 49:18 valueless 42:15 45:20 values 56:19 vandermark 4:23 37:18,21,23,24 38:2,5 43:8,18,22 43:23 54:17,19 57:16,18 58:9,25 varick 4:13 various 14:7,15 veritext 61:20 verted 55:3 view 56:12 57:5 virginia 17:21 visan 21:4 vista 17:21 vladimir 6:13 voice 37:11 voluntarily 11:17 11:18,20,22 voluntary 9:8 15:6</p>	<p>water 37:8 way 8:6 9:13 26:3 44:2 56:18 ways 57:7 we've 37:17 41:1 weeks 49:2 weg 10:1,8,14,17 10:19 weigh 29:6 34:6 weighed 29:22 53:25 weights 35:21 weisenberg 5:13 45:13 52:8,9,10 52:20,25 welcome 37:7 white 4:18 37:24 william 6:21 williams 4:18 37:24 willing 47:25 48:2 wilmer 5:1 wish 44:5 wishes 12:12 43:14 wit 18:7 wl 28:16 33:7,13 33:23 woodrow 29:25 work 52:20 world 5:3 worldview 29:24 write 9:8,8 11:5,9 11:24 written 13:23 wrong 57:22</p>
<p>u</p> <p>u.s. 2:23 4:12 21:8 21:13,15,17,22,24 22:5,17 32:9 u.s.c. 13:4,6,9 17:12 32:4,7,19 ucc 38:11,16 39:10,15 40:13,21 ultimate 20:13 ultimately 53:3 unable 45:21 uncertainty 28:20 unclear 43:13 undeniable 16:20</p>			<p>x</p> <p>x 1:5,11,17 60:1 xi 27:5</p>
		<p>w</p> <p>w.r. 33:12 waiting 37:16 want 46:6 52:2 54:17 55:9 56:5 wanted 54:9 warehouse 49:25 warning 12:22 warranted 16:10 22:11 30:17 35:24</p>	<p>y</p> <p>yeah 10:5,9 11:8 48:13 51:3</p>

year 36:17
york 1:2 2:3 4:6
4:14,21 5:4 13:8,9
15:10 38:17
young 4:9 6:18
8:22,25 9:1,22,25
10:2,7,9,13 11:4
11:12 12:18 27:10
44:1,1,8,11,12
45:10 46:4,9,14
46:20,23 47:21,24
48:12 49:1 50:11
51:9,20 52:4,5
54:14,15 55:9,11
56:9 58:10,11,15

z

zero 45:23
zoom 36:20