

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

SEPTEMBER 2019

EDITOR'S NOTE: THIRD-PARTY RELEASES

Victoria Prussen Spears

NONCONSENSUAL THIRD-PARTY RELEASE LIMITS: SUBSTANTIAL FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION WON'T BUY NON-DEBTORS A RELEASE FROM CLAIMS THAT DON'T ALSO LIE AGAINST THE DEBTOR

Dania Slim

WHEN MAY CREDITORS BE HELD IN CIVIL CONTEMPT FOR ATTEMPTING TO COLLECT DISCHARGED DEBTS?

Steven A. Meyerowitz

THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS ... THE DOCTRINE OF RECOUPMENT

Gabriel A. Morgan and Justin R. Pitcher

BANKRUPTCY COURT DISALLOWS SECURED LENDER'S POST-PETITION LEGAL FEES FOR "POLICING" CHAPTER 11 CASE

Justin F. Paget and Nathan Kramer

TRIBUNE MEDIA—IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS IN BANKRUPTCY SAFE HARBOR PROTECTIONS

Benjamin Mintz



LexisNexis

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Kent K. B. Hanson, J.D., at 415-908-3207
Email: kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

Example: Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.

Copyright © 2019 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SCOTT L. BAENA

Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP

LESLIE A. BERKOFF

Moritt Hock & Hamroff LLP

TED A. BERKOWITZ

Farrell Fritz, P.C.

ANDREW P. BROZMAN

Clifford Chance US LLP

MICHAEL L. COOK

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

MARK G. DOUGLAS

Jones Day

MARK J. FRIEDMAN

DLA Piper

STUART I. GORDON

Rivkin Radler LLP

PATRICK E. MEARS

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2019 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, please access www.copyright.com or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844.

Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, No. 18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, Attn: Customer Service, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342-9907.

Bankruptcy Court Disallows Secured Lender's Post-Petition Legal Fees for "Policing" Chapter 11 Case

*By Justin F. Paget and Nathan Kramer**

The U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of West Virginia issued an opinion in In re Emerald Grande, LLC, illustrating that an oversecured creditor cannot assume that all of its post-petition attorney's fees will be chargeable to the debtor's estate in a Chapter 11 case. The authors of this article explain the decision.

The U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of West Virginia issued an opinion¹ holding that an oversecured creditor could not recover a portion of the creditor's attorney's fees incurred in connection with the borrower's bankruptcy proceeding despite provisions in the loan agreement that provided for recovery of attorney's fees "incurred in connection with the enforcement" of the loan documents. The opinion underscores the need for (i) careful drafting of loan documents for secured commercial loans to ensure that, in the event of a borrower bankruptcy filing, the provisions are broad enough to require the payment of the creditor's post-petition attorney fees and (ii) proper planning once the debtor files bankruptcy to ensure that all actions the secured creditor takes in the borrower's bankruptcy proceeding fall within the scope of the provisions for recovery of attorney's fees.

BACKGROUND

The debtor, Emerald Grande, LLC, owns and leases commercial real estate in the Charleston, West Virginia, area. Prior to filing for bankruptcy, the debtor obtained financing from Premier Bank ("Premier") through two construction loans secured by real estate being improved by the loan proceeds and the revenue generated by the property. The loans were documented by construction loan agreements, promissory notes and security instruments related thereto.

In January 2017, the debtor filed for relief under Chapter 11 of the

* Justin F. Paget is counsel at Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP advising clients on restructuring transactions and defending litigation involving business and consumer bankruptcy law. Nathan Kramer is an associate at the firm focusing his practice on corporate restructuring, bankruptcy, creditors' rights, and other insolvency-related matters. The authors may be reached at jpaget@huntonak.com and nkramer@huntonak.com, respectively.

¹ The decision is *In re Emerald Grande, LLC*, 2019 Bankr. LEXIS 941 (Bankr. N.D. W. Va. Mar. 27, 2019).

Bankruptcy Code. Premier filed a proof of claim in the debtor's bankruptcy case asserting a secured claim for the balances due on its construction loans. As discussed in more detail below, Premier was actively involved in the case over that period of time, including challenging claims of other creditors and filing a motion to dismiss or convert the case to Chapter 7. Toward the conclusion of the case, Premier filed an amended claim asserting, among other amounts, \$154,961.21 in accrued attorney's fees and expenses pursuant to the following terms of the suite of documents related to the loans:

- The construction loan agreements and commercial security agreements provide Premier's legal expenses "incurred in connection with the enforcement of this Agreement," may be paid by the debtor, and that such costs and expenses include those incurred "for bankruptcy proceedings (including efforts to modify or vacate any automatic stay or injunction)."
- The promissory notes permit Premier to "hire or pay someone else to help to collect [the notes] if [the debtor] does not pay," and that the debtor agrees to pay such fees, "including attorneys' fees, expenses for bankruptcy proceedings (including efforts to modify or vacate any automatic stay or injunction)."
- The credit line deeds of trust allow Premier to collect "costs and expenses of preserving and protecting [its collateral]," "costs and expenses paid or incurred to . . . enforce [its] security interests and liens . . . or to defend any claims made or threatened against [it] arising out of the transactions contemplated hereby," "all reasonable expenses [it] incurs that in [its] opinion are necessary at any time for the protection of its interest or the enforcement of its rights," including "fees and expenses for bankruptcy proceedings (including efforts to modify or vacate any automatic stay or injunction)."

The debtor challenged Premier's request for attorney's fees and expenses pursuant to Section 502(b) of the Bankruptcy Code. Specifically, the debtor objected to the portion of Premier's fees related to Premier's:

- (1) Challenge of an administrative claim asserted against the debtor by a third party;
- (2) Monitoring of third party's own pending bankruptcy case;
- (3) Attempts to seek dismissal or conversion of the debtor's bankruptcy case; and
- (4) Clerical work.

THE COURT'S DECISION

The debtor objected to these fees on the basis that they are not recoverable under the terms of the loan documents. The court agreed, determining that the fees were not “incurred in connection with the enforcement of” the various loan documents or “to help collect [Premier’s claim against the debtor].” The court looked to the common example in the loan documents of a motion to modify the automatic stay as the type of action that could support an award of attorney’s fees. But the court noted that “fees incurred for generally ‘policing’ a case do not, in the court’s view, fall within the purview of enforcing loan documents.”

Specifically, the court held that Premier’s “generalized insecurity” concerning an administrative expense claim against the debtors, or the debtor’s alleged lack of capital reserves, were insufficient to establish that the debtor’s service of Premier’s debt would be impacted by the allowance of the third party’s administrative claim. Furthermore, the court ruled that pursuing a motion to dismiss or convert the debtor’s bankruptcy case, monitoring the third party’s bankruptcy case, and performing “clerical work” were all unrelated to enforcement of Premier’s loan documents. The court simply was not convinced that these actions would have improved Premier’s position. Therefore, the court denied Premier’s request to recover attorney’s fees against the debtor in the four challenged categories.

TAKEAWAYS

The court’s decision in *In re Emerald Grande, LLC*, illustrates that an oversecured creditor cannot assume that all of its post-petition attorney’s fees will be chargeable to the debtor’s estate in a Chapter 11 case. A number of other bankruptcy courts have limited or disallowed oversecured creditors’ attorney’s fees for similar reasons.²

At the outset of the lending relationship, a secured creditor should make sure that the language in the loan documents concerning recovering attorney’s fees

² See, e.g., *In re BDC Capital, Inc.*, 2014 Bankr. LEXIS 2306, at *13–14 (Bankr. E.D. Va. May 24, 2014) (distinguishing between actions to collect pre-petition judgment and protect collateral); *In re Sundale, Ltd.*, 483 B.R. 23 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 2012) (disallowing portion of oversecured creditor’s attorney’s fees on the basis that they were unreasonably excessive in proportion to value of collateral); *In re Kalian*, 178 B.R. 308 (Bankr. D.R.I. 1995) (noting that an oversecured creditor’s fees will be reduced when the court is unable to ascertain the nature of the services provided, when it is unclear that the fees were incurred in the collection of the obligation in question or when the hours incurred are not provided).

is appropriately drafted to provide the secured creditor with the best possible argument for recovering post-petition attorney fees. In the *Emerald Grande* case, the court read the related provision to be limited to actions to enforce the loan agreement and protect the collateral, including based on the repeated reference to a motion to modify the automatic stay as an example of a covered enforcement action. Secured creditors may benefit from avoiding such limitations in their loan documents. Further, the applicable provisions in the loan documents generally should provide for recovery of attorney's fees not only for protecting the collateral and enforcing the loan documents, but also for filing and defending claims in bankruptcy, challenges to the secured creditor's liens and any other actions that may relate to a borrower's bankruptcy filing.

Finally, even with appropriate attorney's fee language in the loan documents, secured creditors should be cautioned not to assume that their attorney's fees and costs will be payable by the debtor's estate. Prior to taking action in a borrower's bankruptcy case, a secured creditor should review the applicable language in the loan documents to understand whether acts that it intends to take in the bankruptcy case are within the scope of the attorney fee and cost reimbursement provision. A key question for the court in the *Emerald Grande* case was whether the actions taken by Premier would have improved its position.

Secured creditors should consider the same question before authorizing counsel to take action in a borrower's bankruptcy case, particularly if the action could be viewed as "policing" rather than "enforcing or protecting" the secured creditor's claim or rights in collateral.