

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

SEPTEMBER 2017

Editor's Note: Developments
Victoria Prussen Spears

Insolvency at Its Limits: What Management and Creditors of Insolvent LLCs and LPs Should Know About Fiduciary Duty Waivers and Standing, Inside and Outside of Bankruptcy
Isley M. Gostin, Craig Goldblatt, and George W. Shuster, Jr.

Equipment Leases in Bankruptcy: A Plan for Riding Out the Storm
James Heiser and Aaron M. Krieger

Supreme Court Rejects FDCPA Claim Based on Filing Time-Barred Bankruptcy Claim
Rand L. McClellan

Second Circuit Affirms Refusal to Approve Foreign Debtor's Asset Sale
Michael L. Cook

**Retention of Jurisdiction in Bankruptcy Sale Orders:
The First Circuit Says Not So Fast**
Peter C. Blain

Mortgage Reaffirmation Agreements, Credit Reporting, and the Discharge Injunction: Recent Bankruptcy Court Decision Reveals Underlying Tensions
Tyler P. Brown and Justin F. Paget

**The Thirteenth Labor of Hercules:
Bankruptcy Court Confirms Hercules Offshore Chapter 11 Plan, Approving Debtor Releases Over Committee Objections**
Stephanie N. Morrison

In Case of First Impression, Illinois Appellate Court Holds That Senior Lender's Material Breach of Intercreditor Agreement Warrants Partial Subordination of Senior Debt
Bryan E. Jacobson, James P. Sullivan, and Stephen R. Tetro II



LexisNexis

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 13

NUMBER 6

SEPTEMBER 2017

Editor's Note: Developments

Victoria Prussen Spears 279

Insolvency at Its Limits: What Management and Creditors of Insolvent LLCs and LPs Should Know About Fiduciary Duty Waivers and Standing, Inside and Outside of Bankruptcy

Isley M. Gostin, Craig Goldblatt, and George W. Shuster, Jr. 282

Equipment Leases in Bankruptcy: A Plan for Riding Out the Storm

James Heiser and Aaron M. Krieger 297

Supreme Court Rejects FDCPA Claim Based on Filing Time-Barred Bankruptcy Claim

Rand L. McClellan 304

Second Circuit Affirms Refusal to Approve Foreign Debtor's Asset Sale

Michael L. Cook 307

Retention of Jurisdiction in Bankruptcy Sale Orders: The First Circuit Says Not So Fast

Peter C. Blain 314

Mortgage Reaffirmation Agreements, Credit Reporting, and the Discharge Injunction: Recent Bankruptcy Court Decision Reveals Underlying Tensions

Tyler P. Brown and Justin F. Paget 319

The Thirteenth Labor of Hercules: Bankruptcy Court Confirms Hercules Offshore Chapter 11 Plan, Approving Debtor Releases Over Committee Objections

Stephanie N. Morrison 324

In Case of First Impression, Illinois Appellate Court Holds That Senior Lender's Material Breach of Intercreditor Agreement Warrants Partial Subordination of Senior Debt

Bryan E. Jacobson, James P. Sullivan, and Stephen R. Tetto II 329

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 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 Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, 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.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

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*

Michael L. Cook

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

Stuart I. Gordon

Rivkin Radler LLP

Leslie A. Berkoff

*Moritt Hock & Hamroff
LLP*

Mark G. Douglas

Jones Day

Patrick E. Mears

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

Ted A. Berkowitz

Farrell Fritz, P.C.

Timothy P. Duggan

Stark & Stark

Alec P. Ostrow

Stevens & Lee P.C.

Andrew P. Brozman

Clifford Chance US LLP

Gregg M. Ficks

*Coblentz, Patch, Duffy &
Bass LLP*

Deryck A. Palmer

*Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw
Pittman LLP*

Peter S. Clark II

Reed Smith LLP

Mark J. Friedman

DLA Piper

N. Theodore Zink, Jr.

Chadbourne & Parke LLP

FROM A LITIGATION
PERSPECTIVE . . .

Terence G. Banich

*Shaw Fishman Glantz &
Towbin LLC*

PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2017 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, 718.224.2258. 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.

In Case of First Impression, Illinois Appellate Court Holds That Senior Lender's Material Breach of Intercreditor Agreement Warrants Partial Subordination of Senior Debt

*By Bryan E. Jacobson, James P. Sullivan, and Stephen R. Tetro II**

In a case of first impression, the Illinois Appellate Court recently utilized equitable considerations to resolve a dispute between parties to an intercreditor agreement. The authors of this article discuss the decision.

Intercreditor agreements are commonly used to define the relative rights of senior and junior lenders, including lien and payment priorities. Properly defining priorities between lenders is particularly important when both parties possess security interests in the same collateral because such agreements dictate which party is repaid first from the proceeds of the collateral upon enforcement of the lien and which party controls enforcement rights against the borrower and the collateral.

But what happens when the senior lender breaches the intercreditor agreement? Can the senior lender's entire position be subordinated to the junior lender as a result? In an interesting case of first impression, the Illinois Appellate Court recently utilized equitable considerations to resolve such a dispute between parties to an intercreditor agreement.

BOWLING GREEN SPORTS CTR., INC. v. G.A.G. LLC

In *Bowling Green Sports Ctr., Inc. v. G.A.G. LLC*,¹ borrower received a \$3.4 million loan from senior lender and a \$405,000 loan from junior lender. Senior lender and junior lender executed an intercreditor agreement whereby junior lender agreed that senior lender would be paid before junior lender, and that junior lender would not sue to recover its debt or seek to enforce its liens until borrower repaid senior lender in full. Senior lender agreed that it would not modify the terms of its loan or amend its loan documents without junior lender's consent. The intercreditor agreement also contained a potentially

* Bryan E. Jacobson (bjacob@chapman.com) is an associate in Chapman and Cutler LLP's Banking and Financial Services Department and a member of the Litigation Group. James P. Sullivan (jsulliva@chapman.com) is a partner in the firm's Litigation and Bankruptcy and Restructuring groups. Stephen R. Tetro II (stetro@chapman.com) is a partner in firm's Bankruptcy and Restructuring Group.

¹ 2017 IL App (2d) 160656, 2017 Ill. App. LEXIS 280 (Apr. 27, 2017).

contradictory provision stating that the rights of senior lender thereunder would remain in full force and effect regardless of any change in terms relating to the senior lender's loan. Notwithstanding the provisions of the intercreditor agreement, senior lender subsequently modified its loan documents to increase the size of the senior loan by an additional \$51,000 without obtaining the consent of junior lender.

Junior lender later filed a breach of contract action against borrower to recover its debt, despite the fact that the borrower still owed senior lender almost \$2 million, contending that the intercreditor agreement was unenforceable as a result of the senior lender's breach. Senior lender filed a motion to dismiss junior lender's complaint, contending that, pursuant to the intercreditor agreement, junior lender's complaint was barred because junior lender had agreed not to sue borrower to recover its debt until senior lender's indebtedness was paid in full. Senior lender further asserted that its alleged breach of the intercreditor agreement was immaterial because the agreement provided that it was enforceable under all circumstances. The trial court dismissed junior lender's complaint with prejudice, finding that the intercreditor agreement precluded the junior lender from suing to collect until the senior lender had been paid in full, despite the senior lender's "material breach" of the agreement.

On appeal, the Second District Appellate Court rejected the arguments of both parties and held that although the intercreditor agreement remained effective, the \$51,000 loaned by senior lender without the consent of the junior lender in violation of the agreement was to be subordinated to the debt owed to the junior lender. Although Illinois courts had yet to address this issue, the court noted that other states uniformly hold that consent from a junior lender is required where a modification of the senior lender's loan "prejudices the rights or impairs the security of any junior lender." A senior lender's failure to obtain such consent results in a modification being ineffective as to the junior lender and the senior lender relinquishing its priority with respect to the modified terms. Where the senior lender's actions have "substantially impaired" the junior lender's security interest, a court may *wholly divest* the senior lender of its priority status.

After considering decisions from other states where a senior lender's conduct was to found to have "substantially impaired" the security interest of a junior lender,² the appellate court held that the 1.5 percent increase in senior lender's

² In *Koloff v. Reston Corp.*, the Delaware Court of Chancery rearranged priorities between senior and junior lenders where the senior lender had increased its loan to borrowers by more than nine times the original amount (from \$2.2 million to \$20 million) without junior lender's permission. In *Gluskin v. Atlantic Savings & Loan Assn.*, 32 Cal. App. 3d 307 (Cal. Dist. Ct. App.

loan was not a “materially significant” factor in borrower’s subsequent inability to repay junior lender. Borrower still owed senior lender over \$1.9 million, and the relatively slight increase in the senior loan did not “substantially impair” junior lender’s rights as a junior lender and lienholder. As such, the court rejected as inequitable junior lender’s argument that senior lender’s failure to obtain the junior lender’s consent to the increased senior loan warranted subordination of senior lender’s entire debt. Instead, the appellate court opined that the minimal impairment to junior lienholder’s rights could be remedied by denying senior lender priority only as to the incremental \$51,000 loan. The court then affirmed the trial court’s dismissal of the junior lender’s suit, allowing junior lender to pursue recovery from borrower only after the outstanding principal on senior lender’s loan to borrower was reduced to \$51,000.

CONCLUSION

In *Bowling Green*, the Illinois Appellate Court agreed with the view of certain other courts that, while appropriate only in “rare” cases, a senior lender’s debt can be wholly subordinated if the senior lender substantially impairs the position of the junior lender by modifying the terms of the senior loan without junior lender consent (at least in the absence of intercreditor agreement provisions explicitly allowing such modification). While the particular facts of *Bowling Green* warranted only partial subordination, senior lenders should be mindful of the risks of modifying senior loan terms without lender consent, or of materially breaching the terms of their intercreditor agreement. One of the unresolved questions of *Bowling Green* is at what point will a court will find that a modification of the terms of the senior debt “substantially impairs” a junior lender’s position? It goes without saying that in light of *Bowling Green*, if a senior lender has not precisely followed the terms of an intercreditor agreement, a junior lender in Illinois is likely to argue that they have been “substantially impaired.” A senior lender may be able to avoid or defend such an attack by ensuring that its intercreditor agreement explicitly subordinates the junior creditor’s lien and payment priority under all circumstances, and by strictly following all terms of the intercreditor agreement, including those provisions that specify the extent to which the senior credit agreement that may be amended without the consent of the junior lender.

1973), the Court of Appeal of California, Second District, rearranged priorities between a senior and junior lienholder where the senior lender had substantially impaired the position of the junior lender by significantly reducing the face value of the loan, increasing the interest and shortening the maturity of the note from 30 years to 10 months.

