Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2018

Editor's Note: In the Courts Victoria Prussen Spears

Creditors Typically May Not Offset Section 303(i) Judgments Against Claims Against Debtors Stuart I. Gordon and Matthew V. Spero

A Lease by Any Other Name Would Not Smell as Sweet: Fifth Circuit Denies "True Lease" Status to a "Sale" of Software

James Heiser, James P. Sullivan, Stephen R. Tetro II, and Franklin H. Top III

In re Franchise Services of North America, Inc: The Fifth Circuit Explores Restrictions on Bankruptcy Filing

Mark A. Speiser and Harold A. Olsen

Seventh Circuit Holds That the Illinois Department of Revenue Must Present Evidence to Support the Value of Its Claim for Adequate Protection in a Section 363 Sale Michael T. Benz, Bryan E. Jacobson, and James P. Sullivan

Ya Gotta Have [Good] Faith: Ninth Circuit Holds That in the Context of Plan Voting, a Bad Faith Showing Requires More Than a Negative Impact on Creditors
Fredric Sosnick, Joel Moss, Solomon J. Noh, and Ned S. Schodek

Eleventh Circuit Issues Opinion on New Value Defense to a Preference Claim Edward M. Fitzgerald and Alan M. Weiss

Bankruptcy Court Enforces Non-Consensual Third-Party Releases in Chapter 15 Case Shantel Watters-Roders

A Check Is Transferred When It Is Honored, Not Delivered Matt Barr and Lauren Tauro

Tenth Circuit B.A.P. on Novinda's Classification: No Gerrymandering, No(n)-Creditor Interest, No Problem

Andriana Georgallas

Delaware Bankruptcy Court Declines to Bind Credit Bidders to the Mast Matthew Goren and Kevin Bostel

Getting Off on the Right Foot: Bankruptcy Court Rejects U.S. Trustee's Unconventional Position That Management Consultant Must Be Retained Under Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code

Debora Hoehne and Gaby Smith

More Cautionary Tales in Puerto Rico's Restructuring Laura E. Appleby, James Heiser, and Aaron M. Krieger

In the Matter of CW Advanced Technologies Limited—An Intriguing Decision in Hong Kong Concerning Cross-Border Insolvencies and Restructurings and the New Singaporean Restructuring Regime

Naomi Moore and Daniel Cohen



Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 14	NUMBER 8	NOV./DEC. 2018
Editor's Note: In the Cour Victoria Prussen Spears	ts	359
Against Claims Against Do		
Stuart I. Gordon and Matth	new V. Spero	363
Circuit Denies "True Lease	me Would Not Smell as Sweet: e" Status to a "Sale" of Softwar	
Franklin H. Top III	van, Stephen R. Tetro II, and	369
In re Franchise Services of Circuit Explores Restrictio	North America, Inc.: The Fifth ons on Bankruptcy Filing	ı
Mark A. Speiser and Harolo	d A. Olsen	374
	at the Illinois Department of Ro Support the Value of Its Claim Section 363 Sale	
Michael T. Benz, Bryan E. J	Jacobson, and James P. Sullivan	378
	th: Ninth Circuit Holds That in Bad Faith Showing Requires M	
	Solomon J. Noh, and Ned S. Sch	hodek 382
Eleventh Circuit Issues Op Preference Claim	oinion on New Value Defense to	о а
Edward M. Fitzgerald and A	Alan M. Weiss	385
Bankruptcy Court Enforce Releases in Chapter 15 Ca	es Non-Consensual Third-Party use	
Shantel Watters-Rogers		388
A Check Is Transferred Wi Matt Barr and Lauren Taure	hen It Is Honored, Not Deliver	r ed 393



No Gerrymandering, No(n)-Creditor Interest, No Problem Andriana Georgallas	3
Delaware Bankruptcy Court Declines to Bind Credit	
Bidders to the Mast	
Matthew Goren and Kevin Bostel	4
Trustee's Unconventional Position That Management Consultant Must Be Retained Under Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code Debora Hoehne and Gaby Smith	4
More Cautionary Tales in Puerto Rico's Restructuring	
Laura E. Appleby, James Heiser, and Aaron M. Krieger	4
In the Matter of CW Advanced Technologies Limited—An	
In the Matter of CW Advanced Technologies Limited—An Intriguing Decision in Hong Kong Concerning Cross-Border	
Intriguing Decision in Hong Kong Concerning Cross-Border	2

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or rep	print 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			
$Customer \ Service \ Website \ \dots \ \dots \ http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/$				
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 © 2018 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 2018 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.

Seventh Circuit Holds That the Illinois Department of Revenue Must Present Evidence to Support the Value of Its Claim for Adequate Protection in a Section 363 Sale

By Michael T. Benz, Bryan E. Jacobson, and James P. Sullivan*

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit recently held that the Illinois Department of Revenue could not collect delinquent retail and sales taxes from the proceeds of assets sold pursuant to Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code because it failed to present evidence to the bankruptcy courts of the losses it suffered as a result of the assets being sold free and clear of its right to pursue the purchasers of the assets pursuant to the Bulk Sales provisions of Illinois law. The authors of this article discuss the decision.

Recently, in *Illinois Department of Revenue v. Hanmi Bank* ("Hanmi") and *Illinois Department of Revenue v. First Community Financial Bank* ("First Community"), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit held that the Illinois Department of Revenue ("IDOR") could not collect delinquent retail and sales taxes from the proceeds of assets sold pursuant to Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code because IDOR failed to present evidence to the bankruptcy courts of the losses it suffered as a result of the assets being sold free and clear of IDOR's right to pursue the purchasers of the assets pursuant to the Bulk Sales provisions of Illinois law.²

BACKGROUND

The First Community case involved a cinema and café located in Naperville, Illinois, while Hanni concerned a group of five gas stations in several Illinois

^{*} Michael T. Benz is a partner in Chapman and Cutler LLP's Litigation Group representing secured and unsecured creditors and trustees in bankruptcy proceedings, workout matters, and commercial litigation. Bryan E. Jacobson is an associate in the firm's Banking and Financial Services Department and a member of the Litigation Group. James P. Sullivan is a partner in the firm's Banking and Financial Services Department and a member of the Bankruptcy and Restructuring and Litigation Groups. The authors may be reached at benz@chapman.com, bjacob@chapman.com, and jsulliva@chapman.com, respectively.

¹ 895 F.3d 465 (7th Cir. 2018). The cases were consolidated on appeal to the Seventh Circuit.

² 35 ILCS 5/902(d) and 35 ILCS 129/5j (together, the "Illinois Bulk Sales Acts"). The Illinois Bulk Sale Acts give IDOR the right to pursue the purchaser in a bulk sale for state taxes owed by the seller.

towns.³ In the respective bankruptcy cases, Hanmi Bank and First Community Financial Bank were the senior creditors of the debtors, and IDOR had junior claims for unpaid taxes. In both cases, the debtors sought bankruptcy court approval to sell substantially all of their assets pursuant to Section 363.

Citing Section 363(e), IDOR requested that the bankruptcy courts set aside a portion of the sale proceeds as a form of adequate protection, given that the sales would eliminate IDOR's interest in the debtors' assets and its right under the Illinois Bulk Sales Acts to recover the outstanding taxes from the purchasers.⁴ While the bankruptcy courts in both cases either agreed or assumed that IDOR was entitled to adequate protection for its interest under Section 363, the bankruptcy courts held that because the sale proceeds were insufficient to satisfy the claims of First Community Bank and Hanmi Bank, IDOR was not entitled to any of the sale proceeds.⁵

THE APPEAL

On appeal, IDOR argued that the bankruptcy courts failed to account for its right under the Illinois Bulk Sales Acts not only to pursue a bankruptcy debtor for unpaid taxes but also to recover unpaid taxes from the *purchaser* of a debtor's assets. IDOR's primary contention was that because the debtors' assets were sold free and clear of IDOR's interest, the value of the assets to prospective purchasers was higher than it otherwise would have been, such that the final sale price for the assets necessarily included a premium for the removal of IDOR's interest, entitling IDOR to a share of the sale proceeds.

The Seventh Circuit agreed in principle that IDOR was entitled to adequate protection under Section 363(e) because the removal of IDOR's interest, particularly IDOR's statutory right to recover unpaid taxes from the purchasers,

³ Both bankruptcy cases were initially filed under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code but were later converted to Chapter 7.

⁴ Section 363(e) of the Bankruptcy Code allows a party whose interest has been removed from sold assets to obtain "adequate protection," which typically takes the form of a payment from the sale proceeds to compensate the party for the decrease in the value of its interest extinguished pursuant to Section 363(f). That decrease is calculated by comparing what the creditor will recover in bankruptcy where its interest in property has been extinguished pursuant to Section 363(f) with what its recovery would have been had its interest remained intact.

⁵ The bankruptcy courts found that because IDOR was a junior creditor, and the sales proceeds were insufficient to repay Hanmi Bank and First Community Financial Bank in full, there was no need to consider adequate protection for IDOR. The bankruptcy courts held that affording IDOR a share of the sales proceeds in these circumstances would be tantamount to allowing IDOR to "jump the queue" of priority established by the Bankruptcy Code.

likely increased the sales prices. Nevertheless, the Seventh Circuit held that IDOR failed to provide the bankruptcy courts with evidence upon which the bankruptcy courts might assign a reasonable value to its interest.

The Seventh Circuit disagreed with IDOR's position that it was entitled to sales proceeds equal to 100 percent of the taxes it was authorized to collect from the purchasers, describing as unrealistic the idea that IDOR would necessarily have recovered 100 percent of the tax delinquency from an "informed purchaser." Any premium a purchaser might pay for the removal of IDOR's interest, the court explained, would have been discounted by the likelihood of IDOR actually collecting the delinquent taxes from the purchaser. The court found it more likely that a purchaser would negotiate with IDOR to settle IDOR's claim for delinquent taxes at "something less than 100 percent that the Bulk Sales Provisions would allow it to collect." More importantly, because IDOR presented no evidence regarding how much it would have collected from the purchasers, there was no way to determine what decrease in value the Section 363 orders caused or what consideration the purchasers paid specifically to buy the assets free and clear of IDOR's interest under the Illinois Bulk Sales Acts. Accordingly, the Seventh Circuit concluded that the bankruptcy courts did not err in valuing IDOR's adequate protection interest at \$0.

CONCLUSION

Although IDOR was unsuccessful in the *Hanmi* and *First Community* cases, bankruptcy practitioners in Illinois and other jurisdictions⁶ should review whether prospective bankruptcy sales under Section 363 will trigger the application of state specific statutory schemes governing bulk sales, and whether negotiations should take into account possible adequate protection claims by state taxation authorities for delinquent taxes owed by the debtor. Lenders' counsel should also review the availability of state law foreclosure relief as an alternative remedy, since as the Seventh Circuit recognized in the *Hanmi* and

⁶ Most states maintain successor liability provisions in their tax statutes governing the payment of delinquent taxes by purchasers of business assets in bulk sales. *See, e.g.*, Cal. Rev. & Tax. Code § 6811 *et seq.* (requiring a purchaser of a business or stock of goods to withhold sufficient of the purchase price to cover payment of delinquent state taxes until the former owner produces a receipt from the California State Board of Equalization showing the taxes have been paid or a certificate stating that no amount is due); N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 20, § 537.0 *et seq.* (requiring a purchaser of bulk assets to notify the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance at least 10 days prior to closing. Within five days of receipt of the notice, the Department must advise the purchaser whether it is possible the seller has unpaid sales taxes, and within 90 days thereafter, must notify the purchaser of the actual amount of sales taxes due from the seller).

First Community cases, foreclosure does not trigger the application of the Illinois Bulk Sales Acts.