

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT™

FEBRUARY/MARCH 2015

EDITOR'S NOTE: CROSS-BORDER MATTERS

Steven A. Meyerowitz

CROSS-BORDER RESOLUTION OF BANKING GROUPS: INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES AND U.S. PERSPECTIVES—PART IV

Paul L. Lee

THE LOOMING SHADOW IN THE PRC PROPERTY MARKET

Christopher W. McFadzean and David Richardson

**IF IT WALKS LIKE A DUCK ... *IN RE DUCKWORTH*:
ANOTHER WARNING TO LENDERS TO TAKE CARE IN DRAFTING
SECURITY DOCUMENTS**

Jeffrey Close, Mark Silverman, and Bryan Jacobson



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 1-800-424-0651 ext. 3207

Email: kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com

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) 487-3000

Fax Number (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site <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 (518) 487-3000

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

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

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

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

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 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

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 trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2015 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 Offices

630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Scott L. Baena

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena
Price & Axelrod LLP*

Thomas W. Coffey

Tucker Ellis & West LLP

Matthew W. Levin

Alston & Bird LLP

Leslie A. Berkoff

*Moritt Hock & Hamroff
LLP*

Michael L. Cook

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

Patrick E. Mears

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

Ted A. Berkowitz

Farrell Fritz, P.C.

Mark G. Douglas

Jones Day

Alec P. Ostrow

Stevens & Lee P.C.

Michael L. Bernstein

Arnold & Porter LLP

Timothy P. Duggan

Stark & Stark

Deryck A. Palmer

*Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw
Pittman LLP*

Andrew P. Brozman

Clifford Chance US LLP

Gregg M. Ficks

*Coblentz, Patch, Duffy &
Bass LLP*

N. Theodore Zink, Jr.

Chadbourne & Parke LLP

Kevin H. Buraks

*Portnoff Law Associates,
Ltd.*

Mark J. Friedman

DLA Piper

Peter S. Clark II

Reed Smith LLP

Robin E. Keller

Lovells

PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2015 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., PO Box 7080, Miller Place, NY 11764, smeyerow@optonline.net, 631.331.3908. 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, 630 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974.

If It Walks Like a Duck . . . *In re Duckworth*: Another Warning to Lenders to Take Care in Drafting Security Documents

*Jeffrey Close, Mark Silverman, and Bryan Jacobson**

A lender loans a borrower a substantial sum of money, memorialized by a promissory note, secured by certain goods owned by the borrower under a security agreement. The note expressly references the security agreement. The security agreement misidentifies the date of the note. Now the borrower has filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy petition. Can the lender use evidence outside the four-corners of the security agreement to prove that it has a valid security interest against the bankruptcy trustee? The authors of this article explain a recent U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit decision holding that the lender's lien is invalid against the bankruptcy trustee for borrower's other creditors.

A lender loans a borrower a substantial sum of money, memorialized by a promissory note, secured by certain goods owned by the borrower under a security agreement. The Note expressly references the security agreement. Sounds like a fairly straightforward transaction—except that the security agreement misidentifies the date of the Note. The mistake goes unnoticed. Now the borrower has filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy petition. Can the lender use evidence outside the four-corners of the security agreement to prove that it has a valid security interest against the bankruptcy trustee?

IN RE DUCKWORTH

Unfortunately, a recent U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit decision providing guidance on this issue holds that the lender's lien is invalid against the bankruptcy trustee for borrower's other creditors. In *In Re: David L. Duckworth*,¹ the Seventh Circuit explained that the mistaken identification of secured debt cannot be corrected by using parol evidence to show the intent of the parties to the original loan. In this matter, a \$1,100,000 Promissory Note was executed in favor of the State Bank of Toulon by Duckworth on December 15, 2008 (the "December 15 Note"). A separate Security Agreement granted

* Jeffrey Close is a partner and Mark Silverman and Bryan Jacobson are associates in the Litigation, Bankruptcy, and Restructuring Group of Chapman and Cutler LLP. The authors may be contacted at jclose@chapman.com, msilver@chapman.com, and bjacob@chapman.com, respectively.

¹ Nos. 14-1561 and 14-1650 (7th Cir. November 21, 2014).

the bank a security interest in crops and farm equipment. The Security Agreement mistakenly stated that it secured a Note dated *December 13, 2008*, rather than correctly referencing the date of December 15.

Thereafter, Duckworth filed a petition for bankruptcy protection under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. The bank filed adversary proceedings, and the bankruptcy court held that the mistaken date in the Security Agreement did not defeat the bank's security interest. The Chapter 7 Trustee appealed to the district court, which affirmed the bankruptcy court's ruling. The Trustee then took the matter up to the Seventh Circuit.

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT DECISION

The Seventh Circuit reversed. The Trustee argued that the Security Agreement failed to grant a security interest to secure the December 15 Note because it unambiguously identified non-existent debt. The court first analyzed the text of the Security Agreement itself and concluded that the Security Agreement unambiguously referred to a Note dated December 13, 2008, a note that simply never existed, and the plain text of the Security Agreement failed to incorporate the December 15 Note.

Next, the court took up Lender's argument that parol evidence—evidence outside the four corners of the document—could be used to read the Security Agreement as securing the December 15 Note. The bank contended that because the Security Agreement would be enforceable against Duckworth it should also be enforceable against the Trustee. The court noted there was no question the bank officer who prepared the documents made a mistake in preparing the Security Agreement, and even opined that it was confident the bank would have been able to obtain reformation against Duckworth, if Duckworth had tried to avoid the Security Agreement based on the mistaken date. However, the position of the borrower was critically different than that of a bankruptcy trustee, who is tasked with maximizing the recovery for unsecured creditors. While a bankruptcy trustee typically stands in the shoes of the debtor, here the Trustee, in utilizing the “strong-arm” provisions of the bankruptcy code, could act as a hypothetical judicial lien creditor and void the defective security interest, even if the defect was not intended to mislead anyone. Accordingly, lender's asserted security interest was not valid against a later creditor because that later creditor would be entitled to rely solely on the plain text of the Security Agreement.

In finding that the Security Agreement was to be enforced as written, the court relied on prior decisions that stressed the importance of a third party's right to rely on unambiguous documents to determine the validity and priority of security interests. The court recognized that such policy may produce harsh

results, but reasoned that the interest in allowing parties to rely upon documents to mean what they say overcame all such concerns. The court ultimately found that parol evidence cannot “be used to undermine the ability of later lenders (or bankruptcy trustees) to rely on unambiguous security agreements.” Accordingly, the court held that the mistaken identification of the debt to be secured cannot be corrected against a bankruptcy trustee by using parol evidence to show the intent of the parties to the original loan, and reversed and remanded the matter for further proceedings.

CONCLUSION

As the title suggests, and *Duckworth* holds, when a loan document “walks like a duck and talks like a duck,” it is to be construed by the court “as a duck.” The lesson gleaned from *Duckworth* is to ensure the accuracy of your loan documents.