

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:

BLITZ U.S.A., Inc., *et al.*,<sup>1</sup>

Debtors.

BLITZ U.S.A., INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TABITHA ALEXSON AS NATURAL  
GUARDIAN AND NEXT FRIEND FOR  
ETHAN GROOMS; JASMINE ALEXIS  
BALLEW, A MINOR, BY AND  
THROUGH HER GUARDIAN AD LITEM,  
KAREN BRITT PEELER AND JASMINE  
BALLEW; JERRY C. BARNETT AND  
DANIEL R. FULTON; MIGUEL  
BARRERA, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS  
PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE  
ESTATE OF SIXIALFREDO BARRERA;  
LANDON BEADORE, BY AND  
THROUGH HIS PARENTS, PAUL  
BEADORE AND MELISSA WEEKS, AND  
MELISSA WEEKS, AND PAUL  
BEADORS, INDIVIDUALLY;  
CHRISTOPHER BOSSE; AMANDA  
BURCH, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS NEXT  
FRIEND AND NATURAL GUARDIAN  
FOR TIMOTHY BURCH; CHRISTOPHER  
DRONEY; JESSICA FENN AND  
JEREMIAH FENN, SR., INDIVIDUALLY  
AND ON BEHALF OF THEIR

) Chapter 11

) Case No. 11-13603 (PJW)

) (Jointly Administered)

) Adv. Proc No. 11-53578 (PJW)

) **Obj. Deadline: 7/23/12 at 4:00 p.m. (EDT)**

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, include: LAM 2011 Holdings, LLC (8742); Blitz Acquisition Holdings, Inc. (8825); Blitz Acquisition, LLC (8979); Blitz RE Holdings, LLC (9071); Blitz U.S.A., Inc. (8104); and MiamiOK LLC (f/k/a F3 Brands LLC) (2604). The location of the Debtors' corporate headquarters and the Debtors' service address is: 404 26th Ave. NW Miami, OK 74354.



DECEASED SON AND DAUGHTER, )  
JEREMIAH FENN, JR. AND JA'EL FENN; )  
KAYLEE FREELAND, A MINOR; CHAD )  
FUNCHESS; KAREN GUENIOT- )  
KORNEGAY, INDIVIDUALLY, AND ON )  
BEHALF OF ALL OF THE WRONGFUL )  
DEATH BENEFICIARIES OF MATTHEW )  
DYLAN KORNEGAY; WADE )  
GUILFORD; ROBERT JACOBY; )  
RANDALL JOHNSON; CARMEN LOPEZ )  
AND SANTIAGO ROSA, GUARDIANS )  
AD LITEM FOR JESUS SANTIAGO )  
ROSA, CARMEN LOPEZ AND )  
SANTIAGO ROSA IN THEIR OWN )  
RIGHT, AND JESUS SANTIAGO ROSA, )  
IN HIS OWN RIGHT; MARY JO PIERCE )  
FOR B.P., A MINOR, BY HIS MOTHER )  
AND NATURAL GUARDIAN; SHERRI )  
PURVIS INDIVIDUALLY AND AS NEXT )  
FRIEND AND NATURAL GUARDIAN )  
FOR JAMES C. PURVIS; LORI SHICKEL, )  
BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND AS )  
MOTHER AND NEXT FRIEND OF )  
JORDAN SHICKEL, A MINOR; ROBYN )  
SMITH, FOR DEVAN VANBRUNT, A )  
MINOR, BY HIS MOTHER AND )  
NATURAL GUARDIAN; STATE FARM )  
LLOYDS, AS SUBROGEE OF ERIC AND )  
TAMMY BALCH; DENNIES )  
THORNTON, A MINOR, BY AND )  
THROUGH HIS NEXT FRIEND AND )  
FATHER, DAVID THORNTON; DYLAN )  
J. TREVINO, A MINOR, Suing BY HIS )  
NEXT FRIEND AND GUARDIAN, )  
DIANA TREVINO, AND DIANA )  
TREVINO, INDIVIDUALLY; KENNETH )  
WARD AND CURTIS WARD; RICHARD )  
L YIM, JR.; and JOHN DOES 1-1000, )

Defendants. )

---

**DEBTORS' SECOND MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER  
EXTENDING TIME TO SERVE SUMMONS**

The above-captioned debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the “Debtors”), hereby submit this motion (the “Motion”) pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (the “Federal Rules”) and Rules 7004 and 9006(b) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”) for entry of an order, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, further extending the Debtors’ time to effect service upon the above-captioned defendants (the “Defendants”). In support of this Motion, the Debtors respectfully represent as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409. The statutory bases for the relief sought is Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006(b), and Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), made applicable here by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004.

**BACKGROUND**

**A. General Background**

2. On November 9, 2011 (the “Petition Date”), each of the Debtors filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532 (the “Bankruptcy Code”), thereby commencing the above-captioned chapter 11 cases (the “Chapter 11 Cases”). The Debtors continue to operate their business and manage their properties as debtors in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. Additional information regarding the Debtors’ business and the background relating to events leading up to the Chapter 11 Cases can be found in the *Declaration of Rocky Flick, President and Chief Executive Officer of Blitz U.S.A., Inc. in Support of Debtors’ Chapter 11 Petitions and*

*First Day Motions*, which was filed on the Petition Date. As of the date hereof, no trustee or examiner has been appointed in the Chapter 11 Cases.

**B. Specific Background**

3. Since its early beginning in 1966, Blitz U.S.A., Inc. (“Blitz”) and its predecessors have been successfully producing portable fuel containers for consumer use. As of the Petition Date, with as many as 150 million units currently in circulation, Blitz accounted for approximately 70% of the market share in the United States in the portable fuel containment and storage industry.

4. For the past 45 years, Blitz has operated profitably with minimal interruption from litigation. Approximately three years ago, Blitz began to experience an increase in litigation with approximately four to seven new personal injury cases filed against Blitz each year. Although Blitz had been able to successfully manage its litigation exposure and associated defense costs, Blitz became the subject of an increased influx of lawsuits during the past several years. Indeed, between March 2011 and the Petition Date, as many as 22 new cases were filed against Blitz, for a total of 36 pending lawsuits (the “PCGC Litigation”). Though the number of such lawsuits is small in comparison to the millions of portable consumer gasoline containers (“PCGCs”) in circulation, which is a testament to the safety of the PCGCs when used properly, with a self-insured retention (“SIR”) of \$1 million per occurrence, Blitz was forced to divert virtually all net operating cash flows after debt service to fund SIR payments in defense of the PCGC Litigation. Thus, Blitz was forced to commence the Chapter 11 Cases to obtain a much needed breathing spell from its pending litigation.

5. As noted above, prior to the Petition Date, the Debtors actively defended against any liability in the PCGC Litigation. The Debtors also were providing a defense to Wal-Mart

Stores, Inc. and certain of its affiliates (collectively, “Wal-Mart”) who (along with other parties (with Wal-Mart, collectively, the “Third Parties”)) had been named in one or more of the PCGC Litigation, including subject to and pursuant to certain indemnification agreements between the parties.

6. Although the PCGC Litigation is stayed as to the Debtors, as of the Petition Date, the Debtors were concerned that the continual prosecution of the PCGC Litigation against the Third Parties would require the Debtors to continue to litigate in the PCGC Litigation, including in order to protect the Debtors from the risk of increased indemnification obligation, claims for set-off, or other litigation or claim risks including collateral estoppel, evidentiary prejudice and/or *stare decisis*. Therefore, on the Petition Date, the Debtors filed the above-captioned adversary proceeding (the “Action”) and moved the Court for the entry of (1) judgment enjoining the Defendants from prosecuting the pending PCGC Litigation and commencing new actions or proceedings asserting any PCGC claims against the Third Parties and (2) declaratory judgment that the transfer and consolidation of the PCGC Litigation does not violate the automatic stay. The Debtors also moved for entry of a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) extending the automatic stay for PCGC-related claims to the Third Parties.

7. The Court declined to grant the TRO at the Debtors’ first day hearing. Instead, during that hearing, the Court suggested that the relevant Third Parties seek stay-related relief from the courts in which the PCGC Litigation is pending. The Court also scheduled a further hearing (the “Hearing”) on the Debtors’ request for entry of injunctive relief with respect to Kinderhook Capital Fund II and Kinderhook Industries, LLC (collectively, “Kinderhook”), a Third Party in certain of the PCGC Litigation.

8. After the First Day Hearing, Wal-Mart and Kinderhook moved to stay or dismiss one or more of the actions in the courts where the PCGC Litigation is pending against them (the “PCGC Motions”). Upon information and belief, certain of the PCGC Motions have been decided by those courts — some have been granted, some denied and at least one remains pending. The Debtors have continued the Hearing on several occasions including in order to permit the relevant courts to consider and decide the pending PCGC Motions. As of the date of this Motion, the Hearing has been continued to a date to be determined.

9. On June 29, 2012, the Debtors filed their *Debtors Motion Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a), 363, and 365, and Bankruptcy Rules 2002, 6004, and 6006 for (I) Entry of An Order (A) Establishing Bidding and Auction Procedures Related to the Sale of Substantially All of the Debtors Assets; (B) Establishing Procedures for Approval of Related Bid Protections; (C) Scheduling an Auction and Sale Hearing; (D) Establishing Notice Procedures for Determining Cure Amounts for Executory Contracts and Leases to be Assigned; and (E) Granting Certain Related Relief; and (II) Entry of an Order (A) Approving the Sale of Substantially All of the Debtors Assets Free and Clear of All Liens, Claims, Encumbrances And Interests; and (B) Authorizing the Assumption and Assignment of Certain Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases* [D.I. 574] (the “Sale Motion”). Pursuant to the Sale Motion, the Debtors have moved the Court for authority to, among other things, sell substantially all of the Debtors’ assets through an auction process.

10. As described more fully in the Sale Motion, due to the weight of the claims made in the PCGC Litigation, the Debtors have been unable to obtain the financing required to continue their operations or the renewal of products liability insurance, without which the Debtors are unable to continue manufacturing and selling PCGCs. Many of the customers of

Blitz, who are the resellers of Blitz's PCGCs, require that Blitz indemnify the reseller against any personal injury claims related to the sale of the PCGCs and to name such reseller as additional named insureds under the Debtors' product liability insurance policies. Moreover, maintaining product liability insurance is required pursuant to the United States Trustee's Operating Guidelines, for Blitz to continue to manufacture and sell PCGCs. The Debtors' current product liability insurance expires on July 31, 2012. As a result, the Debtors have determined that they must cease production and sale of PCGCs by July 31, 2012. *See* Sale Motion at ¶¶ 4, 17-20.

11. The Debtors believe that the sale proceeds will allow the Debtors to further pay down their secured debt obligations, and hopefully, when coupled with the other aspects of the Debtors' sale and wind down efforts, will yield a return for unsecured creditors or otherwise provide a basis for continued efforts to determine a global resolution for the PCGC Litigation. *See* Sale Motion at ¶ 26.

12. A hearing on the proposed bid procedures is scheduled for July 17, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. (EDT), and a hearing date for the sale has been requested by the Debtors for August 29, 2012. *See* Sale Motion at ¶ 31. Accordingly, as of the date of this Motion, given the procedural posture of the Chapter 11 Cases, the Debtors do not know whether any further relief is needed in the Action.

13. The Debtors' sought an extension of the initial 120-day time period for service in this Action under Bankruptcy Rule 7004 and Federal Rule 4(m), which expired on March 8, 2012 (the "Initial Time Period"), in its *Debtors' Motion For Entry of an Order Extending Time to Serve Summons* [Adv. D.I. 25] (the "First Extension Motion"). The Court extended the Initial Time Period to July 6, 2012 [Adv. D.I. 28] (the "Extended Time Period"). As noted above, the

Debtors are continuing to assess the need to move forward (or not) with the Action. Therefore, in order to maintain the status quo, the Debtors seek to extend the Extended Time Period through November 2, 2012.

### **RELIEF REQUESTED**

#### **I. Extension of Time**

14. By this Motion, the Debtors seek to further extend the time period contained in Federal Rule 4(m) an additional 119 days from the expiration of the Extended Time Period to November 2, 2012.

15. Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1), the Court “for cause shown may at any time in its discretion (1) with or without motion or notice order a time period enlarged if the request is made before the expiration of the period originally prescribed or as extended by a previous order.” Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006(b)(1).<sup>2</sup> The Court’s discretion under Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b) allows enlargement of time periods except where the Bankruptcy Rules specifically do not permit enlargement. *See Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P’ship*, 507 U.S. 380, 389 n. 4 (1993) (“The time-computation and time-extension provisions of Rule 9006 ... are generally applicable to any time requirement found elsewhere in the rules unless expressly excepted.”). In addition, Federal Rule 4(m), incorporated into this proceeding by Bankruptcy Rule 7004(a)(1), permits a court to extend the time period to effect service of process upon a showing of “good cause.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

16. For the reasons set forth herein, the Debtors submit that good cause exists for enlargement of their deadline to serve the Complaint.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Extended Time Period is extended pending this Court’s resolution of the Motion. *See* Del. Bankr. L.R. 9006-2. As the Motion was filed before the expiration of the Extended Time Period, a bridge order is not needed. *See* Del. Bankr. L.R. 9006-2 (“if a motion to extend the time to take any action is filed before the expiration of the period prescribed by the Code, the Fed. R. Bankr. P., these Local Rules or Court order, the time shall automatically be extended until the Court acts on the motion, without the necessity for the entry of a bridge order.”).



**(i) The Debtors have demonstrated cause warranting an extension under Bankruptcy Rule 9006.**

17. While there are no cases within the Third Circuit that address the quantum of proof necessary to show “cause” under Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1) where the deadline has not yet expired, cases examining the “good cause” standard are instructive. In defining “good cause” in the context of enlarging time periods, courts in this district have equated “good cause” with “excusable neglect.” See, e.g., *Sun Healthcare Group, Inc. v. Mead Johnson Nutritional (In re Sun Healthcare Group, Inc., et al.)*, 2004 WL 941190, \*3 (Bankr. D. Del. Apr. 30, 2004) (citing *Petrucelli v. Bohringer and Ratzinger*, 46 F.3d 1298, 1312 (3d Cir. 1995)); see also *Chama, Inc. v. Arcadian Management Servs., Inc.*, 403 B.R. 313, 315 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009) (“The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has equated ‘good cause’ with the concept of ‘excusable neglect’ with respect to requests for enlargement of time.”) (internal quotations omitted) (quoting *MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. Teleconcepts, Inc.*, 71 F.3d 1086, 1097 (3d Cir.1995)). “Excusable neglect requires ‘a demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement [of time for service] and some reasonable basis for non-compliance with the time specified in the rules.’” *Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*3 (citations omitted).

18. The Debtors have moved for relief in the Action in good faith and have a reasonable basis for seeking an extension of the Extended Time Period. As discussed above, certain of the Third Parties have moved to dismiss or stay pre-petition actions as against them. While many of the PCGC Motions have been decided, at least one remains pending. In addition, the Debtors are currently involved in a sale process. An extension of the Extended Time Period as requested hereunder will conserve estate resources at a critical time in the Chapter 11 Cases – protecting the Debtors from incurring the burden and expense of serving the Complaint – while protecting the Defendants from the potentially unnecessary burden of receiving the Complaint at

a time when the Debtors are not yet certain that further relief may be necessary from the Court. An extension of the Extended Time Period therefore not only conserves estate resources but also minimizes potentially unnecessary disruption to the Defendants. Accordingly, ample “cause” exists justifying the requested extension under Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b).

19. Pursuant to section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, a court “may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.” 11 U.S.C. § 105(a). This authority, coupled with the discretion granted under Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1), further provides a basis for granting the extension.

**(ii) The Debtors have demonstrated good cause warranting  
an extension under Federal Rule 4(m).**

---

20. Federal Rule 4(m) provides that the 120-day time period should be extended upon due motion filed before the time period has expired. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Here, the Extended Time Period to serve the Complaint has not yet expired and the Debtors timely have filed this Motion to extend the Extended Time Period for the reasons discussed.

21. The Third Circuit has held that deciding whether or not to extend the prescribed time period for service of a complaint pursuant to Federal Rule 4(m) requires a two-step analysis. *Petrucelli*, 46 F.3d at 1305. First, a court must determine whether “good cause” exists for an extension of time. *Id.* As the *Petrucelli* court explained, “[i]f good cause is present, the district court must extend time for service and the inquiry is ended.” *Id.*; *see also Boley v. Kaymark*, 123 F.3d 756, 758 (3d. Cir. 1997). Courts generally consider three factors in determining whether good cause exists to extend time under Federal Rule 4(m): (1) whether the plaintiff has reasonably attempted to effect service; (2) whether the defendant is prejudiced by the absence of timely service; and (3) whether the plaintiff moved for an extension of time for effecting service. *See United States v. Nuttall*, 122 F.R.D. 163, 166-67 (D. Del. 1988); *see also In re Submicron*

*Systems Corp.*, 2004 WL 883391, \*4 (D. Del. Apr. 5, 2004) (describing factors); *Ritter v. Cooper*, 2003 WL 23112306, \*4 (D. Del. Dec. 30, 2003) (same).

22. The second step only comes into play if good cause does not exist. *Petrucelli*, 46 F.3d at 1305. If good cause has not been demonstrated, the Court in its discretion still may extend time for service. *Id.*; see also *Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*4. “Courts prefer to avoid default judgments and dispose of cases on the merits.” *Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*5 (citing *Tozer v. Krause Milling Co.*, 189 F.2d 242, 245 (3d Cir.1951) and *In re USN Communications, Inc.*, 288 B.R. 391, 398 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003)). As discussed by the Third Circuit in *Petrucelli*, the Advisory Committee notes on Federal Rule 4(m) provide factors for courts to consider when deciding to exercise their discretion. 46 F.3d at 1305-06. These factors include (1) whether the applicable statute of limitations would bar re-filing of the action, (2) the frivolousness of the complaint, (3) the objective unreasonableness of the plaintiff’s case (factual and legal), and (4) the plaintiff’s motivation in pursuing the claims.<sup>3</sup> *Id.*; see also *Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*4 (describing factors courts consider when deciding to exercise their discretion to extend time for service of summons); *Ritter*, 2003 WL 23112306, at \*3 (same). “The greater the number of these factors that appear true, the weaker the rationale for the court to exercise its discretion in favor of extending the time for service.” *Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*4.

23. Here, good cause exists to extend the Extended Time Period. While the Debtors have not served the Complaint on the Defendants, the Defendants’ counsel was served and thus the Defendants have received preliminary notice through their attorneys. As discussed above, the Debtors move for an extension of the Extended Time Period because the Debtors are at a

---

<sup>3</sup> Other factors courts have considered are “if the defendant is evading service or conceals a defect in attempted service.” *Id.*

critical stage in the Chapter 11 Cases. The resolution of the remaining PCGC Motions as well as the outcome of the sale process may obviate the need to continue the Action. Therefore, extension of the Extended Time Period not only preserves estate funds but also prevents a potentially unnecessary service of the Complaint on the Defendants. Moreover, no prejudice will result to the Defendants. Under these circumstances, the Debtors submit that good cause exists to enlarge the Extended Time Period.

24. Alternatively, if the Court concludes that the Debtors have failed to establish good cause to enlarge the Extended Time Period, it should nonetheless exercise its discretion to extend the Extended Time Period. The Action is not frivolous or unreasonable. The Debtors seek relief in order to prevent them from having to expend their limited resources defending certain Third Parties in the PCGC Litigation while in the midst of the Chapter 11 Cases. The Debtors' requested relief is motivated by their desire to preserve estate assets. *See Sun Healthcare Group*, 2004 WL 941190, at \*4 (granting extension of Federal Rule 4(m) time period where complaint was not frivolous, unreasonable or based on improper motive).

25. Based on the reasons discussed above, the Debtors believe that good cause exists to grant an extension of the Extended Time Period. Furthermore, even if the Court decides that the Debtors have not demonstrated good cause, the Court should extend the period in its discretion.

## **II. Service of Motion**

26. Bankruptcy Rule 2002(m), which gives the Court discretion to enter orders regulating notice, provides that the Court may designate the scope, form, and manner of notices except as otherwise provided under the Bankruptcy Rules. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(m) ("The court may from time to time enter orders designating the matters in respect to which, the entity to whom, and the form and manner in which notices shall be sent except as otherwise provided by

these rules.”); *see also* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9007 (“the court shall designate, if not otherwise specified herein, the time within which, the entities to whom, and the form and manner in which the notice shall be given.”). Furthermore, section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code grants the Court authority to issue any order “necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.” 11 U.S.C. § 105(a).


27. The Defendants in this Action are plaintiffs in the PCGC Litigation and are represented by counsel in those actions; certain of those Defendants also are members of the Debtors’ Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “Committee”) and, through counsel, are actively involved in the Committee and the Debtors’ Chapter 11 Cases. In order to preserve estate funds as well as prevent unnecessary disruption to the Defendants, the Debtors request that service of this Motion upon the Defendants’ respective counsel in the PCGC Litigation rather than the Defendants personally (just as was done with the First Extension Motion) be deemed sufficient under the circumstances.

*[the remainder of this page intentionally left blank]*

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Debtors respectfully request entry of an order substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, (i) granting the relief requested herein and (ii) granting such other or further relief as is just and proper.

Dated: July 6, 2012  
Wilmington, Delaware



---

Daniel J. DeFranceschi (No. 2732)

Michael J. Merchant (No. 3854)

Marcos A. Ramos (No. 4450)

Julie A. Finocchiaro (No. 5303)

Amanda R. Steele (No. 5530)

**RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.**

One Rodney Square

920 North King Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Telephone: (302) 651-7700

Facsimile: (302) 651-7701

*Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession*

**EXHIBIT A**

**Proposed Order**

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:	)	Chapter 11
BLITZ U.S.A., Inc., <i>et al.</i> , <sup>1</sup>	)	Case No. 11-13603 (P JW)
Debtors.	)	(Jointly Administered)
BLITZ U.S.A., INC., <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	Adv. Proc No. 11-53578 (P JW)
TABITHA ALEXSON AS NATURAL	)	
GUARDIAN AND NEXT FRIEND FOR	)	
ETHAN GROOMS; JASMINE ALEXIS	)	
BALLEW, A MINOR, BY AND	)	
THROUGH HER GUARDIAN AD LITEM,	)	
KAREN BRITT PEELER AND JASMINE	)	
BALLEW; JERRY C. BARNETT AND	)	
DANIEL R. FULTON; MIGUEL	)	
BARRERA, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS	)	
PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE	)	
ESTATE OF SIXIALFREDO BARRERA;	)	
LANDON BEADORE, BY AND	)	
THROUGH HIS PARENTS, PAUL	)	
BEADORE AND MELISSA WEEKS, AND	)	
MELISSA WEEKS, AND PAUL	)	
BEADORS, INDIVIDUALLY;	)	
CHRISTOPHER BOSSE; AMANDA	)	
BURCH, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS NEXT	)	
FRIEND AND NATURAL GUARDIAN	)	
FOR TIMOTHY BURCH; CHRISTOPHER	)	
DRONEY; JESSICA FENN AND	)	
JEREMIAH FENN, SR., INDIVIDUALLY	)	
AND ON BEHALF OF THEIR	)	

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, include: LAM 2011 Holdings, LLC (8742); Blitz Acquisition Holdings, Inc. (8825); Blitz Acquisition, LLC (8979); Blitz RE Holdings, LLC (9071); Blitz U.S.A., Inc. (8104); and MiamiOK LLC (f/k/a F3 Brands LLC) (2604). The location of the Debtors' corporate headquarters and the Debtors' service address is: 404 26th Ave. NW Miami, OK 74354.



DECEASED SON AND DAUGHTER, )  
JEREMIAH FENN, JR. AND JA'EL FENN; )  
KAYLEE FREELAND, A MINOR; CHAD )  
FUNCHESS; KAREN GUENIOT- )  
KORNEGAY, INDIVIDUALLY, AND ON )  
BEHALF OF ALL OF THE WRONGFUL )  
DEATH BENEFICIARIES OF MATTHEW )  
DYLAN KORNEGAY; WADE )  
GUILFORD; ROBERT JACOBY; )  
RANDALL JOHNSON; CARMEN LOPEZ )  
AND SANTIAGO ROSA, GUARDIANS )  
AD LITEM FOR JESUS SANTIAGO )  
ROSA, CARMEN LOPEZ AND )  
SANTIAGO ROSA IN THEIR OWN )  
RIGHT, AND JESUS SANTIAGO ROSA, )  
IN HIS OWN RIGHT; MARY JO PIERCE )  
FOR B.P., A MINOR, BY HIS MOTHER )  
AND NATURAL GUARDIAN; SHERRI )  
PURVIS INDIVIDUALLY AND AS NEXT )  
FRIEND AND NATURAL GUARDIAN )  
FOR JAMES C. PURVIS; LORI SHICKEL, )  
BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND AS )  
MOTHER AND NEXT FRIEND OF )  
JORDAN SHICKEL, A MINOR; ROBYN )  
SMITH, FOR DEVAN VANBRUNT, A )  
MINOR, BY HIS MOTHER AND )  
NATURAL GUARDIAN; STATE FARM )  
LLOYDS, AS SUBROGEE OF ERIC AND )  
TAMMY BALCH; DENNIES )  
THORNTON, A MINOR, BY AND )  
THROUGH HIS NEXT FRIEND AND )  
FATHER, DAVID THORNTON; DYLAN )  
J. TREVINO, A MINOR, SUING BY HIS )  
NEXT FRIEND AND GUARDIAN, )  
DIANA TREVINO, AND DIANA )  
TREVINO, INDIVIDUALLY; KENNETH )  
WARD AND CURTIS WARD; RICHARD )  
L YIM, JR.; and JOHN DOES 1-1000, )

Defendants. )

---

### **ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO SERVE SUMMONS**

Upon the motion dated July 6, 2012 (the “Motion”),<sup>2</sup> of the above-captioned debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the “Debtors”) for an order pursuant to Federal Rule 4(m) and Bankruptcy Rules 7004 and 9006 further extending the Debtors’ time to effect service upon the above-captioned defendants, as more fully set forth in the Motion; and the Court having jurisdiction to consider the Motion and the relief requested therein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334; and consideration of the Motion and the relief requested therein being a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b); and venue being proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and due and proper notice of the Motion having been given; and the relief requested in the Motion being in the best interests of the Debtors and their estates and creditors; and the Court having reviewed the Motion; and the Court having determined that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion establish just cause for the relief granted hereon; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause therefor;

#### **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Motion is granted.
2. The Debtors have given due and proper notice of the Motion and no other or further service of the Motion was necessary or required.
3. The time period provided by Federal Rule 4(m), made applicable by Bankruptcy Rule 7004, within which the Debtors may serve the summons in the Action, is further extended to November 2, 2012.
4. Such extension is without prejudice to the Debtors’ right to file one or more motions seeking a further extension of their time to serve the summons in the Action.

---

<sup>2</sup> Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Motion.

5. This Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters relating to the interpretation or implementation of this Order.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2012  
Wilmington, Delaware

---

THE HONORABLE PETER J. WALSH  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Julie A. Finocchiaro, do hereby certify that on July 6, 2012, I caused copies of the foregoing **Debtors' Second Motion for Entry of an Order Extending Time to Serve Summons** to be served by first class mail as indicated on the attached service list.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Julie A. Finocchiaro (No. 5303)

**SERVICE LIST**

**Counsel for the Defendants**

Terry Edward Richardson , Jr Brady Ryan Thomas Daniel S Haltiwanger RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK AND BRICKMAN PO Box 1368 Barnwell, SC 29812	Hank Anderson Gant Grimes Benton Ross THE ANDERSON LAW FIRM 4245 Kemp Blvd. Suite 810 Wichita Falls, TX 76310
Danny E. Cupit Sean C. Cupit LAW OFFICES OF DANNY E. CUPIT, PC P.O Box 22929 Jackson, MS 39225	Casey Langston Lott LANGSTON & LOTT, PA PO Box 382 Booneville, MS 38829
Paul Koller RODEY DICKASEN SLOAN AKIN & ROBB 201 Third Street NW Suite 2200 Albuquerque, NM 87102	Michael Kessler ROSENBLUM RONAN KESSLER & SARACHAN, LLP 110 Great Oaks Office Park Albany, NY 12203
John D. Sloan, Jr. Justin A. Smith SLOAN, BAGLEY, HATCHER & PERRY LAW FIRM 101 East Whaley St. PO Drawer 2909 Longview, TX 75606	Anton Cheskis Michael R Strom SIEBEN POLK P.A. 1640 S. Frontage Rd. Hastings, MN 55033
Terry Edward Richardson , Jr. Brady Ryan Thomas Daniel S. Haltiwanger RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK AND BRICKMAN PO Box 1368 Barnwell, SC 29812	Diane Breneman Stacy Dungan BRENEMAN DUNGAN, LLC 311 Delaware Kansas City, MO 64106
Samuel Kirkpatrick Morgan WALKER & MORGAN, LLC 135 East Main Street PO Box 949 Lexington, SC 29072	William Paul Walker , Jr Samuel Kirkpatrick Morgan , Jr WALKER AND MORGAN LLC PO Box 949 Lexington, SC 29072

Kenneth Wilson RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK ETC - BARNWELL SC 1730 JACKSON ST BARNWELL, SC 29812	Thomas N. Petersen BLACK CHAPMAN WEBBER & STEVENS 221 Stewart Avenue Suite 209 Medford, OR 97501
Claude A. Wyle CHOULOS CHOULOS & WYLE 425 California Street Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94104	Michael A. Galpern LOCKS LAW FIRM Liberty View Building 457 Haddonfield Rd., Ste. 500, Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
Daniel Scott Haltiwanger RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK & BRICKMAN, LLP 1730 Jackson Street PO Box 1368 Barnwell, SC 29812	Brady Ryan Thomas RICHARDSON PATRICK WESTBROOK AND BRICKMAN, LLC 1730 Jackson Street PO Box 1368 Barnwell, SC 29812
Michael T Mullen PAUL B EPISCOPE LLC Suite 300 77 West Washington Street Chicago, IL 60602	John Tippit ESCOBEDO, TIPPIT & CARDENAS 2900 North 10th Street - Suite 950 McAllen, TX 78501
N. Scott Carpenter Craig M. Schumacher Brian R. Wesley CARPENTER & SCHUMACHER, P.C. Parkway Centre IV 2701 North Dallas Parkway, Suite 570 Plano, TX 75093	Randall Loftin Kinnard Daniel L. Clayton KINNARD, CLAYTON & BEVERIDGE The Woodlawn 127 Woodmont Boulevard Nashville, TN 37205
Gregory M. Martin Walter McBrayer Wood MARTIN & JONES PLLC 410 Glenwood Ave., Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27603	Charles H. Williams, III WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS PO Box 1084 Orangeburg, SC 29116
Daniel T. Ryan BOLLWERK AND RYAN, LLC 10525 Big Bend Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63122	

**Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors**

Kenneth A. Rosen  
Sharon Levine  
Jeffrey D. Prol  
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068

Francis A. Monaco, Jr.  
Kevin J. Mangan  
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE,  
LLP  
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1501  
Wilmington, DE 19801

**Counsel for the DIP Lenders**

Margaret M. Manning  
KLEHR, HARRISON, HARVEY &  
BRANZBURG LLP  
919 Market Street, Suite 1000  
Wilmington, DE 19801-3062

Samuel S. Ory  
FREDERIC DOWART, LAWYERS  
Old City Hall  
124 East Fourth Street  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-5027