

	Document Page	
		3
1	APPEARANCES (via video and te	lephone conference continued):
2	For the ACC:	Robinson & Cole LLP BY: MICHAEL R. ENRIGHT, ESQ.
3		280 Trumbull Street Hartford, CT 06103
4		Winston & Strawn LLP
5		BY: DAVID NEIER, ESQ. CARRIE V. HARDMAN, ESQ.
6		200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166-4193
7		Hamilton Stephens Steele & Martin
8		BY: GLENN C. THOMPSON, ESQ. 525 North Tryon Street, #1400
9		Charlotte, NC 28202
10		JD Thompson Law BY: LINDA W. SIMPSON, ESQ.
11		P. O. Box 33127 Charlotte, NC 28233
12	For The Gori Law Firm:	Essex Richards, P.A.
13		BY: JOHN C. WOODMAN, ESQ. 1701 South Boulevard
14		Charlotte, NC 28203
15	For Trane Technologies Company LLC and Trane U.S.	BY: GREGORY J. MASCITTI, ESQ.
16	Inc.:	825 Eighth Avenue, 31st Floor New York, NY 10019
17		McCarter & English, LLP
18		BY: PHILLIP S. PAVLICK, ESQ. Four Gateway Center
19		100 Mulberry Street Newark, NJ 07102
20		Burt & Cordes, PLLC
21		BY: STACY C. CORDES, ESQ. MEGHAN L. ABERNATHY, ESQ.
22		122 Cherokee Road, Suite 1 Charlotte, NC 28207
23	For Bankruptcy Administrator:	
24 25		402 W. Trade Street, Suite 200 Charlotte, NC 28202-1669
د ∡		

	Document Page 	e 4 of 31 4
1	APPEARANCES (via video and te	lephone conference continued):
2	For TIG Insurance Company and Evanston Insurance	Ifrah Law BY: GEORGE R. CALHOUN, ESQ.
3	Company:	1717 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W#650 Washington, DC 20006
5	For Travelers:	Steptoe & Johnson BY: JOSHUA R. TAYLOR, ESQ. 1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
6		Washington, D.C. 20036
7	For Shrader & Associates, LLP:	Touchstone Family Law BY: CHRISTOPHER J. CULP, ESQ.
8		6101 Carnegie Blvd., Suite 100 Charlotte, NC 28211
10		Shrader & Associates, LLP BY: ROBERT SHUTTLESWORTH, ESQ. 9 Greenway Plaza, Suite 2300
11		Houston, TX 77046
12	For Certain London Market Companies:	Duane Morris LLP BY: RUSSELL W. ROTEN, ESQ.
13		865 S. Figueroa St., Suite 3100 Los Angeles, CA 90017
14		Duane Morris LLP
15		BY: BRIAN KELLY, ESQ. One Market Plaza, Suite 2200
16		San Francisco, CA 94105
17	For Allstate Insurance Company:	Windels Marx BY: ANDREW CRAIG, ESO.
18	Company.	One Giralda Farms Madison, NJ 07940
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS (Call to Order of the Court) 2 3 THE COURT: All right. Have a seat, everyone. morning. 4 We are back in the Aldrich Pump LLC case, both the 5 base case and the adversary, pursuant to an agenda and an 6 7 amended notice of a proposed agenda that has been filed. Let go ahead and start with the, getting appearances. 8 And let me just read out who I understand to be appearing based 9 on what you've told our office and then I'll ask for 10 11 corrections, then additions as well. I have appearing by video Mr. Erens on behalf of 12 Aldrich, as well as Caitlin Cahow. 13 We have Natalie Ramsey, Davis Wright, David Neier, and 14 Kevin Maclay. These are listed as Certain Asbestos Plaintiffs' 15 Firms, but we may have the ACC by now. Let me just note that 16 17 that's the way it's printed, anyway. Stacy Cordes for Trane Technologies, along with Greq 18 Mascitti. 19 Robert Shuttlesworth, Estate of Ignacio Galaces 20 21 (phonetic). Christopher Culp for Shrader & Associates. 22 Russell Roten for Certain --23 If -- folks, you might want to put your, mute your 24 25 microphones. Okay.

	Ÿ		
1	Russell Roten on behalf of Certain London Market		
2	Companies, Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's.		
3	Those are the video appearances.		
4	On video, but audio only:		
5	Mark Cody, David Torberg.		
6	Are we getting a reverb there?		
7	MR. LAMB: It's the phone, somebody on the phone.		
8	THE COURT: All right.		
9	Mark David Torberg, Genna Ghaul, all on behalf of		
10	Aldrich Pump.		
11	Jack Miller, Michael Evert on behalf of Aldrich Pump.		
12	Linda Simpson's on behalf of the Official Committee.		
13	Glenn Thompson on behalf of the Official Committee of		
14	Asbestos Claimants.		
15	Andrew Craig for Allstate Insurance Company.		
16	Todd Phillips on behalf of Certain Asbestos		
17	Plaintiffs' Firms.		
18	And Carrie Hardman, a group of Certain Asbestos		
19	Claimants.		
20	Then appearing telephonically only:		
21	Michael Enright, Certain Asbestos Claimants.		
22	Jamie Edmonson, the same.		
23	Laurie Krepto for Certain Asbestos Claimants.		
24	Phillip Pavlick on behalf of Trane Technologies/Trane		
25	USA, as well as Meghan Abernathy.		

```
And Brian Kelly for Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's.
 1
             Someone is still - we're getting noise from you. So
 2
    if you're not speaking, please mute your microphone. We're
 3
    getting a lot of extraneous voices.
 4
 5
             Hang on one moment. We're going to see if the, the
    staff can figure this out.
 6
 7
        (Pause)
             THE COURT: Ready to proceed? Do you need to --
 8
             MR. LAMB: Mr. Erens, can you mute your microphone?
 9
10
    He may have gotten lost.
11
             THE COURT: All right. We ready to go? All right.
             With that, first, are there any corrections in any of
12
    the appearances that I've read out? Do you need to restate,
13
    revise, or, or otherwise amend? Anyone?
14
15
             MS. ABEL: Your Honor? Your Honor, Shelley Abel's
    also on the Zoom --
16
17
             THE COURT: Right. I was going to add --
18
             MS. ABEL:
                       -- Bankruptcy Administrator.
             THE COURT: -- ask for those who had not been asked
19
20
    for, had not been announced. But I'm trying to get
    corrections, first.
21
22
             MS. ABEL: Apology.
23
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. MACLAY: And, and, your Honor, just to clarify
24
25
    what you said a moment ago, you're correct. The attorneys that
```

```
show up as being for the Certain Asbestos Claimants are here
 1
    now for the Committee.
 2
 3
             THE COURT: Okay. I haven't seen those orders, as
    yet. Have they come through on the --
 4
 5
             In any event, the -- well, we'll just assume on a de
 6
    facto basis that we're able to go forward today with the, the
 7
    amendments as being counsel to the Committee.
             Anyone that has any other corrections?
 8
             All right.
 9
             MR. CODY: Your Honor, it's, it's Mark --
10
11
             THE COURT: All right, Mr. Cody.
             MR. CODY: Your Honor, it's Mark Cody. I -- just to,
12
    just to clarify. I plan to be heard briefly on Item No. 3 on
13
    the agenda --
14
15
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. CODY: -- for the debtors.
16
17
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you --
18
             MR. CODY:
                        Thank you.
             THE COURT: -- Mr. Cody. All right. And, Mr. Cody,
19
20
    are you with, representing the debtors, or someone else?
                        I'm with the debtors, your Honor.
21
             MR. CODY:
             THE COURT: Okay, very good.
22
                        With Jones Day for the debtors.
23
             MR. CODY:
                                                          Thank you
                         Thank you.
24
             THE COURT:
25
             All right.
                         What I was going to ask for next is if you
```

```
1
    were not announced and you are needing to announce an
 2
    appearance, this is the time to do so.
             So do I have any other folks who were not called
 3
    previously?
 4
 5
             MR. CALHOUN: Your Honor, this is George Calhoun
 6
    appearing on behalf of TIG Insurance Company and Evanston
 7
    Insurance Company.
             THE COURT: Okay.
 8
             Anyone else?
 9
             MR. TAYLOR: Morning, your Honor. This is Josh Taylor
10
11
    from Steptoe & Johnson on behalf of The Travelers Indemnity
    Company, United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Travelers
12
13
    Casualty and Surety Company, St. Paul Surplus Lines Insurance
    Company, St. Paul Guardian Insurance Company, and St. Paul Fire
14
15
    and Marine Insurance Company.
             THE COURT: Okay.
16
17
             Anyone else?
18
             MR. WOODMAN: Good morning, your Honor. John Woodman
    on behalf of The Gori Law Firm.
19
20
             THE COURT: All right.
21
             Anyone else?
22
         (No response)
                         All right. Are we ready to proceed, then?
23
             THE COURT:
             Let's start with the debtor. Mr. Erens, any updates
24
    or good-of-the-order type announcements before we get into the
25
```

1 motions? 2 MR. ERENS: Thank you, your Honor. No, I don't think so. I think this hearing'll be 3 relatively brief and, if pleases the Court, we would suggest 4 5 just going in the order of the agenda. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 Anyone else need to say anything by way of preliminaries, or we're ready to go straight to the motions? 8 9 (No response) THE COURT: All right, very good. 10 11 The first matter on the docket, of course, is the debtors' motion to authorize the retention and compensation of 12 professionals hired by, utilized by the debtors in the ordinary 13 course of business. 14 15 So, Mr. Erens, if you want to lead off. MR. ERENS: Yeah. I'm going to turn that one over to 16 17 Ms. Cahow, who I think will handle the first two motions, 18 Mr. Cody'll handle the third, then I'll come back and handle 19 the adversary. THE COURT: Okay, very good. 20 Ms. Cahow? 21 Thank you, your Honor. Caitlin 22 MS. CAHOW: Yes. Cahow of Jones Day on behalf of the debtors and, as Mr. Erens 23

alluded to, I'll be addressing Items 1 and 2 on the agenda and

then my colleague, Mr. Cody, will be addressing Item No. 3.

24

And I will just pause for a moment to have --1 Mr. Erens, would you mind muting? 2 Sorry, your Honor. Getting a little feedback on our 3 end. 4 5 THE COURT: That's all right. We're all learning how It's a new world. 6 to do this by video. 7 MS. CAHOW: Understood, and thank you, your Honor. As I was saying, each of the three main case motions 8 was filed on the petition date and we've received no formal 9 objections to the requested relief. However, we did receive 10 11 informal comments from the Bankruptcy Administrator and also proposed counsel to the Asbestos Claimants' Committee as well 12 as a reservation of rights filed by the Committee with respect 13 to the intercompany agreements motion. So we will address 14 15 those in turn. THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 16 17 response). I also would note for the Court that after 18 MS. CAHOW: conversations with proposed counsel to the Committee we have 19 agreed to further extend the Committee's deadline to object to 20 certain orders under the current agreed order that your Honor 21 entered at Docket No. 110 by an additional 14 days to give the 22 Committee and their counsel a little bit more time to 23 coordinate and we anticipate providing your Honor with an 24

amended form of order reflecting that extension within the next

few days after the parties have had a chance to review.

2 So I did just want to put that on the record for your 3 Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Noted.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CAHOW: In turning to the first item on the agenda, as your Honor mentioned, this is the ordinary course professionals motion. It's a fairly standard, straightforward motion that seeks authority to retain, employ, and pay certain ordinary course professionals to render services to the debtors in the same manner and for the same general purposes that services were provided prior to the petition date without the need for individual retention applications or fee applications, but subject to certain fee caps and other procedural requirements and limitations. A list of the currently identified ordinary course professionals is attached to the motion as Exhibit A and that list, generally, is comprised of law firms and although the majority of the ordinary course professionals are counsel in asbestos litigation expected to remain stayed, the debtors do believe they may require their services for things like filing stay notices, addressing potential stay violations, monitoring dockets, compiling historical information regarding the debtors' asbestos litigation, and generally providing information about those cases that are not otherwise available. And so while important resources for the debtors, it's important to note that the

ordinary course professionals will not be materially involved in the administration of the chapter 11 cases and in the event they do become materially involved in the administration of the bankruptcy cases, then we would seek to have them separately retained.

And with respect to the procedures themselves, they're similar to procedures that your Honor has seen in, in DBMP and similar to procedures that have been approved in other cases.

Just at a high level, each professional will provide a declaration for filing. A form of that declaration was attached to the motion as Exhibit B. And key parties, including the Committee, Future Claimants' Representative, when appointed, and the Bankruptcy Administrator will have an opportunity to object. If there are no objections, the professional is considered retained as an ordinary course professional and the debtors are authorized to pay them subject to a monthly cap of \$50,000 and an aggregate cap of \$500,000. If the monthly cap is exceeded, the ordinary course professionals would have to serve a monthly statement on the same key parties who would have had an opportunity to object to their retention and those parties will have an opportunity to object to the monthly statement.

If the ordinary course professional exceeds the aggregate cap, then he has to file a fee application with the Court for the excess amount.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The debtors also will file quarterly statements regarding the fees and expenses incurred and payments made to ordinary course professionals. And that's, really, a, a general high level description of the relief. We did receive one clarifying comment to the order from proposed counsel to the Asbestos Claimants' Committee and I believe we uploaded a copy of a modified form of order with the blackline. I don't know if your Honor has had an opportunity to review that. THE COURT: I have. MS. CAHOW: Great. So that's -- we have incorporated that comment that we received and that is at Paragraph 4 of the order, as modified. And, and really, this modification makes clear, as was intended, that the fee limits are on a firm basis and not on an individual basis. So we're, we're fine with that comment. And unless your Honor has any questions, we would ask that the Court enter the proposed order as modified. THE COURT: Any other parties need to weigh in on this motion? (No response) Everyone good with it? All right. THE COURT: The motion is approved. Thank you, your Honor. MS. CAHOW:

Moving to Item 2 on the agenda, this is the interim compensation motion, which seeks entry of an order establishing procedures for compensation and reimbursement of professionals retained under Sections 327 and 1103 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Again, these procedures are similar to what your Honor would have seen in DBMP and Kaiser and we believe them to be fairly typical.

Just at a high level, they provide for circulation of monthly fee statements to key parties, including the debtors, the Bankruptcy Administrator, the Committee, and the Future Claimants' Representative, when appointed. There's a 14-day objection period. Assuming no objections, the debtors then would be authorized to pay 90 percent of the fees with a 10 percent holdback and a hundred percent of expenses.

In case of an objection to a monthly fee statement, the procedures provide a mechanism for resolution of that objection. Essentially, the parties can resolve the objection consensually or present the objection to the Court. We also can defer involving the Court until the interim or final fee application hearing.

I would note that the failure to object to a monthly fee statement does not waive the right to object later to a fee application.

Interim fee applications will be filed every four months with the first due November for the interim fee period

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

motion?

from June through September and, in an effort to alleviate administrative burden to the extent practicable, all the interim fee applications will be noticed together and heard on the same hearing date with the same objection deadline. So we're hopeful that will streamline the process a In the absence of objections, the interim fee applications may be granted without a hearing. One final thing that I would mention concerns The order does authorize professionals to use their retainers. pre-petition retainers, but it also requires professionals to use any remaining retainer by the time it files the first interim fee application, or as soon thereafter as practicable. So I did want to flag that provision for the Court. Again, that's a quick summary of the relief requested. We did receive one informal comment from the Bankruptcy Administrator, which we think makes a lot of sense, and we've incorporated that comment into subparagraph (o) of Paragraph 2 of the order. And it just simply requires that notice parties may request monthly fee statements and interim fee applications in an electronically searchable format. So unless your Honor has any questions, we would ask that the, you enter the order as modified. None on my end at the moment. THE COURT: Anyone else got a comment or a concern about the

1 (No response) 2 THE COURT: No one? All right, very good. Approved. 3 MS. CAHOW: Thank you very much, your Honor. 4 I'll turn things over to Mr. Cody. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Cody, you want to address the 6 7 intercompany agreements motion? MR. CODY: Yes, your Honor. Good morning. Mark Cody 8 of Jones Day here on behalf of the debtors. 9 Your Honor, Item No. 3 on the agenda is the debtors' 10 11 motion for an order authorizing them to perform under certain intercompany agreements with a non-debtor affiliate. 12 13 Basically, your Honor, the, the debtors have, are party to certain service agreements that provide business, 14 15 administrative, tax, legal, and other office-type services, as well as a secondment agreement by which the, the debtors' 16 17 parent seconds certain employees to the debtors. 18 Your Honor, the, the objected, the objection deadline to this motion was July the 2nd. There were no objections to 19 the relief that were filed. We did, however, receive some 20 informal comments from the ACC yesterday afternoon. We're in 21 the process of reviewing those, those comments, your Honor, and 22 are hopeful to come together and reach a consensus, then 23

come -- put -- put together a consensual form of order that we

can submit to your Honor for approval, hopefully in the next

24

```
1
    coming days.
             In addition, I, I believe late last night, the, the
 2
    ACC filed a, a reservation of rights with respect to this
 3
    particular motion.
 4
             Unless your Honor has any questions on it, I would
 5
    request that, suggest that we will work with the ACC to come up
 6
 7
    with a, a potential form of order to, hopefully, get this to
    you in the near, in the coming days.
 8
             THE COURT: All right. No, I've, I've read the
 9
10
    motion.
11
             Are there other parties wishing to address the same?
    Any comments, concerns?
12
             MR. MACLAY: Your Honor, just, just a very quick
13
    comment, your Honor. Kevin Maclay for the Committee.
14
15
             Mr. Cody accurately set forth the current state of
           I would just add the changes we're seeking are
16
17
    consistent with those in the CertainTeed bankruptcy and we do
18
    anticipate reaching a consensual resolution of those with the
    debtor, we presume.
19
             THE COURT: Okay. And CertainTeed being the DBMP
20
21
    bankruptcy?
22
             MR. MACLAY: That's correct, your Honor.
23
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             All right. Anyone else?
24
```

(No response)

```
THE COURT: Okay. If not, that is approved as well,
 1
    subject to, to the final form of the order. If you get any
 2
    sticking points there, let me know and we'll try to break the
 3
    logjam.
 4
 5
                        Thank you, your Honor.
             MR. CODY:
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Erens, I think we're back
 6
 7
    to you.
             We've got the motion --
             MR. ERENS:
                         Yes.
                               Thank you.
 8
             THE COURT: -- for the preliminary injunction.
 9
                               Thank you, your Honor.
10
             MR. ERENS: Yes.
11
             So -- can you hear me all right, by the way? We've
    been having a little bit of feedback.
12
13
             THE COURT:
                         Umm.
             MR. ERENS:
14
                         Okay.
15
             THE COURT:
                         I think everyone is a little bit up and
    down today for some reason. But yes, you're coming through
16
17
    loud and clear at the moment.
18
             MR. ERENS:
                         Terrific. Okay. Appreciate it.
             At the last hearing on the 6th, your Honor, it was
19
    agreed that the TRO would be extended through the maximum 28-
20
    day period consensually, which is July 23rd. So an order was
21
    entered to that effect. I think the order, actually, just got
22
    entered yesterday. There were some back and forth and then --
23
24
             THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
25
    response).
```

MR. ERENS: -- some things that had to be adjusted. 1 So that order is in place and that provided that today 2 we would have a hearing for purposes of entering an order that 3 provides for a preliminary injunction to the date of a full 4 hearing on the motion, the so-called evidentiary hearing --5 6 THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 7 response). MR. ERENS: -- to be followed by a case management 8 order that would provide a briefing schedule, discovery 9 schedule, and the like. 10 11 We did have a discussion with the ACC which had just been formed last week. We talked about a few issues as to how 12 13 that preliminary injunction order might look. We gave them a couple options. We had a nice discussion and they wanted, 14 15 obviously, to take it back and, and have some deliberations. The Committee is just being, you know, in its, its infancy, so 16 17 to speak. It's just being, it's just been formed and the ACC 18 has informed us that they're still deliberating on some issues with respect to that order and wanted to have a further 19 conversation with us, I think, by the end of the week. 20 So we were certainly fine with that. We, as a result, 21 22

do not have a form of order to propose to your Honor today. As I indicated, the temporary restraining order runs through the 23rd. So we still have over a week to get that form of preliminary injunction order entered --

23

24

```
THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
 1
 2
    response).
             MR. ERENS -- and as a result, the suggestion is
 3
    simply to, through Chambers, once we're done having a
 4
    discussion with the Committee and come, hopefully, to a form of
 5
    final order, we'll be submitting it to Chambers for your
 6
 7
    Honor's approval.
             THE COURT: Okay, very good.
 8
             Others? Anyone?
 9
             MR. MACLAY: Yes, your Honor. What Mr. Erens said is,
10
11
    is accurate. The Committee is preparing to, you know, work
    through with the, the debtor on a, hopefully, consensual basis
12
13
    how that order should look.
             One outstanding issue that your Honor had raised
14
15
    before and that I tried and ultimately was successful in trying
    to do was to figure out the Committee's position on your
16
17
    Honor's suggestion that the DBMP and this bankruptcy be heard,
18
    potentially, together on the PI. And I haven't had a chance --
    I apologize -- to raise this with the debtor yet. I believe,
19
    in fact, I can say affirmatively both Committees are willing to
20
    have those preliminary injunction hearings be heard together in
21
    a joint session just for the record.
22
             THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
23
    response).
24
             MR. MACLAY: And obviously, this is something we'll be
25
```

talking about with the debtors, too, in figuring out what makes 1 2 sense, but that's at least the Committee's position that I wanted to, to say now that I know it, as we think through what 3 that order should look like. 4 THE COURT: With that said, we're currently scheduled, 5 I think, September 9 and 10 in DMB and, DBMP -- excuse me. 6 7 we likely to be ready to go in this case by that day? MR. MACLAY: Well, your Honor, it's obviously an open 8 I think from the Committee's perspective we could be 9 and I don't know what the debtors' position on that is 10 11 'cause -- I apologize -- I haven't had a chance to talk with them since I became aware that the two Committees were, were 12 willing to proceed in that fashion. I don't know the debtors' 13 perspective and I don't want to speak for them. 14 15 THE COURT: Mr. Erens, do you have any off-the-cuff impressions there? 16 17 MR. ERENS: As Mr. Maclay indicated, the, we weren't 18 sure what the Committees' position was. If you look back at the DBMP case, they asked for a decent amount of discovery, 19 which took a significant amount --20 THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 21 22 response). MR. ERENS: -- of time to put together. So pending 23 what they were going to want in that discovery period we held 24

off having that discussion. Because, for instance, if it took

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
them, you know, if the requests were for discovery that was
going to take four months, then the hearing just couldn't come
together at the same time.
         I'm just hearing for the first time, as you are, from
Mr. Maclay that the Committee is willing to have the --
         THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
response).
         MR. ERENS: -- hearings together. So we will, then,
take that back to our clients, obviously, as well and have that
discussion.
         I suppose the other point is someone's going to have
to ask the DBMP estate --
         THE COURT: Right.
         MR. ERENS: -- what their position is because it's,
it's not just us. It's them as well.
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
         Well, that was my long-winded way of me asking have
you figured out when you want to have this hearing and I guess
the answer to that is, no. Are -- what are we going to put in
the preliminary injunction? Are we going to schedule that
hearing in, in the order you're going to submit, or are we
going to have a follow-on order that says the injunction's
entered, has been entered until a hearing can be set and then
having a follow-on order that sets the hearing?
```

MR. ERENS: That was some of the discussion we had

with the Committee. So we said, you know, there's a couple 1 2 options. We can put a hearing date in, but until we have a case management order and some sense of what the Committees are 3 going to be looking for in terms of discovery and the like. 4 And then there's also the FCR, which is an entity that 5 hasn't been created yet. So I didn't know if that was relevant 6 or not to the discussion. 7 THE COURT: Right. 8 But in any case, we had proposed not 9 MR. ERENS: necessarily putting a hearing date in the order --10 11 THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 12 response). MR. ERENS: -- pending a CMO and a determination of 13 what the ACC might be looking for in terms of discovery and the 14 15 like. So we gave them those couple different options. That's what I think they're deliberating on. 16 17 With respect to putting the hearings together, that 18 will, you know, we're now at mid-July. 19 THE COURT: Right. MR. ERENS: And we're talking about a hearing in early 20 21 22

September, which is about six weeks away. So that will clearly truncate the amount of discovery that really is conceivable in this case. Now if that's what the Committee is willing to do, then, you know, that's certainly their choice.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, it -- it is of no moment to me,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

response).

It just occurred to me that the two estates since either way. they're arguing substantially the same ground might want for everyone to get a shot at it before I make a ruling in one case and that adversely affects the position of someone in the second. So the bottom line, I quess, is that the Court can do it either way. The, the other thing I would suggest as you're talking and trying to negotiate this order is try to determine how much time you're going to need. November is always -- if we don't do this in September, we've got some availability in October. November's always a crowded month because of Thanksqiving and the like and other commitments that we have. Maybe this year we won't have our state seminar going in November, but -- and then December, at least in theory, I'm supposed to be out of the office for a couple weeks around the holidays and everyone gets crowded then. So it would be most useful in finding days to know how much time you're going to need in advance, okay? MR. ERENS: Understood. MR. MACLAY: And, your Honor, a quick follow-up comment. You had suggested at the last hearing that your Honor had September 8th available to add to the 9th and 10th --THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative

MR. MACLAY: -- that we currently have for the DBMP 1 2 hearing. 3 THE COURT: Right. MR. MACLAY: If it would be possible, your Honor, to 4 essentially reserve that while we engage in discussions with 5 the debtor about the potential for a joint hearing, that would 6 7 at least preserve some optionality there, if, if, in fact, that day is still available for you. 8 THE COURT: It is available to me. Before we start a 9 day early in that case, somebody in that bankruptcy needs to 10 11 discuss whether it works for everyone there. But on my end, I'll hold the day for you. 12 MR. MACLAY: Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. So you're going to work on the 14 15 order and, hopefully, send something down. You're meeting on Friday, is that right, or by Friday? So we should expect 16 17 something early next week? 18 MR. MACLAY: Yes, your Honor. I don't -- it's hard to predict exactly when we'll finalize our discussions with the 19 debtor, but we both understand that an order needs to be 20 uploaded or at least a hearing scheduled or, or something 21 immediate if it has to happen between now and the 23rd. I 22 think we all anticipate that will happen. 23 As your Honor knows, there are some things between now 24 and then, including the Kaiser confirmation hearing, but we'll 25

get it done.

THE COURT: Right. That -- that was -- what I was anticipating is if we don't get our problems worked out this week, we've got issues next week since the Kaiser confirmation is scheduled for all week long. And the 23rd, of course, is Thursday. So we may well be in the other case at the same time that we need to be talking about an injunction.

But sounds to me like you're on the same page. So whatever we get into over that could be handled fairly, in fairly short order. Maybe we start at 9:00 Eastern and take a half an hour, if you have any remaining issues to talk about, one of the, the mornings before the 23rd.

But let's hope for the best and then we'll just schedule as we can if, if something comes up. Just don't expect a lot of time if you get into a fight about the order. We're, we're not going to have much time to accommodate you.

And I'm sure, for the participants in Kaiser, y'all are going to have a lot of other things on your mind.

So let's see if we can't get this resolved before the weekend, if we can, all right?

MR. MACLAY: And just one quick follow-up comment for your Honor's information.

THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative response).

MR. MACLAY: We are about to have a, a pretrial in

Kaiser where we're going to go through the schedule and the way 1 things look. 2 THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 3 response). 4 MR. MACLAY: As of right now, I think there's broad 5 consensus on the plan proponent side at least that the hearing 6 7 may take as few as one to two days, given the settlement with all the excess insurers that would have been, frankly, the bulk 8 of the time required in the hearing, given the submission of 9 all direct examinations by declaration --10 11 THE COURT: Right. MR. MACLAY: -- the actual -- and, and given the 12 13 prospect of having closings follow post-trial briefing. THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 14 15 response). MR. MACLAY: Given all of that, we anticipate on the 16 17 plan proponent side that the, the hearing is unlikely to take 18 the full week and may take as little as one to two days. But you'll hear more about that at the, at the Kaiser 19 pretrial. I just wanted to highlight that for you now so you 20 can incorporate it into your thinking. 21 I don't want to get off us having a 22 THE COURT: conversation about another case without everyone there, but the 23

only thing I would take back, Mr. Maclay, on my end of it is

for planning purposes you may share with everyone -- and I'll

24

```
tell them again tomorrow -- at the moment at least I'm caught
 1
 2
    up on the reading and I've read all the declarations and
    reports.
 3
             So the short-play version on direct might be
 4
    appropriate as opposed to feeling like you have to highlight
 5
    everything in those declarations for me, so. All right?
 6
 7
             Let's go back to --
             MR. MACLAY: Well, yeah. Just to be clear, your
 8
    Honor, I don't actually think there's going to be any live
 9
    direct at all. I think they're all just coming in through
10
11
    declarations, but we'll confirm that at the pretrial.
                         That's my understanding, but -- in any
             THE COURT:
12
    event, let's not get any further afield from that.
13
             Back to the injunction. If you run into problems,
14
15
    please let my law clerk know and we will try to scratch out
    some time for us to talk about whatever they may be. But
16
17
    otherwise, I'll expect to see the injunction order coming from
18
    you end of the week or early next week.
19
             All right.
                         What else do we need to talk about in, in
    Aldrich?
20
21
             MR. ERENS:
                         I think that's it, your Honor.
                         Okay, very good.
22
             THE COURT:
                         I think we're good.
23
             MR. ERENS:
             THE COURT: All right, wonderful.
24
             Well, thank you all. I do appreciate your, your
25
```

```
1
    flexibility in trying to learn this new technology. I've been
    very impressed with everyone so far of how, how quickly
 2
    everyone has adapted to it and I don't see things, at least in
 3
    North Carolina, changing anytime soon. We're like everyone
 4
           The numbers of COVID infections are going up again and
 5
    else.
    consequently, the Governor is not being very aggressive in
 6
 7
    terms of opening up and we are, more or less, trying to stay
    fairly consistent with what's being done by our state.
 8
             So I, I think this is the status quo at least for the,
 9
    for the foreseeable future, so. We'll let you know if anything
10
11
    changes down here.
             If there's nothing else, we'll recess, okay?
12
                         All right. Thank you, your Honor.
13
             MR. ERENS:
             THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
14
15
    response).
16
         (Proceedings concluded at 10:01 a.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Boodinone Ago of or or
1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	I, court approved transcriber, certify that the
3	foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic
4	sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
5	matter.
6	/s/ Janice Russell July 17, 2020
7	Janice Russell, Transcriber Date
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	