Barry W. Davidson (WSBA No. 07908) Bruce K. Medeiros (WSBA No. 16380) DAVIDSON BACKMAN MEDEIROS PLLC 1550 Bank of America Financial Center 601 West Riverside Avenue Spokane, Washington 99201 1 Telephone: (509) 624-4600 Facsimile: (509) 623-1660 2 Email: bdavidson@dbm-law.net 3 bmedeiros@dbm-law.net 4 Paul M. Hoffmann STINSON LLP 5 1209 Walnut, Suite 2900 6 Kansas City, Missouri 64106 Telephone: (816) 691-2746 7 Facsimile: (816) 412-1191 8 Email: paul.hoffmann@stinson.com 9 Darrell W. Clark STINSON LLP 10 1775 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 800 Washington, DC 20006-4605 11 Telephone: (202) 785-9100 12 Facsimile: (202) 785-9163 Email: darrell.clark@stinson.com 13 Attorneys for Cerner Corporation 14 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 16 In re. . . 17 ASTRIA HEALTH, et al., 18 19 Debtors and Debtors in Possession.¹ 20

Jointly Administered Under: Lead Case No. 19-01189-WLH11

Chapter 11

OBJECTION OF CERNER CORPORATION TO DEBTORS'

The Debtors and their respective case numbers are as follows: Astria Health (19-01189-11); Glacier Canyon, LLC (19-01193-11); Kitchen and Bath Furnishings, LLC (19-01194-11), Oxbow Summit, LLC (19-01195-11); SHC Holdco, LLC (19-01196-11); SHC Medical Center-Toppenish (19-01190-11); SHC Medical Center-Yakima (19-01192-11); Sunnyside Community Hospital Association (19-01191-11); Sunnyside Community Hospital Home Medical Supply, LLC (19-01197-11); Sunnyside Home Health (19-01198-11), Sunnyside Professional Services, LLC (19-01199-11); Yakima Home Care Holdings, LLC (19-01201-11); and Yakima HMA Home Health, LLC (19-01200-11).

Page 1 Objection to Second Amended Plan Pleadings/Astria.svr

21

22

23

24

25



19-01189-WLH11 Doc 2065 Filed 12/04/20 Entered 12/04/20 13:04:39 Pg 1 of 22

SECOND AMENDED JOINT CHAPTER 11 PLAN OF REORGANIZATION OF ASTRIA HEALTH AND ITS DEBTOR AFFILATES

Hearing Date: December 18, 2020, at

10:00 a.m.

Objection Deadline: December 4, 2020

COMES NOW, Cerner Corporation on behalf of itself and its affiliates (collectively, "Cerner"), by and through counsel, and in support of its objection to the confirmation of the Debtors' Second Amended Plan (defined below), states as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. As of November 5, 2020, a dispute has arisen over damages alleged by Debtors against Cerner arising out of the CBA (defined below) between Cerner and the Debtors (the "Cerner Dispute"). Cerner has filed a pending motion for relief from the stay to refer the Cerner Dispute to arbitration per the CBA (the "Cerner Arbitration Motion"). The Second Amended Plan identifies the Cerner Dispute as the Vendor Claim and appears to generally reserve to Debtors the right to pursue the Vendor Claim. In addition, the Plan Supplement (defined below) filed by Debtors does not list the CBA among the contracts to be assumed. Accordingly, the Second Amended Plan deems the CBA to be rejected as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan. Cerner does not oppose confirmation of the Second Amended Plan, including rejection of the CBA, so long as (i) the relief requested in

the Cerner Arbitration Motion is granted, (ii) the confirmation order is clear that Debtors have affirmatively opted to terminate all services under the CBA and accept all consequences associated with their decision to discontinue use of all software, services, and support from Cerner as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan,² and (iii) the Second Amended Plan does not impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect all rights, remedies, claims, and defenses of Cerner after the Cerner Dispute is fully resolved in the arbitration noted in the Cerner Arbitration Motion. For example (and as Cerner notes in the Cerner Arbitration Motion), if the arbitrator or arbitration panel denies all claims by Debtors against Cerner sometime in 2021 or 2022, then Cerner shall be free at that point in time to pursue all available rights, claims, and remedies against Debtors, including but not limited to pursuing full payment of all amounts Cerner is owed by Debtors on the Cerner Administrative Claim (defined below) on the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan.

2. Alternatively, if the relief requested in the Cerner Arbitration Motion is denied, then Cerner objects to confirmation of the Second Amended Plan for failure to either pay, or provide an appropriate deposit for payment, of the Cerner Administrative Claim (defined below) on the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan.

24

25

²³

² As discussed further below, Cerner questions whether Debtors truly want to reject the CBA when they realize the consequences of their decision to reject the contract and immediately terminate their relationship with their electronic health records ("EHR") vendor. Nevertheless, Cerner acknowledges Debtors may reject the CBA and refrain from using Cerner's EHR platform as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 3. On May 6, 2019 ("<u>Petition Date</u>"), Astria and its debtor affiliates and debtors in possession (collectively, the "<u>Debtors</u>"), each filed a Petition for relief under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101 1532 (the "<u>Bankruptcy Code</u>"), in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Washington.
- 4. The Chapter 11 cases are jointly administered under the lead bankruptcy case number 19-01189-11 (the "Chapter 11 Cases"). Since the Petition Date, the Debtors have remained in possession of their assets, and managed their business as debtors in possession, pursuant to §§ 1107 and 1108.
- 5. On the Petition Date, Debtors filed a Declaration of John M. Gallagher in Support of Emergency First-Day Motions ("First Day Declaration") [Dkt. No. 21] which states:

in preparation for its acquisitions of SHC Yakima and SHC Toppenish, Astria contracted for a new system-wide Electronic Health Record ("EHR") platform for ambulatory and inpatient services for all three Hospitals and their clinics. Shortly thereafter, Astria also contracted for the outsourcing of its revenue cycle, billing and collection functions and extended business office services. In connection with the system conversion and the outsourcing of its revenue cycle functions, Astria has experienced certain unexpected challenges including, among other things, a significant decline in cash flow from collections on accounts receivable.

First Day Declaration, ¶55. Nonetheless, Debtors did nothing after the Petition Date to reject the CBA or to affirmatively collect any alleged damages from Cerner until November 2020,

when Debtors filed an objection, discussed below, to an administrative expense claim filed by Cerner.

- 6. Cerner is a company that provides EHR software platforms, support, and related services to allow hospitals, health systems (and their related clinics) to operate their facilities and manage a single patient electronic medical record across the entire continuum of care. The contract referenced in the First Day Declaration is known as a Cerner Business Agreement. Thereafter, Debtors entered into various additional sales orders, amendments, schedules and arrangement letters with Cerner (collectively with the Cerner Business Agreement, these sales orders, amendments, schedules and arrangement letters are a single, integrated, executory contract referred to herein as the "CBA").
- 7. Under the terms of the CBA, Debtors licensed from Cerner certain software EHR solutions, software support, and professional services that allowed Debtors to operate their hospital facilities using an electronic record for each patient.
- 8. After the Petition Date, Debtors have continued to operate their health system using Cerner's software, services, and support under the CBA and the accompanying licenses granted by Cerner. And from the Petition Date through today, Cerner has continued to provide the healthcare information technology and services Debtors have requested without interruption. However, Debtors have not stayed current in their payments to Cerner for post-petition use of the licenses or services.
 - 9. On August 1, 2019, Cerner filed a Proof of Claim against Debtors in the

aggregate amount of \$5,543,238.83 as of the Petition Date [Claim No. 364-1] (the "Cerner Pre-Petition Claim"). In addition, the Cerner Pre-Petition Claim noted aggregate administrative claims as of that date in the aggregate amount of \$1,368,732.36. To date, Debtors have not filed any objection to the Cerner Pre-Petition Claim.

- 10. On June 5, 2020, Debtors filed a Motion for Entry of an Order (I) Fixing the First Interim Bar Date for Filing Certain Postpetition Administrative Expense Claims and (II) Approving the Form of Notice of the Administrative Expense Claims Bar Date [Dkt. No. 1350] which was granted by an order entered on June 17, 2020 [Dkt. No. 1416]. These pleadings set a bar date of July 22, 2020, for administrative claims against the closed regional medical center operated by Astria and Yakima.
- 11. On July 7, 2020, the Debtors, on behalf of themselves, and Lapis Advisers, LP and various affiliates, as lender under the Debtor in Possession Facility in the Chapter 11 Cases, agent under the Debtors' prepetition Credit Agreement, and as investment advisor and investment manager for certain funds which are beneficial holders of those certain Washington Health Care Facilities Authority Revenue Bonds, and any fund managed or affiliated with the foregoing (collectively the "Lapis Parties" and, together with the Debtors, the "Plan Proponents") filed their Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Astria Health and Its Affiliates. [Dkt. No. 1471].
- 12. On July 7, 2020, the Plan Proponents filed a Joint Motion for an Order Approving (I) Proposed Disclosure Statement; (II) Solicitation And Voting Procedures; (III)

Notice And Objection Procedures for Confirmation Of Joint Plan; and (IV) Granting Related Relief. [Dkt. No. 1473].

- 13. On July 22, 2020, Cerner filed a Request for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claim of Cerner Corporation [Dkt. No. 1573] (the "Yakima Administrative Expense Claim") seeking allowance and payment of \$2,125,497.75 for equipment, software, maintenance, support, licensing fees and related obligations provided to Yakima under the Agreement. However, as noted in footnote 2 of the Yakima Administrative Expense Claim, the total administrative amount owed as of around July 22, 2020 was \$5,135,736.00.
- 14. On November 5, 2020, after six stipulations to extend the deadline (which gave Cerner and Debtors time to engage in additional settlement discussions), Debtors filed a certain Objection to Cerner Corporation's Motion for Allowance of Administrative Expense Claim [Dkt. No. 1973] (the "Yakima Administrative Expense Claim Objection").
- 15. On November 11, 2020, the Plan Proponents filed the Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Astria Health and its Debtor Affiliates [Dkt. No. 1986] (the "Second Amended Plan") and the related disclosure statement [Dkt. No. 1987] (the "Disclosure Statement").
- 16. The Second Amended Plan contains several provisions relevant to the Cerner Dispute and this Objection. First, the Second Amended Plan states as follows regarding the "Vendor Claims" against Cerner:

The Debtors (or the Reorganized Debtors, if after the Effective Date) and the Lapis Parties, in consultation with the Committee (or the GUC Distribution Trustee, if after the Effective Date), will jointly use their best efforts to settle or otherwise resolve each of the Debtors' Vendor Claims subject to the following principles:

Prior to the Effective Date, the Debtors (with the prior consent of the Lapis Parties) shall have the right to settle any and all Vendor Claims in their sole and absolute discretion after consultation with the Committee, and the Committee shall not have the right to object to any such settlement.

After the Effective Date, the Liquidation Trustee shall have the right of the Liquidation Trust (including any consent terms by the primary beneficiaries) to settle any and all Vendor Claims after consultation with the Debtors and the Committee, and the Debtors, Committee, and GUC Distribution Trustee shall not have the right to object to such settlement.

Prior to or after the Effective Date, the Debtors (with the prior consent of the Lapis Parties) or the Liquidation Trustee (subject to the terms of the Liquidation Trust, including any consent terms by the primary beneficiaries) may commence and prosecute litigation to resolve the Vendor Claims. Consent shall be conditioned on, *inter alia*, the retention of counsel and retention terms acceptable to the Lapis Parties.

Second Amended Plan, § III.C.

17. Second, the Second Amended Plan states as follows regarding executory contracts not listed in the Plan Supplement:

Immediately prior to the Effective Date, all Executory Contracts of the Debtors will be deemed rejected in accordance with the provisions and requirements of §§ 365 and 1123 except those Executory Contracts that (i) have been assumed by order of the Court, (ii) are subject to a motion to assume pending on the Effective Date, or (iii) have been identified on a list of assumed contracts to be filed with the Court prior to the Voting Deadline, which shall be a date prior to the Effective Date of the Plan. The Confirmation Order will constitute a Court order approving such rejections of Executory Contracts as of the Effective Date pursuant to §§ 365 and 1123.

Second Amended Plan, § IV.B.1.

18. Third, the Second Amended Plan states as follows regarding administrative claims as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan:

Except for Ordinary Course Administrative Expenses (which will be paid in the ordinary course of business) and DIP Claims, all Administrative Claims, including Cure Payments, 503(b)(9) Claims, and U.S. Trustee Fees, will be paid in full in Cash (a) on the later of the Effective Date or the date such Claims are Allowed under § 503, or (b) upon such other terms as may be mutually agreed upon between the Holder of such Claim and the Plan Proponents, and consistent with the terms of the Definitive Documents.

Second Amended Plan, Section II.D.1).d.(ii). The definition of Ordinary Course Administrative Expenses is:

Ordinary Course Administrative Expense means Administrative Claims for goods and services of types consistent with the Debtors' ordinary course business operations as of the Petition Date that will be paid as they come due after the Effective Date in the ordinary course of Reorganized Debtors' business.

Second Amended Plan, Section I.A.1.115. Cerner respectfully submits that the Cerner Administrative Expense Claim should be considered an Ordinary Course Administrative Claim because it involves "goods and services of types consistent with the Debtors' ordinary course business operations as of the Petition Date." However, the Cerner Administrative Expense Claim has <u>not</u> been "paid as they come due [prior to] the Effective Date in the ordinary course of Reorganized Debtors' business."

19. Accordingly, if the Cerner Administrative Expense Claim is not considered an Ordinary Course Administrative Expense, then it appears to be subject to an Administrative,

Professional and Priority Claims Cap, as follows:

Administrative and Priority Claims Reserve Amount means Cash in an amount to be determined by Plan Proponents on or before the Effective Date, subject to the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap, to be funded by the Debtors to the Reorganized Debtors in an amount sufficient to pay in full all accrued but unpaid U.S. Trustee Fees and Administrative, Priority Tax, Priority, and Professional Fee Claims other than Ordinary Course Administrative Expenses that are Allowed after the Effective Date to the extent that such Claims have not been paid in full on or before the Effective Date consistent with § 1129(a)(9).

Second Amended Plan, Section I.A.1.3. The Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap referenced above is defined as follows:

Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap means \$4,624,674, which shall be the maximum amount payable under the Plan for the payment of pre-Effective Date U.S. Trustee Fees and Administrative, Priority Tax, Priority, and Professional Fee Claims on or after the Effective Date. To be clear, DIP Claims and Ordinary Course Administrative Expenses are not subject to this Cap.

Second Amended Plan, Section I.A.1.7.

20. Finally, to the extent relevant (see below), the Second Amended Plan states as follows regarding cure amounts for assumed executory contracts:

Any monetary amounts by which each Executory Contract to be assumed is in default shall be satisfied, pursuant to § 365(b)(l), by payment from the Administrative and Priority Claims Reserve, of the default amount (as set forth in the Debtors' books and records), a schedule of which will be Filed and served by the Voting Deadline, in full in Cash on the later of the Effective Date or when such Cure Claim is Allowed, or on such other terms as the parties to each such Executory Contract may otherwise agree. In these Chapter 11 Cases, prior to Confirmation of the Plan, some known Cure Payments will have already been paid or resolved by stipulation or agreement. In the event of a dispute regarding (a) the amount of any Cure

Payments, (b) the ability of Reorganized Debtors to provide "adequate assurance of future performance" (within the meaning of § 365) under the contract or lease to be assumed, or (c) any other matter pertaining to assumption, the cure payments required by § 365(b)(1) shall be made following the entry of a Final Order resolving the dispute and approving the assumption. Pending the Court's ruling on such motion, the Executory Contract at issue shall be deemed assumed by Reorganized Debtors as of the Effective Date, unless otherwise ordered by the Court on a motion to reject the agreement, and the Debtors will reserve amounts for Disputed Cure Payments in the full amounts claimed by objecting contract counterparties. In no event shall the GUC Distribution Trust be liable or otherwise responsible for any Cure Payment. Further, the GUC Distribution Trustee shall have no authority to direct or otherwise oppose any assumption or rejection of an Executory Contract.

Second Amended Plan, § IV.A.2.

- 21. On November 12, 2020, the Court entered the Order Granting Joint Motion for the Order (I) Proposed Disclosure Statement; (II) Solicitation And Voting Procedures; (III) Notice And Objection Procedures for Confirmation Of Joint Plan; and (IV) Granting Related Relief. [Dkt. No. 1991].
- 22. On November 13, 2020, Cerner filed the Motion of Cerner Corporation for (1) Relief from the Automatic Stay to Allow Arbitration; (2) for Determination that Arbitration is Required and Should Proceed; and (3) Recognizing Federal Arbitration Act Stay of Further Proceedings on Objection to Administrative Expense Claim; and Notice Thereof [Dkt. No. 1995] ("Cerner Arbitration Motion"). The Cerner Arbitration Motion is set for hearing after this Objection is filed and prior to the hearing on confirmation of the Second Amended Plan.

- 23. On November 25, 2020, Debtors filed a Notice of Filing Certain Plan Supplements to the Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Astria Health and Its Debtor Affiliates [Dkt. No. 2043] ("Plan Supplement") which does not appear to list the CBA on Exhibit A, Schedule of Assumed Agreements. Accordingly, Cerner assumes that Debtors intend to reject the CBA pursuant to Section IV.B.1. of the Second Amended Plan noted above.³
- 24. Cerner notes that Debtors' decision to not assume the CBA may be an oversight for two reasons. First, Debtors' rejection of the CBA will entitle Cerner to withdraw provision of all software licenses, services, and support under the CBA as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan. To be clear, Debtors' decision to reject the CBA would cause Debtors to forfeit all benefits of using the Cerner EHR to operate their health system (and would include Debtors' termination of all undisputed electronic medical record services provided by Cerner throughout these cases in addition to the disputed "revenue cycle" services included within the Cerner Dispute).
- 25. Second, Debtors have continued to use the software, services, and support provided by Cerner under the CBA throughout these cases notwithstanding Debtors' decision not to make timely payment for the software, services, and support to date.

³ Cerner notes that Section IV.A.1 of the Second Amended Plan allows Debtors to amend the Plan Supplement until the Voting Deadline (December 4, 2020). However, Section IV.B.1 of the Second Amended Plan also appears to allow Debtors to assume executory contracts that "are subject to a motion to assume pending on the Effective Date."

Accordingly, Debtors have accumulated aggregate administrative claims owed to Cerner as of November 19, 2020 in the amount of \$6,894,806.75 (the "Cerner Administrative Claim"). If Debtors' intent was always to reject the CBA, Debtors could have avoided or mitigated the Cerner Administrative Claim by rejecting the CBA anytime on or after the Petition Date.

- Other software and services solution for their health system that will be operative as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan. However, Debtors (or whatever EHR software provider they have chosen to contract with going forward) have not reached out to Cerner to begin the necessary transition/migration of archival EHR information, which would require a separately negotiated agreement and payment. If Debtors have not already lined up another EHR vendor—and if Debtors are not ready to go-live with the new vendor by the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan—Cerner believes Debtors' only recourse upon rejection of the CBA would be to return to paper record-keeping (which seems unlikely to be Debtors' intent).
- 27. Finally, if Debtors reverse course and decide to assume the CBA, Cerner notes that the total "cure" amount that will be owed to Cerner as of the Effective Date will be the Cerner Administrative Claim, plus the Cerner Pre-Petition Claim, plus any additional amounts owed to Cerner under the CBA between November 19, 2020 and the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan (the "Cerner Cure Claim"). The first two components add up to \$12,438,045.58.

III. <u>LIMITED OBJECTION IF THE CERNER ARBITRATION MOTION</u> IS GRANTED

28. If the relief requested in the Cerner Arbitration Motion is granted, then Cerner objects to the confirmation of the Second Amended Plan only if and to the extent that it (a) seeks to impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect all rights, remedies, claims, and defenses of Cerner after the Cerner Dispute is resolved pursuant to the arbitration noted in the Cerner Arbitration Motion, and (b) there is any dispute that Cerner can terminate all services under the CBA as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan. Thus, for example, as noted above, if the result of the arbitration noted in the Cerner Arbitration Motion is a denial of all claims by Debtors against Cerner sometime in 2021, then Cerner shall be free at that point in time to pursue all available rights, claims, and remedies against Debtors, including but not limited to the Cerner Administrative Claim owed to Cerner under the CBA at that time.

29. The Second Amended Plan provision noted above that Debtors or the Liquidation Trustee "may commence and prosecute litigation to resolve the Vendor Claims" does not appear to impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect all rights, remedies, claims, and defenses of Cerner. However, out of an abundance of caution, Cerner respectfully requests that any order confirming the Second Amended Plan explicitly state that nothing in the Second Amended Plan shall impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect all rights, remedies, claims, and defenses Cerner may have after the Cerner Dispute is resolved

pursuant to the arbitration noted in the Cerner Arbitration Motion.

30. The Second Amended Plan provision noted above that "[i]mmediately prior to the Effective Date, all Executory Contracts of the Debtors will be deemed rejected in accordance with the provisions and requirements of §§ 365 and 1123..." also does not appear to impair, prevent, or otherwise adversely affect Cerner's ability to terminate the CBA as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan due to Debtors' material nonpayment of Cerner prior to and after the Petition Date. However, out of an abundance of caution, Cerner respectfully requests that any order confirming the Second Amended Plan explicitly state that nothing in the Second Amended Plan shall impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect Cerner's ability to terminate the CBA as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan.

31. The Second Amended Plan provisions noted above regarding payment of administrative claims may or may not create issues for the Cerner Administrative Claim. If the Cerner Administrative Claim is considered an Ordinary Course Administrative Claim that is not subject to the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap, then the administrative expense provisions of the Second Amended Plan do not appear to impair, prevent or otherwise adversely affect Cerner's ability to collect the Cerner Administrative Claim. However, if the Cerner Administrative Claim is not considered an Ordinary Course Administrative Claim, and therefore is subject to the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap, then the cap amount needs to be modified to include an amount

adequate for the potential Cerner Administrative Claim pursuant to the requirements of Section 1129 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3020(a). Assuming that Debtors have not yet included any amount for the Cerner Administrative Expense Claim in the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap, then Cerner respectfully suggests that the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap needs to be increased by the Cerner Administrative Expense Claim amount which, as noted above, was \$6,894,806.75 as of November 20, 2020 and will need to be increased for amounts due to Cerner as of the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan. This may require the Administrative, Professional and Priority Claims Cap to be increased from \$4,624,674 to at least \$11,519,480.75.

- 32. Finally, if Debtors end up assuming the CBA, the statement above that "Debtors will reserve amounts for Disputed Cure Payments in the full amounts claimed by objecting contract counterparties" also appears to address Cerner's concern about being able to assert all rights, remedies, and claims of Cerner after the Cerner Dispute is resolved pursuant to the arbitration noted in the Cerner Arbitration Motion. To be clear, Cerner hereby asserts the full amount to be claimed by Cerner, and therefore included in the Administrative and Priority Claims Reserve, is \$12,438,045.58 plus an amount to be determined is owed to Cerner between November 20, 2020 and the Effective Date of the Second Amended Plan.
 - 33. Moreover, Cerner notes that, if Cerner's understanding of the above Second

Amended Plan provisions is correct, there is no reason to deny the Cerner Arbitration Motion for the following reasons. First, as explained in the Cerner Arbitration Motion, the only reason to deny the Cerner Arbitration Motion is because the Cerner Dispute is "inextricably intertwined" with something under the Bankruptcy Code. *See* Cerner Arbitration Motion ¶¶ 17-21. Second, Cerner does not see how anything in the Cerner Arbitration Motion could be "inextricably intertwined" with anything under the Bankruptcy Code because the Second Amended Plan proposes to (a) resolve any disputed administrative or cure claim after confirmation, and (b) create a reserve for any disputed cure claim "in the full amounts claimed by objecting contract counterparties [i.e. Cerner]."

IV. <u>ALTERNATIVE OBJECTION IF THE CERNER ARBITRATION</u> MOTION IS DENIED.

- 34. As noted above and explained in the Cerner Arbitration Motion, the only reason to deny the Cerner Arbitration Motion is because the Cerner Dispute is "inextricably intertwined" with something under the Bankruptcy Code. *See* Cerner Arbitration Motion ¶¶ 17-21.
- 35. Since no party has responded yet to the Cerner Arbitration Motion, and this Court has not ruled on the Cerner Arbitration Motion, Cerner will not speculate as to what the parties or the Court may determine on this point.
- 36. However, Cerner respectfully submits that whatever the parties allege as to whether the Cerner Dispute is "inextricably intertwined" with the Bankruptcy Code, unless

the Court determines that it is required to resolve the Cerner Dispute <u>prior to</u> confirmation of the Seconded Amended Plan, there cannot be any issues that are "inextricably intertwined" with the Bankruptcy Code within the meaning of relevant law that would justify delaying confirmation.

- 37. Determination of the Cerner Dispute prior to confirmation of the Second Amended Plan will require Debtors to file a separate adversary action that will require appropriate discovery and contested hearings. Simultaneously, Cerner likely will pursue an appeal of any order denying the Cerner Arbitration Motion.
- As discussed in the Yakima Administrative Expense Objection and the Cerner Arbitration Motion, Debtors acknowledge that the Cerner Dispute will require "extensive" discovery and "significant" pre-trial proceedings. Cerner Arbitration Motion, ¶ 10. Moreover, unlike the arbitration agreed to by the Debtors and Cerner in the CBA, this litigation will be subject to appeals to at least two other courts.
- 39. Accordingly, due to the assumed determination by this Court of the "inextricably intertwined" nature of the Cerner Dispute and other Bankruptcy Code concepts, Cerner respectfully suggest that confirmation of the Second Amended Plan either be denied or delayed pending entry of final orders determining the Cerner Dispute and the assumed "inextricably intertwined" Bankruptcy Code issues.

V. <u>INDEPENDENT OPT-OUT OF THE THIRD PARTY RELEASES</u> PROVIDED IN THE SECOND AMENDED PLAN.

- 40. Regardless of whether the Cerner Arbitration Motion is granted, Cerner hereby independently opts out of the Third Party Releases provided in the Second Amended Plan.
- 41. In relevant part, the Second Amended Plan provides for certain Released Parties to be released from certain claims by certain Releasing Parties. See Second Amended Plan, §§ 1.133, VII.F.2, VII. G, and VII.H.
- 42. However, there is a way for a Released Party to opt out of any release of the Released Parties. In the definition of Releasing Parties, it states:

Releasing Party means (a) the Released Parties; and (b) all Holders of Claims that (i) vote to accept the Plan, and (ii) do not affirmatively opt out of the third party release provided by Section VII.F.2 hereof pursuant to a duly executed Ballot; provided, that, notwithstanding anything contained herein to the contrary, in no event shall an Entity that (x) does not vote to accept or reject the Plan, (y) votes to reject the Plan, or (z) appropriately marks the Ballot to opt out of the third party release provided in Section VII.F.2 hereof and returns such Ballot in accordance with the Solicitation Procedures Order, be a Releasing Party.

Second Amended Plan, §1.133. And in the Release provisions, it states:

THE RELEASING PARTIES SHALL INCLUDE (A) THE RELEASED PARTIES, AND (B) ALL HOLDERS OF CLAIMS THAT (I) VOTE TO ACCEPT THE PLAN, AND (II) DO NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OPT OUT OF THE THIRD PARTY RELEASE PROVIDED BY THIS SECTION PURSUANT TO A DULY EXECUTED BALLOT. NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING TO THE CONTRARY HEREIN, IN NO EVENT SHALL AN ENTITY THAT (X) DOES NOT VOTE TO ACCEPT OR REJECT THE PLAN, (Y) VOTES TO REJECT THE PLAN, OR (Z) APPROPRIATELY MARKS THE BALLOT TO OPT OUT OF THE THIRD PARTY RELEASE PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION AND RETURNS SUCH **BALLOT** ACCORDANCE IN WITH THE SOLICITATION

PROCEDURES ORDER, BE A RELEASING PARTY.

Second Amended Plan, § VII.F.2.

43. Cerner intends to submit a ballot opting out of the Release provisions of the Second Amended Plan. Independently, if and to the extent Cerner is not entitled to vote on the Plan and could be considered a Releasing Party, Cerner hereby affirmatively opts out of the Release provisions of the Plan and otherwise reserves, retains, and does not waive, compromise or release any of the Released Parties identified in the Second Amended Plan.

WHEREFORE, Cerner Corporation respectfully requests that this Court enter an Order denying confirmation of the Second Amended Plan to the extent inconsistent with this Objection, and granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem equitable and proper.

DATED this 4th day of December 2020.

DAVIDSON BACKMAN MEDEIROS PLLC

/s/ Bruce K. Medeiros

Barry W. Davidson, WSBA No. 07908 Bruce K. Medeiros, WSBA No. 16380 1550 Bank of America Financial Center 601 West Riverside Avenue Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 624-4600 Facsimile: (509) 623-1660

Email: bdavidson@dbm-law.net bmedeiros@dbm-law.net

Attorneys for Cerner Corporation

'	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

STINSON LLP

/s/ Darrell W. Clark

Darrell W. Clark

1775 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20006-4605 Telephone: (202) 785-9100

Facsimile: (202) 785-9163

Email: Darrell.clark@stinson.com

STINSON LLP

/s/ Paul M. Hoffmann

Paul M. Hoffmann

1209 Walnut, Suite 2900

Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Telephone: (816) 691-2746 Facsimile: (816) 412-1191

Email: paul.hoffmann@stinson.com

Attorneys for Cerner Corporation Admission Pro Hac Vice

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing Objection of Cerner Corporation to the Confirmation of the Debtors' Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Astria Health and its Debtor Affiliates was served this 4th day of December, 2020, electronically through the Court's ECF system and by first class mail, postage prepaid, upon the following:

Mr. Samuel R. Maizel, Esq.
Dentons US LLP
601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2500
Los Angeles, CA 90017
samuel.maizel@dentons.com
Counsel to the Debtors

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Andrew H. Sherman, Esq. Mr. Boris I. Mankovetskiy, Esq. Sills Cummis & Gross P.C. One Riverfront Plaza Newark, NJ 07102 asherman@sillscummis.com bmankovetskiy@sillscummis.com Counsel to the Committee

Mr. William Kannel, Esq.
Mr. Ian Hammel, Esq.
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
wkannel@mintz.com
iahammel@mintz.com
Counsel to the Lapis Parties

Mr. Gary W. Dyer, Esq.
Office of the United States Trustee
920 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 593
Spokane, WA 99201
gary.w.dyer@usdoj.gov
Counsel to the United State Trustee

DATED this 4th day of December 2020.

DAVIDSON BACKMAN MEDEIROS PLLC

/s/ Bruce K. Medeiros
Bruce K. Medeiros, WSBA No. 16380