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THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. I'm sorry for the delay. We thought we had this all worked out, but best laid plans.

Go ahead, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: May it please the Court? Evan Fleck of Milbank LLP on behalf of debtors.

Let me start, Your Honor, by expressing our sincere appreciation to Your Honor, to the courtroom staff, to the deputies, everybody involved in making today happen. And obviously, it's an extremely significant day for these debtors as we hope to make our final approach towards emergence.

We, obviously, had significant amount of planning to get to today, including by Your Honor's staff. And we certainly appreciate the efforts that were made to be here in person. It makes it all the more real for us. Many of us haven't actually seen the other person in the courtroom in an in-person setting, that haven't seen Your Honor for quite some time. So it's great to be here. Like I said at the first-day hearing which obviously was telephonic that we look forward to hopefully being here at Bowling Green in person at some point. I didn't realize it was going to take until the end of the cases.

I also -- maybe we should have predicted that after eighteen months of Zoom and telephonic hearings the day we
decided to come in person would be a nor'easter in the area. A little envious of the people who are on the phone and on Zoom. But again, we're thrilled to be here.

There are some particularly significant folks that I want to make mention of their presence, some of whom flew in on redeyes to be here. This is an extremely serious process for the debtor. They take every aspect of Your Honor's proceedings and process very seriously. And it was important for them to be here.

So there are a number of the members of the senior management team that I'd like to identify in the courtroom. And they're behind me, obviously, socially distanced. Now, I'll recognized first, to Your Honor's left in the gallery, Mr. Rohit Phillip, the debtors' CFO. To his side is Adrian Neuhauser, the president and CEO of the debtors and is also one of our declarants today.

If $I$ can see behind me properly, Mr. Richard Galindo who is the general counsel of the debtors. Behind Mr. Galindo is Ms. Lucy Avila who is the vice president, corporate finance and treasurer of the debtors. And that makes up the management team who's in the courtroom today.

I'll just also note one other declarant for today, Ms. Ginger Hughes from Seabury. And certain of her colleagues are also in the courtroom today.

I want to be clear, Your Honor, though that we're --
there are just a few of us here that make up the team. And I'll make mention of them again later. But it's really -- in addition to those folks here, the Avianca team in Bogota, elsewhere, some who are in our office participating in the overflow room that you've been good enough to make available, they've been active participants in this process and helped us to achieve what is really remarkable, a nearly fully consensual confirmation process for these debtors.

Your Honor noted more than a year ago in connection with our debtor-in-possession financing relief that it was one of the most complex packages of financing that Your Honor had seen. I think that view was shared by many of us. And that was also a fully consensual process. All of the work that's gone in to achieve these cases could have happened with a lot of loose ends.

This team in particular wanted to make sure we could achieve consensus. We made that commitment to Your Honor back on -- well, I think it was the day after Mother's Day that we had our first-day hearing over the phone that we would do everything possible to try to achieve consensus in the cases that we knew would be complicated, particularly given the multijurisdictional aspects of the cases. And I'm proud of what the team had achieved to bring that before the Court.

In addition to myself, Your Honor, some of my colleagues will be taking the podium to address the Court. And

I'll just for purposes of the record make mention of Mr . Satterfield who's at the table with me, Mr. Bray who is just behind him, Mr. Schak, and as well Mr. Renenger, my litigation partner, who may have occasion to participate today. Again, other colleagues are working hard, working hard late in the evening yesterday to get us here.

So, Your Honor, in terms of how we would propose to proceed but obviously we'd defer to Your Honor's preferences, we have a couple of matters on the agenda that have come up before the confirmation proceedings. So we would propose to take those up first. We did file a further amended agenda this morning at docket number 3277.

And what we propose to do, again, with the Court's permission would be to first take up the Serrano settlement motion which is contested. Then we'd like to take up the matter that relates to ECAs (ph.) and the finance issue. It's not on for hearing today for ultimate adjudication, but we did want to bring the report in an orderly matter to try to work to achieve through consensus of the parties. But we'd like to just give Your Honor some familiarity with how it fits into the broader puzzle and then take direction from the Court through the scheduling. We would like to have the matter heard at the Court's earliest convenience, but it need not be addressed today. We know that it was filed on very short notice.

And following that, we would propose to move into the
confirmation with -- including the presentation materials that Your Honor has. And then we'll take up the case in chief.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor.
So at this point, I'll cede the podium to Mr. Schak who will take up the Serrano motion.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. SCHAK: Good morning, Your Honor. Benjamin Schak of Milbank for the debtors.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, as Mr. Fleck mentioned -sorry, I'm still getting the hang of being in person again.

THE COURT: So am I.
MR. SCHAK: As Mr. Fleck mentioned, the first matter on the agenda is the Serrano settlement related to the subsidiary known as SAI or Servicios Aeroportuarios Integrados. And it was filed at docket 2184.

Your Honor, SAI is a ground handling business which means that they basically help move luggage around the airport. This was an independent enterprise that Avianca bought a ninety percent stake in back in late 2017. After further consideration, new management and per the Court, Avianca thinks that ground handling is not a core part of its business. And Avianca has been in discussion with regarding the motion around a potential sale to a third party.

Your Honor, one of the $I$ would say obstacles in the way of the value maximizing sale to the third party of the SAI equity is that there's a shareholders agreement in place right now with the ten percent owners, the Serrano siblings, Mr. Serrano, Ms. Serrano. Most importantly, under that shareholders agreement, Avianca can't not drag along the Serranos with a sale. And the purchaser might potentially be burdened by a (indiscernible) that the Serranos enjoy under the shareholders' agreement.

So the history here during the case, Your Honor, is that earlier this year where Avianca filed a notice of rejection of that burdensome shareholder agreement. As Mr. Fleck mentioned, we have continually sought a consensus in this case. And so that filing had effective jumpstarting negotiations with the Serranos.

Happily for everyone I think, those negotiations ended up in consensual settlement here which is embodied in the motion. The key terms are a reduction of the amount that put options so that the price will now be roughly 3.8 million dollars rather than 4.8 million.

Avianca now has the ability to drag the Serranos to force them to sell their ten percent interest for the 3.8 million dollars if and when Avianca decides to sell that -- if and when Avianca decides to sell its ninety percent interest. And there's also some other terms such as the breakdown of any
indemnification liabilities and an agreement that SAI will distribute its unpaid dividends both to the Serranos and under the plan also to the rest of the Avianca entities.

Your Honor, this settlement is not the largest piece of the puzzle here. There's important steps for the debtors to clear the cloud over their investment in SAI and be able to market and sell that business at the most advantageous price in the future. There are no objections to document 2184, the Serrano settlement motion. So I would respectfully request that the Court grant the SAI settlement.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schak.
Does anybody else wish to be heard? All right. The Court has reviewed the settlement. Obviously, there have been no objections filed to it. The settlement is approved.

MR. SCHAK: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Schak.
MR. SCHAK: I'll cede now to Mr. Bray.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BRAY: Good morning, Your Honor. Gregory Bray, Milbank LLP.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. BRAY: Thank you for setting this for a status conference today. We apologize for the timing. It was unavoidable. There have been a number of parties literally working around the clock for the last few days to be at this
deal (indiscernible).
As Mr. Fleck said, our request of the Court today is to set a motion for hearing as soon as the Court is comfortable doing so. It is a large -- it involves twenty-seven claims in our fleet, a significant number and is an important part of the company's --

THE COURT: It's permissible while you're at the podium if you want to remove your mask. If you want to leave it on, you can leave it on as well. But anybody who's at the podium can remove their mask.

MR. BRAY: I can do that. Yeah. Thank you.
So if it pleases the Court, I'll just give you a little context here with respect to the relief we're requesting. As I said, this motion involves twenty-seven planes in our fleet. And the planes have been financed in a relatively complex structure. Essentially, each plane though is owned by an SPB. Avianca leases each plane from the SPB.

The current financing parties, prepetition parties, we refer to them as ECA finance parties. And I'm pleased to announce to the Court that we have an agree in principle with ECA finance parties to settle the claims and pay them off and that we expect to finalize that agreement as literally I hope today or tomorrow and then very shortly thereafter file it with the Court, a settlement motion to approve that agreement. That's a significant accomplish for us to get the debt size and
fleet and the number of planes involved in the size of the claims which are about 500 million dollars.

So, Your Honor, the motion itself, the relief we request in the motion, is essentially for authority for the debtors to enter into what we call umbrella agreements and related documents that the goal is that the counterparties of those motions will essentially provide the company with a substantial portion of liquidity which will offset essentially settlement with the ECA finance parties. In essence, what will happen -- and I'm greatly simplifying the transaction. But essentially, the SPBs that own these aircraft will be sold to the two counterparties: Castlelake, FTAI. And then they essentially are purchasing them and then pay Avianca the funds for the purchase.

Then Avianca will then continue to lease the planes through the existing restructure. So we're essentially preserving the structure. And again, I'm speaking in generalities, but essentially refinancing out the transactions. That is not a literal statement but a general one.

And part of the -- we'd also request is we're asking the Court to approve the assumption of the amended leases as part of this transaction to maintain continuity in the corporate structure. That is, in essence, what relief we request to the motion. It is a high priority for the company. THE COURT: Let me ask a question because a set of a
papers was --
MR. BRAY: Yes.
THE COURT: -- delivered to me this morning.
MR. BRAY: Yes.
THE COURT: But not everything is signed and agreed at this point?

MR. BRAY: No. We have a signed -- we have signed binding agreements from counterparties. And that's one of the reasons for the urgency of the company, Your Honor. That's contingent upon this Court's approval.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BRAY: It's very important. And we know that our parties in the agreement are legally bound.

THE COURT: All right. So I only have the briefest opportunity to look at the papers. Serve it with a notice of presentment that a deadline of 5 p.m. next Tuesday, November 2nd and a hearing date and time if necessary of November 3rd at 11 o'clock.

MR. BRAY: Very well, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. I wasn't -- when the request came in yesterday to go forward with the matter today when the papers hadn't even been filed yet, I wasn't prepared to do that. So there have been numerous other lease assumptions that have gone forward. I think all have been uncontested at this point. So as I say, Tuesday the 2nd at 5 p.m. for notice of
presentment. And if necessary, we'll go forward on the 3rd at 11 o'clock. We'll do that by Zoom, Zoom for Government, not live. I have hearings at 10 and at 2 on the 3 rd, but we'll do this at 11 at necessary. If there are no objections, it's likely the order will be entered and the hearing canceled.

MR. BRAY: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
MR. FLECK: For the record, once again, Your Honor, Evan Fleck for the debtors.

Before I begin walking through the brief presentation, I just want to handle a couple of important housekeeping matters, if I may. And that is requesting the Court to admit into evidence certain declarations that have been filed in today's evidentiary record.

First, Your Honor, as I noted in the introductions, is the declaration of Adrian Neuhauser, the president and CEO of Avianca Holding S.A.. That's at docket number 2263. The second, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Let's take them one at a time. Just give me a second, Mr. Fleck.

All right. So attached to the agenda for today as Exhibit A is the defendant's -- the debtors', excuse me -debtors' witness and exhibit list. And I'm looking at page 2 at -- near the bottom of the page. And it has the list. It shows the description and the exhibit number. So the first one
is the Neuhauser declaration, 2263. Are there any objections?
All right. The Neuhauser declaration is admitted in evidence.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor --
MR. FLECK: ExCuse me, Your Honor. Someone in --
THE COURT: I'm sorry. Come on up to the microphone, if you would, please.

MR. LENIHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Glen Lenihan with Oved \& Oved.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. You have to speak a little louder.

MR. LENIHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Glen Lenihan with Oved \& Oved. We represent the creditors Udi Baruch Guindi, David Baruch, Shoshana Baruch, Habib Mann, Golan LP, and Isaak Baruch. We're holders of certain of -- what's been called the 2023 notes.

And just with respect to Neuhauser declaration and also the declaration that presumably they'll put in next of Ms. Hughes, we just wanted to lay objections that that -- with respect to the declarations that much of the language in there is deliberately vague and broad. And we would like the opportunity to cross-examine the --

THE COURT: Well, that's a different issue whether you cross-examine or not. But --

MR. LENIHAN: I just wanted to preserve our rights as
going forward. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Are you objecting to the admission of the declaration in evidence? Yes or no?

MR. LENIHAN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. The Neuhauser declaration, ECF 2263, is in evidence.
(Neuhauser declaration was hereby received into evidence as Debtor's Exhibit, as of this date.)

THE COURT: And we'll go through the list. And you can offer them. Then I'll rule. They are subject to cross -the witnesses are subject to cross-examination

Go ahead, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor.
The next declaration that we seek to have admitted is docket number 2262, declaration of Ginger Hughes in support of confirmation of the joint Chapter 11 plan of Avianca Holdings S.A. and its affiliated debtors.

THE COURT: Are there any objections to the Ginger Hughes declaration? Hearing none, the Hughes declaration is admitted in evidence.
(Hughes declaration was hereby received into evidence as Debtor's Exhibit, as of this date.)

MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor.
Lastly, the declaration of -- rather, it's a voting certification at docket number 2239, certification of $P$. Joseph

Morrow, IV with respect to tabulation and votes on the joint Chapter 11 plan for Aviana Holdings S.A. and its affiliate debtors.

THE COURT: Are there any objection to admitting the Morrow declaration, ECF 2239, in evidence? Hearing none, it's admitted in evidence.
(Morrow declaration was hereby received into evidence as Debtor's Exhibit, as of this date.)

MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor. And each of parties is either here in the courtroom and also, in the case of Mr. Morrow, on Zoom and available, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. FLECK: As Your Honor is aware, we did provide a copy of -- your chambers a copy of the dec that is not on the screen. Hopefully everybody who's participating remotely is able to see this.

Your Honor, we thought it important to help to bring to context for this hearing today where these debtors came from. We've achieved remarkable success in these cases. But this outcome was far from known at the time these cases began. I think Your Honor noted on a number of occasions that there were quite reasonable concerns as to where these cases would be and if we find ourselves at this level of consensus to successful reorganization.

I think the team -- the team that's here from Avianca
has shown how resilient they are and how resilient the airline is. Even before we started today, many of them started to help to try to address the technological issues in the courtroom.

THE COURT: For those of you who -- maybe this was explained before. We did the dry run last week. All the technology worked perfectly. If it can go wrong, I guess it will. But we're making the best of it.

Go ahead, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: Understood, Your Honor.
So we want to put in context -- I know that time is somewhat short because people are on vacation, so I don't want to belabor the point. So we'll move through this relatively quickly. But hopefully it'll be a useful tool as well as we move into the confirmation standards and the very few objections and the nonobjection that was received from the Office of the United States Trustee which we'll take up in due course.

Before the commencement of these cases, Your Honor, the debtors first of all had been subject to Chapter 11 proceedings before Judge Cropper (ph.) and then subsequently were on a path towards a restructuring out of court. They had identified a number of the key issues and objectives that needed to be addressed that went right in the gamut from issues with respect to litigations, default, with respect to the shareholder vote, from United Airlines and other operational
issues that the company had addressed. But in fact, as of February 2020, the Avianca plan was -- Avianca plan was working. It was ahead of its financial goals. And the unsecured bonds of the company that actually recovered to par.

The impact of COVID-19 and the pandemic on, frankly, all of us -- but significantly important for today's purposes this airline was (indiscernible). The management team, under the supervision of the board, took steps immediately to try to address what was happening to the company whose business was literally suspended and grounded. Some of those steps included radical measures to control costs to spending debt and lease payments, furloughing employees, and reducing wages, obviously decisions that were very painful for the management team to make as well as for the individuals who were affected by that most directly and their families.

So we came into the Chapter 11 cases, obviously, in May of 2020 with a cash position that was below what is appropriate for a business at this type. And as we mentioned earlier, it was only when we were able to secure a complicated debtor-in-possession financing with the company's liquidity position was shored up and ultimately led us through these Chapter 11 cases through effectively the financing of the DIP and the conversion of the exit financing.

As I noted, and Your Honor became aware very early on in our first-day hearing, the time $I$ was in my basement on my
phone talking to you, presenting that initial presentation from the debtors, the airline was grounded literally. Both of Avianca key markets, El Salvador and Colombia, had closed the airspace to commercial passenger flights. There was nothing the airline could do about that, notwithstanding their best efforts.

Passenger flying has now fortunately recommenced with Colombia and Central American markets reopening. I don't think we're on a (indiscernible) path at this point; Mr. Neuhauser's team will certainly tell you that. But there's cause for optimism.

The one -- the one sort of outperformer during the pandemic in terms of the airline was the cargo performance. And we've talked about that a number of times. And we've reflected here, the cargo fleet and the (indiscernible) opportunities were that the company seized upon really to put the company on solid financial footing while there were significant uncertainties.

We've talk a lot in my updates to the Court and in other pleadings before the Court about the key goals that were both in terms of the restructuring goals as well as the business objectives to get the company where we are today in emergence. Obviously, there's significant overlap in those. I'll just touch upon them. All of them have (indiscernible) because, with the exception of confirmation we hope will come
today, we have achieved -- we've achieved what we set out to achieve. When I say "we," I really mean, obviously, the company through the work of the management team and the employees. Again, we achieved or we have -- we're very comfortable with respect to the targets going forward.

So labor, we've had extremely strong support. We've very proud of that. Avianca has significantly reduced the payroll expenses and has new agreements with its labor pool. In addition, obviously, we haven't spent a lot of time and used a lot of court time with respect to the fleet. A lot of that was as a result of the very hard work of the team at Seabury. We understood the circumstances where the airline and the industry found itself during these cases.

You'll recall that we reached power-by-the-hour agreements early on in the cases. Those really kept us in a -in a good footing with those relationships while we worked to negotiate long term transactions with a lot of the lessors. The airline has substantially reduced its overall fleet cost, has increased flexibility, which is of key importance, and also has introduced over 300 other cost-savings initiatives. And noted here, Your Honor, is that the key metric of cost per available seat kilometer has been reduced or will be reduced by 2023 we estimate by forty-one percent which is really remarkable.

Just a look here at some of the people that actually
worked at the airline and the business around us again and what we're working for.

One of the other goals, Your Honor, is obviously to restructure the secured debt, to establish collateral. I think that's known to the Court at this point both with respect to the tranche A DIP and the tranche $B$ which ultimately has now formed the basis for a conversion to the equity of the reorganized debtors. Having the access to that facility and Your Honor's understanding of the imperatives of that facility is really key for these debtors.

In addition the work we were doing here, and in some large measure aided by what Your Honor approved in this Court, the debtors were able to overhaul their business plan. There were deep strategic efforts of the work of a lot of advisors that were done and then redone and then reworked again because, obviously, the environment was dynamic, to say the least. And the debtors had to react and respond to that which they have done. There is now a focus on leisure travel which $I$ think is consistent with what the airline is expecting in the industry. Avianca has added more direct routes, reduced its (indiscernible), unbundled products, increased cabin capacity, and also we've noted a couple of the others here. It's still providing Wi-Fi service for select profitable routes. The airline is also going to maintain its profitable cargo and its loyalty business which is LifeMiles which is not a debtor in
these cases.
Your Honor may have also taken note of some changes that the airline has put in place with respect to the network and the (indiscernible) plan. There's an increase in the destinations, a dramatic increase in the routes, as well as an increase in the routes per city. There are a number of exciting new locations. I have thought about adding pictures of some sort of beach destinations on here. I thought you might be envious of that with the -- particularly with today's rain. So I'd pass that aside. But there's a lot of energy and enthusiasm around this business plan and what the debtors are expecting to put in place in the near term.

I think we've also talked about the DIP-to-exit which was key to helping us to get here today and to take advantage of favorable conditions of the market at the right time to reduce costs, overall expenses on the company in terms of the financing expenses to position us well for this exit today.

Your Honor has also become aware, including through the ECCA motion which we took out at the disclosure statement hearing, of the conversion of the 900 million-plus in tranche $B$ loans into equity. We also made the requests of the tranche $B$ lenders and the market to provide new equity. And that was met -- that request indeed was met by the tranche $B$ lenders. We'll talk about this in a moment, the different opposition in terms of which of the tranche $B$ lenders are providing that.

But reportedly, for purposes of today including feasibility and the like, we -- the full 200 million dollars in new money is coming in to the debtors in connection with the effectiveness of the plan.

Your Honor also became aware perhaps too much as the chairman of the USAVflow matter, but the resolution of that matter on terms that were advantageous, we believe, to all the parties that -- particularly from our vantage point the debtors will also be important going forward. And we didn't spend as much time in the courtroom fortunately on the Grupo Aval matters, but those were resolved, obviously, and subject to documentation at this point.

So as I noted, where we are today is, obviously, we're looking to secure confirmation of our plan. We've developed a plan that has received importantly the support of all key constituencies in the case, including the unsecured creditors' committee which has been a true partner, both to the advisors to the committee as well as the members throughout this process, challenging us to do better, a number of key junctures and inflection points. And I think -- I hope that they would agree that we met those challenges as well. And also, obviously, by the support of a number of other key constituencies, including the tranche A and the tranche B lenders.

We have achieved acceptance of the plan by all voting
classes. Obviously, we'll get into the voting standards and how we satisfied them and confirmation standards rather in a couple of minutes. I think we wanted to highlight for the Court as well the dramatic change that we have effected to the capital structure. And we expect to realize from this business coming out of bankruptcy by the comparison from 2019, the pre-petition period to post-petition -- sorry, post-effective date of 2021, later on -- later on this year both in terms of a dramatic reduction in the debtors' debt and then an increase significantly of the cash position of the debtors.

At this point, Your Honor, before I -- before we move to the plan, description of the plan and then into the case in chief, I do want to note -- sometimes people feel like this is a bit overdone. And I don't want to belabor the point. I said it a couple times, talked about consensus. But I do want to emphasize that in addition to the company which is noted here at the top -- and that includes the independent directors which really probably are the most independent of a group of directors in a situation that could have gone in a different way in other cases to the management team employees' efforts to get us here today, I noted as well the creditors' committee, the official committee and their original members listed here. There's been one resignation recently. But tremendous work by that group and partnership as I noted.

The DIP lenders as well, both the original DIP lenders
as well as the new DIP lenders, also embarked on this partnership with the debtors. In the case of the tranche $B$ lenders subordinating debt -- again, at a time -- I think for us to bring ourselves back to a point in time where it felt like there was so much risk, (indiscernible) thinking, that kind of stuff, and believing in the future of this airline. And those parties did that -- obviously, they view their economic interest. But it was certainly not a foregone conclusion that it would work out as well as the transaction did and seamlessly.

The airline doesn't operate in a vacuum. In addition to parties that were in this Chapter 11 case, other key stakeholders understood and took a pragmatic approach towards these debtors and noted a few of them here, customers, vendors. And I would be remiss if I didn't make special mention of United Airlines which -- and the other members of the Star Alliance, but United Airlines in particular as a tranche B lender as well as having entered into further revised agreements that have now been filed in the docket that we'll talk about in a moment for our continued partnership with United Airlines as well as certain key accommodations that United had made at the request of the debtors to allow us to emerge as quickly as possible.

We've had some favorable news even yesterday from DOJ in terms of approvals for the transactions. And we have a
couple of steps further. But United has responded to the request from the debtors to put us in a position to be able to emerge as soon as we are ready and to make certain
modifications to the transactions if that's required in order to get us to an exit as quickly as possible which is what we believe is in the interest of the debtors and the stakeholders.

Lastly, obviously, this is an airline and so our aircraft lessors and counterparties were key to getting us to this stage of the process. So thank-yous all around. We're not quite there yet. But I'd like now, Your Honor, with the Court's permission, unless you have any questions with me to move to an overview of the Chapter 11 plan. And as you can see here, we'll go over the confirmation standards and then talk about the objections. There are only a few. But we'll also give Your Honor an update with respect to the objections that have been adjourned or otherwise resolved.

THE COURT: That's fine. I think when we get to your side about structuring change, I'll have questions. But I will wait until then.

MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. SCHAK: Good morning again, Your Honor. Again, for the record, Benjamin Schak of Milbank for the debtors.

Your Honor, over the next few minutes, I'd like to take the opportunity to just talk over what the plan is proposing to do from a very high sort of cruising altitude
level here. And certainly, along the way, I'd love the opportunity to answer any questions Your Honor has, including once we get to the side about the structural modifications here.

Your Honor, the first slide here is probably the most important fact about what the plan is doing which is that it's getting rid of a massive amount of funded debt. The bar on the left-hand side here shows, Your Honor, roughly what the capital structure is as we stand here today. So there is a large amount of DIP loans plus a large amount of pre-petition debt which is classified as unsecured under the plan.

What the plan will do is three major, major
transformations, Your Honor. First, as Your Honor is aware from the DIP to exit structure that was approved roughly a month or two ago, the dip tranche A will convert into long-term exit notes. Those are seven-year exit notes which are a key factor into our belief that the plan is feasible and will put Avianca in a strong footing in the long term.

The second major point, Your Honor, is that the roughly 837 million dollars of tranche B DIP loans will be converted into roughly seventy-seven percent of the organized equity, complete equitization. And that, along with the new money coming in from the tranche B lenders in the amount of 200 million which will convert into twenty-one percent of the equity, is another major point and way in which the claim will
set Avianca on the right footing.
The third point here, Your Honor, is that the remaining unsecured funds, remaining 2023 funds, and the other unsecured claims which are largely projection damages pertain to rejected aircraft leases, those will convert also into equity, approximately two percent primary equity and approximately -- warrants for approximately five percent of reorganized equity.

The only footnote on that, Your Honor, is that some of those claimants have elected to receive a cash substitute based on the equivalence of the securities package being equivalent to thirty-six million dollars. And there's also, of course, the convenience class, Your Honor, so that relatively small nonnoteholder claims will receive simply one percent cash.

So turning to the next slide, Your Honor, Mr.
Satterfield will address the objections that pertain to Sub-con later. And I won't go into argument here. I just wanted to show Your Honor this rather simplified view of the organizational chart which demonstrates what exactly we're doing with substantive consolidation. I think here the three points, Your Honor, to note are that the two boxes on the right side of this chart, one of them is SAI which is the ground handling company I discussed earlier that has its own independent operations, independent capital structure. And it is treated as a separate entity on the plan -- under the plan.

It is not consolidated.
Likewise, AeroUnion, which is another independently managed independent capital structure entity, it provides cargo services and is a Mexican entity. That's another one that we believe is appropriately not consolidated.

Everything else on this chart, Your Honor, that you see is consolidated. And that basically covers the Avianca brand. So the Avianca passenger flights, for instance, are distributed among the Aerovias del Contintente entity which is kind of in the middle, Avianca Ecuador, Avianca Costa Rica, Taca, Aviateca, and Islena as well. Avianca Cargo sits at the cargo entity on that chart. And the Avianca loyalty program, LifeMiles, is kind of there on the upper left.

So those are the entities, Your Honor. Basically the Avianca brand are the entities that are being consolidated.

THE COURT: Will those entities continue to exist post-exit?

MR. SCHAK: Yes, Your Honor. All the entities on this chart except for the top-level holding company, which we'll get to in a couple slides, will continue to exist and will be arranged in the same way. The consolidation -- substantive consolidation is part of the global plan and settlement that we as fiduciary and unsecured creditors' committee has fiduciary and all the other parties thought it was appropriate that they consolidated.

THE COURT: Not all the parties. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. SCHAK: Correct, Your Honor, of course.
And I think -- we did file the complete org chart as part of the disclosure statement, but this is perhaps a more digestible chart to flip back to when we get to argument on the substantive consolidation.

For the major unsecured classes, Your Honor, there are a lot of them in the plan, but it basically boils down to this: The large unsecured creditors and all of the noteholders fit into class 11 which is the general unsecured Avianca claims. That's the class that has the election between the securities package that can be warrants or the thirty-six million. And there was in the plan a provision for distribution if it's contingent on acceptance by that class. We're obviously very happy that all of the voting classes voted to accept. So the distribution of that class, Your Honor, will include that incremental distribution which is figured into those 2.5 and five percent and thirty-six-million-dollar figures there.

Convenience class, smaller, nonnoteholders, one
percent in cash. And then the three entities that are not substantively consolidated, SAI, AeroUnion -- and Avifreight is essentially an intermediate holding company for AeroUnion. I'm not aware of actually any creditors who sit there. But those
are entities where no creditors nor the equity holders for that matter are (indiscernible).

For secured classes, this has not been a major part of what we've discussed with Your Honor before, but I did want to cover it just for the sake of completeness. The engine loan claims, which is a facility from Kassib (ph.), on that one the amount is going to be the same. But we've agreed to extend the maturity to 2028 and reduce the amortization schedule.

Similarly, the Citi Bank-led secured RCF -- the maturity is an extension to December of 2022. That's a facility that's secured by spare parts and various other pieces of collateral.

The USAV and Grupo Aval claims, those are the --
largely the credit card securitization facilities that Your Honor I think is somewhat familiar with. And those will be treated consistent with the respective settlement agreements.

And finally, there's a class for a cargo receivable facility that sits at AeroUnion. And that will be unimpaired just like all other creditors at AeroUnion.

And then we get to the structural changes. On the left-hand side is the current structure where there is a holding company, Avianca Holdings S.A., about which is a Panamanian company. That's the Panamanian flag there which is held by existing equity holders of course. And then it has, as the previous chart showed, set of direct subsidiaries and indirect subsidiaries sitting below it.

The post-emergence structure will really not involve Avianca Holdings S.A. In place of Avianca Holdings S.A. will be a new entity sometimes referred to as reorganized $A V H$, sometimes referred to as -- I think its official title is going to be Avianca Group International Ltd. which is going to be organized in the UK. That's a brand new entity. It's not on any existing org chart. But it's the entity that's going to be the top-level holding company for Avianca Business going forward.

So that's the entity that will actually issue securities to the tranche $B$ lenders and to the general unsecured creditors who have elected into the equity. And then through a series of rather complicated steps that are advantageous from a tax perspective I'm told, the direct subsidiaries and the indirect subsidiaries will migrate over to the new top-level holding company. The result on the middle part of this chart here will be that Avianca Holdings S.A. will still exist as a legal entity in Panama, but it will not have any value in it. And so the tranche $B$ lenders and the general unsecured creditors who are receiving value from this plan will not really have anything to do with Avianca Holdings S.A. It'll simply be left behind in Panama.

I'm happy to pause there to address any questions,
Your Honor.

THE COURT: So at the disclosure statement hearing, I
raised questions and we had discussion about the timing of the plan's supplement. And because I was told, well, it's complicated, we need more time, I required some additional things to go on the disclosure statement but basically exceeded to the request to give more time before the plan supplement was filed.

So the disclosure statement itself, which is at ECF 2138, on page 57 and 58, has a session 3, restructuring transactions that barely touched on what was really contemplated. And when the plan supplement -- there were two notices of filing a plan supplement, two different pieces to it. But they -- ECF 2185, Exhibit A, notice to plan supplement, description of restructuring transactions and transaction steps, it essentially goes on for ten pages with some block diagrams. And I have to say, it really seemed material to me that post-emergence the top-level company is going to be this new UK organized Avianca Group International Ltd.

In reviewing the steps that are contemplated to get to that point, it goes on for pages with -- till you get to step 21.2. There was no explanation in the disclosure statement about how this new structure came about, what was contemplated and what were the reasons for the new top-level company being the UK entity. No discussion about -- and one of the things that I did require in addition to the disclosure statement was
on the required administrative approvals that were required. And I have no clue whether getting the requisite approvals in Colombia and other countries are going to be complicated by the fact that the new structure that's contemplated has a UK entity at the top.

And let me ask a rather specific question first. The first filed case here was Avianca Inc., 20-11132, the New York Corporation, place of business in Miami. Is it going to continue to exist?

MR. SCHAK: It will continue.
THE COURT: Where is that going to be at on an organization chart?

MR. SCHAK: It will continue to exist exactly where it is in the current organizational chart, except of it's under Avianca Holdings S.A. now, it will instead be under Avianca Group International Itd.

THE COURT: So what $I$ tried to -- and I can't say that I fully comprehend all of the steps created post-exit. I wondered whether the structure was the result of negotiations between the debtor and probably the tranche $A$ and tranche $B$ lenders about -- well, what happens if there has to be a restructuring case number 3 and that what really was contemplated here was a UK top-level company because there were discussions and negotiations about possibility of a scheme of arrangements or part 26A plan, restructure in the UK?

So my very specific question is, did the negotiations about the new proposed structuring include discussions about further restructuring through a UK either scheme of arrangement or part 26A? Because the structure also included release of guarantees which is possible in the UK but maybe not elsewhere. So $I$ want to know whether there were discussions in negotiations. Tell me how this new structure came about.

MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, I'm happy to speak to that. This was, in fact, Your Honor, very much a debtor-led process to identify the appropriate new jurisdiction or the -- for the top-level Avianca business. We certainly did that in consultation with the tranche $B$ lenders as the plan sponsor and with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors. And we did look like -- we did look at a number of jurisdictions, Your Honor.

To address your question head-on, further restructuring was not what was driving this at all, Your Honor. We think that this is the restructuring plan that is going to put Avianca on a path for success for restructuring in the future.

What was really driving this, Your Honor, was to get the company over to a jurisdiction that, 1 , we're very confident will respect this Court's orders and give respect to this restructuring plan that we're doing right now; and 2, a jurisdiction that the people analyzing tax issues thought works
from a tax perspective or the business as a whole. Those are the main two driving issues, Your Honor, and really not driven by future restructuring considerations.

THE COURT: And are there plans to seek recognition -assuming that the plan is confirmed here, what, if any, steps do the debtors intend to seek recognition and enforcement of a confirmed Chapter 11 plan?

MR. SCHAK: That would take place, if it takes place, in the United Kingdom, Your Honor. They do have a recognition redeem, as Your Honor well knows, similar to Chapter 15. I don't believe we've made the call yet whether we need to seek that. It depends in some part, you know, what we're facing coming out of the restructuring. But if there is a recognition proceeding that needs to be done, we feel as confident in the UK as we are anywhere that we can gain that recognition and give effect to this Court's orders in the United Kingdom.

THE COURT: Do the debtors need to seek recognition and enforcement in Colombia?

MR. SCHAK: No. From earlier -- very early in this case, Your Honor, we made the decision not to file a recognition proceeding in Colombia. The debtors, of course, stay close to their regulators, both corporate regulators, aviation regulators of all stripes, including in Colombia, and continue to think that that's the case. And by the way, the regulators have been supportive of this restructuring. And as
you expect, the Colombia -- the Colombian government wants their nation's largest airlines to continue to be healthy and to succeed into the future.

THE COURT: Should the disclosure statement have included a discussion of the intention to establish the top-level company in the UK and the reasons for that?

MR. SCHAK: I think, Your Honor, the disclosure statement -- we did try to put in --

THE COURT: Well, that -- I pointed -- the only thing I found in the disclosure statement is page 57 and 58 where -I think Mr. Fleck wants to show you something else.

MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, that's right. But page 57 notes that the debtors might seek to reincorporate or reorganize certain of the debtors under the laws of jurisdictions other than the laws under which such debtors are currently incorporated.

And then, you know, at the -- at the plan supplement stage, we did file -- and I acknowledge, Your Honor, it's perhaps a long and difficult document. But at the end of it --

THE COURT: The 2,215 pages with a short piece showing the block diagrams and explaining the new top-level company in the UK, I didn't read every page of the 2,215. But I did scan it and did find what I'm asking about. It's buried in there.

MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, I think we did disclose it. I think we also worked very constructively with our partners in
this case and the committee and the tranche $B$ lenders and the tranche A lenders for that matter to explain the reasons that we thought the UK was an appropriate place to go.

But the other comment that I'd make, Your Honor, is that the disclosure statement did set forth alternatives to what would happen if this restructuring did not go forward.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that. But I'm troubled that it didn't -- it, obviously, was something that didn't spring upon you or the Court when the disclosure statement was filed. A lot of work had to go into that proposed structure, none of which was revealed in the disclosure statement even in a summary fashion. So I'm not happy about that.

MR. FLECK: If I may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He's doing just fine, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: For the record, Evan Fleck for the
debtors. When the judge isn't happy, then I'll -- that's my normal (indiscernible).

Let me just -- we appreciate your concerns, Your
Honor. I'll just -- this may be obvious, but I think it's important, given the audience, the participants in the hearing.

There was nothing held back in terms of the disclosure. At the time that the disclosure statement --

THE COURT: Never told me about it.
MR. FLECK: At the time the disclosure statement was filed, no determinations had been made. And it was our view
that -- at the time to put out a bunch of different options in terms of potential jurisdictions --

THE COURT: Whoever is speaking not in the courtroom needs to mute their line.

Go ahead, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: To have done that at that point in time would in fact have not advanced the disclosure and helped creditors to make a decision. I think above all, from our perspective, and I think I feel confident that the perspective is also shared by the other key parties in the case that are here and can speak to this should it be helpful to the Court, that the steps that are being taken in terms of the corporation reorganization are in furtherance of creditor interest. They are not -- although I understand your concern, obviously from the Court, an effort to plan for or be strategic with respect to any restructuring that could come in the future. That is not the case.

THE COURT: Well, it's no secret that the scheme of arrangement or part 26A doesn't apply the absolute priority rule and allows equity to retain its interest even over the negative vote of a class of unsecured creditors for example which is problematic here.

So there are important things about choosing the UK as the jurisdiction for the top-level company in the event of a future restructuring, none of which is laid out. I mean, I
just -- as I started reviewing -- trying to understand the structure going back to a disclosure statement, seeing not informative language that was included there, it raised questions in my mind, Mr. Fleck.

MR. FLECK: No, we understand, Your Honor, and appreciate that. If we could go back and have had more information at the time, we would have provided that. Your Honor hopefully has come to know that these debtors and the professionals, including our firm, has gone above and beyond to provide as much disclosure as possible. And the information we had put in the disclosure statement at that time was the best available information we had. We think the structure that's been --

THE COURT: Are you telling me at the time of the disclosure statement the planning for the new corporate structure with a UK entity at the top had not progressed to the point where you had that structure in mind?

MR. FLECK: It had not progressed to the point where we had a structure that we could put in the disclosure statement. There were discussions which were not -- as Mr. Schak said were not motivated by any of the concerns that Your Honor raised. They were motivated principally by the -- by what Mr. Schak identified, including tax reasons and a beneficial structure and enforceable one (indiscernible), a beneficial structure in a go-forward business.

THE COURT: And we have witnesses --

MR. FLECK: Your Honor, we could provide evidence. It should be helpful to the Court.

THE COURT: I think let's move on.

MR. FLECK: Thank you.
MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, I believe my -- Andrew Schak again for the record.

Your Honor, my last slide here is on the most recent modifications to the plan which principally have to do with the United Airlines agreements that Your Honor is seeing in this case.

Very early, Your Honor, in this case United and Avianca entered into an omnibus amendment to their commercial arrangements. By that, I mean things like coach sharing, frequent flyer mile sharing, those sorts of arrangements.

Just yesterday, Your Honor, Avianca and United got to an agreement on -- and a second omnibus amendment to those commercial arrangements which is intended to strengthen the alliance and give the two airlines an opportunity to build that alliance over the next -- over the next four years.

Your Honor, the term -- the key terms here -- this isn't filing, but it's more to address three bullet points perhaps. Avianca and United will extend their alliance to September 2025. There was previously a ten-year extension that have been agreed. And United has agreed to waive that ten-year
extension while Avianca will pay United thirty-five-milliondollar amount which was basically the same amount that was specified in the first omnibus amendment in case Avianca decided to back out of the ten-year extension.

And finally, Avianca, United, and Copa which is another airline with the alliance based in Panama will engage in discussions regarding further amendments to their own joint business agreement over the next two-year period.

Your Honor, this is an agreement that has been filed in the plan supplement yesterday morning, almost as soon as the ink was dry on the signature for the agreement. And we hope it's something that will strengthen the alliance over the coming several years.

The component here, Your Honor, that goes along with that is amendment to the equity contribution and commitment agreement that Your Honor approved about a month ago. On this, Your Honor, United has decided to assign its roughly forty-three-million-dollar new money commitment to the other tranche $B$ lenders to serve them at the other tranche $B$ lenders, I should say. And that, Your Honor, has the effect actually of getting that 42.6 million dollars to the debtors sooner than it otherwise would have.

As Your Honor might recall, United's contribution was going to be structured as putting airplanes into a trust and then selling those airplanes over the course of about a year.

That's no longer going to be the case. The debtors are simply going to get that forty-three million dollars upon merchants.

United will still convert the tranche B DIP loans into equity, roughly sixteen percent. And to make sure that the debtors are able to emerge as promptly as possible following confirmation, if antitrust approvals have not been obtained by November 11th, United will instead receive some form of alternative consideration such as equity warrants for convertible instrument.

Well, I'll pause there in case Your Honor has any questions.

THE COURT: I don't.

MR. SCHAK: And then the one -- the last point I'd like to address, Your Honor, simply because some of the stakeholders -- oh. United's counsel would like to have a word. Pardon me.

MR. BURKE: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Burke, Sidley Austin, for United Airlines. And I'm sorry to interrupt for just a second.

But obviously, this was just a slide for presentation purposes with very limited bullets and what have you. The agreements have been filed, obviously, as planned supplements. And essentially, I'm coming up here saying the agreements control, obviously not the minimal bullets that were presented.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BURKE: Thank you.
MR. FLECK: Your Honor, I was very proud of my bullets. And I'm disappointed to hear that Mr. Burke doesn't think that -- I have to say, I've never seen an order that said the bullets before.

MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, the one last comment I'll make just in response to some discussions we had with stakeholders, particularly aircraft lessors, stakeholders, has to do with internal distributions out of the plan. Your Honor, the plan does provide for interim distributions. And there probably will be one or more of those during the case for emergence.

I want to say, Your Honor, that the debtors are going to manage that process conservatively so that recipients of early distributions do not receive greater distributions than recipients of later distributions. It is possible that not all proofs of claim will have been filed until some point next calendar year because the debtors will have a window after emergence to make a decision to assume or reject certain aircraft.

We do understand, Your Honor, there are some yet-to-be-filed claims out there at the moment in interim distribution. We will have to take those potential claims into account in calculating the appropriate distributions. So I can say that, Your Honor, if the debtors do decide to make interim distribution before all of the unsecured claims have been
filed, then we will engage in good faith with potential claimants to ensure that any material potential rejection claims are appropriately factored into that calculation. That's all I have to say on that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schak.
MR. SCHAK: And I'll now turn it over to Mr.
Satterfield.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SATTERFIELD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Kyle Satterfield of Milbank LLP on behalf of the debtors. A little bit more choreography.

But as my colleagues have expressed, it is a big privilege to be here in person today. I thought this day would never come. So thank you to you and your staff.

As previewed by Mr. Fleck, holdings of claims entitled to vote on the plan overwhelmingly voted to accept the plan as displayed in the chart here until ninety-nine percent in amounts of all claims to cast votes in the plan, whether to accept the plan. In terms of what that translates into in terms of dollar amount, holders of 3.645 billion dollars of claims voted to accept the plan. We're very proud of that fact. That includes acceptances of the plan by (indiscernible) classes entitled to vote on the plan. As you can see on the chart, 100 percent in both amount and number of claims in classes 3, 4, and 7 voted to accept the plan.

With respect to class 11 , that's general unsecured Avianca claims, clearly 98.7 percent in amount. And that's over 3.4 billion dollars of general unsecured claims. And over ninety-two percent in number voted to accept the plan.

Similarly, class 15 at the bottom of the chart, which is the convenience class, accepted the plan similarly in substantial numbers. Thus, Your Honor, each and every impaired class entitled to vote on the plan with respect to the Avianca debtors voted to accept the plan. And with respect to the other debtors, the unconsolidated debtors that were discussed before, all classes and claims in interest are unimpaired other than (indiscernible). And therefore, those plans -- the plan expected those debtors (indiscernible).

Moving now to other confirmation standards, Your Honor, the plan is also feasible pursuant to Section 1129(a) (11) of the Bankruptcy Code. As set forth in Mr. Neuhauser's declaration and as demonstrated by the financial projections and as Exhibit $D$ to the disclosure statement, the debtors expect to begin generating positive EBITDA next fiscal year. And EBITDA is projected to materially increase on a year-for-year basis thereafter. Then proof financial performance is projected to resolve the net income of thirty-two million dollars in fiscal year 2023 which is projected to scale to 447 million dollars by the end of the projection period which is fiscal year 2028.

And pursuant to the financial projections, unrestricted cash is at least 800 million dollars at all times during the projection period. Thus, the debtors will have the ability to make all payments and distributions required under the plan. And the plan is otherwise feasible pursuant to the standards set forth in Section 1129 (a) (11) of the Bankruptcy Code.

Your Honor, the debtors also submit that the plan satisfies all of the other applicable requirements of the Bankruptcy Code set forth in Section 1129, as set forth in our confirmation brief which was filed at docket number 2261.

Additionally, Your Honor, the debtors made certain modifications to the plan following the commencement of solicitation. We filed a cumulative redline of those changes. That was filed at docket number 2260 for the record. And that redline begins on page 137 of that document. Your Honor would characterize those modifications largely as clarifying changes and technical changes. And none of the changes adversely change the treatment of any holder of claims or interests pursuant to bankruptcy rule 3019.

Further, Your Honor, the debtors filed a proposed confirmation order, the initial version of which was attached to our confirmation brief as Exhibit E. And again, that was at docket number 2261. Last night the debtors filed a revised version of the confirmation order with very minor revisions,
significant but minor. That was filed at docket number 2272, along with a redline for (indiscernible).

Your Honor, turning now to the objections that were filed, of the nearly 80,000 parties that received notice of the plan and confirmation order, the confirmation hearing in this case, only eight parties filed timely objections to confirmation of the plan as well as a handful of parties that filed contract-related objections. And they're summarized on this chart, Your Honor. Five of those eight objections were filed by what we refer to as the Burlingame parties. As the Court knows, Mr. Lakin (ph.) filed pro se objection on behalf of Burlingame. The Court struck that objection. And then it was subsequently filed in substantively identical form by five different parties, again, by Burlingame who has retained counsel.

There's also an objection from --
THE COURT: You would agree that parties that file those objections hold 2023 notes?

MR. SATTERFIELD: So, Your Honor, counsel has represented to us that counsel represents each of those parties. So because the substance of those objections are essentially the same and Burlingame has refiled --

THE COURT: Did you agree that any of those parties actually own 2023 notes?

MR. SATTERFIELD: One second, Your Honor. We do, Your

Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. SATTERFIELD: The next group of parties is the Baruch parties. They are also holders of 2023 notes that filed a separate objection. And just quickly, it -- I'll address the substance of those objections next.

El Salvador filed an objection on the dockets in the short objection. I think our response is set forth in our objection chart that was annexed to the confirmation brief. The substantive of that objection is that El Salvador asserts that it has a tax claim. Our response is that the plan provides for the appropriate treatment of tax plans under the Bankruptcy Code, despite the fact that $I$ believe we may just do that claim, that that could be taken up at a later date.

With respect -- taking these a little bit out of order, the Texas Comptroller, Your Honor, we're pleased to --

THE COURT: I take it you would agree that El Salvador's tax claim, if there is one, would not be prejudice by confirmation of the plan?

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct, Your Honor. The plan provides for the appropriate treatment of taxes and to the extent that they have them.

We're happy -- we're pleased to report that the Texas Comptroller's objection we resolved with inclusion of a language in the confirmation order, the proposed confirmation
order. There were also a number of, as I said, contract counterparties who filed objections who had contracts. Those objections have either been resolved or will be adjourned to a further hearing before the Court. And I think one important note, it's not an objection, the U.S. Trustee filed a statement in this case. It essentially reiterated its position with respect to the third-party releases that were covered at the disclosure statement hearing, but that is not in sustenance an objection to confirmation.

THE COURT: Do you agree that the U.S. Trustee preserves its right to challenge the opt-in versus opt-out in the ballot even if the plan is confirmed at this point?

MR. SATTERFIELD: We believe that that issue has been settled by the Court. And we submit that --

THE COURT: Well, I wrote an opinion and I ruled on it. But if I confirm that -- they filed the statement. I read it. I read it as an objection to confirmation without reiterating an entire arguments that this Court previously ruled on. Do you agree that if I confirm the plan, the U.S. Trustee's right to appeal on that issue is preserved?

MR. SATTERFIELD: I don't think we understood the statement that the U.S. Trustee submitted as an objection to the opt-out issue. I would assume they have appeal rights with respect to your opinion. But with respect to the disclosure statement, that piece of it --

THE COURT: I don't plan on writing another opinion about whether opt-in or opt-out. I addressed it at the disclosure statement hearing.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SATTERFIELD: And I believe the U.S. Trustee explicitly reserved its rights with respect to the extent that we try to oppose nonconsensual releases which we are not doing.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. SATTERFIELD: Also, one further objection that one of my colleagues informed me was filed this morning prior to the start of the hearing. Rolls-Royce has filed a cure objection similarly to the other objections that were -- the contract-related objections that were filed. That will be adjourned in a similar manner and go handle that at a later date as to that.

THE COURT: The Rolls-Royce objection is filed as ECF docket 2279. It was filed this morning. I have the docket open in front of me.

MR. SATTERFIELD: Thank you, Your Honor.
Your Honor, now turning to the substance of the noteholder objections and for purposes of this discussion I'll speak of that as a group, I think there's an assortment of arguments that have -- that have been placed, that have been asserted by the parties in the objections. I think for
purposes of this discussion, I think they get placed in three categories. First, there would be inapplicable arguments related to Section 1129 (b). Quite simply, Your Honor, all of the arguments relating to the fair and equitable and unfair discrimination test in Section 1129 (b) are inapplicable because those tests only apply to impaired classes that have not accepted the plan.

As I stated previously, and as demonstrated in our chart and in the voting certification, class 11 in which the 2023 notes claims are classified overwhelmingly voted to accept the plan. And further -- and also as set forth in the voting certification, even if those 2023 notes claims were separately classified in a class of their own, that class of 2023 notes claims would have voted to accept the plan. Nearly eightyeight percent in number of 2023 notes claims. Those who accepted the plan in 77.5 percent in amount. Thus, the debtors submit that the $1129(b)$ arguments relating to the fair and equitable standard and unfair discrimination standard are inapplicable in these cases.

The second category of objections challenges the classification and, in effect, the unsecured nature of the 2023 notes claims. Your Honor, 2023 notes claims are unsecured and, thus, properly classified in class 11. And the analysis here is quite simple. The 2023 notes were secured by a lien on what we're now referring to as the shared collateral.

THE COURT: It was shared as part of the approval of the DIP loan.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's right.
THE COURT: It was not shared pre-petition.
MR. SATTERFIELD: That's right. So the DIP loan refers to it as the shared collateral. That's what you're referring to it as.

Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the final DIP order, that lien of the 2023 noteholders was primed by the DIP facility which, thus, as a senior lien on the shared collateral. And pursuant to paragraph 28 of the final DIP order, DIP facility claims must be satisfied first by recourse to the shared collateral. Thus, if DIP facility claims exceed value of the shared collateral, the 2023 notes claims are, by definition, unsecured.

As demonstrated by the debtors' competitive marketing process and as set forth in Mr. Neuhauser's declaration, the value of the shared collateral is less than the amount of the DIP facility claims. The value of the shared collateral is not adequate to satisfy the DIP facility claims in full.

Just a few notes on that marketing process.
(Indiscernible) contacted over 125 potentially interested parties, many of whom were already familiar with the debtors' business and thirty-five of whom accessed the virtual data room after initial contact. The marketing process was overseen by
the independent equity committee at the board. And the debtors' management team, including Mr. Neuhauser, participated in focused, diligent sessions with interested parties.

THE COURT: Let me ask you some questions.
MR. SATTERFIELD: Certainly.
THE COURT: So I'll call it the Burlingame objectors, but I'm including all of those that have made the similar arguments. I take it none of them are so-called consenting noteholders who executed the RSA; is that correct?

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Who is the indenture trustee for the 2023 notes?

MR. SATTERFIELD: It's WSFS, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And is there a separate collateral agent?
MR. SATTERFIELD: I don't believe so, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Did the indenture include a requisite
lender's direction? In other words, frequently the indenture sets a percentage of noteholders who can give a direction to the indenture trustee or the collateral trustee type certain action. I don't -- we looked for the indenture. We can't find the -- it doesn't -- if it was filed as an exhibit, we can't find it. And so I was looking to -- I wanted to know whether there was a requisite lenders provision in the indenture because the RSA included a direction to the collateral agent I think with respect to the approval of the DIP. Can you tell
me, am I right or wrong?
MR. SATTERFIELD: That's right, Your Honor. And that direction was with the requisite creditors.

THE COURT: Do you know what the percentage for the requisite lenders was?

MR. SATTERFIELD: It's 50.1 percent, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And the consenting noteholders, did that encompass more than 50.1 percent of the 2023 noteholder?

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct.
THE COURT: And so the RSA included a provision with the support of the requisite lenders directing the collateral agent of the 2023 notes to approve the priming?

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SATTERFIELD: So that the shared collateral could be used --

THE COURT: Because there was no objection to the priming that was filed.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct.
THE COURT: And were there any provisions for adequate protection for the 2023 noteholders in connection with -- that are in agreement to the priming?

MR. SATTERFIELD: There were, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And what was the adequate protection that was provided?

MR. SATTERFIELD: I believe that various payments were made to WSFS, the indenture trustee, with that pool of adequate protection payments. Fees and expenses were satisfied and that -- and as the plan provides, there's still cash left over after -- I believe there is right now, to the extent there still is cash that's left over after fees and expenses are satisfied that cash would be distributed pro rata to holders of the 2023 notes.

THE COURT: From -- there were no -- correct me if I'm wrong. I don't remember any objections to the final DIP order that permitted the priming of the security interest of the 2023 noteholders with respect to a shared collateral.

MR. SATTERFIELD: I believe that's right, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. All right. Go ahead.
MR. SATTERFIELD: So, Your Honor, you were speaking about the marketing process as being evidence of the value of his shared collateral. The market evidence which this Court and others have found to be the best indicator of value indicates that the equity valuation of the debtors, which invariably must include valuation of the shared collateral itself, does not exceed the amount of DIP facility claims. And therefore, the 2023 notes are unsecured.

THE COURT: Well, they filed the objections, one of which included this issue about -- they assert that the debtor failed to establish that the 2023 noteholders had no value in
the shared collateral. Who has the burden of proof?
MR. SATterfield: We do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You don't. You really think you do?
MR. SATTERFIELD: If you're telling me --
THE COURT: Did you look at the case law, Mr. -- did you look at -- did anybody look at the case law in this circuit? Not in this circuit. But look at Heritage Highgate, 679 F.3d at 132, 140 (3d Cir. 2012), holding that, "The ultimate burden of persuasion is upon the creditor to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence both the extent of its lien and the value of the collateral securing its claim."

I so held in case In re Scneijder, 407 B.R. 46, page 55 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2009).

The Third Circuit in Heritage Highgate quoted from case In re Robertson, 135 B.R. 350 at 352 (Bankr. E.D. Ark. 1992). And there are other cases as well. I believe the case law places the burden on the creditor, not the debtor, to show the value of the collateral. And the objections included no evidence to show that there was value.

You put in evidence that you believe support the market test you believe supports the view that the collateral -- that the 2023 noteholders' subordinated interest in the shared collateral has no value because it wasn't enough to cover the DIP.

MR. SATTERFIELD: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: If you know of a case to the contrary in this circuit, please tell me. But --

MR. SATTERFIELD: I will take your word for it, Your Honor. I appreciate it.

Your Honor, on a practical level, despite the noise raised by these objections, these valuation-related objections (indiscernible) to the fallout of an investment decision. Holders of 2023 notes claims were put on notice that the liens on the -- what we now refer to as the shared collateral will be primed by the DIP. They were also given the option to roll up a portion of their notes into the DIP facility, including the option to do so while contributing no new money. It was a free option.

Noteholders that chose not to elect that option made an investment decision, a bet that unsecured recoveries would be better than the economics of exercising that free option to roll up their notes into the DIP, a wrong -- they made a bad bet. And now the objecting noteholders are launching what amounts to a belated collateral attack on the final DIP order that, as you know, was not objected to at the time.

THE COURT: Are you going to deal with the other objections they asserted?

MR. SATTERFIELD: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Are you going to deal with the other
objections they asserted? They also claim that it was a breach of the RSA. Were they parties to the RSA?

MR. SATTERFIELD: They were not, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do they have standing to object to a contract they weren't a party to?

MR. SATTERFIELD: They do not. Similarly with the
DIP --
THE COURT: They claim there was a breach of fiduciary duty. Is there any fiduciary duty owed by the debtors to creditors?

MR. SATTERFIELD: There is not. Similarly, with the DIP, they assert that we violated the DIP credit agreement, that, as we just stated, they didn't roll up into the DIP credit agreement. So they're not parties to the DIP credit agreement and don't have standing to raise those issues.

THE COURT: What's the governing law of the 2023 notes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: New York.

MR. SATTERFIELD: New York law.
Your Honor, finally, the third category of objections are those relating to substantive consolidation of the Avianca debtors.

Your Honor, the objecting noteholders take alternating positions on Sub-con. At certain points the objecting noteholders argue that $S u b-c o n$ is inappropriate. At other
times they want more of it.
The debtors have made their case for the Sub-con, the Avianca debtors, in our papers, Your Honor. And the evidence supporting those are contained in Ms. Hughes' declaration.

As Mr. Schak touched on earlier, the operations of the Avianca debtors are complex since (indiscernible). They hold themselves out as collectively Avianca, under the Avianca brand. Creditors generally view them as Avianca, the Avianca brand, on a consolidated basis. And there are numerous cross-entity guarantees.

The Avianca debtors also share headquarters as well as directors and officers. Avianca Holdings, which is the TopCo, capitalizers the other Avianca debtors as necessary through intercompany loans. And the employees at the Avianca debtors perform work for all of the debtors, regardless of the entity status.

Second and importantly, Your Honor, sub-con of the Avianca Debtors is supported by the creditors' committee. And sub-con is -- of the Avianca Debtors is an important part of the global plan settlement. Without the global plan settlement, including the Sub-con the Avianca debtors, the supporting tranche B DIP lenders may be unwilling to exercise their DIP claims or contribute additional capital as currently contemplated by the plan. Given that all recoveries in this Case for unsecured creditors are carve-outs of the tranche $B$

DIP lenders' collateral, this would have a detrimental impact on the unsecured recoveries. Therefore, we believe that sub-con the Avianca debtors is, in fact, in the best interest of general unsecured creditors.

Lastly, Your Honor, sub-con of the other debtors, the unconsolidated debtors is not appropriate, despite the noteholder objectors' alternate pleas for more of the sub-con. All three of the entities have separate operations. They are not marketed under the Avianca umbrella. And creditors generally don't understand them in the marketplace as being part of them. They also have separate accounting and treasury systems that the Avianca debtors can't get access.

Your Honor, subject to any further questions of the Court, this sub-con arguments, as well as all of the arguments raised by the objecting noteholders, we believe they're red herrings. The plans received tremendous support from the debtors -- across the debtors' capital structuring. And we're proud of that support. We believe that the plan is a singular achievement for the debtors. It's in the best interest of all stakeholders and satisfies the confirmation requirements of the Bankruptcy Code. We submit that it should be (indiscernible). Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else of the debtor before we get into evidence? Is there anything else that the debtors want to raise, Mr. Fleck, Mr. Satterfield?

MR. FLECK: No, Your Honor. Obviously, there may be -- there may be arguments to make in closing or of similar, but not at this point. Nothing further.

THE COURT: Sure. All right. Does the committee want to be heard? What I'm going to is I'll hear from any of the proponents of confirmation now. Then what we'll do is take a recess. We'll talk about how long and try to keep it relatively short. And what I would like for those objectors -I want to find out who they wish to cross-examine. And they are entitled to cross-examine the declarants with evidence that's been put in. And I would like you to try and agree on the order in which that will occur. All right?

And before they begin very -- typically, the direct has come in evidence already. And so witnesses will be tendered for cross-examination. I'll permit the objectors to make an opening statement before they then proceed with the cross-examination. Obviously, they can do a redirect as well. But I'll hear now from any other proponents of confirmation. Then we'll take the recess. And I do want you to try and just work out in order how many witnesses you want to examine, what order you're going to do it in.

And we'll take -- I'm not going out in the rain. So there are places close by that you can go if you want to get a sandwich or something. But I'd like to keep it really short.

THE COURT: Mr. Miller, do you want to --

MR. FLECK: May I just -- administrative matter, Your Honor. Sorry. With the one party counsel spoke earlier, obviously they're here in the courtroom, $I$ guess we'll coordinate by phone with Mr. --

THE COURT: You can leave the connection open so you can -- there are people --

MR. FLECK: Okay.
THE COURT: -- a lot of people on Zoom.
MR. FLECK: Okay. Well, we can do that or I think we have his phone number from that --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FLECK: -- Mr. Shenfield's phone number on the pleadings. And maybe we'll reach out to him at the --

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. FLECK: Thank you.
THE COURT: Mr. Miller?
MR. FLECK: Sorry.
MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Brett Miller, Willkie Farr \& Gallagher, on behalf of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors in this case.

Your Honor, at docket number 2265 we filed the joinder and stated in support of confirmation.

Further, we echo the comments made by Mr. Fleck regarding Your Honor, your staff, the Court, the building, getting --

THE COURT: Everything worked perfectly last week. MR. MILLER: You know, it's Murphy's Law. It always does.

But briefly, this was a case where the committee was very involved. And it doesn't necessarily show up in the docket in terms of pleadings filed. Most things in this case were done in the background, behind the scenes. When you consider that the debtors completely overhauled their business plan, their fleet plan, their network, labor deals, those were done consensually. The committee was included in those discussions, weekly calls, sometimes daily calls to resolves these things. I think the most litigious part of the case was USAVflow adversary which thankfully came to a favorable conclusion. And we spared, Your Honor, airing any other dirty laundry during the case.

We did have some knockdown, drag-out fights with the tranche B lenders and the debtors in terms of the plan. But the committee does support the plan. The committee was actively involved in this structure of the plan. The U.S. Trustee has mentioned the deathtrap provision as being possibly -- I forget the exact word in the pleading, but let's call it obnoxious.

But to the extent that we, the committee, restructured it to -- what we'd like to call love-trap in terms of it incentivized creditors to vote in favor, it worked. More than
ninety percent of the creditors voted in favor. Maybe eight percent I think was (indiscernible).

So we are where we are. We think the objections as just walked through by the debtor should be overruled. The one that is most $I$ guess relevant to the creditors' committee is the sub-con objection. Besides the Augie/Restivo decision, there's also the Republic Airlines decision. Mr. Goran and I were counsel to that creditors' committee before Judge Lane. We went through it in that case. I think that's very informative. And I think the purposes of this case, the same law applies and the same fact and facts are very similar. And I don't think that leads to any different results. So I'm not exactly sure where the bondholders are going with that objection.

So on that point, we would say that the Court certainly should find in favor of the debtors and overrule that objection because the plans satisfies all the requirements of 1129 and does not violate any law with regard to the way that it -- the entities were subsequently resolved. That's it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Anybody else who is a proponent of the plan wish to be heard? All right.

So at least one objector's counsel is in court. Any other counsel in the courtroom representing an objector? I
know there are people who were I believe on Zoom. I just want to get a sense as to how many people are going to be cross-examining.

Is there anybody on Zoom that is going to wish to cross-examine any of the declarants? All right. We'll take a break.

Mr. Fleck, see if you can figure out how many people want to do the cross-examination and each witness, the order, okay?

MR. FLECK: Yes.
THE COURT: And let's take a break until 1:30.
(Recess from 12:46 p.m., until 1:33 p.m.)
THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. People are filing back in.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. FLECK: So we took the opportunity at the break to confer with the two objecting parties. We understand that both parties wish to make an opening statement. And if they would like to -- one of the parties, the Baruch parties wish to cross-examine Mr. Neuhauser, and both parties wish to have a cross-examination of Ms. Hughes, so we'll proceed with that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FLECK: I wanted to note, Your Honor, one other item -- well, two other items.

One is a party in the case whose objection has been resolved has asked me to make a representation on the record which we propose to do after just to make sure the record is clean for them and the matters are being adjourned to a subsequent hearing.

And I did want to, if I may, Your Honor, during the break we took the opportunity to review the final DIP order just so that we can have a little more clarity for purposes of the record as to what it says in response to Your Honor's questions.

I think we answered them, I hope, to Your Honor's satisfaction, but $I$ just thought it might be helpful, both for the record and also for the objecting parties that we know exactly what Your Honor's order provided. And this is docket number 1031 which was filed -- rather, entered on October the 5th of 2020. And what the order does, among other things, is make abundantly clear that the trustee, WSFS, which was actually the party with authority, it was the collateral trustee as well in response to Your Honor's question pursuant to New York law-governed documents had express authority, and Your Honor made findings to the effect that WSFS did have authority to, in fact, take a direction from a majority of the noteholders who were the relevant party that had interest in the collateral and were able to direct the trustee. They directed the trustee, and they also agreed that they would not
be entitled to adequate protection solely with one limited exception that Mr . Satterfield spoke to and that was a piece of adequate protection in the form of power-by-the-hour payments.

And if I may, Your Honor, I'll just be just very brief just to point Your Honor to those specific provisions because they --

THE COURT: Well, let me turn to the order, okay.
Just bear with me a second. I have the document open.
MR. FLECK: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. I have ECF docket number 1031, an order dated October 5, 2020 open.

MR. FLECK: Great.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. FLECK: So I'm looking at page 7 of 67 , and that's paragraph (e)(iv). The paragraph is entitled "Collateral sharing agreement".

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. FLECK: And it concludes with the -- in relevant part, "The existing notes trustee" -- that's WSFS -- "is the applicable authorized representative as defined therein and has sole authority to act or refrain from acting with respect to the shared collateral including sole authority to consent to the incurrence of priming liens on the shared collateral and the nonapplicable authorized representatives, and the noncontrolling secured parties may not contest or object to
such actions".
With respect to the direction, Your Honor, you can find the relevant language of your order on page 10 of 67. It's paragraph (f) like Frank.

THE COURT: Just a second. Hold on. Okay. Yes.
MR. FLECK: F like Frank, (iii), six lines down, "WSFS, in its capacity as the applicable authorized representative on behalf of all first lien secured parties, and at the direction of the existing noteholders holding a majority of the existing notes obligations, has consented to the priming of all liens on the shared collateral" and then it continues. So that speaks to the direction. Obviously, the identity of the parties.

And then lastly, as I referred to a moment ago, on page 50 of 67 --

THE COURT: Let me get there. Hold on.
All right. I'm there.
MR. FLECK: Thank you, Your Honor. It's paragraph 34 entitled "Certain adequate protection provisions". And the second line picking up from the word "none of the first lien secured parties shall have any claim or right against any debtor or rising out of or related to adequate protection including for the avoidance of doubt on account of the priming of any liens in respect to the shared collateral pursuant to Sections $361,362,363,364,503(d)$, or 507 of the Bankruptcy

Code or otherwise".
Just wanted to bring those provisions --
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FLECK: -- to the Court's attention. And with
that we'll, obviously, follow your direction, but presumably lead to the opening statements of those parties.

THE COURT: Well, yes. We'll hear the opening statements now.

Are both parties who want to give opening statements in the courtroom or one by Zoom?

MR. FLECK: No, Your Honor. Mr. -- the Baruch parties' counsel is here, and Mr. Shenfield is on Zoom.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. SHENFIELD: Your Honor?
THE COURT: Well, we'll hear counsel in the courtroom first, and then, Mr. Shenfield, I'll let you speak then, okay?

MR. SHENFIELD: Okay. Your Honor, Mr. Blake (sic) is going to be speaking for the objectors.

THE COURT: No, he's not.
MR. SHENFIELD: Well, Your Honor, I represent the -Mr. Meier, William B. Meier, David Kang and Im Jo Degerman. And Mr. Kim who is one of the objectors would then be appearing pro se. And I was brought in only less than two weeks ago on this matter. I've had very limited time to get up to speed on this case, and I would ask the Court to allow as my
representation is Burlingame Investment Partners and for Mr. William Meier and David Kang to adopt Mr. Kim's pro se opening statement.

THE COURT: Let me raise the question then, because I haven't seen any evidence that Mr. Kim is the owner of a 2023 note. He's provided no proof with any of his objections. His initial objection was stricken. He filed another pro se objection, but he's provided no evidence that he is a holder.

When I asked counsel this morning whether they agreed that any of the objectors were holders, the answer was yes, and so I'm going to hear the substantive objective.

And as to you, Mr. Shenfield, are you admitted pro hac in this court or admitted to the bar in this court?

MR. SHENFIELD: I am -- I am admitted to the bar in the State of California and in the Northern District of California. I'm not admitted, that I'm aware of, that I had to get admitted specially to this court.

THE COURT: Well, you had to get admitted pro hac vice to be able to appear in the case. I believe the order that I struck Mr. Kim's initial objection specifically had indicated that it had to be a member of the bar of this court or a member appearing pro hac vice, and you've done neither. You don't satisfy either of those.

That order was clear and the procedure for getting admitted pro hac vice is also clear, and you've not done that.

But Mr. Kim -- well, let me ask counsel. Hold on. Let me hear from debtor's counsel. Go ahead.

MR. RENENGER: Your Honor, may it please the Court, Aaron Renenger --

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Renenger.
MR. RENENGER: -- of Milbank LLP on behalf of the debtors.

I just want to point out that the objection filed at docket number 2218 by Mr. Shenfield was the preliminary objection of Burlingame Investment Partners LP, various other entities, including the Blake W. Kim Rollover IRA. That corresponds with Mr. Shenfield. He's held himself out in that court representing Mr. Kim and not just Burlingame. So we just want to note that for the record. We would object to Mr. Kim appearing pro se for that reason.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Renenger.
Mr. Shenfield, I will permit you to argue provided that within seven days from today you file your application and pay the fee to be admitted pro hac vice.

The order I entered striking Mr. Kim's objection made clear that I would hear from lawyers who were members of the bar of this court or who appeared pro hac vice. So obviously, you didn't bother reading the order, or you didn't bother following it. I'll permit you to argue provided -- and you've appeared for Mr. Kim's IRA -- I'll permit you to argue
provided, I'm going to give you seven days from today to file your application, pay the fee, and get admitted. I'll take your representation you're a member of the bar in good standing in California, which would entitle you to appear pro hac vice, but I just don't -- I'm not going to allow you -- you should have been on notice about this.

MR. SHENFIELD: Can I make -- take a moment to speak with Mr. Kim, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Take all the time you want because I'm going to hear from other counsel while you're doing that.

MR. SHENFIELD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead. Why don't you --
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Again, my name is Glen Lenihan with Oved \& Oved LLP for creditors Udi Baruch Guindi, David Baruch, Shoshana Baruch, Habib Mann, Golan LP, and Isaak Baruch.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, we believe that the plan is fatally defective for three separate but related reasons and that it mandates that the Court reject the plan.

The first issue is that the 2023 noteholders are improperly classified as unsecured creditors. The disclosure statement said in absolutely conclusory terms that as a result of the DIP roll-up and the fact that the DIP lenders would be paid first it serves no value from the shared collateral to
allow for any recovery for the 2023 noteholders. And that is on page 46, page 55, and 261 of the disclosure statement at docket 2138. That's footnote 11.

As a result of the DIP roll-up and the DIP marshaling provision, no value with respect to the shared collateral will be available to satisfy the 2023 note claims after the DIP facility claims are satisfied, thereby rendering the 2023 notes, as well as any other indebtedness secured by the shared collateral on equal footing with the 2023 notes, effectively unsecured pursuant to $506(a)$.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Lenihan, you were here in the courtroom when I asked the question of debtors' counsel as to who has the burden, and I pointed everyone to the Third Circuit's decision in Heritage Highgate, 679 F.3d 132 at page 140, Third Circuit 2012. I read the quote from it. "The ultimate burden of persuasion is upon the creditor to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence both the extent of its lien and the value of the collateral security as claimed". And that's quoting In re Robertson, 135 B.R. 350 at 352, (Bankr.E.D.Ark.1992).

I so held in In re Sneijder, S-N-E-I-J-D-E-R, 407 B.R. 46 at page 55, (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2009). You've not offered -the objection provided no evidence that the 2023 noteholders had -- that there was any value for them in the collateral.

MR. LENIHAN: So Your Honor, I would respond to that
in two separate ways.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LENIHAN: First In re Heritage, the prior page, at 139, the Third Circuit held, "We now hold that a burden shifting framework controls valuations of collateral to decide the extent to which claims are secured pursuant to 506 (a) ".

THE COURT: And that burden shifting framework
provides that once the amount and extent of the secured claim has been set, the burden shifts to a debtor seeking to use, sell, lease, or otherwise encumber the lender's collateral under Sections 363 or 364 of the Code to prove that the secured creditor's interest will be adequately protected.

So the burden initially is on the creditor to establish it does have value, and then that shifting framework puts the burden on the debtor to show that they're adequately protected. You haven't gotten over the first level of that. MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, with all due respect, the Third Circuit --

THE COURT: What about in this district? What about like -- did you look at my Sneijder decision?

MR. LENIHAN: Your Sneijder decision as well as the -another 2013 decision $I$ don't remember off the top of my head, Your Honor. I apologize for not recalling the name. But in both of those, you did cite to Heritage, or in the 2013 decision you cited to Heritage --

THE COURT: And what about -- there's also in this district, Wilmington Trust -- actually, it's the district court decision -- Wilmington Trust v. AMR Corp., In re AMR Corp, 490 B.R. 470 at 477 and 78, (S.D.N.Y. 2013) holding that "The creditor seeking adequate protection need only establish the validity, priority, or extent of its interest in the collateral while the debtor bears the initial burden of proof on the issue of adequate protection".

So if you established there was value, then the debtor would have to show adequate protection, but you haven't gotten there. The law in this district is that you have the burden and you've not put forward any evidence. In fact, while the debtor didn't have the burden, they nevertheless came forward with evidence that supports their argument that there was no value for the 2023 noteholders.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, if I may, just a couple things.

The Third Circuit in Heritage did say that the circumstances will dictate the assignment of the burden of proof on the question of value. And here, the creditors, the 2023 noteholders, have effectively no way to demonstrate the value of the aircrafts and the intellectual property that comprised what became the shared collateral. But even putting that aside just for a moment, the problem is not so much one of whether who has the proof or who has not the proof, the
disclosure statement came out and affirmatively said there is no value.

THE COURT: Look, this is a confirmation hearing --
MR. LENIHAN: Yeah.
THE COURT: -- and now is the time that there needs to be evidence. The debtor has come forward with the evidence to support their position, which they didn't have the burden for in my view, was the market test.

MR. LENIHAN: So Your Honor --
THE COURT: And in terms of valuation, cases are fairly legion that the market test is the best method for valuation. You haven't come forward with any evidence of value.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, where I'm going with this is twofold, but I can speak to the evidence of valuation that they put forth, but the point I wanted to make first is when everyone voted on this plan, they voted on this plan based on the disclosure statement that said there is no value. And in the same disclosure statement, it said to the Class 11 of the unsecured creditors if you vote to approve and the class approves, you get a forty percent kick. Instead of only getting one percent, you get 1.4 percent. So there was incentive to go along and approve this plan, and there was disincentive to object, especially on the plain face of the disclosure statement it said there is no value. So anyone who
received this plan that was a noteholder --
THE COURT: Okay. I have your argument. Go on to your next argument.

MR. LENIHAN: With respect to the -- with respect to the evidence that they're putting forward about the value, Your Honor, Mr. Neuhauser's affidavit is clear that he says I believe the amount of the DIP facility claims exceeds the value of the shared collateral. Nowhere does it say the shared collateral is X or approximately X . Rather, they talk about a process for soliciting equity investments as demonstrating that this small tranche of collateral is insufficient. But an equity investment is going to be based on a number of other things other than the value of the aircrafts. It has to look towards what cash flow's going to be in the future, it has to look towards what they projected EBITDA to be, it has to take into account the demand destruction for travel that's occurred because of the COVID-19 pandemic, especially for business travel and leisure travel as well. It takes into account a whole host of things. And someone not wanting to invest in an airline while they're still -- especially in this period, April through June --

THE COURT: Mr. Lenihan, go on to point 2.
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
Point 2 relates to the substantive consolidation. And even if they have met their burden of showing that there should
be some form of substantive consolidation where they propose thirty-seven out of forty of the debtors being substantively consolidated, they leave out three of the other creditors, and especially with one of them.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Three of the other debtors?
MR. LENIHAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. Yes, thank you. Three of other debtors.

They say that the reason that there are these thirtyseven separate entities is the separate corporate existence of many of the Avianca debtors was driven primarily by local regulatory requirements. So they set up different companies to meet local regulatory requirements.

The only reason that they give that Avifreight should not be part of this, should not be part of the substantive consolidation is because that they say that Avifreight was established with the sole purpose of complying with Mexican regulatory requirements. That's the exact reason they give why all of the other debtors should be substantively consolidated, yet they hold out this other debtor that --

THE COURT: But they go on to argue that the books and records of those three entities are separate, they have separate -- it was the Hughes' declaration. Let me see if it I have in front of me.

MR. LENIHAN: It's docket 22 --
THE COURT: Yeah, I have it. The Ginger Hughes
declaration.
MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, with all --
THE COURT: Just hang on a second.
MR. LENIHAN: Yes.
THE COURT: It's paragraphs 23 to 28 of her
declaration which was admitted in evidence this morning. It goes through each of those three separate debtors that are not included in the substantive consolidation.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, with all due respect, 26 is the only one that deals with Avifreight, and it says it maintains separate operations, but it doesn't say it maintains separate accounting and treasury. It doesn't say anything of the other ones for SAI in paragraph 24 and Aero Union in 25 go on to talk about how they have a distinct management team, separate operational and financial systems, separate headquarters, separate treasury and accounting systems. All it says for Avifreight is that it was established for the sole purpose of complying with extrajudicial regulations.

Your Honor, we would submit that it does not -- that it seems that they are being purposely excluded for reasons that I don't know, but why those -- this company is being excluded, and its equity holders are unimpaired while creditors that went into this bankruptcy proceeding as secured creditors are now being reduced to unsecured creditors and getting a literal penny on the dollar, why the Avifreight equity holders
should be made whole is a question that is not answered in any of these papers. They had the full opportunity to explain exactly why. They could have said that they have -- they're not part of consolidated financial statements. They could have said that they don't -- they're not part of a tax group. They could have shared they had their own employees. They could have said everything that they said for Aero Union and SAI. They don't say for Avifreight. And it's entirely unclear to me why it should be excluded, and why it's equity holders are unimpaired.

THE COURT: So your argument now is limited as to Avifreight?

MR. LENIHAN: Well, I would like to -- I'm reserving rights on cross-examination.

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely. I'm not taking away your right to cross-examine.

MR. LENIHAN: But I -- thank you, Your Honor. But without going -- without having the benefit of the crossexamination, the most jarring thing that stands out from this affidavit is the limited information about Avifreight --

THE COURT: All right. What's your third point?
MR. LENIHAN: Well, it went in -- I really did the two of them at the same time. It said Avifreight's equity holders are getting a full recovery, and that would violate the absolute priority rule.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else you want to add then?
MR. LENIHAN: No. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
All right, Mr. Shenfield, are you going to argue?
MR. SHENFIELD: Your Honor, I would reiterate my request that since Mr . Kim did file his statement on a pro se basis for himself, that he be allowed to speak and that I be allowed to simply notify the Court that we adopt his argument, because he is speaking pro se.

THE COURT: Well, does he own the 2023 note, yes or no?

MR. SHENFIELD: Yes, he does, Your Honor, and we -the debtors' counsel last week sent us requests for production of documents and we responded to those over the weekend and produced evidence that Mr. Blake Kim is an owner of the 2023 notes. And I believe early on in the hearing they acknowledged that he is an owner along with the other parties.

THE COURT: No, they did not. They did not. I'll ask again. Did debtors' counsel acknowledge that Mr. Blake (sic) is an owner of a 2023 note?

MR. RENENGER: Your Honor, Aaron Renenger on behalf of the debtors.

We did receive statements from Mr. Kim showing that as of last month he was an owner of 2023 notes.

THE COURT: All right. On that basis, I will permit

Mr . Kim to argue.
Mr. Shenfield, you signed papers and filed in this court. I expect that within a week from today, you will apply to appear pro hac vice and file -- and pay your fee for having done so. You filed papers, even though you're not admitted to practice in this court.

Mr. Kim, go ahead.
MR. KIM: Yes, Your Honor. This is Blake Kim.
Well, Your Honor, we are here today because according to the debtors, our senior secured debt has become general unsecured claim. And as a result of a few shell games I will state, Your Honor, in the process, there is -- (indiscernible) in many coats, Your Honor, and I laid out first that they broke out absolute priority rule, that's 1129, by reducing the recovery of senior secured class while providing a hundred percent recovery to the unsecured equity classes and equity as well.

Second, Your Honor, the debtors have reached multiple agreements that were on the various documents.

And third, the debtors have performed illegal (indiscernible) they say by reducing the recovery of 2023 noteholders. And I have gone through my calculations on assets and liabilities that the debtors have produced, and I have stated on my objection what those are.

Fourth, Your Honor, the debtors did not perform a fair
evaluation for a secured class. Those (indiscernible) 0506. Now, debtors have produced what the equity value is from the perspective of, I guess, what they were trying to raise for exit financing, and they say that is 800 million dollars in equity. However, Your Honor, if it applies (indiscernible) what is essential, because that is the amount that the company would -- an acquirer would pay. And with that value, they have to do, like, a waterfall analysis to determine what is the (indiscernible) of our positions.

Fifth, Your Honor, the debtors perform -- argue substantive consolidation breaching the meaning of substantive consolidation, Your Honor. I have my own reasons why I believe that they are excluding that, and I have submitted -- which actually did not go through -- was the SAI SAS's report on their financials.

Basically, their assets and EBITDA has grown 728 percent in the two years since they were acquired, Your Honor. They were acquired in October of 2017. In those two years they have grown 728 percent. And I believe they are -- all the equity parameter of stakeholders and, perhaps, (indiscernible) which they (indiscernible), Your Honor. So those equity are probably in those collateral, Your Honor.

So to this (indiscernible), it would be a very difficult process, I believe. That's why I believe they are excluded.

And sixth, Your Honor, the debtors have performed substantive consolidation to disparate creditors. They have very different asset/liability profiles. And thus breaking Code 1122, and that is extremely -- extreme prejudice against 2023 noteholders, Your Honor.

More, the debtors of 2023 notes are essentially the holding company and they're very valuable assets of the holding company and are equity. However, the debtors do not even calculate what the equity values are. As you can see on their filed dockets on assets and liabilities, they did not announce (indiscernible) to determine value, but that is the greatest value for a holding company.

So going back to 1122, Your Honor, they're talking about that if we are a general unsecured creditor that we are being fairly treated but that is not so, Your Honor. Because again, our assets are much more valuable that other GUCs', Your Honor.

So that is my opening statement, Your Honor. And again, going back to absolute priority rule, Your Honor, there were a lot of documents that stated that we were protected in some sense. One was we were the RFP. Not RFP. Sorry, Your Honor. It was basically a note sent to the noteholders by the (indiscernible) of noteholders. And on the second page of that which is part of my Exhibit A they state that we were (indiscernible) collateral of the underlying secured -- the

2023 notes, but junior to Tranche A and Tranche B. All of their state -- that kind of statement, now, they're saying we have no collateral (indiscernible). So they had made those kind of statements, Your Honor.

And then on docket 964 which $I$ also stated on my objection, they talk about that they were stipulating the priority and validity of our notes, Your Honor.

And then lastly --
THE COURT: But not as to value. They haven't contested the validity or priority, but the issue is what's the value of the shared collateral.

MR. KIM: Yes, Your Honor. Yes.

So even on the third, which I wanted to mention which was the revised DIP agreement, they state that -- even they go far as they will protect, you know, whatever the value, I guess, of 2023 note is. And I don't have the exact statement, and I didn't pull up that language, but that gave us security that we are basically a get out of jail free card despite the company being in dire straits at the beginning, and $I$ felt that as the company recovered from COVID-19 that all the valuations will go up.

And even on the DIP presentation that the debtors were presenting to you, all of us back in 2020 they showed that we had an ample value of collateral besides -- we covered all the DIP finance. And in fact, I believe, we had almost a billion
dollars in equity. So that gave me a comfort that we just need to wait, wait this out. Don't sell out now, Your Honor.

And so -- and sure enough, the debtors have really improved, as far as the financials go since then. And Colombia is one of the greatest recovering countries in Latin America based on vaccination rates, Your Honor.

And -- so a lot of those numbers are showing that the debtors are doing quite well, however, the numbers that the debtors are presenting in this Chapter 11 have stopped on March. They have not gave us any semblance of valuation afterwards, only the fact that the entity's worth 800 million. But again, Your Honor, we have to (indiscernible) to (indiscernible) identified that not an equity matter, and they have not done so.

THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Kim?
MR. KIM: So -- yes, Your Honor.
And they talk about waiving the equitable marshaling which I do not know until, you know, disclosure statement was presented and they said that for that reason we are an unsecured class. Basically, we have gave our collateral by waiving that right.

The debtors never stated about those things, Your
Honor. And I say a lot of their contracts were like a contract written by Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, because some part of the contract were very benign to us. But then we didn't know about
the equitable marshaling, waiving the equitable marshaling because that was the one that really is now biting us in the back. They have submitted those things.

So in one sense, they were putting our guards down and then biting us later with this clause that they put in which I feel is circumventing absolute priority rule. And again, the tenor of bankruptcy court is ignore, Your Honor. And they are saying again we're worthless. And I think that should be taken a deep look at because DIP financing has been used in the last couple of years drastically because of, you know, where we are, with COVID. And I'm sure, you know, some of this is going to be taken a deeper look at, because obviously the debtors are using that to circumvent the tenor of bankruptcy protocols.

I think that's about it for me, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kim.
MR. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Lenihan, you've already addressed the Court. Go ahead.

MR. LENIHAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought we were moving on to the cross-examination.

THE COURT: Oh, we are. Okay. I thought you wanted to say something else before we called him.

MR. LENIHAN: No.
THE COURT: Did you agree on the order of witnesses?
MR. RENENGER: We did, Your Honor. Mr. Neuhauser will
go first --
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. RENENGER: -- and then we'll cross-examine.
THE COURT: Mr. Neuhauser if you would come on up to the witness stand?

Excuse me, Mr. Lenihan, I just didn't understand what --

MR. LENIHAN: No, Your Honor. It's not a problem at all.

MR. NEUHAUSER: Your Honor, (indiscernible)?
THE COURT: Yeah. It's right up there.
MR. NEUHAUSER: Oh, I didn't --
THE COURT: Right there. And if you'll stand and raise your right hand, you'll be administered the oath, okay? (Witness sworn)

THE COURT: Please have a seat. You can take your mask off if you want to.

And his direct testimony is already in evidence, and the witness is sworn. Mr. Lenihan, please proceed with crossexamination.

MR. LENIHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And thank you Mr. Neuhauser.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. LENIHAN:
Q. In your declaration, you state that you were a managing director of Credit Suisse from 2016 to 2019. Can you just very briefly tell me what your duties and responsibilities were in that role?
A. Sure. Most of my career has been in investment banking.

A combination of focused on general Latin American banking, and aviation-specific banking. When I -- when I took the role at Credit Suisse, the role at Credit Suisse was a dual role. I was in charge of their (indiscernible) office, so I was the generalist coverage officer for investment banking, i.e., capital raising, M\&A, et cetera activities in (indiscernible). And I also took leadership and coverage of Latin American Airlines.
Q. Thank you. And it says since July 2019 until about April 2021, you were the chief financial officer of Avianca. What entities specifically were you the CFO of from July 2019 to April of 2021?
A. I was hired in the dual contract by Avianca Holdings and by Avianca Colombia.
Q. Were you employed by any other companies during that time?
A. I was not.
Q. Were you an officer at any other companies during that time?
A. I believe I was.
Q. What other companies were you an officer of?
A. I do not know.
Q. Are any of those companies that you were an officer of debtors in today's proceedings?
A. Avianca Holdings is, as is Avianca Colombia.
Q. Any of the other ones?
A. I assume there are, yes.
Q. Do you know if you were an officer for all forty of the debtors?
A. I do not.
Q. And presently, since April 2021, you are the chief executive officer of Avianca Holdings S.A. Are you the chief executive officer of any other of the debtor entities?
A. My contract again replicates my role in both Avianca Holdings and Avianca Colombia.
Q. So you're not aware of whether you're the CEO of any of the other debtor entities --
A. I am not.
Q. -- other than those two?
A. I am not.
Q. Are you aware of whether there are any debtor entities that you are not the CEO of?
A. I am not.
Q. So to the best of your knowledge, you don't know if you're the CEO of all of them or only two of them?
A. That's correct. I know that I'm the CEO of the holding
company and therefore can direct the subsidiaries.
Q. In your declaration, you state that you understand the plans, classification scheme, generally tracks the debtor's pre-petition capital structure. What did you mean by the prepetition capital structure?
A. I mean the capital structure of Avianca Holdings, i.e., its consolidated obligations, its consolidated equity and debt.
Q. And that's true for all the forty debtors?
A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. You state that the scheme generally tracks the debtors, plural, the defined term debtors, pre-petition capital structure. I'm asking if you understand that to be true for all forty of the debtor entities?
A. I believe so.
Q. Is there any debtor entity that you're not sure that's true for?
A. I'm not sure where your question's going. Again, my testimony is from a consolidated standpoint, and from a consolidated standpoint I believe it tracks.
Q. So when you say consolidated, do you mean that all forty of the debtor entities they're consolidated financials or something else?
A. They're consolidated financials.
Q. And that's true for all forty of the debtor entities?
A. That's true for Avianca Holdings.
Q. Is it true for all forty of the debtor entities?
A. Individually? I don't know.
Q. Are all forty of the debtors on the same consolidated financial statements?
A. All forty of the debtors -- all forty of the debtors, I believe so.
Q. You also state in your declaration that you believe "the plan divides the applicable claims and interest in the classes based on the underlying instruments and/or liabilities giving rise to such claims and interests". Do you believe that's true for the 2023 notes as well?
A. I do.
Q. And it's your testimony that you believe the 2023 notes are unsecured?
A. It is.
Q. At presently, that is?
A. Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Lenihan, can you just hold on for a minute because Mr. Neuhauser's video is not up on the screen and Deanna, we may need somebody from IT to fix that. I don't know why there's a camera that focuses on the witness stand, but he is not on the screen. If you just hold on.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
THE COURT: Okay?
THE WITNESS: Yep.

THE COURT: See if we can get this fixed. Everybody just stay in place and --

THE CLERK: (Indiscernible).
THE COURT: Everybody just stay in place.
(Pause)
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
Q. And --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let me cut in?
THE COURT: No, please. Mr. Lenihan's proceeding with his questioning. Go ahead.
Q. Mr. Neuhauser, $I$ just want to confirm that as you set forth in your declaration you're familiar with all the debtors' day-to-day operations, financial affairs, business affairs, and books and records, correct?
A. I am.
Q. Mr. Neuhauser, you state in your declaration that you believe that the amount of the DIP facility exceeds the value of the shared collateral.
A. I do.
Q. What is the value of the shared collateral today?
A. We haven't appraised it.
Q. Can you give me an approximate number?
A. Probably not, but it's less than what the DIP facility is worth, because as we stated in our document, we were unable to raise financing to that amount.
Q. You stated specifically that you were seeking equity investments; is that correct?

THE COURT: What paragraph are you looking at?
MR. LENIHAN: I'm sorry. Paragraph 11.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. LENIHAN: It's paragraph 11 of docket 2263.
THE COURT: That's fine. I'm there. Go ahead.
Q. You state specifically that you were soliciting equity investments, correct?
A. We were soliciting both, yes.
Q. Both being what -- what's the other thing?
A. Government financing and equity.
Q. I didn't hear you. I'm sorry.
A. Government financing of the (indiscernible) and equity.
Q. Did you reference the debt refinancing in your declaration?
A. I don't know.
Q. I can represent to you it's not here.
A. Right.
Q. Is there a reason that wasn't represented?
A. I don't know.

MR. RENENGER: Your Honor?
THE COURT: Mr. Renenger?
MR. RENENGER: Just, it might be helpful to give the witness a copy of the declaration when you ask these questions
about --
THE COURT: Do you have an extra copy, Mr. Renenger?
MR. RENENGER: I do have one here.
THE WITNESS: That'd be good.
THE COURT: Mr. Renenger's got it in his hand.
Go ahead, Mr. Lenihan.
MR. RENENGER: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yeah. Please. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Thanks so much.
THE COURT: So on page 5 of 19.
A. Oh, that's correct.

THE COURT: I think if you push the microphone a
little bit further away.
THE WITNESS: Thank you. Okay.
Q. So you have the declaration in front of you, Mr .

Neuhauser?
A. I do.
Q. Looking at paragraph 11 on page 5?
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. Great. So would you agree that soliciting an equity investment that potential investors are looking at far more than just the book value or the market value of the assets owned by the company?
A. I would.
Q. And you would agree that they would be looking to what the
company would generate in returns on a forward-looking basis, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And as far as you understand, the COVID-19 pandemic still exists, has not been eradicated, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Wouldn't you agree that the COVID-19 pandemic has had appreciable changes in the habits of customer fliers such as Avianca's customers?
A. I would.
Q. Including business people and leisure travelers?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would be something that an equity investor would look to in determining whether or not they wanted to make an investment; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So could it be that the demand instruction for travel, for airfare specifically, is so great that it would obviate whatever the value of the shared collateral is in terms of looking for an equity investment?
A. Well, if I can answer that, I think generally things are worth what people are willing to pay for them. So it could be, but then I would argue that the value of the shared collateral is what's determined in the market test. So you're right. And, yes.
Q. So you didn't go out and try and sell the shared collateral or try to find someone to buy an interest only in the shared collateral, correct?
A. Well, the shared collateral is a large portion of our operating assets. So I'm not sure it's separable.
Q. What do you understand the shared collateral to be?
A. The shared collateral in the case of -- in the case of --
Q. The 2023 notes?
A. -- of the 2023 notes is a set of aircraft and some receivables.
Q. You understand it's receivables and not intellectual property rights?
A. And the intellectual -- there's a small set of receivables and there's the IP, correct.
Q. So would you agree then that just because an equity investment failed to yield the financing alternative, that that doesn't show that the shared collateral today is worth less than the DIP facility claims?
A. No.
Q. Well, you just said you agreed with me that an equity investor's going to be looking at a whole litany of things in deciding to make an investment. And it could even be an attractive investment that doesn't give them the return that they need internally, and that could be a reason why they wouldn't -- that it wouldn't become an equity investor; is that
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So just because something's not going to give an internal rate of return that's sufficient to induce someone to invest in this equity, how does that, then, translate into a claim that the shared value -- the value of the shared collateral is less than the DIP facility claims?
A. It's very hard for me to imagine that intellectual property that essentially ties to our brands and used aircraft that essentially we are the last operators for are going to have greater value as nonoperating assets than operating assets.
Q. Has greater value than nonoperating assets. But they're airplanes, correct?
A. There's airplanes and there's intellectual property, correct.
Q. Just sticking with the airplanes for a moment, how many airplanes represent the shared collateral?
A. I don't recall.
Q. What's the status of those airplanes at the moment?
A. Some of them are in use, some of them are not.
Q. Why are -- the ones that are not in use, why are they not in use?
A. I cannot give you an extensive list, but if you look at our fleet today, we've taken a -- broadly, and I can't speak to
the ones that are specifically in the shared collateral -we've taken out aircraft because they're inefficient, we've taken out aircraft because they have upcoming maintenance events that we have not decided to expend the maintenance on, we've taken out aircraft because they don't meet (indiscernible) fleet requirements.
Q. And how many aircrafts have you taken out of operation?
A. Well, we started -- we went into -- into this process with about 120 narrow bodies, 23 wide bodies. We're going to emerge with ninety-eight and twelve. And within the ninety-eight narrow bodies, we're going to have significant rotation. So I'm going to guess it's about fifty or sixty.
Q. When you say significant rotation, can you explain what that means?
A. Yes. We've rejected aircraft and we've replaced them with others.
Q. What do you do with the rejected aircraft?
A. Well, we generally return them to the creditors.
Q. So despite the fact that you don't know how many aircraft actually comprise the shared collateral, and despite the fact that the sole basis for determining that the DIP facility claims exceed the value of the shared collaterals that people didn't want to invest in your companies, you believe that you can state with certainty that the value of the DIP facility -the amount of DIP facility claims exceeds the value of the
shared collateral?
A. I do.

MR. LENIHAN: I have no further questions at this time.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Lenihan.
Anybody else wish to cross-examine Mr. Neuhauser?
Mr. Kim, did you wish to cross-examine Mr. Neuhauser?
MR. KIM: No, sir.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Renenger, redirect?
MR. RENENGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RENENGER:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Neuhauser.
A. Hi, Mr. Renenger.
Q. Mr. Neuhauser, can you describe the purpose of the marketing process the debtors undertook to seek to refinance the DIP facility?
A. Sure. So and I'm going to back in history, I think, a little bit, because I think it's relevant.

When we -- when we -- when we filed the company back in May of last year, we had very little cash, right. Something like 480 million, if I recall correctly, and no access to financing. All of our assets had been pledged in the prior restructuring we had done in 2019 out of court. And so the
biggest challenge we faced was really raising the cash that we needed to survive through this process. And we actually spent the vast majority of the six months that led us to finally raising a DIP in October on that, and I'll remind you, you know, we -- we basically had to restructure most of our capital structure, right. So we had to reach agreement with a group that had provided a convertible -- a set of convertible notes and bonds prior to December to agree and to subordinate themselves and release the collateral and put up more money.

We had to reach agreement with an ad hoc group of 2023 noteholders that ultimately allowed us to put that collateral into the structure.

And even so, when we went to market, and we went to market with a very solid syndicate of top-notch banks, we were unable to reach the amounts we needed to put together a DIP, right. And -- and -- and -- and the issue there as -- as, you know, I'll attest is -- was again, collateral.

In fact, when we -- when we announced we had reached a structure for a DIP, it was only with 380-something-million dollars of support from the Colombian government that we were able to achieve it. Subsequent to that, that created momentum which allowed us to reduce the support from the Colombian government to slightly over 200 million. And then finally with the similar loan that we received from the government, we were able to overcome a judicial block that occurred in -- in -- in

Colombia that didn't allow the government to fund and finally bridge the last 200-odd million.

So ultimately, the -- the DIP structure came through with a lot of difficulty and at a very challenging time, right. So as we then moved forward, the biggest challenge that we foresaw to emergence was really refinancing the DIP.

So when we went to market and we asked Seabury to go to market for us, there were two parts, right. One was to carry out as -- as -- as broad and -- and -- and comprehensive a marketing effort as we could to ensure that we had properly priced the equity, and that if we exercised the conversion that would be the best possible alternative for us and that we weren't simply exercising the conversion blindly.

And the second which was a little bit of -- of a -- of a shadow exercise and -- and again, I'll take the point that it isn't highlighted here -- was to then also seek refinancing of -- of the -- of the A DIP, and how we turned the A DIP into something more permanent.

In fact, we were -- we were successful in -- in the first but not in the second, right, as a result of that -- that process. We were able to -- to negotiate a -- a refinancing of our DIP, right, into a DIP to exit that we then executed. And I think that was summarized by Mr . Fleck at the beginning that allows us to now have permanent financing going forward. But we were unfortunately not able to -- to refinance the equity on
terms that would be better than exercising the conversion.
Q. Do you believe it was necessary to refinance the DIP in order to emerge?
A. I do.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because we would have -- because the DIP has superpriority and we do not have sufficient cash to pay it back.
Q. Okay. So Mr. Lenihan asked you some questions with respect to your views on value. Why do you believe that the marketing process supports your conclusion that there's no value to the shared collateral --

THE COURT: No value for the 2023 noteholders'
interest in the shared collateral.
MR. RENENGER: Thank you, Your Honor, for that clarification.
A. Thank you. Well, let me -- the 2023 noteholders' interest was pooled with the rest of the collateral rights. So that shared collateral then became part of a broader collateral pool which became the DIP pool. So I think taking it back from that, the question is -- the question you asked which is why do we believe there's no residual collateral, and the answer is simply that we were unable to find better terms to refinance than we have now, and so therefore we were unable to pay back the DIP B other than through conversion.
Q. Okay.

MR. RENENGER: No further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right.

There's somebody on Zoom, Carlos Manuel Nino Espirito. He's raised his hand several times and I'll give him a chance to address the Court --

MR. ESPIRITO: Thank you.
THE COURT: -- Mr. Lenihan, before I give you more question. Go ahead.

MR. ESPIRITO: Thank you, Mr. Glenn. I am
(indiscernible) own attorney. My name is (indiscernible)
Espirito. I work in Avianca Peru. I am (indiscernible) -- I am (indiscernible) aircraft. I am (indiscernible) -- I have to (indiscernible) for me (indiscernible) by me. Please I make my picture (indiscernible). Please (indiscernible). Thank you Mr. Glenn.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Espirito. Thank you.
Mr. Lenihan, did you have further questions?
MR. LENIHAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you.
THE COURT: Please. If you go back to the podium so we can turn the microphone on.

MR. LENIHAN: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LENIHAN:
Q. Mr. Neuhauser, on redirect you testified about seeking debt refinancing. Was that solely for the A DIP or also for the B DIP?
A. We tried to make it as expensive as possible. In fact, we tried increasing the amount the debt by 300 million dollars. We were unsuccessful.
Q. When you say you tried to increase the amount of debt by 300 million, is that the total of the DIP facility claim or just one tranche or another tranche?
A. It was the A tranche, the senior tranche. We were trying to raise more debt.
Q. So is it your testimony then that you were seeking debt 300 million dollars more than what exists, and because you couldn't get debt 300 million dollars in excess of what was already out there that that shows that the shared collateral is not -- does not have enough value to exceed the present DIP facility claims?
A. My testimony is that we were unable to raise just a mere -- we actually raised 160 million dollars more than what existed. So just a mere 140 million dollars more that's the debt we were unable to raise, and we were unable to raise alternative sources whether it be equity or some other structure to refinance the DIP B after an extensive marketing process. That's my testimony.
Q. So your testimony was that you were able to get more debt in excess of the A DIP; is that correct?
A. We were able to, as has been disclosed, increase the A DIP in refinancing by 100 and, I believe, 40 million dollars.
Q. And that's your testimony then that that exceeds the -that -- excuse me.

MR. LENIHAN: Strike that.
Q. That the value -- the amount of the DIP facility claims exceeds the shared collateral because you were able to go to market and get 140 million dollars more debt?
A. No. You'll recall that the DIP facility claims are not only the DIP A but also the DIP B. So the question -- the question's a little different which is can we refinance the entire DIP against the collateral. And the answer is we were unable to do so. We were able to raise a little bit more senior debt, and we were unable to raise equity or an alternative to equity on better terms than what we had.
Q. And when you were trying to raise the -- refinance the $B$ DIP, were you doing that at the same time? Were you trying to refinance both tranches or were you doing that separately?
A. We were having concurrent discussions.
Q. So you were trying everything?
A. Yes we were.
Q. And it's your test -- and what time period was this?
A. It was -- we refinanced the -- we refinanced the -- we
ended it about three months ago, so this was probably, you know, in a period that was probably started six months ago.
Q. Is this the same April to July 2021 period that you were -- you testified to --
A. That sounds about right. Yep.
Q. And in so doing that, what was being offered as collateral to the new lenders, the refinancing lenders?
A. The same package that -- that secured the DIP before that.
Q. Anything else?
A. Not that I recall. We don't have much else that's in place.

MR. LENIHAN: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Lenihan.
Mr. Renenger, do you have any other questions?
MR. RENENGER: No more questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. You're excused, Mr. Neuhauser.
MR. KIM: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Thank you very much for your testimony.
MR. NEUHAUSER: Thanks very much.
THE COURT: And --
MR. KIM: May I ask a question, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Sorry. All right. Go ahead. Mr. Kim?
MR. KIM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Mr. Kim has a question. Go ahead, Mr.
Kim.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KIM:
Q. Mr. Neuhauser, when you guys came up with the DIP and when you guys put in the waiver of equitable marshaling, what was your intentions for that, Mr. Neuhauser?

MR. RENENGER: Your Honor, I'll object that that's beyond the scope of the redirect.

THE COURT: Sustained.
Any other questions, Mr. Kim?
MR. KIM: Not right now, sir.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Kim.
All right. Mr. Neuhauser, you're excused.
MR. NEUHAUSER: Thanks.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, we'd like to call Ms. Ginger Hughes.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay.
MR. LENIHAN: And for the record, her declaration is 2262.

THE COURT: All right. If you would come on up to the witness stand and you'll be sworn, Ms. Hughes. Please stand and raise your right hand, and you'll be sworn. You have to stand.

MS . HUGHES : Oh.
THE COURT: You okay? Sorry. Go ahead.
(Witness sworn)
THE COURT: All right. Please have a seat. Just make sure you're close enough to the microphone so we can pick up your voice.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: And the direct testimony is already in evidence.

Mr. Lenihan, go ahead.
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you very much.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. LENIHAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Hughes. Thank you for your time.

In your affidavit, you -- excuse me -- in your declaration you stated you're the managing director and a partner of Seabury International Corporate Finance and its affiliate Seabury Securities LLC. Can you tell me just briefly what Seabury does?
A. Sure. So the two entities that are there were sort of the ones that I'm a managing director and partner of are an aviation-focused investment bank and advisory firm. We've got, was it is, thirty years, I believe, close to thirty -- twentyfive, thirty years of history with a substantial number of aviation transactions all around the world and quite a few bankruptcies because unfortunately that's what happens in this industry.
Q. And what specifically has Seabury's relationship been to this bankruptcy?
A. Sure. So we were hired specifically in the case as the investment banker and financial advisor to Avianca. We did have a previous relationship with the debtors. We were the banker and advisor during the 2019 restructuring. I specifically led the fleet restructuring in 2019, as well as participated in what we refer to as the stakeholder loan which was the 375-million-dollar convert.
Q. Thank you. You state in your declaration that Seabury prepared a liquidation analysis that was annexed as exhibits -THE COURT: Wait, hold on a second. Mr. Renenger, do you have an extra copy of -MR. RENENGER: I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- of the declaration? If you'd bring it up, that would be helpful. Okay?

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Renenger.
Go ahead, Mr. Lenihan.

THE WITNESS: Glad I brought my glasses.
Q. You state in your declaration on paragraph 12 that Seabury prepared a liquidation analysis that was annexed as Exhibit C to the disclosure statement. Is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What was your involvement in preparing that liquidation
analysis, if any?
A. So two of the individuals at my direction which included both the company and my team at Seabury prepared the liquidation analysis.
Q. And did you review it?
A. I did.
Q. Are you familiar with it?
A. I am familiar, yes.
Q. What entities does the liquidation analysis cover?
A. It covers all of the debtors in these cases on a collective basis.
Q. On a collective basis?
A. Right.
Q. And how does the information that under -- underpins this analysis put together?
A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.
Q. Sure. So let me strike that and try again.

You go through -- the liquidation analysis goes through certain assets, like cash and cash equivalent requested -restricted cash, short term investments, account receivables, et cetera, et cetera. How is the information of those assets compiled?
A. So the starting point at the analysis is the company's balance sheet. And just to choose a marker in time because you have to have a marker in time when you're dealing with assets
of a business, it was, I believe, the March 31st, if I'm not mistaken, of 2021 , that balance sheet. That -- that's, I would say, is a process of identifying the assets themselves, not necessarily their value. And -- but as far as to identify the kind of -- the set of assets that existed.
Q. So the set of assets, and you say in paragraph 13 of your declaration that it's based on the unaudited book values as of March 31st, 2021. So excellent memory. And you said it was the company's balance sheet. Is that a consolidated balance sheet?
A. It was.
Q. And is that on behalf of all forty debtors?
A. Of Avianca Holdings, correct. It was actually -- Avianca Holdings, and in this case it includes the debtors, it includes the debtors' equity interest and nondebtors.
Q. Okay. Does it also include the assets of S -- what's been referred to as SAI?
A. [Sigh], correct.
Q. \{Sigh], excuse me.
A. (Indiscernible).
Q. Aero Union?
A. And Aero Union.
Q. Apologies for my butchering the language.
A. No. We're all --
Q. And also Avifreight?
A. Avifreight as well.
Q. So those are all -- so the company's books and records, at least as of March 20th, 2021 had consolidated financial statements for all forty of these entities, correct?
A. And so there are books and records we can -- on what we call a general ledger in the accounting world for -- but yeah, this is the consolidated which generally is an amalgamation of books and records of all of the underlying companies.
Q. Okay. So all of the underlying companies including Aero Union and Avifreight and SAI had their assets and liabilities together on these same consolidated financial statements?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, in paragraph 18 of your affidavit which is on page 6, you state that the Avianca debtors which are all the debtors except Aero Union, Avifreight, and SAI have operated in a consolidated manner. And then you state that the separate corporate existence of many of the Avianca debtors was driven primarily by local regulatory requirements; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then in paragraph 26 of your affidavit on page 9 in discussing Aero Freight -- Avifreight, excuse me -- you said because air carriers certify -- certificated in Mexico are subject to Mexican regulatory requirements including foreign ownership restrictions, Avifreight was established with the sole purpose of complying with those regulations.

If it was established with the sole purpose of complying with regulatory -- local regulatory requirements, how is that different from the other Avianca debtors?
A. So we -- I did use the vague reference, regulations, but they're very different regulations. When you're talking with respect to operating entities, like, airlines, for example, airlines are certificated. They're certificated under the regulations of particular aviation authorities, and those aviation authorities in most cases, if not all cases, are individual country. So the subcon debtors, or the Avianca debtors, are under those regulated entities with respect to the certification of air carriers and what we think of in the United States as the FAA and the Department of Transportation.

With respect to Avifreight, it's a different regulation, and it's with respect to the foreign ownership specifically. Q. Now, with respect to what you define as the Avianca debtors, and talking about the local regulatory requirements, the operating airlines for Avianca, what countries have regulatory purview over them?
A. The -- well, it's quite a few.

With respect to the certificated air carriers there's what Mr. Neuhauser referred to as Avianca Colombia, also referred to as Aerovias, that's in Colombia. There's another entity in Colombia, Regional Express. I'm just picking out a few of the countries.
Q. Let me rephrase my question if I wasn't clear. I'm sorry. Which countries do the operating airlines operate under and such that they are under the purview of their local version of the FAA? You said Colombia, I believe Costa Rica --
A. Colombia, Costa Rica, and El Salvador, Ecuador, and probably Guatemala. I believe so. I'm not -- I'm not a hundred percent sure. I -- those are the -- some of the larger ones.
Q. Okay. So five or six; is that correct, then?
A. At least, correct.
Q. That's South American and Central American countries?
A. Correct.
Q. So why is Avifreight specifically excepted from that, solely because it's under the regulatory purview of Mexico?
A. Well, Avifreight is a holding company. Avifreight has no operations. Avifreight, it holds voting and nonvoting shares and receives dividends. It's -- it's -- it's -- it's a nonentity.
Q. Why, in paragraph 26, do you say, "because air carriers certificated in Mexico are subject to Mexican regulatory requirements, Avifreight was established with the sole purpose of complying with those regulations"?
A. Because it was.
Q. What does the fact that air carriers certificated in Mexico have to do with Avifreight --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- complying with the local regulations if Avifreight's not an airline?
A. Avifreight -- Avifreight is not an airline. AeroUnion, that is the sole asset holder --

THE COURT: We need to mute the lines of anybody who's not speaking.

Deanna, I don't know whether you can do that. Go ahead, Mr. Lenihan.

MR. LENIHAN: I apologize, can -THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: (Indiscernible) -THE WITNESS: Who is Maria Marquez (ph.)? THE COURT: Hang on. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Judge, I can mute everyone if you give me one second -THE COURT: Yeah. Please mute everybody, Deanna. Thank you.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: -- and then I'll have to unmute. Okay. THE COURT: That's my courtroom deputy. THE WITNESS: Okay. THE COURT: Hold on until -MR. LENIHAN: I think she said they were -THE COURT: All right.

MR. LENIHAN: -- she had muted everyone.
A. Okay. So -- so AeroUnion --

THE COURT: Let me just -- so we have a clear record, go ahead and ask your question again, and --

THE WITNESS: Okay.
THE COURT: -- we'll get a clear transcript.
MR. LENIHAN: Sure.
BY MR. LENIHAN:
Q. So in paragraph 26 of your declaration, you state, "Because air carriers certificated in Mexico are subject to Mexican regulatory requirements, Avifreight was established with the sole purpose of complying with those regulations."
A. Correct.
Q. What regulations was Avifreight established --

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I'm sorry?
Q. -- in Mexico to comply with?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Can you hear me?
THE COURT: Yes, Deanna. Hold on. You got everybody muted, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think she muted her call.

THE WITNESS: I think she muted herself.
THE COURT: Now I'm muted, too.
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: (Indiscernible).
THE COURT: Okay. Now I'm muted, too.
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: You're unmuted.
THE COURT: Hold on.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Bear in mind, I can -- I have to -- it mutes everyone, so we won't be doing that.

THE COURT: No. That's okay. Deanna, I'm unmuted now. Everybody else is muted, I think.

Go ahead, Mr. Lenihan.
MR. LENIHAN: Sure.
Q. So Ms. Hughes, in paragraph 26 of your affidavit, do you say, "Because aircraft carriers certificated in Mexico are subject to Mexican regulatory requirements, Avifreight was established with the sole purpose of complying with those regulations." What regulations was Avifreight established in Mexico to comply with?
A. So Avifreight's sole purpose -- so it is an intermediate holding company. Its sole asset is shares of AeroUnion. AeroUnion is a Mexican certificated air carrier, and so Avifreight serves as the entity that holds both nonvoting -nonvoting shares of AeroUnion to comply with the foreign ownership requirements of Mexican certificated air carriers.
Q. And who owns Avifreight?
A. Avifreight is owned partially by Tampa Cargo, which is one of the debtors, and there are a -- a few minority shareholders.
Q. Do you know offhand what percentage Tampa Cargo owns?
A. So it's -- it's -- it's a bit complex if -- if you kind of pull it all the way through the economic ownership structure. Tampa Cargo owns ninety-two percent of AeroUnion, but it does
vary on voting and nonvoting.
Q. Owns ninety-two percent of AeroUnion or of Avifreight?
A. Well, Tampa through Avifreight --
Q. Um-hum.
A. So Tampa owns twenty-five percent direct of -- of AeroUnion, and then it owns -- I can't remember the exact percentage. I'd have to get out -- see the org chart. But it owns a piece of Avifreight, and then Avifreight owns -- and this is economic I'm speaking to, not the -- not the governance but the other seventy-five percent of AeroUnion. And then, they're -- so Avifreight has Tampa as a shareholder and minority shareholders.
Q. And is that why Avianca's -- generally speaking, their consolidated financials include these other three companies?
A. Correct.
Q. Because Avianca has substantial, if not a hundred percent, ownership interest in them?
A. They -- they -- they --
Q. Directly or indirect?
A. -- they have a controlling share hold, yes. THE COURT: Hold on. Deanna, we've got to solve this problem.
(Off-the-record conversation)
(Pause)
THE WITNESS: Are we good?

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Lenihan.
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you.
Q. Ms. Hughes, going back to your declaration, paragraph 18, you have a list of bullet points, and you state that the Avianca debtors have a centralized cash management system. Are all of the Avianca debtors part of that cash management system? A. It -- it -- let me just make sure. Avianca debtors, if I recall correctly, excludes --
Q. Excludes the --
A. -- AeroUnion, Avifreight, and SAI.
Q. Correct.
A. Then, correct. Yes, they are.
Q. And you write, in bullet point 2, page 7, Avianca Holdings provides intercompany loans and other advance capitalization to the other Avianca debtors as necessary. Are those loans documented? Are they journaled?
A. They are.
Q. And so they're recorded?
A. Yes.
Q. And do the Avianca debtors provide any loans or capital or other kind of financing to the three accepted debtors?
A. They did provide initial capital, certainly, but they -nominal, if any, intercompany loans, and it has been quite a while since (indiscernible).
Q. Well, except that the three -- can I call them the
unconsolidated debtors --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- and you understand I mean SAI, AeroUnion, and Avifreight?
A. Right.
Q. Did the unconsolidated debtors participate in the DIP financing in this proceeding?
A. I believe so.
Q. And how is the financing apportioned to those three entities?
A. I don't believe any of those entities used any of the benefits of the -- they -- they haven't had any intercompany -the -- the DIP financing went in at HoldCo, and these entities have not taken any loans, so -- you know, from -- from the DIP. Q. You write, in the third bullet point on page 7, which is still paragraph 18 --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- the Avianca dentors (sic) share many of the same officers, directors, and shareholders. How many of the Avianca debtors have their own distinct officers?
A. Well, so many of them have distinct governance, with respect to the requirements of -- of -- of the -- the laws in which the countries were -- were organized. But with respect to kind -- what $I$ would think of at all -- well, Americans would think it was officers that run the company and kind of
made management decisions. The Avianca debtors are -- are excluding the unconsolidateds, are -- are all run by one management team.

THE COURT: Let me make sure I understand your answer. Are the three unconsolidated debtors managed or governed by those same people?

THE WITNESS: No, they are not.
Q. So going back to what you testified to just a bit ago was that all forty of these entities are on the same consolidated financial statements, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Can you explain to me what the difficulty is, then, or why it's so easy to disentangle the assets and liabilities of the unconsolidated debtors from the Avianca debtors?
A. Sure. So the unconsolidated debtors maintain their own books and records. So by nature, they have their own general ledger. They have their own accounting staff. They -- they produce their own financial statements. I think of them akin -- if you think of -- many companies have controlling stakes in a company that they do consolidate into their financial statements, but they have a fifty-one percent -- so they receive -- I think shows my age, but a fax that says, here's my financial statements, you can add them in a spreadsheet to create your consolidated financial statements. But the books and records are completely separate. They do
create, in a spreadsheet, a set of consolidated financial statements for the holding company, but they're not a integrated books and records.
Q. So you used a reference or an example where a holding company or an entity has a fifty-one percent share in a different company. Here, the holding company, directly or indirectly, has upwards of ninety percent interest in the unconsolidated debtors, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And we've also gone through your testimony that for the Avianca debtors, when they provided loans or other financing, that was booked in accordant -- well, I didn't say that, actually. Would it be in accordance with GAAP or the applicable -- or the equivalence of GAAP accounting?
A. It would be International Financial Reporting Standards.
Q. And that's true for all forty of the debtors?
A. Well, the -- the holding company financial statements have to be produced in international IFRS, which is the International Financial Reporting Standards. I am not positive of the requirements for each of the individual debtors from a financial statement -- local regulatory purposes. I -- I -- I am an accountant many years back in my head. So in some cases, there are countries that do require a local GAAP for their local, you know, kind of regulatory reporting. But as far as the financial statements that, you know, from a holding
company -- holding company perspective, they would all be under IFRS.
Q. And getting back to the books and records for a second, you said the unconsolidated debtors have their own books and records. Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that three sets of books and records or fewer?
A. I believe it's three sets. I -- yeah, I mean, they're -they're separate. I mean, SAI completely separate from AeroUnion. They're in completely different businesses.

Different management teams. So there's no functional way that they could be the same.
Q. And AeroUnion and Avifreight?
A. AeroUnion and Avi- -- I mean, Avifreight is -- again, it's just a holding company.
Q. Um-hum.
A. So its books and records are -- are a spreadsheet at best.
Q. And going back to the Avianca debtors, how many sets of books and records are there for those thirty-seven entities?
A. But -- so I think you have to go into the -- what is a definition of a book and a -- books and records.
Q. That's a fair --
A. There is a general ledger.
Q. So the general ledger, there are thirty-seven general ledgers or fewer?
A. There are subledgers of the same general ledger.
Q. So they're all separately accounted for, the transactions?
A. To the best you can separate them, there is an attempt to create subledgers as -- as best you can of an -- an enterprise that's completely integrated.
Q. What are the struggles in -- let me take a step back. So you got a journal, and then you have subjournals on it for the thirty-seven, or I guess maybe the thirty-six, Avianca debtors from Avianca Holdings down. What are the troubles -- can you articulate what the troubles are in segregating them such that each transaction is appropriately booked for whatever entity it applies to?
A. Yeah. So -- I said I began my career as an auditor of airlines straight out of school. I've seen the financial
statements and worked in general ledgers of airlines all around the globe. I'll say -- I'll tell you I've never seen one this complex as Avianca Holdings by a longshot. It -- it -there -- there is -- you know, you have to have -- for some of these, you know, local countries if you have a company registered in one country and another, you have to attempt to, you know, show the -- show the books and records of one company, but if you went to try and kind of separate the whole, you're inherently going to run into lots of issues because of how complex the operations are.
Q. And why does that --
A. Integrated, actually, is probably a better word than complex.
Q. And why does that not apply to Avifreight and its interest in AeroUnion?
A. So like I said, Avifreight's just an intermediate HoldCo, so it's very simple. So I mean, that one's kind of straightforward. AeroUnion, its business is run completely separate. So when you think about an airline, you think -- and we think -- we -- we use the reference "airline" when we think of Avianca as a whole, but it's really airlines, kind of in a sense.

An airline is -- is basically its network. Its network is where it flies, when it flies, and you can think about it from a customer proposition perspective. All of that is -- in the case of the passenger airlines, Tampa Cargo, that are what we're call the Avianca debtors -- is all one managed, integrated network. One airline might fly this flight or that flight because of regulatory purposes, but the customer proposition is all the same.
Q. In paragraph 27 of your declaration, you state that creditors of the Avianca debtors, including the 2023 noteholders, are not materially impacted by the exclusion of what we've called the unconsolidated debtors.
A. Um-hum.
Q. You say none of the unconsolidated debtors are guarantors
of the 2023 notes. How many of the Avianca debtors are guarantors of the 2023 notes?
A. I don't know the specific number, but all of the operating carriers as well as Avianca Holdings are guarantors of them. So -- which is -- which, when we say that reference, it's basically everybody that has claims other than the exceptions. Q. So in paragraph 19, your first bullet point, you identify nine of the debtors that are guarantors of the 2023 notes; is that correct?
A. I'm sorry. Which paragraph?
Q. Paragraph 19, the first bullet point.
A. Yes.
Q. You identified nine of the debtors that are guarantors of the 2023 notes.
A. Correct.
Q. So that means that twenty-eight of the debtors are not guarantors -- I'm sorry, my math is wrong there. Excuse me. Thirty-one of the debtors are not -- no, I was right the first time. Twenty-eight of the Avianca debtors are not guarantors of the 2023 notes; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. So the fact that the unconsolidated debtors are not guarantors of the 2023 note really doesn't differentiate them all that much from the vast majority of the Avianca debtors, correct?
A. I'm sorry. Say that again?
Q. Sure. The mere fact that the unconsolidated debtors are not guarantors of the 2023 notes doesn't really put them in a different position than the vast majority of the Avianca debtors; is that correct?
A. That fact, specifically, you are correct.
Q. All right. And then you said that the residual value of the Avianca debtors are augmenting the recoveries of the creditors, including the 2023 noteholders. Because Avianca debtors is a ninety-percent shareholder in SAI and has a ninety-two-percent beneficial interest in AeroUnion. How does being the largest shareholder presently do anything to help the 2023 noteholders?
A. Well, so the value of the stock that is in the plan to be provided to the -- all the unsecured creditors contemplates the ownership of these two entities.
Q. But these three entities -- the unconsolidated debtors.
A. Yes.
Q. Have they been kicking up any dividends or distributions or anything like that to their owners?
A. On a post-petition basis, I am uncertain because they're debtors, so I'm not sure what's happening on a dividend basis. But specifically, AeroUnion has been highly profitable and would be sending dividends up to the parent, you know, if and when that the, you know, ability to do so and not -- when they
were not a debtor anymore.
So -- but at a minimum, their cash balance falls directly into the cash balance of Avianca Holdings. And as you know, when you're looking at valuation of a company, cash balance is a direct, you know, dollar-for-dollar benefit to them.
Q. So I need to understand that a little, and I apologize.
A. Um-hum.
Q. The cash balance of the unconsolidated debtors --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- goes directly to the Avianca debtors?
A. It -- it -- it -- it's not -- you can't go into the bank account and go pull it out. But if you take -- when we -those consolidated financial statements --
Q. Um-hum.
A. -- are the sum of the parts.
Q. Okay.
A. And you know, one of those has -- if it has, you know, twenty-five, thirty million dollars in cash, that twenty-five, thirty million dollars in cash is on the balance sheet of the whole -- you know, the -- the consolidated financial statements of Avianca Holdings, and therefore the value of Avianca Holdings is thirty million better because of that unconsolidated entity --
Q. Because all --
A. -- or that consolidated entity.
Q. -- all forty of the debtors are on the same consolidated financial statements.
A. I -- I've already said that before. Correct.

MR. LENIHAN: No further questions at this time, Your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Kim, did you have any questions?
You have to unmute.
MR. KIM: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. KIM:
Q. Ms. Hughes, you say that three unconsolidated entities had separate management. I looked at SAI more in detail. Like, normally, there is one general manager for 600 employee company. How many people manage SAI?
A. I do not know.
Q. Also, for the board of directors, Mr . Neuhauser, the COA, is listed. What does Mr. Neuhauser do in this capacity?
A. I'm sorry. I can't -- I -- I can't hear you.
Q. I'm sorry. On the list of board of directors for SAI, Mr.

Neuhauser of the CEO is listed. What does he do for SAI in this capacity?
A. He is a member of the board of directors. I mean, as the controlling shareholder of SAI, the -- the -- the holding company, Avianca Holdings, has governance rights to designate
board members.
Q. Okay. Is he paid for his services?
A. I do not know.
Q. Okay. Another question, Ms. Hughes. You indicated that objectors have three equity interests -- they have three entities. Sorry. Equity interests in three entities. How did you determine that?
A. I'm -- I -- I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question and get closer to the mic? I'm struggling to hear you.
Q. Sorry. Maybe my Zoom is not good. You indicated that the objectors have equity interests in three entities -- I guess the holding company is what you meant, in your testimony. And how is -- my question is, how did you determine that?
A. How did I determine that they have equity interest in the entities?
Q. Sorry. You said, like, a ninety-two percent, ninety-three percent. The three entities that were unconsolidated, you said that the holding company owns these percentages. And my question is, how did you determine those percentages?
A. So $I$ was provided an organizational chart. Actually, back in 2019 is the first instance when $I$ was working with the company that shows the ownership percentages of the -- you know, if -- typical org chart of a company that shows the percentage ownerships of one company, and then, you know, in the waterfall of companies. And -- and that's -- that's --
those are the percentages that are on that chart.
Q. All right. And you indicated that 2023 noteholders are beneficiaries of all of these entities, and then you describe that we receive cash. I believe you're referring to dividend payments, also from these three entities. Do you know how much (indiscernible) have been receiving from these three unconsolidated entities?

THE COURT: Mr. Renenger?
MR. RENENGER: Yeah, I'm going to object as a mischaracterization of the testimony.

THE COURT: Do you understand the question?
THE WITNESS: I think I know where he's headed with the question. I mean, it -- it -- it -- it's very straight forward.

THE COURT: Go ahead and answer it.
A. I mean. Yeah. If you own ninety percent of something, you own ninety percent of something. Whether that is received dividends as a result of that ninety-percent ownership, or whether the entity, you know, ultimately over time is sold or otherwise, you know, the value of its operations, the value of the entity, goes to the owners of the entity.
Q. Yes. That is correct. Okay. You indicate that
liquidation analysis is performed correctly. Do you think liquidation analysis is appropriate to determine the property of secured creditors?
A. I'm -- I -- I -- I -- really struggling to hear you.

THE COURT: I'm having trouble understanding you, as well, Mr. Kim. Go ahead and ask your question again.

MR. KIM: Sorry, Your Honor.
Q. My question is, Ms. Hughes, you indicate that liquidation analysis is performed correctly. Do you believe liquidation analysis is appropriate when determining the recovery value of secured creditors?
A. Well, I mean, in a liquidation analysis, you -- you look at the value of the collateral with respect to the secured creditors, which we did, and assign the value of recovery based on an assessment of the underlying collateral value.
Q. And are you familiar with Code 506 -- Bankruptcy Code 506?
A. I -- I'm certainly familiar with certain elements of the Code. I would have to look at the Code specifically in 506 to be able to tell you whether that specific reference I'm familiar with.
Q. Okay. Well, 506 says that the secured creditor's value should be determined based on how the plan is going to be utilized. So given that, do you still believe that liquidation analysis is appropriate for secured creditors?
A. Well, I mean, a liquidation analysis is -- is the -- is a -- a look at the alternative to the plaintiff reorganization as presented. The liquidation analysis is -- is a look at a Chapter 7 alternative, in which case -- I mean, I've been
through a lot of airline cases, and they're usually pretty easy liquidation analysis from a -- from a -- a standpoint in the sense that the -- the value of an airline as a liquidated basis is worth typically less than zero. It's very hard to have value out of an airline on a liquidated basis.
Q. Sorry. In a liquidation analysis, we have a stark
valuation difference from a (indiscernible) valuation. And I agree with you on that, Ms. Hughes.

THE COURT: Mr. Kim, you can ask questions, but you're not to testify. So ask your questions, okay?

MR. KIM: I'm sorry, sir. Okay. No more questions on this.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Kim.
Mr. Renenger?
MR. RENENGER: Thank you, Your Honor. Once again,
Aaron Renenger, on behalf of the debtors.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. RENENGER:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Hughes.
A. Good afternoon, Mr. Renenger.
Q. Ms. Hughes, in the context of your work for Avianca, were you asked to undertake an exercise to evaluate the propriety of sub-con?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. And were you asked to achieve a certain outcome
with respect to that analysis?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Okay. And well, what was the ultimate conclusion in terms of which entities -- let me just ask it differently. Try not to ask a leading question, but it's hard in your declaration. You concluded that thirty-seven of the entities are appropriate to subcon --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Would it be difficult to disentangle the assets and liabilities of those thirty-seven entities?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Okay. And why is that?

THE COURT: Explain to me why. Oh -- same question.
A. So there's a couple of reasons why it would be next to impossible. So -- so if you just start very simply with the value of an entity, and again, I go back to, you know, the value of an airline is directly correlated to its network -- to its customer proposition. If you just think of it, when you buy a ticket, you know, are you more willing to pay a little bit more for the airline that has the flight at the right time, on the right day, that wants -- gets you where you want to go at the time. And -- and what you think, and then you know, the next four buying decisions -- if you want to buy on -- you
know, you think you -- generally, the loyalty to an airline is are they going to get you at the next destination when you want to go at the right time on the right day. And so that breadth of network has a direct correlation to value, so if -- if you start to take this networked -- you know -- set of airlines and companies and separate them, you -- you diminish the value almost immediately. I mean, the sum of the parts is much greater than -- than the individual parts.
Q. Okay. Now, same question with respect to the three entities that were not consolidated.
A. Um-hum.
Q. Would it be difficult to disentangle those entities?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And why not?
A. Very simply -- very simple. So AeroUnion runs its own business and manages its own books and -- I'll take you through each one of them individually.

AeroUnion runs its own business, has its own set of books and records, has its own set of customers. They -- they -they run an independent business.

Avifreight, as I've said, is nothing other than an intermediate holding company, whose sole purpose it is to hold voting and nonvoting shares, and if there's any dividends they would receive dividends, but from AeroUnion. So it's -- it -it's very simply segregated on that basis.

And in SAI, again, you know, it was an acquired entity. It is run and maintained completely separate and has a management team that's separate and books and records that are separate. It's actually quite easy -- I mean, it's already separate. It's not hard to separate. It already is separate. Q. Okay. And you spoke a little bit in your declaration about the fact that for the thirty-seven Avianca debtors, that the company holds those debtors out as all part of the Avianca network; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Is that true with respect to the three entities that are -- that are not proposed to be subsequently consolidated?
A. No.
Q. Okay. How does Avianca market those entities relative to the rest of Avianca?
A. I'm sure there's references to them being, you know -they're not -- they're not wholly owned in the case of AeroUnions. I'm sure they're marketed in some materials as, you know, an Avianca company, in the sense that they are, you know, consolidated into the entity. But from a customer proposition perspective, they're quite separate. I mean, you know, SAI's primary customer is Avianca, but -- but that's not -- you know, they're not marketing themselves to Avianca as Avianca controlled because Avianca's their customer.
Q. And do you have any understanding of -- can you talk to us now about how Avianca holds itself out? Give me an understanding of how the market views any of the three entities that we're talking about that are not proposed to be consolidated.
A. I do. In fact, specifically with one of the few creditors of AeroUnion. I got on the phone with -- I was -- with -- it was LAWA -- Los Angeles Airport. Los Angeles Air -- something. LAWA. And to -- to have a conversation with them about their claim and about the continuing operations of AeroUnion as part of my advisors to the -- all the debtors. And they wouldn't refuse to speak to me. You know, they -- because they're like, this is Avianca. You're talking to me about AeroUnion. You're -- you're Avianca's advisor. And I had to explain to them and actually had to come back to counsel and have counsel call them and show them how I actually was advising, you know, both of them as debtors because they -- in their mind, they were completely separate.
Q. Thank you. Turning to Avifreight briefly, does it have any creditors to your knowledge?
A. No.
Q. Does it have any operations to your knowledge?
A. No.

MR. RENENGER: No more questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Renenger.

Any additional questions?
Mr. Lenihan, please, step to the microphone.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LENIHAN:
Q. Ms. Hughes, you testified on redirect that it would be difficult to untangle the assets and the liabilities of the Avianca debtors because the sum of their parts is greater than anything individually; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there any other reason that it would be difficult to untangle their assets and liabilities?
A. Quite a few. I mean, with respect to the liabilities, I mean, they're very integrated in the sense that -- take every aircraft. Very large fleet of aircraft, those aircraft are the -- the original lease or loan tends to be with the certificated and regulated operating carrier, but they're guaranteed by the other debtors. So you know, where does all of that sit at the end of the day? It's very complex. You know, even with respect to liabilities, they do a -- quite a bit of contracting, that they do a -- not just aircraft, but where they cross -- cross debtor. Take a catering contract, for example. They -- they issue it in one catering contract that serves all of the passenger airline and cargo airline -well, even though you cater for the crew on a charter airline so that they can, you know, have what they need. Those are all
in kind of one integrated, you know, contract. So where do -where do you put all of these things at the end of the day? Q. When you say one integrated contract, do you mean there's multiple parties -- multiple of the Avianca debtors are party to the same contract?
A. Correct.
Q. And you made reference to guarantees, right, and those guarantees are documented. There's paper that shows those guarantees exist, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. So all of these liabilities that you're referring to are documented, and you testified earlier already that the company maintains -- the company maintains its books and records and that if there's intercompany debts, that they are journaled as appropriate. So I'm having a hard time seeing, when you have all of that, why you can't pull the thread on them and take them apart?
A. Well, it's -- I can tell you, for thirty years, I've been working in the finance departments of airlines and in -starting back in an auditing, and I -- I -- yeah, conceivably, could you? Would it take five, ten years? You know, there's a practicality element to -- to that, that is -- I -- I -- I -- I mean, I can't even fathom how long it would take, with my -you know, based on my experience and knowing the way the -- the airlines operate.
Q. Their books and records and their consolidated financial statements are going to break out who's guaranteed what, correct?
A. Well, the -- you'd have to -- the financial statements probably have disclosure with respect to the guarantees. I'm not sure every guarantee. It may just be the -- some of the more material ones. But you'd probably have to go through every document.
Q. In paragraph 19, you broke out guarantors for several -the Grupo TACA settlement agreement, the USA V settlement agreement, the 2023 secured notes, and others. Was that difficult to do?
A. Well, with respect to those specific financings, it was fairly straightforward, but if you look at the -- one, two, three, fourth -- fifth bullet down, that's all of the aircraft financings.

THE COURT: Identify which one that one is.
THE WITNESS: So it says, Avianca Holdings, Grupo TACA
Holdings Limited. TACA and Aerovias guarantee nearly all aircraft financings and collectively account for over seventyfive percent of the estimated consolidated unsecured claims.
Q. Are they jointly and severally liable on those guarantees?
A. Yes.
Q. So is it that difficult then to apportion that out? They've all potentially face a hundred percent liability,
correct?
A. They are where the claims reside. I mean, I -- portioning them out, again, it comes full circle back to who -- what they could be valuing any of these individual entities at that individually can't operate at anywhere near their value separately that they do together.
Q. Specifically, and we're sticking with the liabilities here, and you brought this up, that these three entities guarantee nearly all the aircraft financing. And you testified that they do so jointly and severally.

So they each are individually liable from one hundred percent of that debt, and I'm struggling to see why that's so difficult, then, to break apart, when they're all just responsible on a guarantee basis for one hundred percent of the debt.
A. That's one piece of how you would separate a books and records. I mean, like I said, this could take -- I -- I've been doing this for a very long time, and I can't imagine how it would be done, and it would take millions of dollars and years to accomplish.
Q. Well, I'm just going off of your declaration, which is your direct testimony in this and the debtor's burden of proof that substantial substantive consolidation is appropriate. So based on your testimony here, everything we're going through, I'm struggling to see why guarantees that --

THE COURT: Leave the editorial comments out and just ask questions.

MR. LENIHAN: Yes, Your Honor.
Q. Going to the assets for a moment of the --
A. Um-hum.
Q. -- Avianca debtors, are those difficult to parse apart?
A. Some assets are -- are -- are relatively easy. Some others are a little more difficult.
Q. Which ones are a little more difficult?
A. So if you get to those aircraft financings, for example.

You know, we -- you'd have to follow the aircraft financing and follow the debtors to track those through. You know, cash, obviously is straightforward. Cash in the bank is -- whatever cash is in the account of whatever debtor they're in. You got spare parts that -- that are used across a network, again. So they're used pretty -- you know, fairly broadly. And then you get into, you know, some of the intangibles. And I'm not a -you know, I'm -- I'm not a valuation expert when it comes to some of those -- those items, but I do believe -- I mean -I -- it would be -- it wouldn't be simple. Let me just put it that way.
Q. For the intangibles, like the intellectual property for example, couldn't you just look to who owns those marks -those rights?
A. Possibly, but again, you're probably going to get to who
owns them in what country and what country -- what mark is valuable at what level at what country. Airlines are ridiculously complex, and -- and if you want to track through, you know, value of things like that, you're going to end up in a -- a very complicated, long, drawn-out exercise that quite frankly I don't understand the point of it at the end of the day.

MR. LENIHAN: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Lenihan. Mr.
Lenihan, any further examination?
MR. LENIHAN: No further redirect from me, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
You're excused.

MR. KIM: I have a question, Your Honor. I have a question, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ask your question, Mr. Kim.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. KIM:
Q. Okay. So Ms. Hughes, you say something that consolidation is appropriate because the difficulty in disentangling the other consolidated networks, correct?
A. Yes. And can you get closer to the mic next time?
Q. Okay. And that seems to be the most important factor, whether if to determine to consolidate or not, correct?
A. I --

THE COURT: Mr. Lenihan?
MR. LENIHAN: Yeah, I guess that sound like an editorial comment. I'm not sure I understood the question, Mr. Kim.

THE COURT: Did you have an objection as to -- can you answer the question?

THE WITNESS: I -- I don't understand what the question was.

THE COURT: Ask another question, Mr. Kim.
Q. So my question, Ms. Hughes, is do you believe difficulty of disentangling is the main reason why something to consolidate them should happen for the debtors?
A. No. I think there are a number of reasons that have been articulated both in my testimony and in -- in other -regarding -- I mean, it -- it -- it -- it -- it's the -- it -there are a number of reasons. That is a very good one.
Q. All right. Are you familiar with the (indiscernible) that what is appropriate for determining substantive consolidation --

THE COURT: We're not going to have legal questions, Mr. Kim.

MR. KIM: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The witness is not testifying as a lawyer.
If you have any other questions, go ahead.
MR. KIM: That's it for now, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.
Mr. Renenger?
MR. RENENGER: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. You're excused. Thank you very much.

MS. HUGHES: Thank you.
THE COURT: Are there any other witnesses? Do the objectors wish to call any witnesses?

MR. LENIHAN: No, Your Honor. (Indiscernible).
THE COURT: Mr. Lenihan, I'm not sure whether the sound system picked it up. Mr. Lenihan indicated that he had no witnesses that he wished to call.

All right. Is there anybody else -- any of the other objectors who wish to call any witnesses in support of their objections?

All right. Hearing none, Mr. Renenger, do the debtors rest?

MR. RENENGER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Do the objectors rest? Mr. Lenihan? You can say it from there if you want.

MR. LENIHAN: I take it Your Honor's not taking closing statements?

THE COURT: Oh, I am, but this is -- I'm turning to the evidence. Do you rest?

MR. LENIHAN: Yes. No, we rest. Thank you, Your

Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kim, do you rest in terms of evidence? I'll give you a chance to argue.

MR. KIM: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. All right. All parties have rested. Let's hear a closing argument.

Who's going to argue for the debtors?
MR. FLECK: I will, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Fleck.
MR. FLECK: And for the record, Evan Fleck, on behalf of the debtors. Your Honor, it's been a long day, and we appreciate the Court's patience with the presentation of all parties. I think it's been helpful. It's been helpful in a number of respects. I think that the debtors have made their case-in-chief with respect to confirmation.

As it pertains to the objections that remain, I think it's fairly straightforward, Your Honor. And we obviously respect the fact that some of the -- some of the parties are not -- at least one of them is not a bankruptcy practitioner. But the conclusion that we think is compelled by the evidence and the law is that the objections be overruled. It's really comes down to two issues that we have, I think, before the Court. One is whether or not the issue with respect -- whether they've made their case with respect to the collateral and whether or not they have a secured interest in that collateral.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Without regard to who had the burden with respect to the valuation of the collateral, explain to me what the evidence in the record shows with respect to whether the 2023 noteholders had a residual value in their lien. What is the evidence? So the evidence that you put in was the testimony regarding the marketing effort. So if you would lay out why you believe that establishes that there is no collateral value remaining for the 2023 noteholders with respect to the shared collateral.

MR. FLECK: Sure. Happy to do that, Your Honor.
I think the evidence is uncontroverted, and I'll put

It was also -- it was overseen by the independent equity committee, the board. The effort was to search for all options, and I think Mr. Lenihan actually --

THE COURT: Equity and debt.
MR. FLECK: Equity and debt. Importantly. I was going to get there, Your Honor, but thank you for leading us there.

I think Mr. Lenihan may have been confused about that. Not a criticism, just a recognition, that -- maybe because of some language in the declaration -- that we were solely focused on equity. He also seemed to criticize when Mr . Neuhauser spoke to the fact that we looked at everything. And that's exactly what we did, and that's the point of it. That's what a debtor is supposed to do. In fact, that's what we committed to Your Honor at the time that the DIP was initially approved in connection with the option of conversion.

What we said to Your Honor at the time, and I think it was impactful for purposes of your entry of the order, ultimately, on the DIP, was that we were going to look for other options. We were going to look for debt options. We were going to look for equity options. We had an incremental need for equity. We were going to scour the market.

And that's what we did. It took time, much to the frustration of the tranche $B$ lenders. It took time because we said this was going to be a robust process. This process was
going to be second to none. And the process was intended to find a different alternative. An alternative where another party or set of parties would come forward, not with one approach but any approach that would have allowed these debtors to have found a solution other than converting the tranche $B$ DIP effectively.

And if we could have found any other source of liquidity, whether that be debt, equity, combination, some other instrument, that would have been taken to the independent equity committee. There was not another option. That's uncontroverted. And what that means is that there was not enough --

THE COURT: The testimony that you did raise some additional debt.

MR. FLECK: Right. Your Honor, we did raise -- we did raise incremental debt that came before the Court in connection with the tranche $A$ refinancing, but that was not enough because that was incremental 140 million --

THE COURT: And was there collateral backing that?
The incremental debt?

MR. FLECK: It's the same -- it's the same collateral package that we're talking about.

THE COURT: And does that take priority over the 2023 noteholders?

MR. FLECK: It does -- it --

THE COURT: In other words, is it the same shared collateral?

MR. FLECK: It's the same arrangement with respect to the collateral and the same hierarchy that was set out in the DIP order controls, with respect to that financing. And so Your Honor, from the debtor's perspective, and I think it's uncontroverted -- well, sorry. This --

THE COURT: That was on -- the addition amount that was raised was how much?

MR. FLECK: I believe the testimony was approximately 140 million. I'm sure someone'll correct me -- yeah, I'm being told still approximately 140 million. We can put the number into evidence before the hearing concludes.

But the time, Your Honor, to have complained with respect to the treatment of the noteholders was at the $D I P$ hearing more than a year ago, as Your Honor noted, in connection with the disclosure statement. The debtors didn't --

THE COURT: Well, the DIP hearing and the DIP order preserved -- I'll refer to it as a junior interest -- of the 2023 noteholders in the shared collateral. That's a fair statement, isn't it?

I mean --
MR. FLECK: That's right, Your Honor. Right, if --
THE COURT: -- there was no determination made at the
time of the DIP --
MR. FLECK: That's fair.
THE COURT: -- the DIP was their goal, that there was no value. They subordinated their interest on the shared collateral to the DIP lenders.

MR. FLECK: Correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FLECK: But I guess my point was that to the extent noteholders, including Mr . Kim and the similarly situated parties, had an issue, they could have -- they could have -- in fact, should have -- brought the issue before the Court at the time. But at bottom, Your Honor, the debtors had a contract with --

THE COURT: Well, the collateral agent had the exclusive right to -- as far as the actual term.

MR. FLECK: Well, that's where I'm -- that's where I'm going, Your Honor. The debtors had a contract with the WSFS, the indenture trustee, and the collateral trustee. And that contract contained a lot of provisions. Mr. Kim pejoratively called it Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. We'll put that aside. But it's a contract that these investors -- and they are sophisticated investors -- made a decision to put themselves subject to the provisions of those agreements. And it's not in dispute that those agreements allowed the trustee, the parties who had the authority on a direction of more than a majority,
and it's not in dispute that they had that direction to do exactly what was done in connection with those transactions. They are actually trying to relitigate those issues.

They are, in addition, as Your Honor notes, saying, well, something must have gone awry because the debtors find themselves saying that we're unsecured, and you're right, there was no determination at the time of the DIP hearing, and it's fair that these other parties were not under the ten. They are not at Seabury. They were not involved in the marketing process. But there were other parties. There were other fiduciaries, like the creditors' committee.

So not only did Jefferies -- not only did Seabury run a process under the supervision of the independent equity committee, Jefferies, on behalf of the creditors' committee, was looking over their shoulder. And it wasn't just some academic exercise. That was very important to the ultimate recovery and outcome for unsecured creditors. They were statutorily charged, and still are, with maximizing the value of unsecured creditor recoveries.

So they made sure that Mr . Luth and his team were looking under every rock and scouring every opportunity and avenue. And the reality is that there was not another availability to take out the DIP. And it's important. I think it might perhaps -- we lose sight of the fact that the moment in time when we had to run this process wasn't just random.

The debtors were obligated to deal with a DIP that was approved by the Court. It had a maturity. And as a result, Mr. Lenihan makes a fair point, that maybe the market changes. It does. Hopefully it improves.

But there's a moment in time when the debtors had to act. They acted. It was open and notorious for all parties that we were engaged in a process. I gave updates to the Court that we were running that process, and the results are now manifest of that process. And there is not -- and there was not -- and it remains the case that for purposes of their argument, there is not value sufficient to render them having any collateral interest -- any residual interest from the collateral on account of their notes.

So now comes a new argument. We didn't hear it at the time of the disclosure statement. And we say, well, we're not happy with substantive consolidation. We don't like it. And I think Ms. Hughes' point, it really should resonate. The debtor didn't have an agenda, and doesn't either today with respect to substantive consolidation. Why would we? There is no insider. There's nobody at the top of any of these entities -- at the three entities that are not being consolidated, where creditors are being unimpaired and a recovery's going to equity. In fact, that was the point of her testimony, that the value with respect to those three entities that are not being consolidated actually flow back into the structure. So I think her point
was -- her testimony's her testimony -- but the point and why it's relevant is that the creditors here who are complaining about the substantive consolidation are not really harmed by it in that the vast majority of the value really comes back or could conceivably come back into the enterprise.

But more importantly --
THE COURT: Well, it's a big difference if a secured creditor gets the value or they're unsecured and they share pro rata with all other unsecured creditors.

MR. FLECK: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I couldn't hear the beginning.

THE COURT: There's a big difference between whether any residual value goes to the secured creditors or they share pro rata with all unsecured creditors.

MR. FLECK: Right, Your Honor. I think the math would suggest that even if those three entities were consolidated, I think the point is that the recoveries to those creditors would not be meaningfully improved. But --

THE COURT: Where's the evidence of -- where is the evidence of that? That's in the declaration?

MR. FLECK: There's a statement to that effect in Ms.
Hughes' declaration.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FLECK: Yeah. But I think the context is important, that the debtors -- against a backdrop of many
airline cases that pursue and have pursued and have been approved by courts in this district and elsewhere substantive consolidation settlements, which this is.

The debtors' embarked on an exercise to see if that was appropriate and where it was appropriate. There were no preconceived agendas. There were no notions that one outcome would be better or not for the debtors. There's no evidence to suggest that there was. We called balls and strikes. Ms.

Hughes has testimony to that effect. She ran a process with a team of individuals to determine what the right --

THE COURT: May I ask you this, Mr. Fleck?
MR. FLECK: -- and fair answer was.
THE COURT: In your brief, you make the statement that substantive consolidation was part of global settlement, and you just referenced that there are other cases where that's done. I didn't see any citations to authority where substantive consolidation was approved as part of a global settlement as you referred to. Is there? I may have missed something.

MR. FLECK: Well, I believe we -- well, we certainly cited cases where there were global settlements of substantive consolidation. Northwest Airlines is one of them that Ms. Hughes --

THE COURT: I have the brief here. I may have missed it, but if somebody would point me to that.

MR. FLECK: I think I -- we'll pull the citation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead with your argument.

MR. FLECK: Okay. I think the last point, Your Honor, on substantive consolidation, which $I$ think is a bit of a red herring, but on the merits of it, I think our -- ultimately, the debtors' fiduciary duty was to figure out what's the right answer -- and by that I mean, where is the Augie/Restivo standard satisfied? And we determined, to the best of our abilities, that only thirty-seven of the forty entities is the standard satisfied.

We presented the evidence of our findings to the creditors' committees advisors. They endorsed that conclusion. We can't get there. We don't think the facts support the case for the other three. The objectors haven't made a case that the facts are there. They don't like the plan. They don't like the outcome. They may not like these debtors. But the reality, Judge, is that's not a winning argument for them. The winning argument is that the facts of the law support it for certain debtors, not for the others. Those are the ones that we're promoting. That's the plan that was put out to creditors. It was open and notorious and on disclosure statement. People endorsed it, not just by a little bit, by overwhelming majorities of all the creditor classes who are
affected.
So we heard the arguments of the objectors. We respectfully disagree with them and would ask Your Honor that those objections be overruled.

And I think Mr. Renenger's giving me a citation.
Your Honor, I'm on the brief, page 36 --
THE COURT: Let me get there. Hold on a second.
Okay.
MR. FLECK: It's paragraph 36 -- sorry, page 36, paragraph 86.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FLECK: There's a string cite, Northwest Airlines.
Judge Roberts' case is one of them. If your precise question -- I fear it may have been -- is in which of those cases where substantive consolidation was approved, was it approved as a settlement? I can tell you that that is the case with respect to Northwest Airlines because I had direct involvement in that.

Mr. Miller, $I$ think, is itching to tell us about some of his cases.

THE COURT: So let me just say that when I look at paragraph 86, and let's put aside Republic Airway Holdings for the moment. Whenever I see citations to an order, it always raises the question whether it was contested and whether the court resolved a contested issue or whether it was consensual.

So when I look at AMR, Delta, Pinnacle, Frontier, the citations are to orders. And I don't know whether I've had the opportunity to make this comment in this case or not, but whenever $I$ see a string cite of orders entered in cases with no reference to a transcript or a decision, I can't tell whether it was entirely consensual resolution of an issue or not.

Obviously, if all parties agree and an order is entered, that there are no objections, that's maybe entitled to some weight but not when the issue is contest. Okay. I did not go and read Republic Airways, both the bankruptcy court and the district court decisions. Those are only where you cite court decisions. I don't know whether the court actually addressed the substance of it.

MR. FLECK: Yes, Your Honor. In Republic, it was contested, and it was addressed by the court -- that issue specifically.

THE COURT: Who was the judge in Republic?
MR. FLECK: Judge Lane.
THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Go ahead.
MR. FLECK: I have nothing further, Your Honor. I'm happy to respond to any questions.

THE COURT: Just give me a second, okay.
Thank you.
MR. FLECK: Thank You, Your Honor.
THE COURT: If there are any of the other proponents
want to be heard before -- Mr. Miller, do you want to be heard before I hear the objectors?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, Brett Miller, Willkie Farr \& Gallagher, on behalf of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors. Having represented the creditors' committees in Republic, in Northwest, and in Pinnacle, both in this district as well as at least a half a dozen others, the reason why you're seeing orders and not case cites is because they were consensual other than Republic, where before, Judge Lane wanted the aircraft parties who had a guarantee at the parent, and its subsidiary did try to upset the negotiated substantive consolidation, and for very much the same reasons. Actually, I think that Ms. Hughes and Mr. Luth were the advisors to Republic.

MS. HUGHES: Correct.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.
MR. MILLER: That's what I thought. And we had a very similar type of hearing going through the accounting and the way that the books and records are kept. And Judge Lane found in favor of substantive consolidation and confirmed plan was confirmed on appeal.

So having lived through it a couple other times, I am advising the committee through the process where we negotiated the substantive consolidation here. I think that it is legally defensible and in fact the right way to go here, and so we'd
support confirmation.
THE COURT: All right. Do you want to address at all the issue of the collateral value -- the shared collateral?

MR. MILLER: Well, Your Honor, I think we're dealing with DIP issues in a confirmation hearing, which is a little awkward. Certainly --

THE COURT: Well, yes and no because the DIP order did not resolve the issue of whether there was residual value for the 2023 noteholders. It resolved the priming fight. And don't you agree it didn't resolve the issue of the value of the collateral?

MR. MILLER: It didn't, but what I can say -- and I don't want to go into negotiations with the debtors of the tranche B lenders, but at a certain point in time, there was zero value for unsecured creditors, which meant there was zero value for residual secured creditors. And as Jefferies was the financial advisor of the banker for the creditors' committee, Jefferies did not only regularly communicate with Seabury but actually tried to shake trees and look under rocks for its own version of financing because the only way to get value to unsecured creditors actually would have benefitted Mr. Kim and the Baruchs in finding more value and showing that that collateral was worth something, more than the existing DIP, but it wasn't. It never appeared, and we negotiated the best case we had, and that's why we have the recovery we have. And I
think it creeps over into the 2023 notes residual value from the shared collateral being zero.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Miller.
All right. Mr. Lenihan?
MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor is obviously familiar with the standard for substantive consolidation. And it's no mere instrument of procedural convenience. Just because you want to do it does not mean it's appropriate. It's effectively treating these entities as alter egos, which is not what the creditors signed up for.

The testimony elicited today said that all thirtyseven of them have their own books and records, that they observe legal formalities, that they have their own -- that there were officers appointed to them, that they comply with the local requirements for governance, and that any time there was a transfer between one and the other, it was booked appropriately in the company receivables and in the company payables and in the company loan and whatever it is.

They haven't had the standing to do that, and just because they want to do it doesn't mean it's appropriate for the Court to allow them to do it when it's not consensual, when the 2023 noteholders -- the nonconsenting 2023 noteholders are going to receive pennies on the dollar.

So we don't believe that they've met that standard, but if they have met the standard, we also then -- and I
realize this is an alternative argument, but that's exactly what it is. They haven't met the -- they shouldn't be allowed to exclude the three profitable companies, the three companies that have assets that could be used to increase the share that's given to everyone, that's made available for all of the impaired classes including the nonconsenting 2023 noteholders.

We don't believe that there's a legal basis for them to do that.

Turning to the other issue of the collateral, the debtors made the affirmative representation in the disclosure statement that there's no value in the collateral to the 2023 noteholders.

THE COURT: They expressed their opinion there's no value. And today is the confirmation hearing. You objected to confirmation. The only evidence with respect to whether there's residual value was put in by the debtors. You crossexamined it, but you offered no evidence to the contrary.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, respectfully, where I was going with that is they made that representation in the disclosure statement. The noteholders presumably relied on it when they voted to approve the plan.

THE COURT: Nonsense. Come on. You objected specifically on that ground. Now is the time when you had to come forward with evidence. The only evidence that's been offered with respect to whether there's residual value is the
evidence that the debtors' witnesses offered, both in declarations and in cross-examination and redirect. That's the only evidence I have before me.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: And I have to decide whether based on the evidence before me somebody has established -- I don't think the burden is going to make a difference in the end, because I'm not weighing evidence that the objectors put in versus evidence that the debtors put in.

The only evidence that's been put in on value is from the debtors' witnesses. Yes, you've cross-examined, but that's the sum total of the evidence. And I have to conclude based on that evidence whether it's been established that there's any residual value to the 2023 noteholders with respect to the shared collateral. Is that a fair statement?

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, respectfully, I would disagree with that somewhat in so that I would just said that the Third Circuit in in re Heritage said the circumstances depend on whose burden (indiscernible).

THE COURT: The only evidence before me is the evidence that the debtors have put in. It isn't a question -I'm not weighing what you've put in versus what they've put in. The only evidence is from the witnesses that they sponsored, you cross-examined. That's the body of evidence which I have to determine whether or not any residual value for the shared
collateral benefitting the 2023 noteholders. Isn't that correct?

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, what I would say to you that -- is that putting aside whose burden it was, if my interpretation is correct that based on the Third Circuit's holding that it should be their burden in the first instance if not solely their burden, I would submit they did not meet their burden such that it did not pass to me, because I do not believe that their only direct -- and on direct they put in an affidavit saying I believe that the amount of the DIP facility claims exceed the value in shared collateral and that's based on the solicitation of equity investments.

THE COURT: There was examination of the witness, both cross and redirect. I have a body of evidence and have to conclude based on the evidence whether the evidence supports a conclusion that there is or is not residual value for the shared collateral to benefit the 2023 noteholders. Correct?

MR. LENIHAN: And I understand Your Honor's position --

THE COURT: Well, is it correct or not? What's wrong with what I just said? You offered no evidence. The only evidence is what's been -- what's come in today in the declarations, cross-examination, redirect examination.

MR. LENIHAN: Your Honor, I don't believe they've met their burden. That is my position. I understand we didn't put
in any evidence. If --
THE COURT: All right. I got your point.
MR. LENIHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't mean to belabor that but I just for the record was getting my point across. I said what I had to say about substantive consolidation, so I thank you for hearing us (indiscernible) today.

THE COURT: All right.
Mr. Kim, do you wish to make a closing statement? You need to unmute.

MR. KIM: Sorry, Your Honor. Yes, sir, this is Blake Kim, Your Honor. So first and foremost, Your Honor, we had questioned (indiscernible) Your Honor ruled whether they were circumvented by doing what the debtors did. And we believe they did, Your Honor. And they basically put in, waiving the equitable marshaling is the key reason why of shared collateral (indiscernible).

THE COURT: So you agree -- you agree that because of the equitable marshaling that's foreclosed by the DIP order that there's no residual value for the shared collateral. That's what you're agreeing to now, correct?

MR. KIM: Your Honor, I can kind of fathom it could be because $I$ don't know the valuation. I mean, first of all, I would say we'd have to do a fair valuation, like an insider valuation to determine that. But outside of that, their
comment or their argument is that because of the equitable marshaling they want to attack all collateral, which is shared collateral first, not equitably (indiscernible).

THE COURT: That's what the DIP order provides. You didn't object to it, and in fact, the collateral agent was the one with the authority to act on -- either the indenture trustee or the collateral agent had the contractual authority to act on behalf of the 2023 noteholders. They didn't object. But you didn't come forward and object. No one did.

And the order got entered, and you're complaining now. You didn't appeal it. No one did. You're trying to collaterally attack an order that was entered with the approval of the collateral agent with respect to dividing up any proceeds from the shared collateral -- first goes to pay off the DIP and only if there's residual value is it there for the 2023 noteholders.

You don't like the order that was entered. The collateral agent didn't object to it. There was a direction by the requisite lenders to the collateral agent to do that, and there was no appeal of the DIP order. No objections, no appeal, that's the reality. You may not like it now, but it's a little late in the day to be raising that issue.

MR. KIM: Well, I understand, Your Honor, where we are now because we lost that. But the way they went about doing it, the process it seems is circumventing the ADR which they
could do over and over again. For people like me, who I would say is layman, I didn't know what equitable marshaling was until the disclosure statement came out saying that we are worthless because of that. Now (indiscernible) --

THE COURT: I don't think they're saying it's because of equitable marshaling that it's worthless. They're saying that the DIP order provided the waterfall for any proceeds from the collateral first to pay off the DIP and only then the residual value to the 2023 noteholders. It's straightforward.

MR. KIM: But that's exactly the equitable -- that's exactly the equitable marshaling, Your Honor. They're basically saying they would pay off first from the shared collateral the DIP. That's the meaning of equitable marshaling, Your Honor, which is what they're saying.

THE COURT: Any other points you want to make, Mr . Kim?

MR. KIM: So, Your Honor, and also they talked about they performed the market tests. And market tests in my mind was more in terms of equity, not the full debt of the company, which includes all the other debts, not just of the DIP loan. It has to be all the debt (indiscernible).

And apart from that, they had to do a waterfall analysis where they calculate a forecast of the cash flow, et cetera, and discounted cash flow analysis, et cetera. That is another alternative to doing market tests. If you're going to
do market test, they have to do the whole thing, not just a component of it and say here it is.

And that's my second argument, that they have not done exhaustive market tests. They've only done a component, Your Honor, equity as well as maybe the DIP. But there's a lot more to that than for the enterprise value calculation, and they have not been waiting for the cash. Cash was not calculated after March. None of their valuations go further than March of 2021. So the point, Your Honor, is that -- yeah, so that is our second argument. And Your Honor, the debtors did not point out -- okay sorry, I'm going to rephrase that.

As far as the substantive consolidation, Your Honor -Your Honor, (indiscernible) say substantive consolidation is (indiscernible) and citing disentangling the DIP from the (indiscernible).

Your Honor, the (indiscernible) for all those points is that substantive consolidation should be done sparingly, only under very narrowly defined circumstances. To that end, the bankruptcy court can exercise its discretion to produce fair and just results. And to that end, they mean that a party will not prevail as substance may not be made to form, that technical considerations will not prevent substantial justice from being done.

My opinion of substantive consolidation, Your Honor, even if Your Honor in general looks at the facts, those assets
have a lot greater value because substantial asset of the debtor, which is the holding company, is the equities of the subsidiaries. None of that was calculated. And it has a lot of cash, as Ms. Hughes just said because the (indiscernible) payments accumulate into that cash, Your Honor, cash of the holding company. So to fork over three billion dollars of (indiscernible) consolidated into one bucket that predominantly which is none of ours, which is none of our debt, is wholly unfair, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Kim. Does anybody else wish to be heard?

MR. KIM: So Your Honor, lastly--
THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Kim?
MR. KIM: -- I wanted to say that recently
(indiscernible) PLC have decided to subclass basically the GUC for this reason, Your Honor. To be fair and equitable, they have a subclass within the GUC, Your Honor. And that seems to be the way to be equitable.

THE COURT: All right. Does anybody else wish to be heard? Okay. Is that a no? You're undecided?

MR. SCHAK: Your Honor, this is Benjamin Schak. I just have a statement that at some point to read into the record regarding a completely different objection. I'm happy to let this one get resolved first though.

THE COURT: No, go ahead and read in the statement.

MR. SCHAK: This pertains to the Oracle objection at 2232, Your Honor. The corporate pricing agreement which was the subject of that objection $I$ just wanted to reiterate on behalf of the debtors that that's a pricing agreement for airline tickets that has nothing to do with Oracle's IT. We're currently looking for the originals. It's apparently some are in Germany, the contract, and when we find it, we'll send it to Oracle, but in the meantime Oracle's rights we've agreed to reserve.

Oracle's rights to file rejection damage claims on contracts we've rejected, we agree are preserved under the plan. And there's a support renewal agreement which the debtors consider themself bound by because it's a post-petition contract, even though it's not on the list of assumed prepetition contracts.

And there's a new-look license that we put on the assumed contract just yesterday, and we are working to resolve the cure issue with Oracle, which we've agreed to adjourn to a future date. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schak.
MR. SCHAK: Sorry for interrupting the flow.
THE COURT: You haven't disrupted the flow.
Mr. Fleck, any reply to what we've heard from Mr.
Lenihan or Mr. Kim?
MR. FLECK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. All of this has remained a bit of a moving target. At 1:24 a.m. today an additional plan supplement was filed, which I have not looked at, other than seeing there is one on the docket. I have no idea what's in there. I don't know what, if any, effect it has on anything that I have been asked to confirm.

What $I$ am going to require is this. I'm going to give the debtors and the objectors a chance to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law by -- just give me a second, and I'll tell you when and the time -- by Thursday at 5 o'clock.

The proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law should be limited to the issues raised by the objections. The Burlingame objectors in the written objections included grounds for the objection other than what they argued today. I think I've already addressed a few of those during the hearing today, but I'd like all of the grounds that are stated in the objections addressed in proposed findings and conclusions.

I think I already -- for example -- well, bear with me a second. For example, there was no response in the debtors' reply to the issue of the breach of the RSA agreement. I mean, I addressed it briefly this morning.

The breach of fiduciary duty, New York law is the governing law of the 2023 notes, and I didn't get the citations this morning, but it's well settled in New York State law,
which is the governing law that the debtor-creditor relationship does not give rise to a fiduciary duty.

But I do want the proposed findings and conclusions to address the issues raised in the objections. Obviously, with respect to the factual issues, it's as to the residual value of the shared -- the residual value of any of the shared collateral.

With respect to substantive consolidation, we heard the evidence and arguments about it, I have not read Judge Lines' Republic Airways decision or the district court's decision affirming it, but I will certain do that. But I don't want to prolong this, so Thursday at 5 is the deadline for proposed findings of facts and conclusions of law.

In the meantime, I'm going to review -- I don't guarantee I'll be able to read every page of the plan supplement, but it's been a moving target including what was filed at 1:30 -- 1:24 this morning.

Are there any further proposed amendments to the confirmation order, Mr. Fleck? I know you filed it, but there were some issues that were raised today, some reservation of rights. I think that the confirmation order -- the confirmation order to the extent you put on the record today reserving rights with respect to assumption and cure, I would like it in the written order. So can you also do any further changes to that by Thursday at 5? Do you want more time? I
know you want to get this resolved.
MR. FLECK: That's fine, Your Honor. Thursday at 5 is
fine. There aren't that many changes to the order. We're happy to do that. Though with everything you just said of course, I just want to be clear. We did not respond to the allegation with respect to breach of duty in the filed exhibits (indiscernible) from chambers that indicated they wouldn't be considered by the Court if they weren't filed in the docket. They were not filed on the docket so far as I'm aware, so that's why --

THE COURT: Well, it was in the -- after I struck the first objection, there were -- they just parroted the prior objections. I thought the same grounds were asserted all over again.

MR. FLECK: We'll address in the findings of fact and conclusions of law each argument. And we will also supplement the proposed confirmation order for matters that have come up subsequent to the last filing including anything today.

THE COURT: Can you give me a preview of what's in the latest plan supplement?

MR. FLECK: Yeah, so there have been a number of agreements that are really organizational documents and similar agreements for the proposed reorg entities. So last night's agreement was the amendment to the (indiscernible) at 1 in the morning that we spoke to here in court because really the
part --
THE COURT: Forgive me for not having read it yet. MR. FLECK: Understood of course, Your Honor, but there were some changes to a prior version of that document. Among other things but principally it now allows for the other security that Mr. Schak and I spoke to, that United may be taking to allow for emergence if there would otherwise have been a regulatory delay.

There are some other changes, fee reimbursement and the like. In our view that creditors other than the parties who are directly a party to those agreements. And I think the Court would agree, but I'll make the statement in any event, that out of an abundance of caution we have gone ahead and filed a number of documents that in other cases perhaps would not form plan supplement documents. But just so that there's as much transparency with respect to these debtors on emergence. So that's the document that was filed. A number of people in the courtroom on Zoom would like for it to have been done earlier, myself included. But --

THE COURT: I can't fault anyone. The amount of -the effort that's gone into all phases of this case has been really incredible, so I'm really not trying to be critical about it. Just something that's filed, I'll have to see it.

MR. FLECK: We understand, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Just to that the record is
clear, because Mr. Kim is in California, when I set the deadline of Thursday at 5, it's New York time. All right. Anything else for today?

MR. KIM: Just one thing, Your Honor. So the filing that you're talking about, when you say a filing by 5 o'clock your time?

THE COURT: Yes, 5 o'clock Thursday.
MR. KIM: Okay, because I did file exhibits, and it didn't get loaded somehow, I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I saw your exhibits and some -- I don't know whether I saw it from ECF or another way. I saw the exhibits that you filed, Mr. Kim. Okay. But just so we're clear, the deadline is New York time Thursday at 5 p.m., proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law, not new evidence only proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Everybody rested today, so the evidence is closed at this point. All right, we are adjourned. Thank you very much, everybody.

IN UNISON: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 4:06 PM)
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