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THE CLERK: Starting the recording for Thursday, January 19th, 2023 at 10 a.m.

Calling Avianca Holdings S.A., case number 20-11133.
Can we have counsel for the reorganized debtors make their appearances one at a time, please.

MR. SCHAK: I'm happy to start. This is Benjamin Schak, S-C-H-A-K, of Milbank for the reorganized debtors.

THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you.
MR. RENENGER: This is Aaron Renenger, also for
Milbank, also for the reorganized debtors.
THE CLERK: All right. Thanks.
MS. DEXTER: This is Erin Dexter, also with Milbank, for reorganized debtors.

THE CLERK: Okay. If you have to speak on the record, Erin, I think you have to mute on your side so we don't get (indiscernible).

All right. Thank you. Is anyone else making an appearance this morning?

Mr. Masumoto?
MR. MASUMOTO: Good morning. Brian Masumoto for the Office of the United States Trustee.

THE CLERK: All right. Thank you. Are there any additional speaking roles this morning?

MR. GRIFFIN: Yes. Good morning. This is Ryan

Griffin for ACDAC.
THE CLERK: All right. Thank you. Anyone else speaking on the record this morning?

MR. SCHAK: We do have an interpreter for a Spanish speaking witnesses. Would you like her to identify herself now?

THE CLERK: Yes. I think she's on the phone.
THE INTERPRETER: Yes. Good morning. My name is Martaluz Jardon, M-A-R-T-A-L-U-Z, Jardon, J-A-R-D-O-N, licensed court interpreter LCI 2287.

THE CLERK: Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: And the reason why I'm on the phone is because $I$ will be interpreting simultaneously for two of the people involved in this lawsuit.

THE CLERK: Understood. Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: Thank you. You're welcome.
THE CLERK: Any additional appearances this morning, if anyone's speaking on the record?

All right. The party that joined us, Elizabeth, can you just give me your last name? Hi. You have to unmute.

THE INTERPRETER: Her full name is Elizabeth Riano, $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}$, Alarcon, $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$.

THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: You're welcome.
THE CLERK: All right. Are there any additional
appearances, anyone that has not given their appearance at this time?

THE INTERPRETER: So I'm not sure if you asked me for all this. There's two ladies that have us answering some questions from the judge. Do you need the other person's name?

THE CLERK: Yes, please.
THE INTERPRETER: Okay. One second. So her name is -- I'm going to have -- Paola, P-A-O-L-A, Maria, M-A-R-I-A, Villota, V as in Victor-I-L-L-O-T-A.

THE CLERK: Thank you. Thank you.
THE INTERPRETER: You're welcome.
(Pause)
THE CLERK: All right. The party with the 973-415-
7916 number. I don't have that number of my roster. Could you just identify yourself? Again the party with the 973-415-7916 number, if you could unmute and identify yourself?

THE COURT: Deanna, you might explain how, if it's a cell phone, what she has to do to unmute.

THE CLERK: Right. It's my understanding that if you press *6 you'll be able to unmute for a cell phone. So again, the 973-415-7916.

Oh. They dropped off.
THE COURT: Okay.
THE CLERK: All right. The 503-706-7318 number. If you could just identify yourself, please. If you could unmute

```
by pressing *6. Again, the 503-706-7318 number.
```

    MR. MONES: It is Paul Mones, M-O-N-E-S.
    THE CLERK: Okay. How do you spell your last name,
    Paul?
    MR. MONES: M-O-N for Nancy-E-S for Sam.
    THE CLERK: Okay. Thank you. I will modify.
    MR. MONES: Let me come up on Zoom. Thank you.
    THE CLERK: Okay. No problem.
    MR. MONES: I'll go on -- will you automatically mute
    me, or do I have to mute myself?
    THE CLERK: If you could mute yourself, please, and
    I'll rename you.
    MR. MONES: Perfect. Okay.
    THE CLERK: All right. Are we waiting on any
    additional parties?
    Ben, is Evan Fleck that is going to be joining?
    MR. SCHAK: Sadly, no.
    THE CLERK: Okay. Just making sure.
    All right. To anyone's knowledge, are we waiting on
    anyone else?
    MR. SCHAK: No.
    THE CLERK: Okay. Judge, would you like to begin, or
        do you want to wait for two more minutes?
    THE COURT: No, we can begin. Thank you.
    And good morning to everybody. This is Judge Glenn.
    We're here for two matters in Avianca. We'll start with the reorganized debtors' motion for order imposing sanctions for violation of Section 524 of the Bankruptcy Code and the discharge injunction in the confirmed plan.

Mr. Schak, are you going to begin?
MR. SCHAK: I will, Judge, and I'm happy to dive into that or provide a brief update of the general case.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you give me an update first, if you could? Thank you.

MR. SCHAK: Sure. So I think the last time we were actually live on Zoom was maybe way back in April, and I said something to the effect then that we were nearing the end of the reconciliation process. Today, I think we're even nearer to the end of the reconciliation process.

All aircraft claims have been resolved consensually. All claim objections were filed at the December 2nd deadline. And I was counting them up this morning. There are only seven sets of claims left to be resolved, everyone of which is scheduled for a hearing either in this Court or before Judge Jones between now and February 8th. We've been resisting very hard any attempts to push hearings past that February 8th date, which makes us all reasonably confident that we will know the universe of general unsecured claims on or around February 8th. And that's particularly important in this case, because the plan provides a fixed amount of total consideration for all
general unsecured creditors to share, so we need to know that final total amount of unsecured claims before the debtors can make their final distributions of cash and securities to unsecured creditors.

To date, there have been about 5.8 million dollars of interim distributions. There's a lot more to come, and we think that the next distribution will be the final one and will occur promptly once that unsecured claims amount has been resolved.

On the aircraft side of things, Avianca and its advisors have had to negotiate new documentation for the whole fleet of leases, at least the ones that have been for the aircraft that have been assumed. Each of those has been fairly complex, and some of these transactions are just logistically difficult to close, because the aircraft needs to physically be in a particular jurisdiction at the moment of closing. Avianca is, thank goodness, a working airline once again, so it can be tough sometimes to get the right aircraft to the right jurisdiction at the right moment. But that process has been accelerating over the past few months, and we expect the last handful of lease transactions to close by the end of February, and that, along with the disbursement of the final distributions, will allow us to file a motion to close these cases, which is, I think, going to be our favorite motion of the case.

THE COURT: Mine too.
MR. SCHAK: Yeah. And the other very brief update is
just on the appeal of confirmation, that has been fully briefed, and it's awaiting argument in the district court.

THE COURT: Who is that before?
MR. SCHAK: It got changed, and I'm blanking on which district judge is. I'm hoping one of the litigators can hop in and help me on this one.

THE COURT: Was it originally before Judge Nathan, who's gone up --

MR. SCHAK: It was.
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR. SCHAK: And then she was elevated, and it just wasn't one that, I guess, was interesting enough for her to keep.

MR. RENENGER: Your Honor, we'll circle back and let you know the name of the judge and what was reassigned momentarily. It's been briefed for almost a year at this point, so it's --

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Renenger.
Go ahead, Mr. Schak.
MR. SCHAK: All right. Unless Your Honor has anything else on the general goings on of the case, I'm happy to turn to the first item on the agenda.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Schak.

MR. SCHAK: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. RENENGER: Your Honor, just briefly, it is before Judge Vernon Broderick.

THE COURT: Okay. And that was Mr. Renenger who indicated that. Thanks very much.

MR. SCHAK: Benjamin Schak, again, for the record. Your Honor, the first item on the agenda is Avianca's uncontested motion to disallow claims as a sanction for various claimants' violation of the Chapter 11 discharge. On the Zoom session today is our declarant for the motion, Elizabeth Riano Alarcon, who is an in-house labor litigation coordinator at Avianca. Since Ms. Riano is a fluent Spanish speaker, we also do have a live interpreter, Martaluz Jardon, and Ms. Riano is here. She's prepared to answer any questions about the pendency and status of the foreign proceedings, Avianca's attempts at communication with the litigants, or any other topics Your Honor may have questions about.

I do a few opening remarks, and then $I$ was planning to turn it over to my litigation colleague, Erin Dexter, to offer Ms. Riano's testimony into evidence, but I'm happy to stage this in whatever order Your Honor prefers.

THE COURT: No, just, maybe you could tell me how many -- so these are parties who have filed proofs of claim in the Chapter 11 case, but they've continued prosecuting actions in foreign courts. So how many creditors are we talking about?

MR. SCHAK: We're talking about 160-something. I'm flipping around, not seeing the exact number immediately, but it's a bit over 160.

THE COURT: All right. And just briefly, review with me service of process with respect to the current pending motion.

MR. SCHAK: Yes. So service of process on the current pending motion was on docket 2645, which is by KCC, which made the mailings. They sent by first class mail to all of these creditors, generally through their counsel, and there are only a few counsels involved here, a notice of this motion. And the email list is on Exhibit $B$ of docket number 2645. There's also a list of first class mailings on Exhibit D, as in dog, of that same docket number 2645. And that was done in early November, November 3rd, November 4th.

THE COURT: And can you tell me whether any of the service by mail was returned undelivered?

MR. SCHAK: It was not. We would have heard about that from KCC.

THE COURT: All right. And could you briefly tell me whether there has been telephone or email communication with representatives of these claimants subsequently, to try and resolve this issue consensually?

MR. SCHAK: Not subsequently, Your Honor. The only one who ever got back to us at any point was Mr. Bain (ph.),
who made it very clear to the folks at Avianca that he was not going to withdraw his client's proof of claim.

THE COURT: And are all of these claims being -- in which courts are they being litigated? Is this all in Colombia?

MR. SCHAK: All in Colombia, except there's one, the client of Ms. dos Santos (ph.), which is in Brazil.

THE COURT: And has Avianca or any of its affiliates appeared in the lawsuits in Colombia or Brazil?

MR. SCHAK: Yes, Your Honor. Avianca recognizes a reality that this Court's confirmation order is probably not going to get those lawsuits dismissed in Colombia and Brazil, at least in an efficient way, so Avianca is appearing and intends to defend those suits on the merits.

THE COURT: Has Avianca moved in any of the courts in which they're pending, seeking recognition and enforcement of the orders entered by this Court or included in the plan?

MR. SCHAK: We've not, Your Honor. Avianca, with its local counsel, has made the strategic decision that they're pretty good at defeating these lawsuits on the merits in Colombia, and I guess, also in Brazil, and thinks that that's the most efficient way to dispatch the suits down there.

THE COURT: Okay. So Brazil has, within the last year or two, adopted the model law on cross-border insolvency. And has Avianca? Maybe these claims are just -- the claim is too
small to merit going through the trying to open a proceeding in Brazil seeking recognition of enforcement of the order of the Court, but Brazil has adopted the model law.

MR. SCHAK: That's correct, Your Honor. Colombia has too. We just made a decision, as for Colombia, at least, very early in the case, that that could open up a can of worms to try to seek enforcement down there.

And Your Honor's exactly right. These claims are simply too small by themselves to merit a full recognition proceeding. If, for instance, an indenture trustee from one of the bond issuances tried to go enforce a billion dollars down there, I think would be a very different story, Your Honor. THE COURT: And what's the aggregate amount of all of the claims that have been asserted in litigation in either Colombia or Brazil?

MR. SCHAK: That's a fair question. The aggregate amount gets up pretty high. These claims are generally, in U.S. dollars, in the five figures, and there are over 160 of them. I can't do the math quite that quickly, but you're quickly getting up into the territory of seven or even eight figures. But I should say Avianca believes its actual exposure is close to zero.

THE COURT: All right. In the proofs of claim that these creditors filed here, did they identify counsel or simply the creditor rather than counsel?

MR. SCHAK: For all but one of them they identified counsel. For perhaps all but two of them, counsel's also identified in the local complaints that were attached to most or all of these proofs of claim.

THE COURT: And were the counsel that they identified served with this motion?

MR. SCHAK: Yes. Those are the counsel who we've made service through and who attempted to communicate directly with as well.

THE COURT: All right. So if I understand correctly, what you're seeking is what $I$ would describe as a coercive contempt sanction, essentially giving these creditors an additional thirty days after the entry of any order by this Court within which to withdraw their foreign court proceedings in order to be able to proceed with the claim process here; is that correct?

MR. SCHAK: That's correct. Your Honor. So it's the one last chance is the idea behind our proposal.

THE COURT: All right. So $I$ think what you said, that Ms. Dexter is going to actually proceed with the hearing, I don't know that we need much more. I do want to get any evidence offered and submitted in evidence before I go further.

MR. SCHAK: Yes, Your Honor. I'll turn it over to Ms. Dexter, then, who is on mute.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Dexter?
MS. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor. Are you able to hear me?

THE COURT: Yes, I can.
MS. DEXTER: Wonderful. For the record, Erin Dexter from Milbank for the reorganized debtors.

As Mr. Schak mentioned, Your Honor, Ms. Riano, who submitted a declaration and supported the motion at Exhibit A to docket 2644 is here today in the event Your Honor has any questions. However, we would like to move her declaration into evidence in support of the motion for sanctions.

THE COURT: All right. Are there any objections to the Court admitting into evidence Riano declaration, which is Exhibit A to ECF docket number 2644? Hearing no objection, it's admitted into evidence.
(Declaration of Elizabeth Riano Alarcon was hereby received into evidence as Debtors' Exhibit A to docket 2644 , as of this date.)

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Ms. Dexter.
MS. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor. Ms. Riano is available in the event Your Honor has any questions for her with the assistance of our translator, Ms. Jardon.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask. Is there anybody who wishes to cross-examine the declarant? And hearing no one say they wish to cross-examine, I don't have any questions.

My question for you, Ms. Dexter, is I'm not aware of any courts that have granted the relief, the specific relief that you're seeking here. Are there cases that you're familiar with where essentially the same sort of relief, a coercive order basically giving a claimant an additional short period of time within which to discontinue actions that -- I think it's really undisputed that the actions that are going on in Colombia and the one in Brazil violate the terms of the plan and the plan injunction? But have any courts that you're familiar with granted the relief that you're seeking here?

MS. DEXTER: Your Honor, I'm not able to cite cases to you today. We're happy to submit supplemental briefing after this hearing. We're not seeking any monetary sanctions or other type of contempt, so we were hoping that it would be a fair exercise of the Court's equitable power to grant this type of relief here.

THE COURT: And if I understand correctly, you're essentially relying on -- your argument is by filing proofs of claim, they've all submitted to the jurisdiction of the Court. Katchen v. Landy is the leading case on point, correct?

MS. DEXTER: That's right, Your Honor. And I invite my colleague, Mr. Schak, to jump in as well, if he has anything to add.

MR. SCHAK: I have plenty more citations on that, Your Honor, but it sounds like we're --

THE COURT: I'm clearly -- I'm familiar with Katchen and some of his progeny, and there's no question in my mind that by filing a proof of claim, each of those creditors has submitted that the jurisdiction, certainly, at least, with respect to the matters involved in the claim. I mean, it's the same issue. I mean, it's not a Stern v Marshall, where the issue is different. So it's clear they've submitted to the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court.

All right. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to take it under submission. Shouldn't be a very lengthy period.

I do want, because I'm not aware of other decisions that have granted the precise relief, in my view, I've had quite a few cases involving contempt, and I've written on what's the, sort of, the permissible range of contempt sanctions. It's clear beyond dispute that bankruptcy courts, bankruptcy judges have the authority to exercise the contempt power where appropriate. And here, what's also quite clear is that coercive contempt sanctions are the classical remedy that can be awarded by a judge, whether it's the bankruptcy judge or a district judge for contempt.

Here, there has been -- the orders which they have failed to comply with are clear and unambiguous. Their failure is likewise also clear and unambiguous. So there is no issue in the Court's mind that each of these creditors have violated the terms of the plan injunction and the plan, and it's
appropriate for a remedy for such contempt to be imposed. The remedy being sought here is the coercive remedy that would give the creditors an opportunity to cure, come into compliance with the terms of the plan by discontinuing their foreign court actions, in which case the claims allowance process with respect to their proofs of claim can continue.

Nothing in what I'm going to rule, should they withdraw their foreign proceedings, will resolve definitively whether their claims should be allowed in the amounts filed or in some other amount, so those issues would all be reserved.

So I'm going to take it under submission, and it shouldn't be very long, Mr. Schak, before you get a ruling from the Court.

MR. SCHAK: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And Ms. Dexter, thank you very much for
your participation.
MS. DEXTER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MS. DEXTER: May Ms. Riano be excused?
THE COURT: Absolutely.
MS. DEXTER: Thank you so much.
And thank you, Ms. Riano.
THE COURT: Okay. So go ahead, Mr. Schak. Are you going to continue on? The ACDAC claim objection is claim 1729. I'm not going to butcher the full name of ACDAC. I think
everybody's proceeding with initials $A-C-D-A-C$.
MR. SCHAK: That's right, Your Honor. My colleague Aaron Renenger, will handle the objection to the claim filed by the Asociacion Colombiana de Aviadores Civiles.

THE COURT: Ah. You're showing me up. You're showing me up. I'll stick with ACDAC.

Go ahead, Mr. Renenger.
And counsel who's appearing for ACDAC, is that Mr. Griffin? You're appearing for ACDAC?

MR. GRIFFIN: Yes. That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So I'll let Mr.
Renenger go first, and then I'll give you an opportunity to speak.

Go ahead, Mr. Renenger.
MR. RENENGER: And good morning, Your Honor. And I will be joining you in simply using the acronym ACDAC.

THE COURT: You're not going to show off the way your colleague did. Go ahead.

MR. RENENGER: No, no. But I am going to give him grief about showing off when we're done here.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. RENENGER: So Your Honor, the first thing I think I'd just like to do, if okay with the Court, is to admit into evidence the declaration of our witness, Paola Maria Villota Martinez, who is on Zoom and available for cross-examination or
any questions the Court may have. Her declaration is Exhibit A to our objection, which is docket number 2660.

THE COURT: All right. Are there any objections to the Court admitting into evidence the Martinez declaration, which is ECF docket number 2660.

MR. GRIFFIN: No objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. It's admitted into evidence.
(Declaration of Paola Maria Villota Martinez was hereby received into evidence as Debtors' Exhibit A to docket 2660, as of this date.)

MR. RENENGER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the ACDAC claim, which is claim 1729, involves a question of whether the ACDAC pilots -- these are union pilots -- have received the incentive pay to which they are entitled under two orders issued in Colombia, one from a court in 2015 and one from an arbitration panel in 2017. The dispute involves incentive payments, and specifically, it relates to incentive payments available for pilots based on performance. So time spent on ground during a trip, fuel conservation, and stability of landings. The better pilots perform, the more pay the pilots get.

When ACDAC filed its claim, it indicated only that Avianca was obligated to pay amounts, "to ACDAC members at one hundred percent of the benefit levels paid to nonunion pilots".

AVIANCA HOLDINGS S.A.

Note the language there. Not a hundred percent of the maximum amounts available, but a hundred percent of the amounts paid to nonunion pilots. Nothing about the language of claim 1729 indicated that ACDAC was contending, as it now does in its brief filed last week, that its members were entitled to receive more than the amounts paid to nonunion pilots.

ACDAC reiterated this view in several filings between then and now. For example, in its limited objection to the plan -- this is docket number 2237 -- ACDAC quoted the 2017 arbitration award, which is the primary language on which it relies. And that quote is, "that the payment of the operational efficiency incentive (monthly) and the payment of the fuel bonus (semi-annual) shall be paid in 100 percent of its corresponding value."

But they didn't stop in that plan objection with quoting that language. The plan objection clarified that one hundred percent of the corresponding value means, "the incentive and bonus amounts Avianca pays to nonunion pilots".

So again, note the language. ACDAC was not contending then that they believed that the 2017 award required Avianca to pay to ACDAC pilots one hundred percent of the maximum allowable amounts. Rather, at that time, ACDAC was clear that its pilots were simply entitled to the incentive amount actually paid to nonunion pilots.

In its March 9th, 2022 response to the debtor's
sixteenth omnibus objection, -- this is docket number 2550 -ACDAC repeatedly affirmed that they were simply seeking equal incentive pay. Paragraph 9 of that pleading stated it incentive payments are "subject to mandatory equalization between ACDAC and non-union pilots".

In paragraph 10 they wrote, "Avianca has not begun paying these benefits to ACDAC pilots at one hundred percent of their corresponding value (i.e., the full amount at which these benefits are paid to non-union pilots)." Here, again, ACDAC is explaining their interpretation, at that time, of the 2017 arbitration award.

Later in that same pleading, paragraph 11, they wrote that they needed Avianca's records to be able to do a calculation of the amounts owed to ACDAC pilots. They argue that such a calculation, "would require examining Avianca's payroll records to determine the full value of these benefits as paid to nonunion pilots since they were first extended in 2013 and the lessor value of these benefits that has been paid to ACDAC pilots since that time".

This is a particularly noteworthy admission, because it reveals the gravamen of ACDAC's claim that their pilots were being paid less.

Now, last week, in their response to our objection, ACDAC asserted, for the first time in this case, that its pilots are entitled to be paid more than the pilots that are
not members of the ACDAC union. Specifically, they now contend that ACDAC pilots are entitled to, "the maximum level of pay for the incentives". And they acknowledge that's regardless of their performance. So whether they conserve fuel, whether they stay on the ground for much longer than they're required to, whether every landing is a poor landing, the ACDAC pilots should get all of the pay as if they were performing at one hundred percent efficiency level in those metrics.

Now, there are several important arguments to note here. First, ACDAC appears no longer to be contending that Avianca has paid incentive payments to union pilots at less than those paid to nonunion counterparts. Indeed, Avianca attach proof to its objection that it provided identical incentive pay to all of its pilots. In light of that proof Avianca, or rather ACDAC, has now shifted to its argument seeking more pay rather than less.

I guess I would first observe, Your Honor, that this new argument really amounts to a new claim that we believe is beyond the bar date, and for that reason alone should be should be denied. Section $502(\mathrm{~b})(9)$ of the Code provides that a claim that is not timely filed will be deemed disallowed. The bar date was January 20th, 2021. If ACDAC's view was that it was entitled to one hundred percent of the maximum allowable bonus, it should have made that claim much earlier on, and I've just noted, it didn't. That's not at all what ACDAC was previously
arguing.
We would also urge the Court not to treat this latest argument as an amendment to the proof of claim. They've not filed an amendment, and they've not sought that it be treated as an amendment, and even if they did, we would ask Your Honor to exercise your discretion to not permit an amendment at this late date, given that they could have made this argument years ago.

But Your Honor, just diving down, then, into the details of a language, and $I$ think this, sort of, more the merits, as opposed to the procedural arguments, ACDAC's reading of the Court judgment in 2015, which I'll refer to as T-69 (ph.), and the 2017 arbitration award is illogical and just wrong on its face.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Mr. Renenger, let me ask you this.

MR. RENENGER: Sure.
THE COURT: Is there ongoing litigation in Colombia regarding the interpretation of the 2017 arbitration award? MR. RENENGER: Not that we're aware of, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. MR. RENENGER: There were some court cases about the interpretation of the 2015 T-69 judgment that pre-dated 2017. And those cases, there were seven of them in total, I believe, the court, in each of those cases, agreed with the
interpretation that Avianca is advancing today.
THE COURT: I mean, effectively --
MR. RENENGER: And I think that --
THE COURT: Is effectively, what you're asking this Court to do is to grant comity to the court and arbitration decisions that were rendered in Colombia. You believe that those are the binding rulings; is that correct?

MR. RENENGER: I think in part, Your Honor. I also think the Court can look at the language of the rulings as submitted to Your Honor, translated into English and submitted to Your Honor, and see that the language simply cannot support the argument that ACDAC is now advancing.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, I have some question about the earlier award, but in the reply, the reply provides copies of the translations of the relevant portions of the court judgment, which confirm that Avianca has properly characterized the judgments.

MR. RENENGER: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't think any party had previously submitted the interpretation of the entirety of the 2017 arbitration award. We felt it was important to do that, because ACDAC relies on just one, or really two sentences in that opinion. And when you read the full opinion, it becomes, like, inescapably clear that the arbitration panel could not have meant what ACDAC now contends. And let me just point you to that language, Your

Honor. And it's found in -- this is Exhibit A to our reply, and it's page 5. Numbered at the bottom, it's page 5. Written on screens, page 8 of the PDF. And while you're pulling that language up, Your Honor and I'll read it to you in a moment, let me just observe that the language of the 2017 award, even the portion upon which ACDAC relies, is qualified by the last clause of the sentence that ACDAC primarily relies on, and that is "Pursuant to Ruling T-69".

So the sentence reads, "It is understood the payment of the operational efficiency incentive (monthly) and the payment of a fuel bonus (semi-annual) shall be paid in one hundred percent of its corresponding value, pursuant to ruling T-69 of $2015^{\prime \prime}$.

So what the 2017 opinion gives was, by its own terms, intended to be consistent with what the 2015 opinion gave. Not more than. Consistent with what the 2015 opinion gave. And the new piece of evidence attached to our reply, which I think really drives home this point so forcefully, again, is on page 5 of that document, the very first paragraph at the top of the page under the heading. And it reads, "For the purpose of issuing the arbitral award to resolve this collective dispute, the took into consideration the statements made by the constitutional court in judgment $T-69$ of 2015, which obligated each and every member of the ACDAC trade union organization to receive the same and equal benefits enjoyed by nonunionized
workers in the so-called voluntary benefits plan".
So that language shows that the 2017 tribunal understood the 2015 judgment to give exactly the same benefits. Not more. Exactly the same benefits given to nonunionized workers. And all the language then does, that ACDAC now relies on, is concludes that, indeed, Avianca must continue to make those payments. And if they haven't made those payments -- it's the second sentence that ACDAC relies on -- if there's any discrepancy, and the language there is Avianca must pay the difference, should there be one. Or the latest translation says and easements that might arise between the amounts that have been paid and the amount required to be paid.

So the judgment didn't conclude that Avianca failed to pay something. The judgment simply said if they have, they've got to do it.

And Your Honor, I guess I would rest there. I can go through the language of $T-69$.

THE COURT: No, that's okay. Let me hear from Mr. Griffin.

Go ahead, Mr. Griffin.
MR. GRIFFIN: Thank you. Good morning, Your Honor. Ryan Griffin for ACDAC. I guess let me try to follow the same order as Mr. Renenger and start with the procedural issues. This is not a new claim or an amended claim. This is the same thing that ACDAC has been saying from the beginning.

We put in the language of the 2017 arbitration award attached to the claim. And that language, we think, is clear. It says one hundred percent of the corresponding value. And we've said throughout what that means in our filings. We've said that means the full amount of these increases, as paid to the nonunion pilots ,to equalize with the full levels due to pay -the obligation to pay the full value.

So from the beginning we've been seeking the same thing. We haven't changed our position. And I think, before addressing the merits arguments, it might be helpful there to explain a little bit the background of this full value and why that is. Why that's what the 2017 arbitration award says, and why that makes sense.

And so this is recounted in our brief. I don't want to go through every detail of it. But very quickly, in 2013 the company offered a package of benefits, including these two incentive payments that are at issue here to its nonunion pilots, while it was bargaining with ACDAC.

The judgment that Mr. Renenger mentioned from 2015, T69, found that the company violated Colombia labor law in doing so, because it was essentially encouraging union pilots to defect from the union to receive these higher benefits. And they said, you're not allowed to do that. And as a remedy for that, what the Court said was, okay, you have to give the union pilots these benefits.

And the company is focused on language from that decision that says, okay, you just have to equalize them. You have to pay the union pilots under the same variable pay scheme, the same incentive pay scheme, that they're already applying to the nonunion.

THE COURT: Well, there was nothing in the award that said that the union pilots get better treatment than the nonunion pilots. It appeared to me to say equalize the treatment. Union pilots shouldn't get worse treatment.

MR. GRIFFIN: That's part of it, but that's not the whole thing. And I think the hundred percent of the corresponding value language does more than that. And so the reason is the, the other key from the $T-69$ judgment is that what the court was trying to do was not only to make sure that union pilots didn't come out worse economically, but it was also protecting and preserving the union's bargaining status in the collective bargaining relationship.

And so what it said is you need to equalize these benefits so that pilots who stayed with the union don't lose out and so that the pilots who left the union for higher pay can come back to the union and come back to their collective bargaining agreement as bargained and represented by the union. And the key to that piece is that the collective bargaining agreement doesn't include these incentives, because the union never agreed to go from a from a straight pay scheme to a
variable or an incentive pay scheme. And so what the Court was saying was, well, you've got to give them some money, so that there's no economic harm for being in the union. But you've also got to -- you also have to let -- the purpose of that is to go back to the collective bargaining regime as it existed.

And when you understand that background, then I think the hundred percent language in the 2017 award makes a lot more sense. What that award was clarifying was, no, it's not enough to just pay them under the same variable -- pay the ACDAC pilots under the same variable pay scheme. That's what Avianca was already doing in 2017 when that award was issued. And what the arbitration is saying is, okay, that's nice, but that's not enough, because, in effect, what you're doing by doing that is imposing on the union and on its collective agreement this whole different variable pay scheme that has never been bargained, has never been agreed to at the bargaining table. And the arbitration answer for how you get around that is, well, you just pay them at the maximum levels. Then nobody from the union is losing out, and nobody from the union is having a pay scheme that they never bargained for imposed on them.

The inverse result, the one the company is seeking, is just illogical. Essentially, the company says, we tried to push this on the union in 2013. The court told us that was a violation of law, and we couldn't do it. But as a remedy, the
court said, okay, you get to push this on the union. And that's just not right.

And so with all that background, we think when you read the arbitration award, one hundred percent is clear. It means you pay the max levels to the union pilots. You don't apply, essentially, the incentive themed deductions that take away from those max levels. And we think that's confirmed by the second clause, which says Avianca shall pay only the difference if there is one. Because if the arbitration -- it was known already in 2017 when that arbitration came out that the company was applying the same scheme to both. And that language is just -- that clause doesn't -- there's no reason for that clause to be there, if all it meant was you need to pay union pilots under the same scheme. That second clause only makes sense if what the arbitration panel says is, no, you've got to pay them at the hundred percent level. You've got to pay the union pilots at the hundred percent level

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Griffin. I have your arguments.

Mr. Renenger, do you have a brief reply?
MR. RENENGER: Yes. Very brief, Your Honor. Mr. Griffin cited a bunch of history for which there is no evidence. What the ACDAC union submitted as evidence is the language from the 2017 opinion, and only the two sentences, and a translation of the 2015 opinion. This idea of what was in
the arbitrator's mind and what they were trying to do because of the history of the collective bargaining, none of that is in evidence, Your Honor. And so it's just pure argument at this point.

And again, with respect to that second clause, and I made this point earlier, but I'll circle back because of where Mr. Griffin ended, it's actually quite easy to give that second sentence that ACDAC cites to meaning if there has been any shortcoming in pay, it should be filled.

What Mr. Griffin has not presented to you is what were the arguments made by the parties in 2017? And in fact, when you look at the opinion, that opinion covers, like, forty something different issues. It talks about submission to the parties that were made, about how to interpret the different provisions. Nowhere has ASDAC provided evidence that the tribunal was asked to consider this issue with the background that he just gave, as if everyone agreed and knew at that time that Avianca was paying to union pilots the same amounts paid to nonunion pilot.

The language, $I$ think, on its face doesn't mean what he says, and the interpretation he tries to give it is far from the most obvious interpretation. That's all I have.

THE COURT: All right. I have the arguments of both parties. I'm going to take the matter under submission. I hopefully will be fairly quick in trying to resolve it.
So that completes our obvious Avianca agenda for this
morning.
Mr. Schak, anything else that we need to take up
today?
MR. SCHAK: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. All right. The Court is in
recess until 11:00.
MR. SCHAK: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:40 AM)
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