## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT <br> EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

In re:

JOINDER OF
THE DETROIT RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN MOTION TO EXTEND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT APPROVAL SCHEDULE [DKT. NO. 3317$]$

The Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit and the General Retirement System of the City of Detroit (together, the "Retirement Systems") join in the Ex Parte Emergency Motion to Extend Disclosure Statement Approval Schedule (the "Motion") filed by Syncora Guarantee Inc. and Syncora Capital Assurance Inc. [Dkt. No. 3317], and respectfully state as follows:

## Preliminary Statement

1. The Retirement Systems understand that the development of the Disclosure Statement by the City is an iterative process that will likely entail the filing of several amended versions. ${ }^{1}$ However, there is no excuse for this process

[^0]coming at the expense of creditors' rights to adequate notice and a reasonable opportunity to review each amended version of the Disclosure Statement and corresponding Plan of Adjustment. The current deadline to object to the as-yet unfiled Amended Disclosure Statement (apparently, to be filed by midnight tonight) is unreasonable.

## Argument

2. At a hearing before the Court on March 5, 2014 to consider, among other things, the Court's First Amended Order Establishing Procedures, Deadlines and Hearing Dates Relating to the Debtor's Plan of Adjustment, counsel for the City stated as follows:

MS. LENNOX: . . . We do not intend to drop on the Court and all the other parties to the case, you know, one amended disclosure statement the night before the hearing and expect people to wade through that, ....

Transcript excerpt, attached hereto as Exhibit A, at 43, and:
MS. LENNOX: . . . I will commit that we are not going to leave major, you know, complete rewrites of the disclosure statement until two days before the hearing.

Transcript excerpt, Exhibit A, at 48-49.
3. Notwithstanding the above representations to the Court, the filing of a significantly revised Disclosure Statement just shortly before the objection deadline is precisely what the City apparently intends to do.
4. In its Objection to the Motion filed today [Dkt. No. 3329], the City cavalierly states in a conclusory fashion that somehow the filing of an overhauled Disclosure Statement just 72 hours before the objection deadline (and with several hearings to attend and other critical activities to undertake in the interim) does not infringe the Retirement Systems' or any party's right to file an informed objection to the amended Disclosure Statement. Objection at $\mathbb{T} \| 2,6$.
5. The City's statements in this regard simply defy reality and demonstrate a lack of any concern for the due process rights of creditors.
6. It is important to emphasize that the amended Disclosure Statement that is to be filed late today by the City is (hopefully) likely to reflect more than minor changes to the previous version. On March 14, 2014, the Retirement Systems duly served on the City their Request to Include Additional Information in the Disclosure Statement, which requested a number of critical documents and items of information. To date, the Retirement Systems have not received any of the requested information.
7. Bankruptcy Rule 2002(b) contemplates (among other things) 28 days' notice of the time for filing objections to a disclosure statement. In light of the likely significant changes to the current Disclosure Statement, providing a mere three business days in which to review and file objections to the amended

Disclosure Statement (and, presumably, review an amended Plan of Adjustment) is unreasonable.

WHEREFORE, the Retirement Systems join in the relief requested in the Motion and/or such other and further relief as may be just and appropriate under the circumstances.
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Debtor. . 2:30 p.m.

HEARING RE. MOTION OF THE CITY OF DETROIT FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER (I) ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES FOR SOLICITATION AND TABULATION OF VOTES TO ACCEPT OR REJECT PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT AND (II) APPROVING NOTICE PROCEDURES RELATED TO CONFIRMATION OF THE PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2789); CONCURRENCE OF THE RETIREE ASSOCIATION PARTIES IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF RETIREES TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2781) (DKT\#2793); RESPONSE OF INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW, TO FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2791); COMMENT TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2780); SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF RETIREES TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDERS ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2781); RESPONSE OF THE CITY OF DETROIT TO THE COURT'S FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2787); OBJECTION TO THE COURT'S FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2778); THE WATER AND SEWER BOND TRUSTEE'S LIMITED OBJECTION TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2794); JOINDER OF WILMINGTON TRUST, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AS SUCCESSOR CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR, TO (A) COMMENT TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES AND (B) THE WATER AND SEWER BOND TRUSTEE'S LIMITED OBJECTION TO THE FIRST AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT (DKT\#2796); STATUS HEARING RE. MOTION OF DEBTOR FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER, PURSUANT TO SECTION 105(a) OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND BANKRUPTCY RULE 9019, APPROVING A SETTLEMENT AND PLAN SUPPORT AGREEMENT AND GRANTING RELATED RELIEF (DKT\#2802)
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Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in session. Please be seated. Case Number 13-53846, City of Detroit, Michigan. THE COURT: May we have appearances for the record, please?

MS. LENNOX: Good afternoon, your Honor. Heather Lennox from Jones Day on behalf of the city. With me in the courtroom are my partners, Tim Cullen, David Heiman, and Bob Hertzberg from Pepper Hamilton.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. MARRIOTT: Good afternoon, your Honor. Vince Marriott, Ballard Spahr, on behalf of EEPK and affiliates. MR. HACKNEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Stephen Hackney on behalf of Syncora.

MS. DIBLASI: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kelly
DiBlasi, Weil, Gotshal, Manges, on behalf of Financial Guaranty Insurance Company.

MS. NEVILLE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Carole Neville from Dentons on behalf of the Retiree Committee, and with me is Claude Montgomery.

MS. ENGLISH: Good afternoon, your Honor. Caroline English from Arent Fox on behalf of Ambac Assurance Corporation.

MS. CECCOTTI: Good afternoon, your Honor. Babette Ceccotti, Cohen, Weiss \& Simon, LLP, for the autoworkers. MR. NEAL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Guy Neal,

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
MR. LEMKE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anyone else?
MR. HACKNEY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Stephen Hackney on behalf of Syncora. You've been very diligent about reading the pleadings, and I don't have anything to add to the one that we filed.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments or objections before I recall the city? Ms. Lennox.

MS. LENNOX: Thank you, your Honor. Just a few points. With respect to Mr. Marriott's request that we -that your Honor set a date by which we file an amended plan and disclosure statement, I think Mr. Bennett referenced when we were here a week ago or ten days ago that we do intend to file probably at least one, if not more, iterations as we progress between now and the disclosure statement hearing, so we intend to do that. We do not intend to drop on the Court and all the other parties to the case, you know, one amended disclosure statement the night before the hearing and expect people to wade through that, so I don't know that a deadine is necessary. In fact, if we can reach agreements that we would want to reflect in that agreement, a deadline may be counterproductive, but I do want to assure the Court that we do intend to do that.

With respect to plan objections preceding some stage
of discovery, $I$ do agree with the Court that we can file basic plan objections which give parties -- all the parties in the case an indication of where people are going and file supplemental objections as we did in the eligibility hearing.

With respect to -- I only have one particular comment to the pleading and the response that was filed by Mr. Marriott and his consortium of compatriots, and that is they suggest that we have an April lst deadline for the city and only the city to designate fact and expert witnesses. That's actually before we have what might be the solicitation portion of the plan done. I think what would be more appropriate is if we move the city's time to do that to the same time the objectors propose to do that or the creditors propose to do that, which would just be two weeks after the disclosure statement hearing in early May, May 1st, May 2nd, so that's the only particular comment that $I$ had.

And then with respect to what Ms. Neville said, I agree with the longer period. In fact, I would assume that the solicitation period that we set will be one solicitation period for everyone, and I do agree that the retirees need particular time. We are definitely working on customizing the ballots. We are working on the plain English, and I think Ms. Neville did a very good job of describing sort of where we are in the process, and we're working cooperatively to get that done.

THE COURT: I'm interested in your response to her concern about the classification issue and whether that's something that should be resolved sooner than later.

MS. LENNOX: I do not -- I don't have a problem resolving it sooner than later. I do think -- first of all, we would calculate separate amounts for pension and OPEB, so if it remains a combined class, it will be easy for them to tell, you know, which is which and then a combined amount. The Retiree Committee has raised the issue in their pleading. We do intend to engage with them between now and the disclosure statement hearing and hopefully work something out, but I don't think the city would object to that particular issue.

THE COURT: If I understood her correctly, their position is that in the plan these two different kinds of claims should be classified separately.

MS. LENNOX: We understand that. I can see an argument for that, and $I$ can also see an argument for combining retiree claims in general in one class. They are all, after all, of the same priority, so that is a discussion that we can have with the Retiree Committee between now and the disclosure statement hearing.

THE COURT: So you would agree to build into the scheduling order some separate process to address this question sooner than later?

MS. LENNOX: We'd be -- certainly be amenable to that, your Honor, and that's all I have.

THE COURT: Okay. The door is fully open.
MS. LENNOX: Thank you.
THE COURT: Anyone else have any comments about the
scheduling order?
MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, my comment isn't specifically on that, but it's sort of to what Ms. Neville addressed, and I don't want to be out of place because I'm not privy to a lot of the discussion, but I do represent an individual retiree, and we've had discussions with similar retirees. And one of the other concerns and the understanding is that we try to reach deals with the annuities that are also part of the plan. That was very confusing in the plan. There was a formula that we couldn't find, and I just wanted to make sure that issue is -- it's the third part of the retiree benefit is the pension benefit, the --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. GOLDBERG: -- health benefits, but also the annuity, which there was a recapture. It was quite confusing in the plan as was outlaid and a big matter of concern to many retirees.

THE COURT: Well, I won't tolerate any confusion. MR. GOLDBERG: No. I appreciate that.

THE COURT: I just -- I won't. Anyone else? Yes, sir.

MR. FRIMMER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rick Frimmer for $\operatorname{FMS}$. Ms. Lennox's last statement about this seriatim modification of the disclosure statement right up until the hearing has us all concerned that we ought to have some deadline date by which we know exactly what it is we're going to object to, and this --

THE COURT: You know, I wish the real world were that simple.

MR. FRIMMER: Even if it's two days beforehand. I mean --

THE COURT: But the truth is agreements with creditors come when they come. Do you want me to set a deadine for you all to come to an agreement with the city? Is that what you want me to do? I don't think so.

MR. FRIMMER: Well, no, but that -- because that can happen afterward also.

THE COURT: Every new agreement potentially requires a new disclosure statement; right?

MR. FRIMMER: Well, we're not talking about what we might agree to. We're talking about changes that might be made because they decide to make a change. That has nothing to do --

## THE COURT: Changes what?

MR. FRIMMER: That they decide to make not having to do with a negotiation with a creditor, just change the plan. THE COURT: Oh, I didn't quite hear that. MR. FRIMMER: That's what I thought I heard. THE COURT: Well, I'll ask. MR. FRIMMER: That's what I thought I heard. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Lennox, the question that's raised is do you foresee any cause to amend the disclosure statement other than as a result of amendments to plans that result from agreements with parties along the way?

MS. LENNOX: Not in a material manner, your Honor. I mean certainly if people come to us and say, "I want you to put this information because we want more information in the disclosure statement," we're going to do that, and that's not going to --

THE COURT: Assuming it's pertinent and accurate. MS. LENNOX: Assuming it's pertinent and it's -exactly, so there may be quite a bit of that. In fact, there may be quite a bit of that, your Honor, but --

THE COURT: Well, I encourage it.
MS. LENNOX: And we don't disagree, so I think there will be some of that. I think, as your Honor indicated, it's a little difficult to put a hard-and-fast timeline on that, but I have committed and I will commit that we are not going to leave major, you know, complete rewrites of the disclosure
statement until two days before the hearing. There will be interim filings.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else? All right. We'll consider this matter closed. The Court will take it under advisement and issue a revised scheduling order. Let's turn our attention to the city's motion to establish procedures for solicitation and tabulation of votes.

MS. LENNOX: Thank you, your Honor. It's a bit of a long motion, and I'll try to address some of the commentary that was objected -- or was raised in some of the responses as I go forward, and I'm going -- I'm not going to repeat everything we did. I'm going to try to be very straightforward.

I do want to point out, just to reiterate what Ms. Neville and I reported to the Court, we will file and we intend to file a supplemental motion to approve what it is that we are going to do with respect to the retiree classes for this plain English insert and for voting purposes, so --

THE COURT: What's your timing on that motion?
MS. LENNOX: Well, we're hoping to get it out in the next couple of weeks, your Honor, and that will depend probably on how much detail we put in this plain language version of what we do. It may have to be at the disclosure statement hearing, you know, the actual final version updated because if there are some agreements or something that may


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Motion.

