

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:

EXTRACTION OIL & GAS, INC., *et al.*,¹
Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 20-11548 (CSS)

Jointly Administered

RE: D.I. 1250 & 1285

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Each of ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC appeal to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(1) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 8002(a)(1) and 8003, from (a) that certain letter ruling entered on December 3, 2020 at D.I. 1250 (the “Letter Ruling”), and (b) that certain *Order Granting Debtors’ Motion for Entry of an Order Enforcing the Automatic Stay Against ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC* entered on December 8, 2020 at D.I. 1285 (the “Order”).

A copy of the Letter Ruling is annexed to this Notice as ***Exhibit A*** and a copy of the Order is annexed to this Notice as ***Exhibit B***.

The parties to the Letter Ruling and Order appealed from, and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of their respective attorneys are as follows:

///

///

¹ The Debtors in the Chapter 11 Cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor’s federal tax identification number, are: Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc. (3923); 7N, LLC (4912); 8 North, LLC (0904); Axis Exploration, LLC (8170); Extraction Finance Corp. (7117); Mountaintop Minerals, LLC (7256); Northwest Corridor Holdings, LLC (9353); Table Mountain Resources, LLC (5070); XOG Services, LLC (6915); and XTR Midstream, LLC (5624). The location of the Debtors’ principal place of business is 370 17th Street, Suite 5300, Denver, Colorado 80202.



2011548201223000000000016

<p><u>Appellant</u></p> <p>ARB Midstream, LLC, and Platte River Midstream, LLC</p>	<p><u>Attorneys</u></p> <p>Curtis S. Miller Matthew B. Harvey Taylor M. Haga Brett S. Turlington Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnel, LLP 1201 Market Street, 16th Floor Wilmington, Delaware 19801 Telephone: (302) 658-9200 Facsimile: (302) 658-3989 Email: cmiller@mnat.com mharvey@mnat.com thaga@mnat.com bturlington@mnat.com</p> <p>– and–</p> <p>Jeffrey T. Wegner Lisa M. Peters Kutak Rock LLP 1650 Farnam Street Omaha, Nebraska 68102 Telephone: (402) 346-6000 Facsimile: (402) 346-1148 Email: jeffrey.wegner@kutakrock.com lisa.peters@kutakrock.com</p> <p>– and–</p> <p>Reid A. Page Kutak Rock LLP 1801 California Street, Suite 3000 Denver, Colorado 80202 Telephone: (303) 297-2400 Facsimile: (303) 292-7799 Email: reid.page@kutakrock.com</p>
<p><u>Appellee/Debtor</u></p> <p>Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc.</p>	<p><u>Attorneys</u></p> <p>Marc Abrams Stephen Brett Gerald Richard W. Riley Whiteford, Taylor & Preston LLC The Renaissance Centre 405 North King Street, Suite 500</p>

Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Telephone: (302) 353-4144
Facsimile: (302) 661-7950
Email: mabrams@wtplaw.com
sgerald@wtplaw.com
rriley@wtplaw.com

– and–

Kevin G. Hroblak
Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, LLP
7 St. Paul Street, Suite 1400
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Telephone: (410) 347-8700
Facsimile: (410) 752-7092
Email: khroblak@wtplaw.com

– and–

William E. Arnault
Stephanie Cohen
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
300 North LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200
Email: william.arnault@kirkland.com
stephanie.cohen@kirkland.com

– and–

Jamie Aycock
Christian Menefee
Anna Rotman
Rebekah Sills
Kenneth A. Young
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
609 Main Street
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713) 836-3600
Facsimile: (712) 836-3601
Email: jamie.aycock@kirkland.com
christian.menefee@kirkland.com
anna.rotman@kirkland.com
rebekah.mcentire@kirkland.com
kenneth.young@kirkland.com

	– and –
<p>Ross Fielder Ciara Foster Kevin Liang Christopher Marcus P.C. Evan Swager Allyson Smith Weinhouse Kirkland & Ellis LLP 601 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10022 Telephone: (212) 446-4800 Facsimile: (212) 446-4900 Email: ross.fielder@kirkland.com ciara.foster@kirkland.com kevin.liang@kirkland.com christopher.marcus@kirkland.com evan.swager@kirkland.com allyson.smith@kirkland.com</p>	
<p><u>Interested Party</u></p> <p>Andrew R. Vara, United States Trustee for Regions 3 and 9</p>	<p><u>Attorney</u></p> <p>Richard L. Schepacarter Office of the United States Trustee U. S. Department of Justice 844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox #35 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 Telephone: (302) 573-6491 Facsimile: (302) 573-6497 Email: richard.schepacarter@usdoj.gov</p>
<p><u>Interested Party</u></p> <p>Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors</p>	<p><u>Attorneys</u></p> <p>G. David Dean Andrew John Roth-Moore Cole Schotz P.C. 500 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1410 Wilmington, Delaware 19801 Telephone: (302) 652-3131 Facsimile: (302) 652-3117 Email: ddean@coleschotz.com arothe-moore@coleschotz.com</p> <p>– and –</p>

	<p>Erez Gilad Kristopher M. Hansen Kenneth Pasquale Jason M. Pierce Gabriel Sasson Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP 180 Maiden Lane New York, New York 10038 Telephone: (212) 806-5400 Facsimile: (212) 806-6006 Email: egilad@stroock.com khansen@stroock.com kpasquale@stroock.com jpierce@stroock.com gsasson@stroock.com</p> <p>– and –</p> <p>Frank A. Merola Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP 2029 Century Park East Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 556-5800 Facsimile: (310) 556-5959 Email: fmerola@stroock.com</p>
--	---

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Dated: December 21, 2020
Wilmington, Delaware

/s/ Brett S. Turlington

Curtis S. Miller (No. 4853)

Matthew B. Harvey (No. 5186)

Taylor M. Haga (No. 6549)

Brett S. Turlington (No. 6705)

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

1201 Market Street, 16th Floor

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Telephone: (302) 658-9200

Facsimile: (302) 658-3989

Email: cmiller@mnat.com

mharvey@mnat.com

thaga@mnat.com

bturlington@mnat.com

- and -

Jeffrey T. Wegner (Nebraska No. 18265)

Lisa M. Peters (Nebraska No. 24526)

KUTAK ROCK LLP

1650 Farnam Street

Omaha, Nebraska 68116

Telephone: (402) 346-6000

Facsimile: (402) 346-1148

Email: Jeffrey.Wegner@KutakRock.com

Lisa.Peters@KutakRock.com

- and -

Reid A. Page (Colorado No. 37722)

KUTAK ROCK LLP

1801 California Street, Suite 3000

Denver, Colorado 80111

Telephone: (303) 295-8000

Facsimile: (303) 292-7799

Email: Reid.Page@KutakRock.com

*Counsel to Platte River Midstream, LLC, and ARB
Midstream, LLC*

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:

EXTRACTION OIL & GAS, INC. *et al.*,¹

Debtors.

)
) Chapter 11
)
) Case No. 20-11548 (CSS)
)
) (Jointly Administered)
)
) **Re: Docket Nos. 950 and 1250**
)

**ORDER GRANTING DEBTORS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER
ENFORCING THE AUTOMATIC STAY AGAINST ARB MIDSTREAM, LLC AND
PLATTE RIVER MIDSTREAM, LLC**

This matter having come before this Court on the *Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order Enforcing the Automatic Stay Against ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC* [Docket No. 950] (the "Motion"); this Court having reviewed the Motion and all responses and materials relevant thereto; this Court having heard oral argument on the Motion; this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the Amended Standing Order of Reference, dated February 29, 2012; this Court having found this is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); this Court having found it may enter a final order consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution; this Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Motion in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; this Court having found that the Debtors' notice of the Motion and opportunity for a hearing on the Motion were appropriate under the circumstances and no other notice need be provided; this Court having

¹ The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc. (3923); 7N, LLC (4912); 8 North, LLC (0904); Axis Exploration, LLC (8170); Extraction Finance Corp. (7117); Mountaintop Minerals, LLC (7256); Northwest Corridor Holdings, LLC (9353); Table Mountain Resources, LLC (5070); XOG Services, LLC (6915); and XTR Midstream, LLC (5624). The location of the Debtors' principal place of business is 370 17th Street, Suite 5300, Denver, Colorado 80202.

reviewed the Motion and related materials; this Court having determined that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion and at the hearing establish just cause for the relief granted herein; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefore; for the reasoning provided in the Court's December 3, 2020 Letter [Docket No. 1250] (the "Letter Ruling"), which is incorporated herein by reference,

IT IS HEREBY FOUND THAT:

1. ARB Midstream, LLC's and Platte River Midstream, LLC's commencement and prosecution of the Colorado Litigation,² including the request for and issuance of an *ex parte* temporary restraining order violated the automatic stay.


2. The entry into Settlement Agreement³ in the face of the temporary restraining order and under the threat of continuing, impermissible litigation was, in and of itself, a violation of the automatic stay.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT:

1. The Motion is GRANTED as set forth in the Letter Ruling.
2. The temporary restraining order entered in the Colorado Litigation and the Settlement Agreement are void *ab initio*.
3. This Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or relating to the implementation of this Order.

² The Colorado litigation is the civil action filed by ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC on September 11, 2020 in the District Court of Arapahoe County, Colorado, captioned as above, and the Debtors' alternative service providers.

³ **Dated: December 8th, 2020**
The Settlement Agreement is the document admitted at the hearing before this Court. **Wilmington, Delaware**



CHRISTOPHER S. SONTCHI
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**APPEAL TRANSMITTAL SHEET****Case Number:** 20-11548BK ☒ AP ☐

If AP, related BK case number: N/A

Title of Order Appealed: Order Granting Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order Enforcing the Automatic Stay Against ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC**Docket #:** 1285**Date Entered:** 12/8/2020

Item Transmitted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Notice of Appeal	Docket #: 1470	Date Filed: 12/21/2020
<input type="checkbox"/>	Amended Notice of Appeal	Docket #:	Date Filed:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cross Appeal	Docket #:	Date Filed:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Motion for Leave to Appeal	Docket #:	Date Filed:
<input type="checkbox"/>	Request for Certification of Direct Appeal	Docket #:	Date Filed:

Appellant/Cross Appellant:ARB Midstream, LLC
Platte River Midstream, LLC**Appellee/Cross Appellee**

Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc.

Counsel for Appellant/Cross Appellant:Curtis S. Miller
Matthew B. Harvey
Taylor M. Haga
Brett S. Turlington
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnel, LLP**Counsel for Appellee/Cross Appellee:**Marc Abrams
Stephen Brett Gerald
Richard W. Riley
Whiteford, Taylor & Preston LLC**Filing fee paid?**Yes ☒ No ☐**IFP application filed by applicant?**Yes ☐ No ☒**Have additional appeals of the same order been filed?**Yes ☐ No ☒***If Yes, has District Court assigned a Civil Action Number?**Yes ☐ No ☒**Civil Action Number:**

(continued on next page)

Bankruptcy Court Appeal (BAP) Number: 20-64

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CHRISTOPHER S. SONTCHI
CHIEF JUDGE



824 N. MARKET STREET
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
(302) 252-2888

December 3, 2020

VIA CM/ECF

Marc R. Abrams
Richard W. Riley
Stephen B. Gerald
Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, LLC
The Renaissance Centre
405 North King Street, Suite 500
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Christopher Marcus
Allyson Smith Weinhouse
Ciara Foster
Kirkland & Ellis, LLP
Kirkland & Ellis International LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Jamie Aycock
Kirkland & Ellis, LLP
Kirkland & Ellis International, LLP
609 Main Street
Houston, Texas 77002

Curtis S. Miller
Matthew B. Harvey
Taylor M. Haga
Brett S. Turlington
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnel LLP
1201 Market Street, 16th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Reid A. Page
Kutak Rock LLP
1801 California Street, Suite 3000
Denver, Colorado 80111

Lisa M. Peters
Kutak Rock LLP
1650 Farnam Street
Omaha, Nebraska

RE: **Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc., et al., Case No.: 20-11548 (CSS)**

Dear Counsel,

Before the Court is the Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order Enforcing the Automatic Stay Against ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC (the "Motion"). As set

forth below, the Court finds that ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC (collectively, “Platte River”) violated the automatic stay in commencing the Colorado Litigation and entering into the Settlement Agreement (both as defined below). The Court will grant the Motion and order that the Settlement Agreement is void *ab initio*.

I. Statement of Facts¹

The factual recitation of the business and litigation history between the parties is somewhat lengthy. For present purposes, however, it can be distilled into the key facts.² The Debtors are in the “upstream” business of extracting hydrocarbons from land in the State of Colorado. The Debtors have sought to reject several of what are commonly known as Transportation Services Agreements or TSA’s. Broadly speaking, the counterparties to these TSA’s are “midstream” pipelines, which transport the Debtors’ hydrocarbons to larger “downstream” pipelines. Platte River operates midstream pipelines and is a party to a TSA with the Debtors (the “Platte River TSA”). Among other things, the Platte River TSA requires the Debtors to ship a minimum amount of volume of oil from a defined “Dedication Area” using Platte River’s pipelines and, if the Debtors fail to do so, make cash payments to Platte River.

The Debtors filed bankruptcy on June 14, 2020. On August 11, 2020, the Debtors filed the Debtors’ Second Omnibus Motion for Entry of an Order (I) Authorizing Rejection of Unexpired Leases of Nonresidential Real Property and Executory Contracts Effective as of the Dates Specified Herein and (II) Granting Related Relief (D.I. 412) (the “Motion to Reject”) in which the Debtors sought to reject the Platte River TSA. While the Motion to Reject and a related adversary proceeding were being litigated, the Debtors ceased using Platte River as its sole transportation vendor in the Platte River dedication area and did not make the required minimum payments, which were breaches of the Platte River TSA by the Debtors. More specifically, in lieu of Platte River, the Debtors engaged a trucking company and an alternative pipeline company to transport their oil.

In late August 2020, the Debtors informed Platte River that they would be using a trucking company “to begin moving oil and shipping around [the Platte River] transportation system.”³ After learning of the Debtors’ intentions, Platte River raised this issue during the September 1, 2020 status conference before the Court. Specifically, counsel for Platte River informed the Court that the Debtors intended to begin trucking oil from certain well pads in the

¹ With minor exceptions, the facts are undisputed.

² For a more complete recitation of the facts please see *Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc. v. Platte River Midstream, LLC, and DJ South Gathering, LLC (In re Extraction Oil and Gas, Inc.)*, No. 20-50833 (CSS), 2020 WL 6694354 (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 14, 2020); and *In re Extraction Oil & Gas, Inc.*, No. 20-11548 (CSS), 2020 WL 6389252 (Bankr. D. Del. Nov. 2, 2020).

³ Sept. 1, 2020 Hearing Tr. at 30:20–23.

Platte River dedication area.⁴ Platte River claimed that the Debtors' use of trucking would result in irreparable harm and previewed that Platte River would file a request for a temporary restraining order in the Court in the next day or two:

MR. MILLER: On Friday, a representative of the debtors contacted my client and said that starting today they were going to begin moving oil and shipping around our transportation system. We got a follow-up email from the debtor's CEO, Matt Owens, yesterday confirming that . . . That would be a breach of the Midstream agreements and - - -

THE COURT: Well, they're free to breach. I mean the rejection order is a breach. The rejection order is just a court authorized breach that has the effect of transferring damages to unsecured versus administrative, but if they breach before the administrative claim and you have damages - - excuse me, if they breach before its rejected then you have damages in their admin claims. Now if you think you're suffering from irreparable harm you need to file a TRO.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, that's exactly what I was going to say is that this is the same issue that came up in the Emerald Oil case before Judge Gross and he did enter a TRO. We were planning on doing the same thing because we believe we are being irreparably harmed and, you know, they are effecting [sic] our property interest. I wanted to mention that to you in light of, you know, the scheduling of everything else. We plan to get on that file in the next day or so, but because of the prejudice that was occurring to our client beginning today I wanted to highlight that for Your Honor, let you know that that additional motion and request for relief will be coming and, essentially, just put it on your radar with everything else . . . So, I just wanted to put that out there so no was surprised when that actually happens. That is a very significant issue for our client. I mean this is a do or die situation for us, Your Honor.⁵

Platte River did not, however, file a request for a temporary restraining order with this Court. Rather, on September 11, 2020, Platte River filed a Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief (the "First Colorado Complaint") in the District Court of Arapahoe County, Colorado against the trucking company the Debtors were utilizing (the "Colorado Litigation"). In the First Colorado Complaint, Platte River asserted nine claims for relief against the trucking company the Debtors were using to transport their produced oil from the Platte River dedication area. These claims included causes of action for civil theft, intentional interference with contractual relations, unjust enrichment, and civil conspiracy. Platte River's claims relied on the assertion that Platte River had an ownership interest in the property, "the Interests, the subject

⁴ *Id.* at 30:20-31:5.

⁵ *Id.* at 31:16-32:3

crude oil, and the Platte River Dedication Area . . . that has substantial value.” A principal of Platte River stated in deposition that the purpose of this litigation was “to enforce [their] rights under the dedication” and “to stop the trucking and require the [D]ebtors to use the PRM transportation system.”⁶

On September 14, 2020, Platte River filed an Amended Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief (the “Amended Colorado Complaint”) before the Colorado state court. Platte River amended the First Colorado Complaint to include as defendants the Debtors’ alternative pipeline provider.⁷ The Amended Colorado Complaint contained the same nine claims for relief that Platte River had asserted against the trucking company defendants.

On September 16, 2020, Platte River filed a motion seeking entry of an *ex parte* temporary restraining order against the Alternative Service Providers. On September 18, 2020, the Colorado state court entered a temporary restraining order through which the Alternative Service Providers were required to “cease all diversion and transport of crude oil from the Extraction wells as of the date of this Order.”⁸

After the entry of the temporary restraining order, Platte River communicated with the alternative pipeline provider concerning a settlement of the claims asserted in the Amended Colorado Complaint. In connection with these settlement discussions, the alternative pipeline provider made a settlement proposal. As part of this proposal, the alternative pipeline provider offered to not “knowingly receive crude oil via existing pipelines connected to the pad locations identified in the [Amended Colorado Complaint], with intent to transport crude oil attributed to [Extraction’s] operated working interest.” The alternative pipeline provider also proposed that any settlement remain effective until this Court “determines[d] whether the Platte River Midstream, LLC and DJ South Gathering, LLC contracts . . . may be rejected under [s]ection 365 of the Bankruptcy Code.”

Platte River provided a counterproposal in which it sought the alternative pipeline provider’s agreement that it would not receive crude oil from all of the pad locations identified in the Amended Complaint (even though it was connected to only two of the pad locations at the time). Platte River also requested that the Settlement Agreement “remain in effect until there is a final, non-appealable order . . . in which it is determined that the contracts between Platte River Midstream, LLC and DJ South Gathering, LLC” and Extraction are effectively rejected under the Bankruptcy Code. Thus, through this proposal, Platte River expanded the scope of

⁶ Sept. 23, 2020 Rogan McGillis Dep. 78:19–23 (“Q. And so the purpose of this litigation was to stop the trucking and require the debtors to use the PRM transportation system. Right? A. It was to enforce our rights under the dedication. Yes.”).

⁷ The alternative pipeline provider and the alternative trucking providers are collectively referred to herein as the “Alternative Service Providers.”

⁸ Colorado Order at 6 (emphasis in original).

the settlement to include any well pads that the alternative provider would connect to in the future and lengthened the amount of time that any settlement would be effective. On September 30, 2020, Platte River and the Alternative Service Providers (including the trucking company) entered into a Settlement Agreement on essentially the same terms as proposed by Platte River.⁹ Platte River did not disclose the existence of the Settlement Agreement or its terms to the Debtors or the Court until the cross-examination of the Debtors' CEO on October 7, 2020, during the evidentiary hearing on the Motion to Reject.

II. The Colorado Litigation and the Settlement Agreement Violate the Automatic Stay

"When a debtor files for bankruptcy, Section 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code imposes a broad automatic stay."¹⁰ The automatic stay is a statutory injunction.¹¹ This statutory injunction arises automatically and "without the necessity of a formal court order."¹² More specific to this case, "a petition filed under section 301, 302, or 303 of this title . . . operates as a stay, applicable to all entities, of . . . (3) any act to obtain possession of property of the estate **or to exercise control over property of the estate** . . ."¹³ Section 362(a)(3) "applies to actions against third parties as well as actions against the debtor."¹⁴

Here, the Debtors assert that both the Colorado Litigation and the Settlement Agreement exercised control over property of the estate in violation of section 362(a)(3) by interfering with the Debtors' contractual and business relationships with the Alternative Service Providers. A violation of section 362(a)(3) "requires both (1) a post-petition act; and (2) property of the estate."¹⁵ There is no dispute that the actions at issue occurred post-petition and involved property of the estate.

Importantly, "Platte River does not dispute that the [Extraction] Oil—the actual crude oil being produced at the wells within the Dedication Area—are [sic] property of [the Debtors'] bankruptcy estate and thereby protected by the automatic stay under section 362(a) of the

⁹ Settlement Agreement at 1-2 (admitted as D-58 during Oct. 20, 2020 hearing).

¹⁰ *In re Nortel Networks, Inc.*, 669 F.3d 128, 137 (3d Cir. 2011).

¹¹ *In re Odom*, 570 B.R. 718, 723 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2017); and *In re Wingard*, 382 B.R. 892, 899 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2008).

¹² *In re Alberts*, 381 B.R. 171, 176 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2008).

¹³ 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(3) (emphasis added).

¹⁴ *Acands, Inc. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co.*, 435 F.3d 252, 259 (3d Cir. 2006). *See also Harrison v. Soroof Int'l, Inc.*, 320 F. Supp. 3d 602, 628 (D. Del. 2018) ("Section 362(a)(3), the terms of which are further defined by Section 541, applies to actions against third parties as well as actions against the debtor.").

¹⁵ *In re Welded Constr., L.P.*, 609 B.R. 101, 127 (Bankr. D. Del. 2019).

Bankruptcy Code.”¹⁶ Moreover, “Platte River does not dispute that [the Debtors’] contractual and business relationships with the Alternative Providers are also property of the estate and thereby protected by the automatic stay.”¹⁷ Courts have repeatedly held that “the mere opportunity to receive an economic benefit in the future is property with value under the Bankruptcy Code.”¹⁸ In this case, the Colorado Litigation and Settlement Agreement do not interfere with an “**opportunity** to receive an economic benefit.” Rather, they interfere with an **existing** business relationship (and its concomitant economic benefits) between the Debtors and the Alternative Service Providers.

In response to the Motion, Platte River raises several procedural objections. Primarily, Platte River argues that the Debtors are attempting to extend the automatic stay to non-debtors. It is certainly true that “[i]t is a tenet of bankruptcy law that the automatic stay provisions of § 362 of the Bankruptcy Code apply only to debtors and do not prevent litigation from proceeding against nondebtors.”¹⁹ However, this is not a case where a debtor is seeking to extend the stay to co-defendants in a litigation merely because there is some legal or factual nexus with the debtor.²⁰ Indeed, the Debtors do not seek to protect the Alternative Service Providers at all. Rather, the Debtors seek to stop Platte River from controlling estate property, i.e., the Debtors’ contractual and business relationships with the Alternative Providers. This is not an extension of the automatic stay.

In addition, Platte River argues that the Debtors’ Motion is procedurally improper because it seeks an injunction, which requires an adversary proceeding.²¹ However, the Debtors are not seeking an injunction. Rather, they are seeking to enforce an existing, statutorily-created injunction. As such, the Debtors may proceed by motion.²² Indeed, the Court could have raised

¹⁶ ARB Midstream, LLC’s and Platte River Midstream, LLC’s Objection to Debtors’ Motion for Entry of an Order Enforcing the Automatic Stay Against ARB Midstream, LLC and Platte River Midstream, LLC [D.I. 1041] (the “Platte River Objection”) at 20.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 22.

¹⁸ *In re Majestic Star Casino, LLC*, 716 F.3d 736, 750–51 (3d Cir. 2013). *See also In re THG Holdings LLC*, 604 B.R. 154, 160 (Bankr. D. Del. 2019) (same).

¹⁹ *In re DESA Holdings Corp.*, 353 B.R. 419, 425 (Bankr. D. Del. 2006); *see also In re UniMarts, LLC*, 399 B.R. 400, 415 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009).

²⁰ *See In re Conference of African Union First Colored Methodist Protestant Church*, 184 B.R. 207, 214 (Bankr. D. Del. 1995) (quoting *Maritime Elec. Co. Inc. v. United Jersey Bank*, 959 F.2d 1194, 1205 (3d Cir. 1991)).

²¹ Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(7).

²² *In re THG Holdings LLC*, 604 B.R. 154, 162 (Bankr. D. Del. 2019) (Unnecessary “to establish each of the factors necessary to impose a preliminary injunction because the Bankruptcy Code itself establishes the basis for the enforcement of the automatic stay.”).

the issue *sua sponte*.²³ And, indeed, the Court did note its concerns in its October 2, 2020 Bench Ruling.²⁴

Thus, the Court finds that the commencement and prosecution of the Colorado Litigation, including the request for and issuance of the *ex parte* temporary restraining order, violated the automatic stay. In addition, the entry into the Settlement Agreement in the face of the temporary restraining order and under the threat of continuing, impermissible litigation was, in and of itself, a violation of the automatic stay.

"[A]ny act post-petition by a creditor that violates the automatic stay under [section] 362 is void."²⁵ Thus, the temporary restraining order and the Settlement Agreement are void *ab initio* and are without any force or effect. The Debtors are directed to consult with Platte River and to submit an order under certification of counsel.

Sincerely,



Christopher S. Sontchi

Chief United States Bankruptcy Judge

CSS/cas

²³ *In re Lessig Const., Inc.*, 67 B.R. 436, 444 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1986) (The Court "must raise the automatic stay issue *sua sponte* when [it] observe[s] its applicability.").

²⁴ Bench Ruling [D.I. 942], p. 17, n. 56 ("The Court was troubled by the testimony of Mr. McGillis, which was also discussed during closing argument, that Platte River had obtained an *ex parte* TRO in Colorado State Court against one of the Debtors' alternative trucking companies based on the terms of the Platte River TSA's. Notwithstanding that the action may have been a violation of the automatic stay, it is based on a theory that does not hold water post-rejection as Platte River will have a rejection claim, and, thus, an adequate remedy at law.").

²⁵ *In re Student Fin. Corp.*, 378 B.R. 73, 78 (Bankr. D. Del. 2007).