IN THE UNITED S	STATES DI STRI CT COURT
FOR THE NORTHE	RN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLA	<u>AS DIVISION</u>
IN RE HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P., Debtor.	(3: 21-CV-1895-D (
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS, L.P., et al, Appellants	(((DALLAS, TEXAS (
VS.	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P., Appellee.	(((JANUARY 25, 2022
TRANSCRIPT OF O	RAL ARGUMENT VIA ZOOM
BEFORE THE HONORAB	BLE SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
UNI TED STATE	S DI STRI CT JUDGE
<u>APPEARANCES</u> :	
Pac 101 13t Los 310 Fax	FREY N. POMERANTZ hulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP OO Santa Monica Blvd h Floor Angeles, CA 90067 -227-6910 : 310-201-0760 il: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
PAMELA J. WI U. S. DI STRI CT (LSON, COURT - 21419340542203150000000000006

FOR THE APPELLANTS:	DAVOR RUKAVINA Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr PC 500 N Akard St Ste 3800 Dallas, TX 75201 214-855-7587 Email: drukavina@munsch.com DOUGLAS DRAPER Heller, Draper & Horn, L.L.C. 650 Poydras Street Suite 2500 New Orleans, LA 70130 504-299-3300 Fax: 504-299-3399 Email: ddraper@hellerdraper.com
COURT REPORTER:	PAMELA J. WILSON, RMR, CRR pam_wilson@txnd.uscourts.gov 1100 Commerce Street, Room 1535 Dallas, Texas 75242 214.662.1557
Proceedings reporte transcript produced by c	ed by mechanical stenography, computer.

ORAL ARGUMENT VIA ZOOM - JANUARY 25, 2022 1 2 <u>PROCEEDINGS</u> The matter before the court is in re: THE COURT: 3 Highland Capital Management bankruptcy appeal oral argument. 4 Before we begin I have some housekeeping matters to 5 cover. 6 First of all, if at some point we lose the court 7 8 reporter, obviously, we need to stop. I hope that will not 9 happen, but if that occurs we will. And if we have any technical difficulties that interrupt 10 counsel's argument time, then I will add to your time so that 11 you have your full allocated time. 12 13 The law clerk is aware of the time warnings that you want and I have advised him to interrupt you or interrupt me 14 15 so that he can announce those time warnings as needed. At this time then we'll begin with counsel for the 16 17 appellants. I believe that's going to be divided time, so if you would proceed at this time. 18 MR. RUKAVINA: Your Honor, good morning. 19 Davor Rukavina of Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr for two of 20 the appellants we call the advisors. I'll be discussing the 21 substance of the appeal, and my co-counsel, Douglas Draper, 22 23 who represents the Dugaboy Trust, will be addressing the two 24 motions to dismiss. Your Honor, may it please the court. 25

Let me first reiterate what we argued in our brief, 1 2 which is that this matter is very much a matter about 3 substance. This is not a matter of procedure. This is not a case where -- where someone can say harmless error or where 4 someone can say, okay, so what, the wrong procedure was 5 followed. It is substance that goes to the core of the 6 bankruptcy court's jurisdiction and what it does, because it 7 8 deals with a confirmed plan. It is substance because the 9 Bankruptcy Code has an express section dealing with plan modifications, if this is a plan modification. 10 THE COURT: Counsel, could I ask you a couple of 11 questions before you continue on? 12 13 First of all, would you address the difference between indemnifying out of reserves and indemnifying out of the 14 subtrust. 15 And second, would you address the assertion that the 16 17 bankruptcy court order does not really add to the universe of entities who are eligible for indemnification. 18 MR. RUKAVI NA: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 I think both of those questions revolve around the same 20 answer, which is that the plan created originally three legal 21 entities, the reorganized debtor, the litigation subtrust, 22 23 and then the master claim and trust. Each of those entities 24 was originally obligated to indemnify its own logistical and professionals. It's a little bit broader than that. 25 There

> PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR/RMR/CRR U.S. DISTRICT COURT - 214.662.1557

4

1 was no cross indemnification. And it's my understanding 2 that, yes, the claim and trust could reserve funds for the 3 indemnification purposes. That is correct. But what the litigation trust or the claim and trust could reserve from 4 its own funds on hand is different than what we have now. 5 For example, we have a \$22.5 million promissory note. That's 6 not just reserving funds on hand. That is the future 7 8 obligation that needs to be repaid before any creditors can be repaid. 9 But I think more importantly -- Your Honor, I apologize. 10

Someone is typing and I can hear them and it's -- it's
interfering with my ability to talk. But it might just be
the court reporter, so I'll continue.

But, Your Honor -- and we have discussed this our reply brief in detail. There is no question that under this new order the claim and trust now is responsible for indemnifying people whom it was not responsible to indemnify in the beginning.

And another thing that I'll point out, Your Honor, with this indemnification subtrust, they're going to have to hold the \$25 million until all possible indemnification claims are asserted and resolved. Under Texas law that's four years for breach of fiduciary duty.

24 So it's not a matter of the debtor's trustee in the 25 exercise of his business judgment reserving some funds at any

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 6 of 50 PageID 4680

6

1	given point to address conceived of or potential or
2	threatened indemnification claims. It is a matter of tying
3	up \$25 million for years to come and by the claim and trust
4	indemnifying people whom it alone or it itself was not
5	indemnifying before.
6	Assume, Your Honor, arguendo, that that the
7	litigation trust created under the plan didn't have the money
8	to indemnify its personnel. That it it it ran through
9	its seed money, it it it prosecuted litigation
10	THE COURT: We've lost your sound.
11	(Pause.)
12	Now you're back on.
13	And I'll instruct the law clerk to add a minute to his
14	time.
15	MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.
16	Your Honor, what I was saying is that hypothetically the
17	original litigation trust could just not have money to
18	indemnify its personnel. Well, now, the claim and trust from
19	its own funds, from it's \$25 million, does so. So I hope
20	I've addressed that portion of the court's question.
21	If I return to to what is a plan modification, Your
22	Honor. Well, first, a plan is a contract. That's black
23	letter bankruptcy law. The contract can be sued upon in
24	state court. So I think Congress, just like fundamental
25	contract law, they say a debtor can't unilaterally modify its

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 7 of 50 PageID 4681

1 contract. No -- no contract party can just unilaterally 2 modify a contract. So you have to follow the 1127(b) 3 prescribed mechanism for a plan modification. And that has extreme safeguards. Your Honor, you have to have a 4 disclosure statement that goes to all the creditors that 5 discloses the economic impact in detail, the length, for 6 example, I mentioned four years, that -- that tells the 7 8 creditors and other parties in interest everything that the debtor knows in an approved format so that it's reasonably 9 accurate for the creditors to make a decision. 10

That's the second point. A modification is voted upon. Here the creditors originally rejected the plan. We believe that they would likely reject the modification. But the creditor democracy is critical to Chapter 11 proceedings. The way that the bankruptcy court proceeded here, we didn't have that.

And third, and most importantly, this motion was approved under a very flexible, equitable, multifactor business judgment test. Section 1129 that governors confirmation has something like 14 elements, not factors, each of which must be proven with competent evidence.

And if the bankruptcy court proceeds on what's called cram down to confirm a plan that's been rejected, now you have two additional very heightened elements. That's what I mean that this is about substance.

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 8 of 50 PageID 4682

8

I	
1	And and we believe that if this proceeded as a plan
2	modification it would have been rejected and denied.
3	Briefly, Your Honor, before I defer to Mr. Draper, we've
4	briefed this at length, but a plan modification is something
5	that changes a plan. We know that from U.S. Brass. In U.S.
6	Brass the plan provided for litigation by trial of claims.
7	It was changed later on to provide for litigation by
8	arbitration. It didn't change the economics of the plan. It
9	didn't change how much creditors were being paid. Yet the
10	Fifth Circuit had no problem in in construing that as a
11	plan modification, something that was prohibited in that
12	case.
13	So the burden is pretty slight to find that a change to
14	a plan is a plan modification. Again, because a debtor ought
15	not to be able to unilaterally change its contract and
16	creditor democracy in Chapter 11 is the key.
17	Here, Your Honor, there is no question that a new trust
18	is being created, the indemnification subtrust. Your Honor,
19	Chapter 11 trusts are created under plans. They're not
20	created by motion. I would urge any any counsel who is a
21	bankruptcy expert to give the court a single case where a
22	trust was created by motion. That's a plan issue.
23	\$25 million is potentially being removed from creditors.
24	It may turn out to be a zero, that's true. But we won't know
25	for many years to come. And in the meantime that \$25 million

is tied up.

1

2	You have this increased indemnification of professionals
3	by the creditor trust that you did not have before. There
4	was no cross indemnification before. There was no guarantee
5	under indemnification. And you have the fact that the plan
6	expressly contemplated as a condition precedent DNO
7	insurance, which could be waived, and they did waive it, but
8	the plan required DNO insurance and now you're substituting
9	that with this new trust. That, Your Honor, is a
10	modification. It changes what is in the plan, both each of
11	those things individually, and certainly I would argue in the
12	totality of the circumstances.
13	Mr. Draper will now handle the motions to dismiss.
14	I would just point out as counsel for NexPoint that
15	NexPoint did have five claims, known claims, when this appeal
16	was commenced, and until recently NexPoint had the sixth
17	claim, Hunter Covitz, which there was confusion internally at
18	the HR department, but it always had that claim. That claim
19	has been disallowed very recently. We are appealing that
20	disallowance order because it was disallowed without a
21	hearing and on negative notice, in violation of Rule 55.
22	And most importantly for standing, the plan requires the
23	creditor creditor trust to reserve more than \$200,000 for
24	that claim until that claim is definitively and finally
25	adjudicated by final order. We also have \$14 million of

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 10 of 50 PageID 4684

10

1 administrative claims that we're going to go to trial on 2 probably now in April. They have not been disallowed. They 3 have not been paid. Your Honor, with that, I'll yield the balance of our 15 4 minutes to Mr. Draper. 5 MR. DRAPER: Your Honor, Douglas Draper. 6 7 Thank you very much for allowing this by zoom. 8 I'm going to address a few items that will be very quick 9 and certainly things that are I believe lost in the pleadings and the papers that have been filed. The first one is citing 10 Judge Jones in Pacific Lumber. Equitable mootness should be 11 employed with a scalpel and not an axe. So it has to be 12 13 narrow in its scope. I'd ask -- though we're talking about plan modifications, understand that the matter before you is 14 15 not an appeal of the confirmation order. It is appeal of a separate order that is not the confirmation order. 16 17 And I'd ask the court to look at two cases, really three Number 1 is the -- the concept of substantial 18 cases. 19 consummation. And in U.S. Brass the Fifth Circuit held that substantial consummation was not a bar to a -- a equitable 20 mootness and was not a cause for equitable mootness. 21 22 The next two cases are probably even more important. ١n Walker Hospital, which is in Sneed Shipbuilding, the Fifth 23 24 Circuit expressly said equitable movements only applies to two types of orders: One an order confirming a plan, that's 25

1	not this case; and number two, an order under 363-M. This is
2	not a sale order either.
3	So by virtue of the Fifth Circuit's express provisions
4	in both Sneed and in Walker equitable mootness is not a is
5	not a bar and should not be the cause of dismissal of this
6	debtor's appeal.
7	The last issue I'd like to address, and I'd ask the
8	court to take a look at, is a recent case out of the Eighth
9	Circuit, which is VeroBlue. That is a very well-written
10	opi ni on.
11	THE COURT: I think we've lost Mr. Draper's sound.
12	MR. DRAPER: Can you hear me?
13	THE COURT: Now I can. Okay. Go ahead, Mr.
14	Draper. MR. DRAPER: Where did you lose me?
15	Was I mentioning VeroBlue?
16	THE COURT: You had started VeroBlue, yes, and then
17	and turned to your right to get some papers.
18	MR. DRAPER: Okay. What I would ask you to look
19	take a hard look at is VeroBlue, 6 Fed 4th 880, the court
20	there did not uphold a dismissal on equitable mootness.
21	Enormous distributions had been made. The plan had been
22	virtually substantially consummated, but the court said,
23	wait, we can we can fashion a relief here that is minimal
24	and that is is not problematic.
25	Let's talk about what relief can be fashioned here. The

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 12 of 50 PageID 4686

12

1 court can apply a scalpel and just go back and say, look, the
2 parties who were originally covered by the indemnity are
3 covered, anybody else who you just picked up is not covered.
4 And -- and the truth is when you look at the equitable
5 mootness cases they fall into two categories. Category 1 is

a creditor who had made concessions is now being asked to

6

7 alter its treatment but still leave the concessions in place.
8 That's not the case here. We don't have a creditor being
9 asked to make a concession. In fact, the people now being
10 covered by this had no expectation. In fact, the plan had no
11 expectation of an indemnification. It was specific insurance
12 coverage that, again, you can apply a scalpel and just go
13 back to what the plan covered and limit it.

And number two is our third-party creditors before the court who were affected by the order. Well, that's not the case either, because the employees and the parties who were being covered by the indemnification are not before the bankruptcy, are not before the court here, were not creditors, who were not insiders. They were just outsiders who they're picking up.

Let me address now the -- the constitutional mootness. And I think there are a few issues here. The first is -- and when you look at it in their papers there's a footnote to a case where they cite that the Fifth Circuit says the -the -- the -- the effect must be pecuniary. That's not true.

In CMS it's a footnote in the pleading that they filed on the
21st, the court there, and that's the Fifth Circuit, said a
trustee who has no
THE CLERK: Two minutes remain.
MR. DRAPER: who has no pecuniary interest in
fact is it doesn't doesn't have to have one and can
appeal.
Number two, Dugaboy has a real pecuniary interest.
Though they have forgotten this, we are a contingent creditor
under that plan. Simple mathematics says if the \$20 million
or \$25 million is available for distribution to creditors my
capability to being paid increases. The the test to
whether I have a pecuniary interest is not a dollar test.
It's a mathematical test. It's a pretty clear that this
trust falls, or this trust is reduced to where it should be,
my capability or my ability for my contingent interest is
is increased.
Again, thank you very much. And, again, I would ask the
court to look at the cases I've cited on the equitable
mootness side because I think they are dispositive of the
Fifth Circuit standing at issue.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Draper.
And the appellants have reserved some time for rebuttal.
Mr. Pomerantz.
MR. POMERANTZ: Good morning, Your Honor.

Can you hear me? 1 2 THE COURT: I can. MR. POMERANTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 I will be focusing my comments this morning on the 4 equitable mootness motion and the merits. We filed our reply 5 in connection with the constitutional mootness motion and 6 I'll largely stand on that unless Your Honor has any 7 8 questions. But I do want to highlight one point, Your Honor. 9 Appellant's standing throughout the bankruptcy case has been 10 an issue, so much so that Judge Jernigan issued an 11 extraordinary order in June 2021 requiring NexPoint and other 12 13 Dondero related entities to disclose all claims they had and all their relationships with the debtor. She entered the 14 order so she could evaluate whether parties had standing to 15 take positions before the bankruptcy court. 16 17 In July 2021 NexPoint filed their disclosure. They identified each employee claim by name, but they did not 18 19 mention the COVID's claim. They had multiple chances to correct this error when its standing was questioned and many 20 times after before the bankruptcy court. 21 22 Only now, after agreeing to withdraw all their other 23 claims does the COVID's claim miraculously appear on the 24 docket ten months -- ten months after it was transferred. Your Honor, they said confusion, there's a huge credibility 25

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 15 of 50 PageID 4689

1 issue here, and the statement in the declaration that the 2 transferred document was not backdated just doesn't cut it. In any event, Your Honor, that claim has been disallowed and 3 can't support standing under the first and agreed standard. 4 Your Honor, with respect to equitable mootness the Fifth 5 Circuit acknowledges that an appeal of a bankruptcy court 6 order can become equitably moot. And appellants are 7 8 incorrect are equitable mootness doesn't apply here. First they argue that it doesn't apply because there is 9 not a planned confirmation order, but the circuit has 10 considered equitable mootness of orders other than 11 confirmation orders. In GWI and in Skull Pack. And Sneed is 12 13 not to the contrary. Sneed only stands for the proposition that a confirmed plan in the case is required, and we have 14 that here. 15 Second, consistent with other circuits, the Fifth 16 17 Circuit does not limit equitable mootness to the organizations as opposed to liquidations. 18 Manges found 19 equitable mootness in a litigation case as -- and also a litigation -- a liquidation was at issue in Superior 20 Offshore. 21 Lastly, while the complexity of the case can be a 22 23 factor, it's not a litmus test. Berryman found equitable 24 mootness in a simple case. And while both Texas Prairie and Superior Offshore rejected equitable mootness, neither case 25

> PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR/RMR/CRR U. S. DI STRI CT COURT - 214. 662. 1557

15

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 16 of 50 PageID 4690

16

г	
1	was complex and that didn't factor into the decision.
2	In any event, Your Honor, the asset monetization under
3	this plan is complex and requires sophisticated management.
4	As a result of serious allegations of mismanagement and fraud
5	against Mr. Dandero, the bankruptcy court appointed Mr. Seery
6	based upon his experience managing complex financial assets
7	similar to the debtor in his work as a restructuring
8	professional. He is the debtor reorganized debtor's CEO
9	and the claimant trustee and his knowledge of the estate's
10	assets the bankruptcy court found was vital to the plan
11	success.
12	The assets consist of operating companies, undeveloped
13	land, structured products, distressed debt, and other unique
14	assets that will only deteriorate in value quickly if not
15	managed effectively. Dismissal upon equitable mootness is
16	appropriate under Manges if it effects either the rights of
17	parties not before the court such that the court cannot order
18	effective relief or the success of the plan, and we meet
19	both, Your Honor.
20	Since the summer of 2020 Mr. Dandero and the other
21	appellants have embarked on a litigation onslaught that's
22	been designed to harass Mr. Seery and the other debtor
23	representatives that has resulted in a TRO against Mr.
24	Debtor Mr. Dandero, and a contempt order for violating the
25	TRO.

Al though the plan confirmed in February 2021, the
effective date was conditioned upon obtaining acceptable DNO
coverage. Why? Because Mr. Seery and the other
post-confirmation management -- post effective date
management was simply unwilling to accept their roles without
a guarantee of their indemnification rights to protect
against Mr. Dandero's attacks.

8 DNO coverage on an acceptable basis wasn't available because of Dandero, and the debtor and the committee pivoted 9 to self-insurance and sought the court authority to implement 10 the indemnity trust. Had the bankruptcy court not authorized 11 the indemnity trust, the plan would not have gone effective, 12 Highland would have remained in Chapter 11 without the 13 ability to make distribution to creditors. But the 14 15 bankruptcy court did approve the indemnity trust, management did rely on it, and the plan did go effective. 16

17 The court simply cannot order any effective relief in this appeal that would reinstate the status quo for the 18 19 managers, and reinstatement of the status quo is a key that comes out of the cases. If the court reverses, management 20 loses protection for their indemnification rights for actions 21 taken after the August 11th effective date. 22 And as the Dandero litigation onslaught has intensified post effective 23 24 date and post confirmation, DNO insurance, not an option six months ago, will not be an option now. So security for the 25

indemnification rights, which was the only reason that the
 plan went effective, will no longer exist.

Reversal will not only pull out the rug from management 3 but will also materially jeopardize the plan. Mr. Seery 4 would resign if the order is reversed and believe the 5 subtrust -- litigation subtrustee and the oversight members 6 7 would follow suit. This a big deal. Mistake can't be easily 8 repl aced. As the court found in the confirmation order in the findings of fact, stripped of the ability to guarantee 9 indemnification rights and without DNO coverage it would be 10 impossible to find replacement managers with the 11 sophistication necessary to monetize the assets, and the 12 result would be a void in management, a likely default under 13 the exit facility, and it would seriously jeopardize the 14 plan's success. 15

Your Honor, equitable mootness cases involve an appellate trying to resolve its appellate rights which if successful will unquestionably enhance their rights. Courts have to balance the rights of the appellant to enhance their rights against parties' expectations and the success of the plan. But this is not the paradigm we have here.

Appellants filed this appeal in the name of unsecured creditors who they said were armed by the indemnity trust, but unsecured creditors were not armed by the indemnity trust. The committee, the statutory fiduciary for unsecured

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 19 of 50 PageID 4693

1 creditors, supported the indemnity trust, and not one 2 creditor with an allowed claim objected to it. The committee 3 supported the order because they recognized protecting management, and having the plan go effective, a plan that was 4 accepted by 99.8 percent in amount of unsecured creditors, 5 was in the bankruptcy's word -- bankruptcy court's words a 6 Voiding the trust, losing competent management, and 7 miracle. 8 jeopardizing success will significantly harm creditors.

9 Stripped of their unsecured claims appellant's
10 motivation in this appeal becomes clear. It never had
11 anything to do with protecting unsecured creditor's rights.
12 They want to do everything they can to destroy the plan.
13 That's not a basis for standing or a basis for allowing this
14 court -- this appeal to continue. The court should dismiss
15 the appeal as equitably moot.

Your Honor, turning to the merits, the indemnity trust order is not a plan modification because it did not alter the parties' rights, expectations, and obligations under the plan.

I want to spend a minute on the -- on the nature of
appellant's interest, because it really goes to what their
expectations could have been under the plan. NexPoint
Advisors is owned and controlled by James Dandero. NexPoint
along with appellant HCFMA (sic), also owned and controlled
by Dandero, assert a \$14 million administrative claim which

PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR/RMR/CRR U.S. DISTRICT COURT - 214.662.1557 19

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 20 of 50 PageID 4694

will be soon tried in the bankruptcy court. But any allowed
administrative claim is not affected by the trust because it
will be paid by the approximately 195 million that was
available projected to be paid to junior unsecured creditors.
There is no circumstance under which this claim will not be
paid.

Appellants could not as trust beneficiaries have had any
expectations of how indemnification claims would be paid
under the plan because they were not trust beneficiaries at
the time of confirmation. Their unsecured claims were
acquired after confirmation.

Appellants are not like the creditors in U.S. Brass and 12 the asbestos cases. In those cases the creditors withdrew 13 their objections to the plan based upon changes specifically 14 made in the plan to address their concerns and when 15 post-confirmation the debtor tried to undo those changes. 16 17 That's not what's happening here. Here, as I said, the committee and other creditors representing 99 percent in 18 19 dollar amount of unsecured claims supported the plan. The committee actively participated in drafting the indemnity 20 trust and supported the order which is being appealed, as it 21 22 was the only way to protect the independent managers and have 23 the plan go effective.

The only reason that the unsecured creditor class rejected the plan was because of a handful of votes of former

> PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR/RMR/CRR U.S. DISTRICT COURT - 214.662.1557

20

employees who were being terminated under the plan, who were
 Dandero loyalists, whose claims are disputed, and who now
 work for Dandero related entities, and none of whom objected
 to the plan.

Before I have turn to the merits on the indemnification, 5 Your Honor, I want to describe the post-confirmation 6 7 structure because I think it's very important. The debtor 8 was reconstituted as the reorganized debtor, a limited 9 partnership. Its limited partner is the claim and trust and its general partner is the corporate entity which is a 10 subsidiary of the claim and trust. The reorganized debtor 11 retained its management contracts with third-party funds and 12 13 other related assets to avoid regulatory complications. The majority of the remaining assets were transferred to the 14 15 claim and trust and Mr. Seery is the claim and trustee.

A litigation subtrust was created because the creditors
wanted prosecution of claims separated from asset
monetization and controlled by a different person. The claim
and trust transferred litigation claims to the subtrust to be
pursued by the litigation trustee, but proceeds generated by
the reorganized debtor assets and the litigation --

22THE COURT: I think we lost our sound just then,23Mr. Pomerantz.

24 MR. RUKAVINA: Your Honor, what happened to 25 Mr. Draper and I is somehow we were muted without pressing

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 22 of 50 PageID 4696

22

1	
1	the button. I don't know how. But perhaps Mr. Pomerantz has
2	been also muted.
3	MR. DRAPER: If there could be a message to him to
4	reengage his microphone it might work. That's what I did.
5	MR. POMERANTZ: Your Honor, can you hear me?
6	I'm not sure where you lost me, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: ALL right.
8	MR. POMERANTZ: I was talking about the corporate
9	structure of the three of the different entities.
10	THE COURT: Yes. You were just transitioning into
11	that. And we'll add two minutes to your time.
12	MR. POMERANTZ: Okay, Your Honor. Sorry.
13	I talked about the general the the limited
14	partnership and that the claim and trust is the limited
15	partner and is the owner of the subsidiary who is the general
16	partner. And the reorganized debtor remained retained its
17	management contracts with third-party funds and other related
18	assets to avoid regulatory complications.
19	The majority of the debtor's remaining assets were
20	transferred to the claim and trust, and Mr. Seery is the
21	claim and trustee. A litigation subtrust was created because
22	creditors wanted prosecution of claims separated from asset
23	monetization and controlled by a different person. The claim
24	and trust transferred litigation claims to the subtrust to be
25	pursued by the litigation trustee.

Г

23

Т

1	So the way these assets work together is proceeds
2	generated by the reorganized debtor's assets and the
3	litigation subtrust claims are upstreamed to the claim and
4	trust for distribution to trust beneficiaries along with the
5	proceeds of claim and trust assets. They work together as a
6	symbiotic group to upstream these assets. All of the
7	preconfirmation debtor assets are end up being upstreamed
8	to the claim and trust after expenses are paid.
9	Your Honor, turning to the merits, the appellant's
10	principal argument is that the indemnity
11	THE LAW CLERK: 10 minutes remaining.
12	MR. POMERANTZ: Thank you.
13	Turning to the merits, the principal argument is that
14	the indemnity trust expanded the people who were to be
15	indemnified by the claim and trust to include people
16	indemnified by the litigation subtrust of the reorganized
17	debtor.
18	Your Honor, first, under the Fifth Circuit's McKenzie
19	decision and Your Honor's All Track Transportation decision,
20	the appellant's have waived this argument by not making it in
21	their pleadings or in the argument below. Even if not
22	waived, Your Honor, the argument mischaracterizes the
23	indemnity trust and the provisions of the plan and its
24	implemented documents.
25	As a threshold matter, Your Honor, neither the indemnity

Г

24

1	trust order or the indemnity trust create any obligations to
2	any party. The turn sheet attached to the motion states that
3	the purpose of the trust is to provide collateral security
4	supporting the indemnification obligations created under the
5	claim and trust agreement, the litigation subtrust agreement,
6	and the reorganized debtor limited partnership. The
7	indemnity trust is only a mechanism to satisfy the indemnity
8	claims that become due under the various plan documents and
9	which are not satisfied first by the claim and trust, the
10	litigation subtrust, and the reorganized debtor. It does not
11	create any new indemnification obligations. Rather, the
12	indemnity obligations are created under the plan documents.
13	8.2 of the claim and trust, 8.2 of the litigation trust, and
14	Section 10 of the reorganized debtor limited partnership.
15	Therefore, the real question, Your Honor, is whether the
16	funding of the indemnification trust is consistent with the
17	plan, and that the answer is yes. The indemnification trust
18	was to be funded with two and a half million dollars of cash,
19	of debtor cash upon inception, and a 22 and a half million
20	dollar note. The claim and trust, the litigation subtrust,
21	and the reorganized debtor are all co-obligors under the 22
22	and a half million dollar note. The assets of all those
23	entities will fund the note.
24	Appellants dismiss the claim and trust ability to create

25 reserves and -- and obligation to fund litigation subtrust

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 25 of 50 PageID 4699

Г

25

٦

1	
1	expenses and the right to contribute capital to the
2	reorganized debtor to preserve its value. Various provisions
3	of the plan and its implementing documents provide the claim
4	and trust with such authority, discretion, and obligation.
5	In addition to the cases cited in our brief, Your Honor,
6	I direct the court's attention to Article 4, Capital A and B
7	of the plan, and Section 3.3(b)(vi) of the claim and trust
8	agreement.
9	The bankruptcy court also ruled correctly that the
10	creation of the indemnity trust to securitize plan approved
11	indemnification obligations was an action to implement the
12	plan authorized by Article 4(d) of the plan.
13	So several principals flow from these provisions.
14	First, the plan authorized the claim and trust and other
15	post-effected date entities to complete reserves and fund
16	expenses of all post-confirmation entities.
17	Second, claim and trust beneficiaries were only entitled
18	to the proceeds net after all expenses were paid and reserved
19	for.
20	Third, the debtor was authorized to take actions to
21	implement the terms of the plan and supporting documents.
22	Fourth, as the bankruptcy court found, nothing in the
23	plan prohibits self-insurance through the creation of the
24	indemnity trust in lieu of DNO insurance.
25	And, last, the structure was consistent with creditor

1 expectations key for the plan modification argument. Asset 2 proceeds would flow up to the claim and trust, go and 3 distribute the net proceeds to creditors after payment of all expenses relating to the asset monetization process. 4 Appellants argue in their briefing that the creditors' 5 rights were fundamentally changed because while the plan 6 7 created discretion to set reserves, the indemnity trust 8 transformed that discretion into a legal obligation. But appellants are wrong for two reasons. 9 First, the indemnity trust authorized the creation of 10 the indemnity -- the order authorized the creation of the 11 indemnity trust. It did not become a legal obligation unless 12 13 and until the claim and trust oversight board authorized the execution of the indemnity trust agreement. The claim and 14 15 trust board actually did authorize the execution of the indemnity trust on August 11th, the effective date of the 16 17 pl an. So the premise of the argument that the indemnity trust order took away discretion is not correct. The claim 18 19 and trust oversight board retained such discretion -discretion and exercised it. 20 Moreover, Your Honor, under the plan all creditors 21 22 seated decision-making authority to the claim and trust and 23 the oversight board over administration of the trust, 24 including the discretion of whether to create reserves to 25 fund litigation trust expenses and reorganize debtor

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 27 of 50 PageID 4701

1					
1	expenses, the amount of those reserves, how much money could				
2	be spent on DNO coverage. All that discretion was given to				
3	those those governing bodies. Because no creditor				
4	influenced how the claim and trust was administered, the				
5	fact				
6	THE CLERK: Five minutes remain.				
7	MR. POMERANTZ: Excuse me?				
8	THE COURT: I think the clerk said five minutes				
9	remain.				
10	MR. POMERANTZ: Okay. Thank you.				
11	Because no creditor could influence how the claim and				
12	trust was administered, the fact that the claim and trust and				
13	the oversight board could reserve and fund expenses as they				
14	deemed appropriate was within creditors' expectations under				
15	the plan and did not change the legal relationship between				
16	the debtor and its creditors thereby requiring a plan				
17	modification.				
18	I want to briefly mention the issue of DNO coverage,				
19	Your Honor. The plan effective date was contingent upon				
20	obtaining acceptable DNO insurance. As I said, the condition				
21	was essential, because Seery and the other managers would not				
22	agree to serve without protection. The debtor could not have				
23	found post-confirmation effective date management without it,				
24	and though the the condition was waivable, unfortunately				
25	acceptable insurance was not available because of Dondero's				

threats and litigation onslaught, but rather than not going 1 2 effective, the debtor made -- decided to self-insure. And who objects to the self-insurance? 3 Appellants. Who did not hold general unsecured claims 4 of confirmation, who are not trust beneficiaries now, 5 notwithstanding Mr. Draper's comments of this contingent 6 7 right, that's clearly not sufficient under the Fifth Circuit 8 standing to be a person aggrieved, who are the reason acceptable DNO insurance cannot be obtained and really who 9 have no legitimate basis to contest the indemnity trust, 10 other than to be, in the words of the bankruptcy court's 11 confirmation order, disrupters. 12 13 The indemnity trust is the functional equivalent of DNO coverage. Both are designed to secure indemnity obligations 14 15 under the plan. The cost of DNO insurance reserves are claim and trust expenses or expenses otherwise necessary to 16 17 preserve the value of the reorganized debtor and are senior to the payment of trust beneficiaries. 18 And while payment of DNO premiums are some costs never 19 to be recovered and potentially distributed to beneficiaries, 20 any funds from the indemnity trust may be freed up to pay 21 22 trust beneficiary claims if no indemnity claims are asserted. Appellants argument that the change to an indemnity 23 trust modified the prayer's rights, obligations, and 24 25 expectations, is not supported by the plan or any of the

1	documents executed in support of the plan, and it's not
2	supported by the case law.
3	The parties have briefed the leading cases of what
4	constitutes a plan modification, and they don't support
5	appellant's argument. In the Fifth Circuit's Brass case,
6	Your Honor, the debtor modified a plan prior to confirmation

to resolve an insurance company's plan objection. The change
provided that future disputes would be resolved by litigation
and not arbitration. That change was critical to the
insurance company. Why? Because it believed arbitration
could result in conducive settlements detrimental to its
coverage defenses.

When post-confirmation the debtor through a settlement agreement tried to change the way in which the claims would be resolved through arbitration, the insurance company objected. Because this change modified a fundamental plan provision, which the insurance company relied upon in withdrawing its objection to confirmation, the Fifth Circuit easily found it to be a plan modification.

THE LAW CLERK: Two minutes remain.
MR. POMERANTZ: Thank you.
This is nothing like what's going on in here.
In the Second Circuit's Joint Asbestos case the plan
carefully created a priority and distribution mechanism to
satisfy asbestos claims against the post-confirmation trust.

Post confirmation the trust became insolvent and could not
satisfy its plan obligations. Certain parties agreed to
modify the trust to change the payment timing, the priority
scheme, and how claims would be resolved. The Second Circuit
found that this restructuring of the trust was a plan
modification. As with U.S. Brass this case is stark -- in
stark contrast to what's going on here.

8 In conclusion, Your Honor, this appeal is nothing but a continuation of James Dandero and his related entities' 9 efforts to throw every roadblock into the debtor's 10 restructuring process. The indemnity order did not alter 11 appellant's expectations of their treatment under the plan. 12 How could it? They didn't have any unsecured claims when the 13 plan was confirmed. Nor does it modify the rights or 14 15 treatment of creditors' claims or effect the relationship in The plan board fall contemplated asset proceeds 16 any way. 17 being upstream to the claim and trust who would fund those expenses, create reserves, and distribute the remaining to 18 19 the trust beneficiaries. The indemnity trust is entirely faithful to this principle. 20 Thank you, Your Honor. 21 22 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pomerantz. Rebuttal? 23 MR. RUKAVINA: Yes, Your Honor. Can the court hear 24

25 me?

THE COURT: Very well.

1

2

MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.

Your Honor, in U.S. Brass the Fifth Circuit rejected the 3 very argument just made, which is that, well, under the plan 4 the debtor had the discretion to compromise claims, so 5 switching from litigating them to arbitration was no harm, no 6 7 foul. So that argument is not a sound argument. Nor is the 8 no harm, no foul argument. The bankruptcy code provides for a mechanism and that mechanism must be complied with. 9 l took Your Honor's questioning of me earlier to -- to go to that 10 argument, no harm, no foul. Respectfully, they are changing 11 a plan, whether it's actually no harm, no foul doesn't 12 That's an argument to be made at the new 13 matter. confirmation hearing. 14

Your Honor, we're not talking about stripping Mr. Seery 15 of indemnification. The all equation that he and the others 16 17 will resign, it's baseless. They can set aside several million dollars -- they have indemnification rights under the 18 19 We're not challenging that. They can set aside pl an. millions of dollars for themselves. For the notion that 20 reversing this order will defeat the plan because the 21 22 professionals will quit is not supported by the record and it's certainly not a logical one. 23

But most importantly, what I take real exception with is, and I'm quoting "the Dandero litigation onslaught". Your

Case 3:21-cv-01895-D Document 51 Filed 03/15/22 Page 32 of 50 PageID 4706

Honor, my two clients represent thousands of investors who
have trusted them with billions of dollars. We're not some
cowboys litigating with everyone. In fact, we are not taking
offensive litigation to the bankruptcy case. We are not
Mr. Dondero. We have not been sanctioned. If the -- if the
debtor is concerned, the debtor has Rule 11 rights. The
debtor has Section 1927 rights.

8 We are the defendants in multiple lawsuits filed by the 9 debtor. In one lawsuit, Your Honor, we had a final trial on 10 six days notice on a mandatory injunction the debtor sought 11 against us. And they lost. The bankruptcy court denied them 12 that.

I am -- I -- I hear my clients being maligned nonstop, 13 but listen to what they're saying. They're saying James 14 15 Dondero. They're saying James Dondero was sanctioned. Whatever the merits of those arguments are, they simply do 16 17 not apply to my clients. My clients are enjoined by the They're enjoined from properly representing their 18 pl an. 19 constituents. That is why we are appealing the plan to the Fifth Circuit. That is why we are involved in this 20 bankruptcy case. As we said at the confirmation hearing, 21 don't enjoin us and we'll go home. 22

So -- so the allegation that we are picking this fight, that we are cowboy litigants, that we are vexatious, is not in the record, Your Honor, and again it shouldn't matter for

> PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR/RMR/CRR U.S. DISTRICT COURT - 214.662.1557

32

1 purposes of this appellant argument.

2 Also not in the record is what Mr. Pomerantz was talking about, the terms of the promissory note here. I just had my 3 associate look and he could not find it and I don't remember 4 It's part of the problem, Your Honor. If this had been 5 it. handled as a plan modification with a disclosure statement, 6 7 all of these documents that have now been signed would have 8 been public, would have been -- would have been known by That's, again, the whole point that the -- the 9 everyone. democracy, not only of the creditors in a Chapter 11, Your 10 Honor, but all the other parties in interest, and certainly 11 my clients are parties in interest, were alleged to owe tens 12 of millions of dollars to the debtor. We're -- we're subject 13 to final and permanent injunctions in the plan. 14

We've also made that argument on standing, Your Honor. 15 The record is clear that the plan itself would not have gone 16 17 effective but for this order. My client right now, and Mr. Dondero -- I'm sorry, Mr. Draper's client right now would 18 19 not be looking down a permanent injunction and exculpations of their claims and releases of their claims without this 20 order. It takes multiple orders to get to an effective plan 21 in Chapter 11, Your Honor, disclosure statement, plans 22 estimation, plan confirmation, et cetera. This is merely the 23 24 last link in that chain. Whether the court agrees with me or 25 not that we have creditor standing, we have standing --

1	THE CLERK: One minute remains.				
2	MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.				
3	because the plan would not be effective.				
4	Your Honor, very quickly, this court I submit has a duty				
5	to supervise the Article I bankruptcy court. That's the				
6	whole point of Northern Pipeline Northern Marathon. We				
7	have cited and quoted Stern v. Marshall, a recent Supreme				
8	Court case, where the Supreme Court says, "Any party may				
9	appeal those determinations to the Federal District Court				
10	where the Federal District Judge will review them," et				
11	cetera. The bankruptcy jurisdictional system does not work				
12	if this court can't review it. And your law clerk can find				
13	it for you, Your Honor. It came out yesterday. It's a				
14	Second Circuit opinion. It's case number 20-2548. In that				
15	Second Circuit opinion standing was iffy. The Second Circuit				
16	didn't find standing under traditional notions, but it says,				
17	"But the fact that this case is a one-off				
18	THE CLERK: Time.				
19	THE COURT: ALL right. Thank you, counsel.				
20	All right. Thank you, counsel for your arguments.				
21	I'm going to ask that you remain on the link after I				
22	leave the courtroom in case the court reporter has any				
23	questions about any portion of your argument or any cases				
24	that you cited. Sometimes she does, sometimes she doesn't.				
25	And then once that process is completed then you're welcome				

1	to sign-off.							
2	At this time the court takes the appeal under submission							
3	and will issue its ruling.							
4	Thank you, counsel.							
5	The court will stand in recess.							
6	(End of proceedings.)							
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

1	INDEX - ORAL ARGUMENT						
2							
3	ORAL	ARGUMENT	Page	Li ne			
4	MR.	RUKAVI NA	3	19			
5	MR.	DRAPER	10	4			
6	MR.	POMERANTZ	13	23			
7	MR.	RUKAVI NA	30	13			
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

3	7
-	

< Dates > February 2021 16: 21 JANUARY 25, 2022 1: 18, 3: 1 July 2021 14: 13	214. 662. 1557 2: 43 21st 12: 23 22 24: 10, 24: 12 23 35: 10 2500 2: 13	< 9 > 90067 1:31 99 20:11 99.8 18:23	3: 21, 19: 16 affected 12: 12, 19: 20 aggri eved 27: 23 ago 17: 20 agree 27: 12
June 2021 14:8 March, 2022 35:29 \$14 9:23, 19:18	< 3 > 3 1: 5, 35: 6	< A > A. 1:21 ability 5:11,	agreed 14:25, 29:17 agreeing 14:18 agreement
\$20 13: 7 \$200, 000 9: 21 \$22. 5 5: 6	3. 3(b) (vi 24: 23 30 35: 12 310-201-0760	13: 13, 17: 8, 18: 4, 24: 15 abl e 8: 13	23: 21, 24: 24, 26: 5, 29: 4 agrees 33: 13
\$25 5: 20, 6: 1, 6: 18, 8: 21, 8: 23, 13: 8	1: 33 310-227-6910 1: 32 363-M 10: 24	accept 16: 25 acceptabl e 16: 22, 17: 3, 27: 10, 27: 15,	ahead 11: 10 Akard 2: 4 al 1: 11 allegation
< 1 > 1 10: 16, 12: 2 10 23: 4, 24: 4,	3800 2:5	27: 24 accepted 18: 23 accurate 7: 8 acknowl edges	31: 5, 32: 12 allegations 15: 24 alleged 33: 1
35: 8 10100 1: 29 11 7: 13, 8: 14,	4 24: 22, 35: 8 4(d 25: 3 4th 11: 16	15: 2 acqui red 20: 3 acti on 25: 2	allocated 3:12 allowed 18:21, 19:19
8: 17, 17: 8, 31: 20, 32: 24, 33: 11 1100 2: 41	< 5 > 500 2: 4	actions 17:16, 25:11 actively 20:13 actually 26:6,	allowing 10:5, 19:7 alone 6:3 alter 12:3,
1127(b 7: 1 1129 7: 18 11th 17: 17, 26: 7	504-299-3300 2: 15 504-299-3399 2: 16	31: 2 add 3: 11, 4: 17, 6: 12, 22: 4 addition 24: 21	19: 11, 30: 1 Al though 16: 21 amount 18: 24, 20: 12, 26: 17
13 35: 10, 35: 12 13th 1: 30 14 7: 19	55 9: 19	addi ti onal 7:23 address 4:13, 4:16, 5:25,	Angeles 1:31 announce 3:15 answer 4:21,
15 10: 2 1535 2: 41 15th 35: 29 19 35: 6	< 6 > 6 11: 16 650 2: 12	10: 6, 11: 5, 12: 18, 20: 8 addressed 6: 19 addressi ng 3: 23	24: 8 anybody 11: 25 apol ogi ze 5: 9 appeal 3: 4,
1927 31: 21 195 19: 21	< 7 > 70130 2:14 75201 2:6	adj udi cated 9: 23 admi ni stered 26: 20, 27: 2	3: 22, 9: 13, 10: 13, 11: 4, 13: 4, 15: 2, 17: 13, 18: 16,
< 2 > 20-2548 34:3 2020 16:15 21-CV-1895-D	75242 2: 42	admi ni strati on 26: 14 admi ni strati ve 9: 24, 19: 18,	19: 4, 19: 7, 19: 8, 29: 23, 33: 22, 34: 16 appeal ed 20: 14
1: 5 214-855-7587 2: 7	8. 2 24: 3, 24: 4 880 11: 16	19: 20 advi sed 3: 14 Advi sors 1: 10,	appeal i ng 9: 17, 32: 8 appear 14: 19

Appellant 14:6,	34:12, 35:1,	aware 3:13	Berryman 15:18
18: 13, 19: 3,	35:4	away 26:9	big 18:2
19: 14, 19: 17,	arguments 32:5,	axe 10: 10	billions 31:16
23: 2, 23: 12,	34:9		bit 4: 25
28: 20, 30: 2,	armed 18: 17,		bl ack 6: 21
32: 15	18: 18	< B >	Bl vd 1: 29
Appellants	around 4:20	back 6:11,	board 26:4,
1: 12, 2: 2,	Article 24:22,	11: 23, 12: 9	26: 6, 26: 10,
3: 17, 3: 21,	25: 3, 33: 19	backdated 14:23	26:14, 27:3,
13: 20, 15: 3,	Asbestos 20:6,	bal ance 10: 2,	30:6
16: 16, 18: 16,	29: 13, 29: 15	18:13	bodi es 26: 19
19: 25, 20: 5,	asi de 31:6,	Bankruptcy 3:4,	Brass 8: 4, 8: 5,
24: 15, 25: 21,	31:8	4:6, 4:8, 4:17,	10: 17, 20: 5,
	assert 19:18		
25: 25, 27: 19,		6: 22, 7: 14,	28: 20, 29: 21,
28: 13	asserted 5:21,	7:21, 8:19,	30:18
appellate	28: 12	12: 15, 14: 6,	breach 5: 22
18: 10, 18: 11	assertion 4:16	14: 12, 14: 17,	brief 4:1,
APPELLEE 1:18,	Asset 15: 22,	15: 2, 15: 25,	5: 14, 24: 21
1: 27	21: 10, 22: 15,	16: 5, 17: 6,	briefed 8:3,
applies 10:22	25: 17, 25: 20,	17:9, 18:25,	28: 18
apply 11:23,	30:6	19: 19, 24: 25,	briefing 25:21
12:9, 15:4,	assets 16: 1,	25: 13, 28: 1,	Briefly 8: 2,
15: 5, 32: 6	16: 5, 16: 7,	30: 23, 31: 18,	27:8
appoi nted 15: 25	16: 9, 18: 7,	31:25, 32:9,	broader 4:25
appropri ate	21:6, 21:7,	33: 19, 33: 25	burden 8: 11
16: 11, 27: 4	21: 14, 22: 11,	bar 10: 18, 11: 3	busi ness 5: 24,
approve 17:10	22: 12, 22: 19,	based 16:1,	7:17
approved 7:8,	22: 20, 22: 23,	20:7	button 21:19
7: 16, 25: 1	22: 24, 22: 25,	basel ess 31:6	
approxi matel y	24:13	basis 17:3,	_
19: 21	associate 32:18	19:6, 19:7,	< C >
April 9:25	Assume 6:5	27:25	CA 1:31
arbi trati on	attached 23:18	became 29:16	call 3:21
8:6, 28:24,	attacks 17:2	become 15:3,	called 7:21
28: 25, 29: 5,	attention 24:22	23: 24, 26: 3	capability
30: 21	August 17:17,	becomes 19:4	13:9, 13:13
argue 9:9,	26: 7	begin 3:5, 3:16	Capital 1:5,
15: 5, 25: 21	authority 17:5,	begi nni ng 5: 17	1:9, 1:16, 3:4,
argued 4:1	24: 20, 26: 13	bel i eve 3: 17,	24: 17, 24: 22
•	authori ze 26: 6	7: 11, 7: 25,	
arguendo 6:5			
ARGUMENT 1: 20,	authorized	10:7, 17:25	case 4: 3, 8: 10,
3: 1, 3: 4, 3: 11,	17:6, 25:3,	bel i eved 28: 25	8: 19, 10: 24,
23: 3, 23: 6,	25:5, 25:11,	bel ow 23: 13	11:6, 12:5,
23: 12, 23: 13,	26: 1, 26: 2,	benefi ci ari es	12: 13, 12: 21,
23: 14, 25: 17,	26: 4	19: 25, 20: 2,	14: 6, 15: 10,
26: 8, 28: 13,	available 13:8,	22: 22, 25: 8,	15:15, 15:17,
28: 20, 30: 19,	17:3, 19:22,	27: 20, 28: 8,	15: 19, 15: 20,
30: 22, 30: 23,	27: 15	28: 10, 30: 9	28: 16, 28: 20,
31: 1, 31: 3,	avoi d 21:6,	benefi ci ary	29: 13, 29: 21,
32: 15, 33: 4,	22: 11	28:12	31: 18, 32: 10,
-, ,	1	-	

33:22, 34:3,	29: 13, 29: 19,	23: 19	20: 4, 27: 20,
34:6, 34:11	30: 18, 32: 9,	comes 17:15	28: 2, 28: 21,
cases 10:15,	34:2, 34:3,	commenced 9:14	29:8, 29:16,
10: 16, 10: 20,	34:4	comments 14:1,	31: 3, 32: 10,
12: 2, 13: 16,	ci rcui ts 15: 12	27:21	33: 12
17: 15, 18: 10,	circumstance	Commerce 2:41	confirmed 4:8,
20: 6, 24: 21,	19: 23		
		committee 17:4,	15: 10, 16: 21,
28: 18, 34: 12	ci rcumstances	18: 19, 18: 21,	30: 4
cash 24:9,	9:10	20: 11, 20: 13	confi rmi ng
24: 10	cite 12:21	companies 16:7	10: 23
categories 12:2	cited 13:16,	company 28:22,	confusion 9:15,
Category 12:2	24: 21, 33: 21,	28: 25, 29: 5,	14: 21
cause 10: 19,	34:13	29: 7	Congress 6:23
11: 3	citing 10:8	competent 7:20,	connection 14:3
CEO 16: 3	claimant 16:4	19:1	considered 15:7
Certai n 29: 17	claims 5: 20,	complete 25:6	consi st 16:7
	6: 1, 8: 5, 9: 13,		consi stent
certai nl y 9: 9,		completed 34:14	
10:7, 31:12,	9:24, 14:9,	compl ex 15: 20,	15:12, 24:7,
32: 25	14: 19, 19: 3,	15: 23, 16: 1	25: 16
certify 35:19,	20:1, 20:3,	complexity	consti tuents
35: 24	20: 12, 20: 20,	15: 17	32: 8
cetera 33:12,	21: 10, 21: 12,	complications	consti tutes
33: 24	22: 15, 22: 17,	21:6, 22:11	28: 19
chai n 33: 13	22: 21, 23: 23,	complied 30:24	consti tuti onal
chal I engi ng	27: 19, 28: 12,	comply 35:24	12: 18, 14: 3
31:8	29: 4, 29: 15,	compromi se	construing 8:9
chances 14:15	29: 19, 30: 3,	30: 20	consummated
change 8:7,	30: 5, 30: 20,	computer 2:48	11: 19
8: 11, 8: 13,	33:9	concei ved 5: 25	consummation
27:5, 28:13,	class 20: 17	concept 10:16	10: 17, 10: 18
28: 22, 28: 24,	clear 13: 11,	concerned 31:20	contempl ated
29:4, 29:6,	19:4, 33:5	concerns 20:8	9:4, 30:6
29: 18	clearly 27:22	concessi on 12:6	contempt 16:19
changed 8:6,	CLERK 3: 13,	concessi ons	contest 27: 25
25: 22	6: 12, 13: 1,	12:3, 12:4	conti ngent
changes 8:4,	23:4, 26:21,	concl usi on	13:6, 13:13,
9:8, 20:7, 20:9	26: 23, 29: 10,	29: 23	27:9, 27:21
changi ng 31:1	33: 15, 34: 1,	condition 9:4,	conti nuati on
Chapter 7: 13,	34:7	27:10, 27:14	29: 24
8: 14, 8: 17,	client 33:6,	condi ti oned	continue 4: 12,
17:8, 32:24,	33: 7	16: 22	5: 12, 19: 8
33: 11	clients 31:15,	conduci ve 29:1	contract 6: 21,
		Conference	
Circuit 8:8,	32:2, 32:6,		6:22, 6:23,
10: 17, 10: 22,	33:1	35:25	6: 24, 6: 25,
11:1, 11:6,	CMS 12: 22	confirm 7:22	7:1, 8:13
12: 21, 12: 24,	co-counsel 3: 22	confirmation	contracts 21:5,
13: 18, 15: 2,	co-obligors	7: 18, 10: 13,	22: 10
15: 6, 15: 12,	24: 12	10: 14, 15: 6,	contrary 15:9
23: 10, 27: 22,	Code 4: 8, 30: 23	15:8, 17:19,	contrast 29:22
28: 20, 29: 8,	col l ateral	18: 3, 20: 3,	contri bute
			1

24:17

22:1

control l ed

core 4:6

19:16, 19:17,

21:11, 22:16

correct 5:3,

14:16, 26:9

cost 28:5

costs 28:9

3: 16, 4: 11, 8: 18, 9: 12,

34:8, 34:9,

coupl e 4:11

Courts 18: 12 **cover** 3:6

16: 23, 17: 3, 18: 5, 26: 18,

27:8, 28:4,

29:2

14:19

coverage 12:9,

covered 11: 24,

11:25, 12:7, 12:10, 12:14

COVID 14: 15,

Covi tz 9: 15

cram 7:22 create 23:17,

cowboy 32:13

24:1, 24:15,

26: 15, 30: 8

6:6, 8:16, 8:17, 8:18,

8:20, 21:9,

22:14, 23:20,

creation 25:1,

24:3, 25:23,

25:14, 26:1,

credi bility

29:14

26:2

14:21

created 4:21,

cowboys 31:17

Davor 2:2, 3:20

day 35:29

days 31:24

9:18

di sal I owed

9:17, 9:18,

docket 14:20

documents

document 14:23

courtroom 34:11

34:18

Counsel 3: 11,

corporate 21:3,

correctly 24:25

		-
creditor 7:13,	ddraper@hellerd	9: 25, 14: 24
8: 14, 9: 1,	•	di scl ose 14: 9
	raper.com 2:17	
9: 21, 12: 3,	deal 18:2	discloses 7:4
12:5, 13:6,	dealing 4:9	di scl osure 7: 3,
18:20, 19:5,	deals 4:7	14: 13, 32: 20,
20: 17, 25: 16,	debt 16:8	33: 11
26: 19, 27: 1,	deci ded 27: 17	di screti on
33: 14	decision 7:9,	24: 20, 25: 23,
creditors 5:8,	15: 21, 23: 11	25: 24, 26: 9,
7:4,7:6,7:9,	decision-making	26: 10, 26: 15, 26: 18, 30: 20
7:11, 8:8,	26: 13	26:18, 30:20
8: 21, 12: 11,	decl arati on	di scussed 5: 13
12: 15, 13: 8,	14:22	di scussi ng 3: 21
17: 9, 18: 17,	deemed 27:4	dismiss 3:24,
18: 18, 18: 20,	default 18:8	9: 11, 19: 8,
18: 24, 19: 2, 19: 22, 20: 5,	defeat 31:10	24: 15
19: 22, 20: 5,	defendants	Dismissal 11:3,
20: 6, 20: 11,	31:22	11: 17, 16: 10
21:9, 22:15,	defenses 29:2	di sposi ti ve
25: 19, 25: 21,	defer 8:2	13: 17
26: 12, 27: 4,	defi ni ti vel y	disputed 20:20
27:6, 30:5,	9: 22	disputes 28:23
32: 24	democracy 7:13,	disrupters 28:2
critical 7:13,	8:14, 32:24	distressed 16:8
28: 24	deni ed 8:1,	di stri bute
cross 5:1, 9:2	31: 25	25: 19, 30: 8
CRR 2: 39, 36: 6	department 9:16	di stri buted
CSR 35: 19	describe 20:24	28: 10
cut 14:23	designed 16:17,	di stri buti on
	28: 4	13:8, 17:9,
	destroy 19:6	22: 22, 29: 14
< D >	detail 5:14,	di stri buti ons
Dallas 1:3,	7:5	11: 18
1: 11, 2: 6,	deteri orate	District 1:1,
2: 42, 36: 9	16: 9	1:2, 1:22,
Dandero 15:25,	determi nati ons	33:23, 33:24,
16: 15, 16: 19,	33: 23	36: 8
17:2, 17:4,	detri mental	di vi ded 3: 17
17: 18, 19: 16,	29:1	Division 1:3,
19: 18, 20: 20,	difference 4:13	36: 9
20: 21, 29: 24,	different 5:5,	DNO 9:4, 9:6,
31: 14	21:11, 22:2,	16: 22, 17: 3,
date 16: 22,	22:16	17:19, 18:5,
16: 24, 17: 17,	di ffi cul ti es	25: 15, 26: 17,
17: 19, 25: 6,	3:10	27:8, 27:10,
26:7, 27:9,	direct 24:22	27:24,28:3,
27:13	di sal I owance	28:5, 28:9

23: 15, 23: 24,	20: 16, 26: 7,	equi tabl y 15:3,	10: 22
24: 3, 24: 19,	27: 9, 27: 13,	19:8	extraordi nary
25: 12, 28: 15,	27:17, 33:6,	equi val ent 28:3	14:8
32: 21	33: 10, 33: 17	error 4:4,	extreme 7:2
dollar 13:10,	effecti vel y	14: 16	
20: 12, 24: 11,	16:10	essential 27:11	
24: 13	effects 16:11	estate 16:4	< F >
dollars 24:9,	efforts 29:25	esti mati on	facility 18:8
31:7, 31:9,	Eighth 11:6	33: 12	fact 9: 3, 12: 6,
31: 16, 33: 2	ei ther 10: 25,	et 1: 11, 33: 12,	12:7, 13:3,
Dondero 14:9,	12: 13, 16: 11	33: 24	18: 4, 26: 20,
27: 15, 31: 19,	elements 7:19,	evaluate 14:11	27:2, 31:17,
32: 4, 33: 7	7: 23	event 14:24,	34: 5
Dougl as 2: 10,	eligible 4:18	15: 22	factor 15:17,
3: 22, 10: 4	Email 1:34,	everyone 31:17,	15: 21
down 7: 22, 33: 8	2:8, 2:17	32: 23	factors 7:19
drafting 20:13	embarked 16:16	everything 7:7,	faithful 30:9
DRAPER 2: 10,	employed 10:10	19:6	fall 12: 2, 30: 6
2: 11, 3: 22,	employee 14:14	evi dence 7: 20	falls 13:12
8: 2, 9: 11,	empl oyees	example 5:6,	fashi on 11:20
10: 3, 10: 4,	12: 13, 20: 19	7:5	fashi oned 11:22
11:8, 11:9,	End 22: 25,	exception 31:13	Fax 1: 33, 2: 16
11: 10, 11: 11,	34:20	excul pati ons	Fed 11: 16
11: 15, 13: 2,	enhance 18: 12,	33:8	Federal 33:23,
13: 19, 21: 18,	18:13	Excuse 26: 22	33: 24
21: 21, 27: 21,	enj oi n 32: 10	executed 28: 15	fees 35: 24
33: 7, 35: 8	enj oi ned 32: 6,	execution 26:5,	few 10: 6, 12: 19
drukavi na@munsc	32: 7	26:6	fi duci ary 5: 22,
h. com 2:8	Enormous 11:18	exercise 5:24	18:19
due 23: 24	entered 14:10	exerci sed 26:11	Fifth 8:8,
Dugaboy 3: 23,	entirely 30:9	exist 17:22	10: 17, 10: 21,
13:5 duty 5:22	entities 4:18,	exit 18:8	11:1, 12:21,
duty 5: 22,	4: 22, 4: 23,	expanded 23:7	12: 24, 13: 18, 15: 1, 15: 12,
33: 18	14:9, 20:21,	expectation 12:7, 12:8	
	22: 2, 24: 14, 25: 6, 25: 7,		23: 10, 27: 22, 28: 20, 29: 8,
< E >	29: 24	expectati ons 18: 14, 19: 12,	30: 18, 32: 9
earlier 30:25	entitled 25:8,	19: 15, 20: 1,	fight 32: 12
easily 18:2,	35: 21	25: 17, 27: 4,	filed 10: 8,
29:8	enti ty 21:3	28: 14, 30: 2	12: 23, 14: 2,
economi c 7:5	Equi table 7:17,	expenses 23: 1,	14: 13, 18: 16,
economi cs 8:7	10: 9, 10: 18,	24: 17, 25: 7,	31: 22
effect 12: 22,	10: 19, 10: 22,	25: 9, 25: 20,	final 9:23,
30: 5	11: 2, 11: 17,	26: 16, 27: 3,	31: 23, 33: 3
effecti ve	12: 1, 13: 16,	28: 6, 30: 8	finally 9:22
16: 13, 16: 22,	14: 2, 15: 1,	experience 16:1	financial 16:1
16: 24, 17: 7,	15: 4, 15: 7,	expert 8:19	find 8: 11,
17: 11, 17: 12,	15: 13, 15: 14,	express 4:9,	18: 5, 32: 18,
17: 17, 17: 18,	15: 18, 15: 20,	11:1	34: 1, 34: 4
17: 22, 18: 23,	16: 10, 18: 10	expressly 9:4,	fi ndi ngs 18: 3
· · ·	·		

First 3:7, 4:1, 5:7, 5:24, **hel d** 10: 17 8:25, 9:2, 9:3, 4:13, 6:21, 6:18, 21:5, Heller 2:11 12:8, 12:14, 17:1, 17:16, 10:8, 12:19, 22: 10, 28: 11 **Highland** 1:5, 14: 25, 15: 5, 17:21, 18:4, **future** 5:7, 1:9, 1:16, 3:4, 23:10, 23:25, 20:1, 20:23, 28:23 17:8 23: 20, 24: 2, 24: 7, 24: 8, 25:5, 26:1 highlight 14:5 FITZWATER 1:21 **hold** 5: 19, < G > 27:19 25:2, 31:5, **Five** 9:13, 26: 21, 26: 23 general 21:3, home 32:11 31:7 **flexible** 7:17 HONORABLE 1:21 indemni fied 22:6, 22:8, **Floor** 1:30 27:19 hope 3:8, 6:18 23:7, 23:8 **flow** 25:4, Horn 2:11 indemnify 4:24, generated 5: 16, 6: 7, 6: 17 25:18 21:13, 22:20 Hospital 10:21 focusing 14:1 **gi ve** 8: 19 housekeepi ng i ndemni fyi ng **follow** 7:1, gi ven 5:25, 3:5 4:14, 5:15, HR 9:16 18:1 26:18 6:3, 6:4 **followed** 4:5 indemnity governing 26:19 huge 14:21 Hunter 9:15 11:24, 17:6, footnote 12: 20, governors 7:18 17:7, 17:10, hypotheti cally group 22:24 12:23 18: 17, 18: 18, foregoi ng guarantee 9:2, 6:15 18: 20, 19: 10, 20: 13, 23: 3, 16:25, 18:4 35: 19, 35: 20 forgotten 13:6 **GWI** 15:8 **format** 7:8, < | > 23:7, 23:14, 23: 16, 23: 17, 35:24 i denti fi ed 23: 22, 23: 23, former 20:18 14:14 < H > 24:2, 25:1, foul 30: 22, half 24:9, **iffy** 34:4 25: 15, 25: 23, 30: 23, 31: 1, 24:10, 24:13 impact 7:5 hand 5:5, 5:7 26:1, 26:2, 31:2 implement 17:5, handful 20:18 25: 2, 25: 12 26:3, 26:5, **found** 15: 14, 15:18, 16:5, handl e 9:11 implemented 26:7, 26:8, 18:3, 25:13, 27:25, 28:3, handl ed 32: 20 23:15 27:13, 29:8, happen 3:9 implementing 28:4, 28:11, 29:20 happened 21:17 24:19 28: 12, 28: 13, **four** 5: 21, 7: 6 happening 20:10 important 30: 1, 30: 9 Fourth 25:13 harass 16:17 10: 20, 20: 25 i ndependent **fraud** 15: 24 hard 11:16 importantly 20:15 Hardt 2:3, 3:20 freed 28:11 **INDEX** 34:21 5:9,7:16, harm 19:2, 9:20, 31:13 i ndi vi dual l y **full** 3: 12 impossible 18:5 30: 21, 30: 23, 9:9 functional 28:3 **FUND** 1: 10, 31:1, 31:2 inception 24:10 influence 27:1 24: 14, 24: 16, 25: 6, 26: 15, include 23:8 harmless 4:4 influenced Harr 2: 3, 3: 20 including 26:14 26: 19 27:3, 30:7 **HCFMA** 19: 17 incorrect 15:3 injunction fundamental hear 5:10, increased 8:25, 31:24, 33:8 6:23, 29:6 11:9, 13:23, 13:14 injunctions fundamentally 21:23, 30:14, increases 13:9 33:3 25:22 32:2 indemni ficati on **insiders** 12:16 hearing 9:18, **i nsol vent** 29: 16 **funded** 24:9 4:18, 5:1, 5:3, funding 24:7 5: 19, 5: 20, 31:3, 32:10 instruct 6:12 **funds** 5:2, 5:5, 6:1, 8:16, heightened 7:23 insurance 9:4,

9: 6, 12: 8, 17: 19, 25: 15, 27: 10, 27: 15, 27: 24, 28: 5, 28: 22, 28: 25, 29: 5, 29: 7	law.com 1: 34 Judge 1: 22, 10: 9, 14: 7, 33: 24 judgment 5: 24, 7: 18	<pre>likely 7: 12, 18: 8 limit 12: 10, 15: 13 limited 21: 1, 21: 2, 22: 6,</pre>	lost 6:9, 10:7, 11:8, 21:15, 21:24, 31:25 loyalists 20:20 Lumber 10:9
intensi fi ed 17: 18 interest 7: 7, 13: 2, 13: 5, 13: 10, 13: 13, 19: 14, 32: 25, 33: 1	Judi ci al 35:25 j uni or 19:22 j uri sdi cti on 4:7 j uri sdi cti onal 33:25	22: 7, 23: 22, 24: 5 Line 35: 4 link 33: 13, 34: 10 liquidation 15: 15	< M > majority 21:7, 22:12 maligned 32:2 managed 16:10 Management 1:6,
i nterferi ng 5: 11 i nternal I y 9: 15 i nterrupt 3: 10, 3: 14 i nvestors 31: 15 i nvol ve 18: 10	< K > key 8: 14, 17: 14, 25: 17 knowl edge 16: 4 known 9: 13, 32: 22	liquidations 15:14 listen 32:3 litigants 32:13 litigating 30:21, 31:17 litigation	1: 10, 1: 17, 3: 4, 15: 23, 16: 24, 17: 10, 17: 15, 17: 23, 18: 8, 18: 22, 19: 1, 21: 5, 22: 10, 27: 13
i nvol ved 32: 9 i ssue 8: 20, 11: 5, 13: 18, 14: 7, 14: 22, 15: 16, 27: 8, 34: 17 i ssued 14: 7	knows 7: 7 Kopf 2: 3, 3: 20 < L > LA 2: 14 I and 16: 8	4: 22, 5: 4, 6: 5, 6: 8, 6: 16, 8: 5, 8: 6, 15: 15, 16: 16, 17: 18, 18: 1, 21: 9, 21: 12, 21: 13, 21: 14, 22: 14,	managers 17: 14, 18: 6, 20: 15, 27: 11 managi ng 16: 1 mandatory 31: 24 Manges 15: 14, 16: 11
issues 12: 19 it 6: 8 items 10: 6 itself 6: 3, 33: 5	largely 14:4 last 11:5, 25:16, 33:13 Lastly 15:17 later 8:6 LAW 3:13, 5:21, 6:12, 6:22,	22: 17, 22: 18, 22: 21, 23: 9, 23: 21, 23: 25, 24: 4, 24: 11, 24: 16, 26: 16, 27: 16, 28: 23, 31: 14, 31: 18	Marathon 33:20 Marshall 33:21 master 4:23 materially 17:24 mathematical 13:11
< J > J. 2: 39, 35: 19, 36: 4, 36: 6 James 19: 16, 29: 24, 32: 3, 32: 4 JEFFREY 1: 27	6: 24, 23: 4, 28: 17, 29: 10, 34: 1 I awsuit 31: 23 I awsuits 31: 22 I eading 28: 18 I eave 12: 4,	litmus 15:18 little 4:25 LLP 1:28 logical 31:12 logistical 4:24 longer 17:22 look 10:15,	<pre>mathematics 13: 7 matter 3: 3, 4: 2, 4: 3, 5: 23, 6: 1, 10: 12, 23: 16, 31: 2, 32: 14, 35: 21</pre>
j eopardi ze 17: 24, 18: 9 j eopardi zi ng 19: 2 Jerni gan 14: 7 Joi nt 29: 13 Jones 1: 28, 10: 9 j pomerantz@pszj	34: 11 legal 4: 21, 25: 24, 26: 3, 27: 5 legitimate 27: 25 length 7: 5, 8: 3 letter 6: 22 lieu 25: 15	11: 6, 11: 15, 11: 16, 11: 23, 12: 1, 12: 20, 13: 16, 32: 18 I ooki ng 33: 8 Los 1: 31 I ose 3: 7, 11: 11 I oses 17: 16 I osi ng 19: 1	matters 3:5 Mckenzie 23:10 mean 7:23 meantime 8:23 mechanical 2:47 mechanism 7:2, 23:23, 29:14, 30:24 meet 16:13

members 10.1	modified 20,14		abi acted 10, 21
members 18:1	modified 28:14,	3:20	obj ected 18: 21,
mention 14:15,	28: 21, 29: 6	muted 21: 18,	20: 21, 29: 5
27:8	modi fy 6: 24,	21: 20	objection
mentioned 7:6	6: 25, 29: 18,		28: 22, 29: 8
menti oni ng	30: 4		objections 20:7
11: 12	monetization	< N >	objects 27:18
merely 33:12	15: 22, 21: 10,	N. 1:27	obligated 4:24
merits 14:2,	22: 16, 25: 20	name 14:14,	obligation 5:7,
19: 10, 20: 23,	monetize 18:7	18:16	24: 16, 24: 20,
23: 2, 23: 6,	money 6: 6, 6: 8,	narrow 10:11	25: 24, 26: 3
32:5	6: 16, 26: 17	nature 19:13	obligations
message 21:21	Moni ca 1:29	necessary 18:6,	19: 12, 23: 17,
microphone	months 14:20,	28:6	23: 20, 24: 2,
21:22	17:20	need 3:8	24:3, 25:2,
million 5:6,	moot 15: 3, 19: 9	needed 3: 15	28:4, 28:14,
5: 20, 6: 2,	mootness 10:9,	needs 5:8	29:17
6: 18, 8: 21,	10: 19, 11: 2,	negative 9:19	obtai ned 27:24
8:23, 9:23,	11: 17, 12: 2,	nei ther 15: 20,	obtai ni ng
13:7, 13:8,	12: 18, 13: 17,	23:16	16: 22, 27: 9
19: 18, 19: 21,	14:2, 14:3,	net 25:9, 25:19	obvi ousl y 3:8
24: 9, 24: 10,	15:1, 15:4,	New 2: 14, 5: 14,	occurs 3:9
24: 13, 31: 7	15: 7, 15: 13,	8:15, 9:7,	offensive 31:18
millions 31:9,	15: 14, 15: 18,	24: 2, 31: 3	Official 36:7
33: 2	15: 20, 16: 10,	Nexpoi nt 9: 12,	Offshore 15: 16,
minimal 11:20	18:10	9:13, 9:14,	15:20
minute 6: 12,	morning 3: 19,	14:8, 14:13,	0kay 4:5,
19: 13, 33: 15	13: 22, 14: 1	19: 15, 19: 16	11: 10, 11: 15,
minutes 10:3,	motion 7: 16,	next 10: 20	22: 5, 26: 25
13: 1, 22: 4,	8: 18, 8: 20,	none 20: 21	once 34:14
23: 4, 26: 21,	14:2, 14:3,	nonstop 32:2	One 10: 8,
26: 23, 29: 10	23: 18	Nor 30: 4, 30: 22	10: 23, 13: 3,
miracle 18:25	motions 3: 24,	Northern 1: 2,	14:5, 18:20,
mi racul ousl y	9:11	33: 20, 36: 8	31: 12, 31: 23,
14:19	motivation 19:3	note 5: 6,	33: 15
mi scharacteri ze	movements 10:22	24: 11, 24: 13,	one-off 34:6
s 23:14	MR. POMERANTZ	24: 14, 32: 17	onslaught
mismanagement	13: 22, 13: 25,	nothi ng 25: 13,	16: 16, 17: 18,
15:24	21:23, 22:1,	29: 12, 29: 23	27:16, 31:14
Mistake 18:2	22:5, 26:22,	notice 9: 19,	operating 16:7
modification	26:25	31:24	opinion 11:7,
4: 10, 6: 20, 7: 2 7: 10	MR. RUKAVI NA	notion 31:9	34:2, 34:3
7:2,7:10,	3: 19, 4: 19,	notions 34:5	opposed 15:14
7:12,8:1,8:3,	6: 14, 21: 17,	notwi thstandi ng	option 17:19,
8: 9, 8: 12, 9: 7, 10: 11 25: 17	30: 14, 30: 17, 33: 16	27:21 Number 10:16	17:20 001 1:20 3:1
19: 11, 25: 17, 27: 7 28: 10	mul ti factor	Number 10:16, 10:24, 12:11,	ORAL 1: 20, 3: 1, 3: 4, 35: 1, 35: 4
27: 7, 28: 19, 29: 9, 29: 21,	7: 17	13: 5, 34: 3	order 4: 17,
32: 20	multiple 14:15,	15.5, 54.5	5: 15, 9: 18,
modifications	31: 22, 33: 10		9: 23, 10: 13,
4: 9, 10: 12	Munsch 2: 3,	< 0 >	10: 14, 10: 23,
,			

10: 24, 10: 25, 12: 12, 14: 8, 14: 11, 15: 3, 15: 6, 16: 12, 16: 19, 17: 12, 17: 25, 18: 3, 18: 22, 19: 11, 20: 14, 23: 17, 26: 2, 26: 9, 28: 2, 30: 1, 31: 10, 33: 6, 33: 9 orders 10: 23, 15: 7, 15: 8, 33: 10 organizations 15: 13 original 6: 16 original ly 4: 21, 4: 24, 7: 11, 11: 24 Orl eans 2: 14 others 31: 5 otherwi se 28: 6 ought 8: 12 outsi ders 12: 16 oversight 18: 1, 26: 4, 26: 10, 26: 14, 27: 3 owe 33: 1 own 4: 24, 5: 5, 6: 18 owned 19: 16, 19: 17 owner 22: 8	PAMELA 2: 39, 35: 19, 36: 6 papers 10: 8, 11: 14, 12: 20 paradigm 18: 15 part 32: 19 parti ci pated 20: 13 parti es 7: 7, 11: 24, 12: 13, 14: 11, 16: 12, 18: 14, 19: 12, 28: 18, 29: 17, 32: 25, 33: 1 partner 21: 2, 21: 3, 22: 8, 22: 9 partnershi p 21: 2, 22: 7, 23: 22, 24: 5 party 6: 25, 23: 18, 33: 22 Pause. 6: 10 pay 28: 11 payment 25: 19, 28: 8, 28: 9, 29: 18 PC 2: 3 pecuni ary 12: 22, 13: 2, 13: 5, 13: 10 peopl e 5: 16, 6: 3, 12: 6, 23: 7, 23: 8 percent 18: 24,	pl ans 8: 17, 33: 11 pl eadi ng 12: 23 pl eadi ngs 10: 7, 23: 13 pl ease 3: 25 poi nt 3: 7, 5: 18, 5: 25, 7: 10, 9: 12, 14: 5, 32: 23, 33: 20 POMERANTZ 1: 27, 13: 21, 21: 16, 21: 19, 23: 5, 29: 11, 30: 12, 32: 16, 35: 10 portion 6: 19, 34: 12 posi ti ons 14: 12 posi ti ons 14: 12 possi bl e 5: 20 Post 16: 24, 17: 18, 17: 19, 29: 16 post-confirmati on 16: 24, 20: 9, 20: 24, 25: 7, 27: 13, 29: 3, 29: 15 post-effected 25: 6 potenti al 5: 25 potenti al 19 8: 21, 28: 10 Poydras 2: 12 Prai ri e 15: 19	principals $25:4$ principle $30:10$ prior $28:21$ priority $29:14$, 29:18 probably $9:25$, 10:20 problem $8:9$, 32:19 problematic 11:21 procedure $4:3$, 4:5 proceed $3:18$ proceeded $7:14$, 7:25 Proceedings 2:47, 7:13, 35:20 proceeds $7:21$, 21:13, 22:19, 22:23, 25:9, 25:18, 25:19, 30:6 process $25:20$, 30:1, 34:14 produced $2:48$ professional s 4:25, 8:25, 31:11
< P > Pachul ski 1: 28 Paci fi c 10: 9 Pack 15: 8 Page 35: 4 pai d 8: 8, 10: 1, 13: 9, 19: 21, 19: 22, 19: 24, 20: 1, 23: 1, 25: 9 pam_wil son@txnd . uscourts. gov 2: 40	20: 11 perhaps 21: 19 permanent 33: 3, 33: 8 person 21: 11, 22: 16, 27: 23 personnel 6: 7, 6: 17 pi cked 11: 25 pi cki ng 12: 17, 32: 12 Pi pel i ne 33: 20 pi voted 17: 4 pl ace 12: 4 pl anned 15: 6	prayer 28: 14 precedent 9: 4 preconfirmation 22: 25 premi se 26: 8 premi ums 28: 9 prescri bed 7: 1, 35: 25 preserve 24: 18, 28: 6 pressing 21: 18 pretty 8: 11, 13: 11 princi pal 23: 3, 23: 6	prohi bi ted 8: 10 prohi bi ts 25: 14 proj ected 19: 22 promi ssory 5: 6, 32: 17 properl y 32: 7 proposi ti on 15: 9 prosecuted 6: 8 prosecuti on 21: 10, 22: 15 protect 17: 1, 20: 15 protecti ng 18: 22, 19: 5

protecti on	10: 15, 19: 14,	29: 10, 34: 10	reserving 5:7,
17: 16, 27: 12	27:24	remai ned 17:8,	5: 24
proven 7:20	reason 17:21,	22:9	resi gn 17: 25,
provi de 8: 6,	20: 17, 27: 23	remaining 21:7,	31:6
23: 19, 24: 19	reasonably 7:8	22: 12, 23: 4,	resol ve 18: 11,
provided 8:5,	reasons 25:25	30: 8	28: 22
28: 23	Rebuttal 13: 20,	remains 33:15	resol ved 5: 21,
provi des 30: 23	30: 13	remember 32:18	28: 23, 29: 5,
provision 29:6	recent 11:6,	removed 8:21	29:19
provisions	33: 21	reorgani ze	respect 15:1
11: 1, 23: 15, 24: 19 25: 4	recently 9:14,	26: 16	Respectfully
24: 18, 25: 4	9:17	reorgani zed	31:1
public 32:22	recess 34:19	4: 22, 16: 3, 21: 1 21: 4	responsi bl e
pull 17:23 purpose 23:19	recogni zed 18: 22	21: 1, 21: 4, 21: 14, 22: 9,	5:15, 5:16
purposes 5:3,	reconstituted	22: 20, 23: 9,	restructuring 16:2, 29:20,
32: 15	21: 1	23: 22, 24: 1,	30: 1
pursued 21: 12,	record 31: 11,	24: 5, 24: 12,	result 15:24,
22: 18	32: 14, 32: 16,	24: 18, 28: 7	18:7, 29:1
22.10	33: 5, 35: 20	repaid 5:8	resul ted 16:18
	recovered 28:10	replaced 18:2	retai ned 21:5,
< Q >	reduced 13: 12	replacement	22: 9, 26: 10
question 5:14,	reengage 21:22	18:6	return 6: 20
6: 19, 8: 15,	regulatory	reply 5: 13,	Reversal 17:23
24:6	21: 6, 22: 11	14:2	reversed 17:25
questi oned	reinstate 17:13	reported 2:47	reverses 17:15
14:16	reinstatement	Reporter 2:39,	reversing 31:10
questi oni ng	17:14	3: 8, 5: 12,	review 33:24,
30: 25	reiterate 4:1	34: 11, 36: 7	34: 1
questions 4:12,	rej ect 7: 12	represent 31:15	revol ve 4:20
4:20, 14:4,	rej ected 7: 11,	representati ves	rights 16:11,
34: 12	7:22,8:1,	16:18	17:1, 17:16,
qui ck 10: 6	15: 20, 20: 18,	representing	17:21, 18:5,
qui ckl y 16: 9,	30: 18	20: 11, 32: 7	18: 11, 18: 12,
33: 18	rel ated 14: 9,	represents 3:23	18:13, 19:5,
quit 31:11	20: 21, 21: 6,	required 9:6,	19: 12, 25: 22,
quo 17: 13,	22: 10, 29: 24	15:10	28: 14, 30: 4,
17:14	relating 25:20	requi res 9: 20,	31: 7, 31: 20,
quoted 33:21	rel ati onshi p	15:23	31:21
quoting 31:14	27:5, 30:5	requiring 14:8,	RMR 2: 39, 36: 6
	rel ati onshi ps 14: 10	27:6	roadbl ock 29: 25 rol es 16: 25
< R >	rel eases 33: 9	reserve 5: 2, 5: 4, 9: 21, 27: 3	Room 2: 41
ran 6:7	relied 29:7	reserved 13: 20,	rug 17:23
Rather 24: 2,	relief 11:20,	25: 9	RUKAVI NA 2: 2,
27:16	11: 22, 16: 13,	reserves 4:14,	3: 20, 35: 6,
RE 1:5, 3:3	17: 12	24: 16, 25: 6,	35: 12
real 13:5,	rel y 17: 10	25: 23, 26: 15,	Rul e 9: 19,
24:6, 31:13	remain 13:1,	26: 17, 28: 5,	31: 20
really 4: 17,	26: 21, 26: 24,	30: 8	rul ed 24: 25
	,,	-	

ruling 34:17	serious 15:24	30: 22	21:4, 22:8
5	seriously 18:9	specific 12:8	substance 3:22,
	serve 27:12	specifically	4: 2, 4: 6, 4: 8,
		20: 7	7: 24
< S >	set 25: 23,	-	
s/pamel a 36:4	31:6, 31:8	spend 19:13	substanti al
safeguards 7:3	settlement 29:3	spent 26: 17	10: 16, 10: 18
sal e 10: 25	settlements	St 2: 4	substanti al l y
sancti oned	29: 1	stand 14:4,	11: 19
31: 19, 32: 4	several 25:4,	34:19	substituting
Santa 1:29	31:6	standard 14:25	9: 6
	sheet 23:18		
satisfied 23:25		standi ng 9: 20,	subtrust 4: 15,
sati sfy 23: 23,	Shi pbui I di ng	13: 18, 14: 6,	4: 22, 5: 19,
29: 15, 29: 17	10: 21	14: 11, 14: 16,	8: 16, 17: 25,
sayi ng 6: 15,	shoul dn' t 32: 14	14:25, 19:7,	21:9, 21:12,
32: 3, 32: 4	sic 19:17	27:23, 33:4,	22: 14, 22: 17,
says 12: 21,	side 13:17	33:14, 34:4	22: 21, 23: 9,
13: 7, 33: 22,	SI DNEY 1: 21	stands 15:9	23: 21, 24: 1,
34: 5	sign-off 34:15	Stang 1: 28	24: 11, 24: 16
		0	
scal pel 10: 10,	signed 32:21	stark 29:21,	subtrustee 18:1
11:23, 12:9	signi fi cantl y	29: 22	success 16: 6,
scheme 29:19	19:2	started 11:13	16: 13, 18: 9,
scope 10:11	similar 16:2	state 6:22	18: 14, 19: 2
seated 26:12	Simple 13:7,	statement 7:4,	successful
Second 4: 16,	15: 19	14: 22, 32: 20,	18: 11
7: 10, 15: 12,	simply 16:25,	33: 11	sued 6: 22
25: 8, 29: 13,	17: 12, 32: 5	States 1:1,	suffi ci ent
29: 19, 34: 2,	single 8:19	1: 22, 23: 18,	27:22
34: 3, 34: 4	si x 17: 19,	35:26	suit 18:2
Section 4:9,	31: 24	status 17:13,	Sui te 2:13
7:18, 24:4,	sixth 9:14	17: 14	summer 16:15
24: 23, 31: 21	Skul I 15: 8	statutory 18:19	Superior 15:16,
secure 28:4	slight 8:11	Ste 2:5	15:19
securi ti ze 25: 1	Sneed 10: 21,	stenography	supervi se 33:19
securi ty 17: 20,	11: 2, 15: 8,	2: 47	support 14:25,
23: 19	15: 9	Stern 33: 21	28: 16, 28: 19
seed 6:8	somehow 21:18	stop 3:8	supported
Seery 15: 25,	Someone 4:4,	Street 2: 12,	18: 20, 18: 21,
16: 17, 16: 23,	5: 10	2:41	20: 12, 20: 14,
17: 24, 21: 8,	Sometimes 34:13	Stripped 18:4,	28: 15, 28: 16,
22: 13, 27: 11,	soon 19:19	19: 3	31: 11
31: 4	sophi sti cated	stripping 31:4	supporti ng
sel f-i nsurance	15:23	structure	23: 20, 25: 12
17:5, 25:14,	sophi sti cati on	20: 24, 22: 2,	Supreme 33: 21,
27: 18	18: 6	25: 16	33: 22
sel f-i nsure		structured 16:8	switching 30:21
	Sorry 22:5,		•
27:17	33:7	subject 33:2	symbiotic 22:24
seni or 28:7	sought 17:5,	submission	system 33:25
separate 10:14	31:24	34:16	
separated	sound 6: 9,	submit 33:18	
21: 10, 22: 15	11:8, 21:15,	subsi di ary	< T >

tal ked 22:6 techni cal 3:10 tells 7:6 ten 14:20	transformed 25: 24 transi ti oni ng 22: 3	undo 20:9 unfortunately 27:14 unilaterally	Voi di ng 19: 1 voted 7: 10 votes 20: 18 VS 1: 14
tens 33:1	Transportation 23:11	6: 24, 6: 25, 8: 13	
termi nated 20: 19	treatment 12:4,	uni que 16:8	< W >
terms 25:12,	30: 2, 30: 5	Uni ted 1: 1,	wait 11:19
32: 17	trial 8:5,	1: 22, 35: 26	wai vable 27:14
test 7:18,	9: 24, 31: 23	uni verse 4: 17	wai ve 9:5
13:9, 13:10, 12:11 15:10	tried 19:19,	unl ess 14:4,	waived 9:5,
13: 11, 15: 18 Texas 1: 2,	20: 9, 29: 4 TRO 16: 18,	26: 3 unquesti onabl y	23:12, 23:13 Walker 10:21,
1: 11, 2: 42,	16: 20	18: 12	11:2
5: 21, 15: 19,	true 8: 22,	unsecured	wanted 21:10,
36: 8	12: 22	18: 16, 18: 18,	22: 15
themsel ves 31:9	trusted 31:16	18: 19, 18: 24,	warnings 3:13,
thereby 27:6	trustee 5: 23, 12: 24, 16: 4,	19:3, 19:5,	3:15
Thi rd 7: 16, 25: 11	21:8, 21:13,	19: 22, 20: 3, 20: 12, 20: 17,	welcome 34:14 well-written
third-party	22: 14, 22: 18	27: 19, 30: 3	11:7
12: 11, 21: 5,	trusts 8: 17	until 5:20,	Whatever 32:5
22: 10	truth 12:1	9: 14, 9: 22,	Whether 13:10,
Though 10: 11,	trying 18:11	26:4	14:11, 24:6,
13:6, 27:14	turn 8: 22,	unwilling 16:25	26: 15, 31: 2,
thousands 31:15 threatened 5:25	20: 23, 23: 18 turned 11: 14	uphold 11:17 upstream 22:24,	33: 13 whole 32: 23,
threats 27:16	Turni ng 19: 10,	30: 7	33: 19
three 4: 21,	23: 2, 23: 6	upstreamed	whom 5:16, 6:3,
10: 15, 22: 2	Two 3: 20, 3: 23,	22: 21, 22: 25	20: 21
threshold 23:16	7:23, 10:15,	urge 8:18	will 3:8, 3:9,
throughout 14:6	10: 20, 10: 22,		3: 11, 3: 23,
throw 29:25 tied 8:24	10: 24, 12: 2, 12: 11, 13: 1,	< V >	9: 11, 10: 6, 14: 1, 16: 9,
timing 29:18	13: 5, 22: 4,	v. 33: 21	17: 20, 17: 22,
together 22: 19,	24: 9, 25: 25,	val ue 16: 9,	17:23, 17:24,
22: 23	29: 10, 31: 15	24: 18, 28: 7	18: 12, 19: 2,
took 26: 9,	TX 2:6	Various 23:24,	19: 18, 19: 21,
30: 24	tying 6: 1	24:18	19: 23, 24: 14,
totality 9:9 Track 23:11	types 10:23 typing 5:10	Verobl ue 11: 7, 11: 12, 11: 13,	31: 6, 31: 10, 31: 11, 33: 24,
tradi ti onal	typing 5.10	11: 16	34: 17, 34: 19
34: 5		vexatious 32:13	WI LSON 2: 39,
TRANSCRI PT	< U >	VIA 1:20, 3:1	35: 19, 36: 4,
1:20, 2:48,	understand	violating 16:19	36:6
35: 20, 35: 24	10:12	violation 9:19	withdraw 14:18
transferred 14: 20, 14: 23,	understandi ng 5: 1	virtually 11:19 virtue 11:1	wi thdrawi ng 29: 7
21: 7, 21: 12,	undevel oped	vital 16:5	withdrew 20:6
22: 13, 22: 17	16: 7	voi d 18: 7	within 27:4
	1	1	1

wi thout 9: 18, 16: 25, 17: 8, 18: 5, 21: 18, 27: 12, 27: 13, 33: 9 word 18: 25 words 18: 25, 28: 1 work 16: 2, 20: 20, 21: 22, 22: 19, 22: 23, 33: 25

< Y > years 5:21, 6:2, 7:6, 8:23 yesterday 34:2 yi el d 10:2

< Z > zero 8:22 Ziehl 1:28 ZOOM 1:20, 3:1, 10:5 Г

1	
2	
3	<u>C E R T L F L C A T L O N</u>
4	
5	
6	I, PAMELA J. WILSON, CSR, certify that the foregoing is a
7	transcript from the record of the proceedings in the
8	foregoing entitled matter.
9	
10	
11	I further certify that the transcript fees format comply
12	with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial
13	Conference of the United States.
14	
15	
16	This the 15th day of March, 2022.
17	
18	
19	
20	s/Pamela J. Wilson
21	PAMELA J. WILSON, RMR, CRR
22	Official Court Reporter The Northern District of Texas
23	Dallas Division
24	
25	