Docket #0051 Date Filed: 5/14/2021

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
**FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**
**HOUSTON DIVISION**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **In re:** | § | **Chapter 11** |
| **Hi-Crush Inc., *et al.*,** | § | **Case No. 20-33495 (DRJ)** |
| **Debtors.**[1] | § | **(Jointly Administered)** |
| **Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC,** | § | |
| **Plaintiff,** | § | |
| **v.** | § | **Adversary No. 20-03471 (DRJ)** |
| **EOG Resources, Inc.,** | § | |
| **Defendant.** | § | |

**DEFENDANT EOG RESOURCES, INC.'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant EOG Resources, Inc. ("**Defendant**" or "**EOG**"), by and through its undersigned counsel, submits this First Amended Answer to the Complaint dated January 7, 2021 [AP ECF No. 14] (the "**Complaint**" or "**Amended Complaint**") filed by Plaintiff Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC ("**Plaintiff**" or "**Hi-Crush**") (the "**Answer**" or "**Amended Answer**").

[1] The reorganized debtors in the bankruptcy cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Hi-Crush Inc. (0530), OnCore Processing LLC (9403), Hi-Crush Augusta LLC (0668), Hi-Crush Whitehall LLC (5562), PDQ Properties LLC (9169), Hi-Crush Wyeville Operating LLC (5797), D & I Silica, LLC (9957), Hi-Crush Blair LLC (7094), Hi-Crush LMS LLC, Hi-Crush Investments Inc. (6547), Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC, Hi-Crush Proppants LLC (0770), Hi-Crush PODS LLC, Hi-Crush Canada Inc. (9195), Hi-Crush Holdings LLC, Hi-Crush Services LLC (6206), BulkTracer Holdings LLC (4085), Pronghorn Logistics Holdings, LLC (5223), FB Industries USA Inc. (8208), PropDispatch LLC, Pronghorn Logistics, LLC (4547), and FB Logistics, LLC (8641). The Debtors' address is 1330 Post Oak Blvd, Suite 600, Houston, Texas 77056.



2033495210518000000000001

## ANSWER

Except as otherwise expressly admitted in this Answer, EOG denies each and every allegation contained or implied anywhere in the Complaint.[2] To the extent EOG uses terms in this Answer that are defined in the Complaint, that use is not an acknowledgement or admission of any characterization that Plaintiff may ascribe to the defined term(s). EOG denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief, including but not limited to the relief sought in the Prayer for Relief on pages 18-19 of the Complaint. EOG expressly reserves the right to seek to amend and/or supplement this Answer as may be necessary.

EOG files this Answer following the filing of *Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC's Motion to Strike Defendant's Answer to First Amended Complaint or in the Alternative to Compel Defendant to File Amended Answer*, AP ECF No. 50 (the "**Motion to Strike**"), and *Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC's Motion to Dismiss Defendant EOG Resources, Inc.'s Counterclaim,* AP ECF No. 49 (the "**Motion to Dismiss**"). This Answer renders moot both the Motion to Strike and Motion to Dismiss, which relate to *Defendant EOG Resources, Inc.'s Answer and Counterclaim to First Amended Complaint*, AP ECF No. 45 (the "**Original Answer**"). However, EOG expressly denies that Hi-Crush would have been entitled to the relief sought in either the Motion to Strike or the Motion to Dismiss with respect to the Original Answer. Further, in withdrawing its counterclaim for attorneys' fees as a prevailing party under Section 17 of the Sand Purchase Agreement, EOG reiterates and relies on Hi-Crush's concession that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2), made applicable in this proceeding by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7054(b)(2), is a proper

[2] For the convenience of the Court and the parties, EOG has copied and pasted the headings and content of the Amended Complaint into this Answer. In doing so, EOG does not in any way adopt or agree with the language of the Complaint.

vehicle for the recovery of fees under Section 17 of the Sand Purchase Agreement if EOG prevails in this action.[3] To the extent EOG prevails in this action, EOG intends to file a motion for recovery of its fees and expenses.

**ANSWER TO "NATURE OF THE ACTION"**

*1. Hi-Crush brings this action to prevent EOG from shirking its contractual obligations and to protect Hi-Crush from losing no less than $45 million as a result of EOG's invalid contract termination and refusal to perform.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 1:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring the action described in Paragraph 1, but expressly denies that the action has any merit. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*2. Hi-Crush seeks declaratory relief and damages because EOG unjustifiably attempted to terminate the long-term Sand Purchase Agreement (defined below) between Hi-Crush and EOG (the "**Parties**"). Specifically, EOG sought to take advantage of Hi-Crush Inc.'s[4] disclosure in a Form 10-Q that Hi-Crush Inc. had defaulted on a **financial covenant** in its ABL Credit Facility, which could potentially trigger the acceleration of certain debt and note obligations. Hi-Crush Inc. also disclosed, however, that it and certain affiliates had entered into a forbearance agreement and ABL Credit Facility amendment with its ABL lenders, which forestalled the acceleration of its debt and note obligations. Ignoring the obvious effect of the forbearance agreement and ABL Credit Facility amendment, EOG promptly sought to terminate the Sand Purchase Agreement under an early termination clause premised on Hi-Crush's "insolvency." EOG took the meritless position that Hi-Crush was insolvent even though nothing in the Form 10-Q stated that Hi-Crush was insolvent or unable to pay its debts as they fell due.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 2:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring the claims described in Paragraph 2, but specifically denies that those claims have any merit. EOG further responds that Hi-Crush's declaratory judgment claims under Paragraph 46(i) and (v) of the Amended Complaint and Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) were dismissed with

[3] While reserving rights to challenge EOG's ability to recover fees, Hi-Crush concedes: "If this Court ultimately concludes that EOG is the 'prevailing Party' pursuant to Section 17 of the SPA, EOG may seek to recover any attorneys' fees to which it may be entitled by filing a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2)." Motion to Dismiss at 7.

[4] *Hi-Crush Inc. is the parent company of Hi-Crush.*

prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37. EOG admits that Hi-Crush Inc. filed a 10-Q on June 25, 2020 describing certain defaults of Hi-Crush Inc. and its subsidiaries (defined therein as the "Company") and a forbearance agreement, and providing that "the Company expects to file for protection from its creditors under the United States Bankruptcy Code." 10-Q at p.11-12. EOG admits that it terminated the Sand Purchase Agreement between Hi-Crush and EOG pursuant to its terms. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*3. EOG's actions were a blatant attempt to avoid its firm obligation to purchase significant quantities of sand annually from Hi-Crush at a fixed price (or make specified shortfall payments if it failed to do so). Hi-Crush quickly rejected EOG's purported notice of termination and demanded that EOG perform. But EOG remained entrenched.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 3:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush purported to reject EOG's notice of termination. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*4. EOG has refused to perform its purchase obligations not only during 2020, but for the remaining [redacted] years to come. Additionally, EOG has refused to pay Hi-Crush the shortfall amounts owed under the agreement for EOG's failure to purchase requisite quantities of sand during 2020. Because of EOG's blatant breaches, Hi-Crush has sustained millions in damages, which will continue to grow if EOG does not resume performance during 2021. Accordingly, and in addition to monetary damages that accrued at the end of 2020 in the amount of at least $5,360,000, Hi-Crush seeks (i) a declaratory judgment that the Sand Purchase Agreement remains in effect, (ii) a declaratory judgment that Hi-Crush properly assumed the Sand Purchase Agreement under 11 U.S.C. § 365, and (iii) an order requiring EOG's specific performance of its contractual obligations or, in the alternative to specific performance, Hi-Crush requests additional damages for the remainder of the agreement's term, which amount to no less than $40,000,000. Finally, Hi-Crush asserts an alternative cause of action for fraudulent transfer because assuming, arguendo, that EOG properly terminated the agreement based on Hi-Crush's "insolvency," the termination deprived Hi-Crush of valuable contract rights and Hi-Crush received nothing in return.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 4:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring the claims described in Paragraph 4, but specifically denies that the claims have any merit. EOG further responds that Hi-Crush's declaratory judgment claims under Paragraph 46(i) and (v) of the Amended Complaint and Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) were dismissed with

prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**ANSWER TO "JURISDICTION AND VENUE"**

*5. On July 12, 2020, Hi-Crush Inc. and certain of its affiliates, including Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC, filed voluntary petitions for relief under chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code") in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas (the "Court" or "Bankruptcy Court").*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 5:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 5.

*6. This Court has jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334. This matter is a core proceeding within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). This adversary proceeding is commenced pursuant to (i) Bankruptcy Rules 7001(1), 7001(2), 7001(9), (ii) sections 105(a), 365, 544, 548 of the Bankruptcy Code, and (iii) 28 U.S.C. § 2201.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 6:** EOG admits that the Court has jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and the matter is a core proceeding within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). EOG admits that Plaintiff states it commenced this adversary proceeding pursuant to (i) Bankruptcy Rules 7001(1), 7001(2), 7001(9), (ii) sections 105(a), 365, 544, 548 of the Bankruptcy Code, and (iii) 28 U.S.C. § 2201. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*7. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7008 and Bankruptcy Local Rule 7008-1, the Debtor consents to the entry of final orders or judgments by this Court if it is determined that this Court, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments in connection herewith consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 7:** EOG admits that Plaintiff purports to consent to the entry of final orders or judgments by the Court if it is determined that the Court, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution. Pursuant to Rule 7008-1 of the Bankruptcy Local Rules of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas, EOG consents to the Court's entry of a final

judgment or order with respect to the adversary proceeding if it is determined that the Court, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution.

*8. The Court has personal jurisdiction over EOG because the actions giving rise to this adversary proceeding occurred in Texas and because EOG has its principal place of business in Texas.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 8:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 8.

*9. Venue is proper before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1408 and 1409.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 9:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 9.

**ANSWER TO "PARTIES"**

*10. The Debtor is a Delaware limited liability company having its principal place of business at 1330 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 600, Houston, Texas 77056.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 10:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 10.

*11. Defendant EOG is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and registered to do business in the State of Texas, with its principal place of business located at 1111 Bagby Street, Sky Lobby 2, Houston, Texas 77002. EOG has been served with process, and the parties have agreed to extend EOG's deadline to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint until January 29, 2021.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 11:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 11.

**ANSWER TO "FACTUAL BACKGROUND"**

*12. Hi-Crush Inc. and its affiliates, including Hi-Crush, are a leading supplier of premium proppant (also known as "frac sand"), used in hydraulic fracturing of oil and gas wells, and logistics services to exploration and production companies, service companies, and pressure pumping companies. They own and operate six sand production facilities, with four in Wisconsin and two in West Texas. These facilities, coupled with Hi-Crush Inc.'s world-class processing technology and systems, allow Hi-Crush Inc. and its affiliates to provide high-quality proppant to their customers with preferred delivery to all major U.S. shale basins. EOG is one of those customers.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 12:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush Inc. and its affiliates, including Hi-Crush, are a supplier of proppant. EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient

to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 and, therefore, denies such allegations.

*13. EOG is engaged in the exploration and production of hydrocarbons with assets both abroad and in the United States, including in the Permian Basin of West Texas. Upon information and belief, EOG utilizes frac sand during the process of drilling and completing unconventional oil and gas wells.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 13:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 13.

*14. On February 13, 2017, Permian Basin Sand Company, LLC and EOG entered into a Sand Purchase Agreement, which was amended effective June 1, 2018 ("**Sand Purchase Agreement**") (attached hereto as Exhibit 1),[5] and governed by Texas law. Sand Purchase Agreement, ¶ 10. Upon information and belief, EOG entered into the Sand Purchase Agreement in order to obtain a reliable, long-term supply of premium frac sand at fixed prices. Indeed, at that time, EOG locked in frac sand pricing that was substantially below then-current spot prices of $70 - $80 per ton.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 14:** EOG admits that it entered into a Sand Purchase Agreement with Permian Basin Sand Company, LLC on February 13, 2017, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 to the Complaint. EOG admits that the Sand Purchase Agreement was amended effective June 1, 2018, replacing all references to "Permian Basin Sand Company, LLC" with "Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC," and replacing all references to "PBS" with "Hi-Crush." EOG admits that section 10 of the Sand Purchase Agreement provides "[t]his Agreement shall be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the Laws of the State of Texas, without regard to its conflicts of law provisions." EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG admits that it entered

[5] *The original party to the Sand Purchase Agreement was Permian Basin Sand Company, LLC, which was later acquired by Hi-Crush. In the Parties' June 1, 2018 First Amendment to the Sand Purchase Agreement, they agreed that all references to "Permian Basin Sand Company LLC" throughout the Sand Purchase Agreement shall be replaced by "Hi-Crush Permian Sand LLC" and all references to "PBS" throughout the Sand Purchase Agreement shall be replaced by "Hi-Crush." First Amendment to Sand Purchase Agreement (included with Exhibit 1), Section 1.01.*

into the Sand Purchase Agreement to obtain a supply of frac sand. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*15. Weeks later, in what was one of its largest acquisitions ever, Hi-Crush acquired Permian Basin Sand Company, LLC for $275 million (the "**Permian Sand Acquisition**"), which increased Hi-Crush's sand reserves by more than 55 million tons. The Permian Sand Acquisition purchase price was based, in part, on the significant value of the recently-executed Sand Purchase Agreement with EOG.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 15:** EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 15 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*16. Contemporaneously with the Permian Sand Acquisition and in reliance on EOG's commitments under the Sand Purchase Agreement, Hi-Crush promptly spent approximately $50 million to construct a mining facility that would be used to service EOG, among certain other key customers.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 16:** EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 16 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*17. With Hi-Crush having invested approximately $325 million and without a dollar invested by EOG, at the time of the mine facility's completion in July 2017, EOG was purchasing sand from Hi-Crush at prices significantly below market prices for delivered sand in the Permian Basin.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 17:** EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 17 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**A. Answer to "Terms of Sand Purchase Agreement"**

*18. Under the Sand Purchase Agreement, EOG is required to purchase a minimum amount of [redacted] tons of sand per Contract Year ("**Annual Minimum**") at a purchase price of $[redacted] per ton. Sand Purchase Agreement, ¶¶ 1(a), 2(a)(i). A "Contract Year" is any one calendar year beginning on January 1 and ending on December 31, with the term of*

*the agreement lasting until at least* [redacted] *(the "**Primary Term**"), subject to extension. Id. ¶¶ 1(h)(i), (3)(a).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 18:** EOG admits that Section 1(a) of the Sand Purchase Agreement provides for the purchase of an "Annual Minimum" of "[redacted] Tons of Sand per Contract Year," subject to certain restrictions expressed in the agreement. EOG further admits that Section 2(a)(i) of the Sand Purchase Agreement provides that "[t]he purchase price for Sand purchased hereunder shall be [redacted] per Ton of Sand." EOG further admits that the term "Contract Year" is defined in section 1(h)(i) of the Sand Purchase Agreement to mean "any one calendar year period during the Term beginning on January 1 and ending on December 31" and that "[n]otwithstanding the foregoing, Contract Year 1 shall consist of the period beginning on [redacted] and ending on [redacted]." EOG further admits that the "Primary Term" of the Sand Purchase Agreement, as defined in Section 3(a), begins with the Effective Date "and will continue in full effect until [redacted]" and can be "extended as provided herein." EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*19. The Sand Purchase Agreement is akin to a "take or pay" agreement. Should EOG fail to purchase and take delivery of the Annual Minimum during any Contract Year, the Sand Purchase Agreement obligates EOG to make annual shortfall payments to Hi-Crush. See id. ¶ 2(b). Hi-Crush relied on these shortfall payments to ensure that it would recoup a portion of the $50 million mining facility and $275 million Permian Sand Acquisition investments that Hi-Crush made so that it could obtain business and fulfill sand orders from certain major customers, including EOG.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 19:** EOG admits that Section 2(b) provides for "Shortfall Liquidated Damages" in the event "EOG fails to purchase or take delivery of the Annual Minimum during any Contract Year, and EOG's failure is not due to an event of Force Majeure."

EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the second sentence in Paragraph 19 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*20. EOG's shortfall payments are calculated based on a contractually-agreed upon formula of "the positive difference, if any, between (A) the Annual Minimum and (B) the amount of Sand that EOG purchased during such Contract Year multiplied by the amount of* [redacted] *per Ton." Id. ¶ 2(b). For further clarity, the Sand Purchase Agreement provides an example of applying that formula: if EOG only purchases and receives* [redacted] *tons of sand during Contract Year 1, EOG shall pay Hi-Crush* [redacted] *times* [redacted] *for a total of* [redacted]*. Id. The Sand Purchase Agreement is, therefore, a highly valuable asset of Hi-Crush because it guarantees Hi-Crush at least $*[redacted] *annually from EOG even if EOG chooses not to purchase any sand during the Contract Year.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 20:** EOG admits that Section 2(b) of the Sand Purchase Agreement provides for a calculation of "Shortfall Liquidated Damages for the purpose of this subsection (b)" and the first sentence of Paragraph 20 accurately quotes in part Section 2(b) of the Sand Purchase Agreement. EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the third sentence in Paragraph 20 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*21. Although the Primary Term of the Sand Purchase Agreement extends through* [redacted]*, the agreement contains certain early termination provisions, but only in the event particular events occur or certain accelerated shortfall payments are made. See, e.g., id. ¶¶ 3(b), 7(b). In an apparent attempt to avoid making any shortfall payments upon termination, EOG purportedly terminated the Sand Purchase Agreement under Section 7(b), which provides as follows:*

> *In the event either Party shall (i) make an assignment or any general arrangement for the benefit of creditors; (ii) file a petition or otherwise commence, authorize, or acquiesce in the commencement of a proceeding or case under any bankruptcy or similar law for the protection of creditors or have such petition filed or proceeding commenced against it;* ***(iii) otherwise become bankrupt or insolvent (however evidenced); (iv) be unable to pay its debts as they fall***

> ***due; or*** *(v) have a receiver, provisional liquidator, conservator, custodian, trustee or other similar official appointed with respect to it or substantially all of its assets, then the other Party shall have the right to immediately terminate this Agreement.*

*Id. ¶ 7(b) (emphasis added). As explained below, EOG had no basis to rely on Section 7(b).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 21:** EOG admits that the Sand Purchase Agreement contains certain termination provisions in Sections 3(b) and 7(b). EOG admits that Section 7(b) of the Sand Purchase Agreement is quoted accurately, with emphasis added, in Paragraph 21. EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG admits that it terminated the Sand Purchase Agreement pursuant to Section 7(b). EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**B. Answer to "The Parties' Performance"**

*22. For Contract Years 1 and 2, both parties fulfilled their contractual duties, with EOG purchasing and Hi-Crush selling and delivering the Annual Minimum of frac sand. However, at times EOG resisted complying with its purchase obligations as frac sand prices dropped, necessitating significant effort on Hi-Crush's part to ensure EOG's performance. In hindsight, EOG's reluctance to meet its contractual obligations were but a preview of EOG's future conduct.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 22:** EOG admits that for Contract Years 1 and 2, both parties fulfilled their contractual duties, with EOG purchasing and Hi-Crush selling and delivering the Annual Minimum of frac sand. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*23. For 2020 (i.e., Contract Year 3), EOG purchased only [redacted] tons of sand, less than half the Annual Minimum. Accordingly, since EOG fell [redacted] tons short of its required Annual Minimum, EOG must pay $5,360,000 in shortfall damages. See Sand Purchase Agreement ¶¶ 1(a), 1h(i), 2(b). Additionally, the Sand Purchase Agreement remains in full force and effect for [redacted], through the end of [redacted], obligating EOG to purchase [redacted] tons of sand annually or pay [redacted] in annual shortfall payments if it fails to purchase any sand during the remainder of the Primary Term. Id. ¶ 3(a).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 23:** EOG states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*24. Hi-Crush has always honored its duties under the Sand Purchase Agreement by satisfying all of EOG's frac sand orders. Indeed, given its obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement and its reliance on EOG's annual minimum volume commitment, Hi-Crush invested approximately $50 million to construct a mining facility on the sand reserves (obtained through the Permian Basin Acquisition) that were used, in part, to satisfy EOG's orders. Hi-Crush remains ready, willing, and able to continue performance of its contractual obligations. In light of recent events, the same cannot be said of EOG.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 24:** EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 24 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**C. Answer to "Hi-Crush Inc.'s 10-Q"**

*25. On June 25, 2020, Hi-Crush Inc., the parent of Hi-Crush, filed a quarterly 10-Q for the first quarter of 2020[6] (attached, in relevant part, hereto as Exhibit 2), wherein it provided a narrative of the enterprise's financial situation and expectations for the future. In particular, it described Hi-Crush Inc.'s decrease in borrowing base and associated June 22, 2020 default under the ABL Credit Facility "due to its failure to be in compliance with the springing fixed charge coverage ratio **financial covenant** under the ABL Credit Facility." 10-Q at p.11 (emphasis added). In the 10-Q, Hi-Crush Inc. noted that this financial covenant default "**could result** in the acceleration of all obligations and termination of all commitments thereunder at the option of the lenders" and potentially other Senior Note indebtedness becoming accelerated and due. Id. (emphasis added). Moreover, it recognized that there was not sufficient liquidity to pay the $450,000,000 principal amount of the Senior Notes (as described therein), "**should they be accelerated**" in the future. Id. (emphasis added).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 25:** EOG admits that on June 25, 2020, Hi-Crush, Inc., the parent of Hi-Crush, filed a 10-Q, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 2 to the Complaint. EOG admits that the quotations in the second, third, and fourth sentences in Paragraph 25 are

[6] *Hi-Crush's Form 10-Q was originally due on May 11, 2020, but Hi-Crush (like other registrants) was permitted by the SEC to delay the filing of its quarterly report for the first quarter of 2020 by 45 days in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.*

contained, without emphasis added, on page 11 of the 10-Q. EOG further admits that the 10-Q speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*26. However, those debts were not accelerated. Instead, Hi-Crush Inc. and certain of its affiliates entered into a forbearance agreement and amendment to the ABL Credit Facility, whereby the lenders agreed to forebear from exercising default-related rights and remedies. Id. In turn, by avoiding acceleration, this forbearance agreement made it easier for Hi-Crush to continue paying debts as they became due in the ordinary course of business.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 26:** EOG admits that page 11 of the 10-Q describes a forbearance agreement and amendment to the ABL Credit Facility. EOG further states that the 10-Q speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 26 and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*27. Hi-Crush Inc. also made disclosures in the 10-Q concerning the engagement of advisors and negotiations relating to a potential prearranged bankruptcy filing, and that "[r]egardless of whether the terms and conditions of a prearranged filing can be agreed upon with the debt holders, the Company expects to file for protection from its creditors under the United States Bankruptcy Code." Id. at p.12. Hi-Crush Inc. did not disclose a specific date for a bankruptcy filing or indicate that such a filing was imminent.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 27:** EOG admits that page 12 of the 10-Q describes the engagement of advisors and negotiations regarding a prearranged bankruptcy filing, and includes the quoted language in the first sentence of Paragraph 27. EOG further states that the 10-Q speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**D. Answer to "EOG's Improper Termination"**

*28. EOG took note of Hi-Crush's affiliate's 10-Q filing, albeit opportunistically. Two days after the filing and by letter dated June 27, 2020, EOG sent Hi-Crush a purported notice of*

*immediate termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement ("**Termination Notice**") (attached hereto as Exhibit 3). In its letter, EOG attempted to base its termination on Section 7(b)(iii) and 7(b)(iv) of the Sand Purchase Agreement and "Hi-Crush's insolvency and inability to pay its debts as they fall due." See Termination Notice.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 28:** EOG admits that it sent Hi-Crush a notice of immediate termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement on June 27, 2020, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 3 to the Complaint. EOG admits that it terminated the Sand Purchase Agreement pursuant to Section 7(b)(iii) and 7(b)(iv) of the Sand Purchase Agreement and that the Termination Notice includes the language quoted in the second sentence of Paragraph 28. EOG further states that the Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*29. For context, Section 7(b)(iii) and (iv) of the Sand Purchase Agreement provides: "In the event either Party shall . . . (iii) otherwise become bankrupt or insolvent (however evidenced); [or] (iv) be unable to pay its debts as they fall due . . ., then the other Party shall have the right to immediately terminate this Agreement." Sand Purchase Agreement ¶¶ 7(b)(iii), (iv).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 29:** EOG admits that Section 7(b) of the Sand Purchase Agreement includes the language quoted in Paragraph 29. EOG further states that the Sand Purchase Agreement speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*30. As supposed evidence that Hi-Crush was insolvent or unable to pay its debts, EOG referenced the 10-Q's disclosure that the company was in default under its ABL Credit Facility; had entered into a forbearance agreement; "**absent an extension** of the Forbearance Agreement," would be in default under its Senior Notes "should they be accelerated;" and had "plans to file for bankruptcy." See Termination Notice (emphasis added).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 30:** EOG admits that the Termination Notice includes, without emphasis added, the language quoted in Paragraph 30. EOG further states that the Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*31. However, EOG's Termination Notice notably omits the portion of the disclosure wherein the default under the ABL Credit Facility was described as a covenant default, rather than a payment default. Unlike a payment default, a covenant default does not equate to an inability or failure to pay.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 31:** EOG admits that the Termination Notice describes and quotes from portions of the 10-Q and does not describe the nature of the default identified in the 10-Q. EOG further states that the Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*32. Likewise, EOG failed to point to any debts that Hi-Crush had failed to pay or was unable to pay when due. This is likely because there were not any debts due or coming due in the near future that Hi-Crush was not able to pay, especially in light of the referenced forbearance agreement that forestalled acceleration of the Senior Notes. Instead, EOG cherry-picked projections from the 10-Q of hypothetical risks – "**absent an extension** of the Forbearance Agreement," "**should** they be accelerated" – rather than the actual course of events. Termination Notice (emphasis added).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 32:** EOG admits that the Termination Notice contains the quotations, without emphasis added, identified in the third sentence of Paragraph 32. EOG further states that Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*33. Further, the 10-Q provided no basis for EOG to contend that Hi-Crush Inc. and its affiliates, including Hi-Crush, were insolvent. To the contrary, the consolidated balance sheet in the 10-Q showed that assets exceeded liabilities by over $250,000,000 at the end of the first quarter of 2020. 10-Q at p.4.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 33:** EOG admits that the consolidated balance sheet on page 4 of the 10-Q shows "Total assets" exceeding "Total liabilities" by over $250,000,000 as of March 31, 2020. EOG further states that the 10-Q speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*34. The 10-Q disclosure relied upon by EOG as the only basis for its termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement is not evidence of insolvency of or inability to pay debts as they fall due by either Hi-Crush Inc. (the entity who filed the 10-Q) or Hi-Crush (the entity who is the counterparty to the Sand Purchase Agreement).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 34:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 34.

*35. Given the baseless nature of EOG's Termination Notice, Hi-Crush disputed it, and rightly so. On July 1, 2020, Hi-Crush sent a letter responding to EOG's Termination Notice ("**Response Letter**") (attached hereto as Exhibit 4) identifying it for what it was – ineffective. "EOG's letter purports, albeit ineffectively, to terminate the Sand Purchase Agreement. . . . The Agreement is still in effect, and Hi-Crush expects EOG to honor its obligations under the Agreement." Response Letter.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 35:** EOG admits that on July 1, 2020, Hi-Crush sent a letter responding to EOG's Termination Notice, which is attached as Exhibit 4 to the Complaint. EOG admits that the second sentence of Paragraph 15 quotes from the Termination Notice. EOG further states that the Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*36. However, following that Response Letter, EOG has shown no intent to honor its contractual obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement. EOG has not ordered one ounce of frac sand, has stated that it will not pay any shortfall damages that accrued at the end of 2020, and has objected to Hi-Crush's assumption of the Sand Purchase Agreement under 11 U.S.C. § 365. Despite this, Hi-Crush remains ready, willing, and able to perform.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 36:** EOG admits that it has not ordered frac sand after terminating the Sand Purchase Agreement. EOG admits that it objected to Hi-Crush's assumption of the agreement under 11 U.S.C. § 365. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**E. Answer to "Hi-Crush's Bankruptcy"**

*37. On July 12, 2020, the Debtor filed voluntary petitions in this Court commencing cases for relief under chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 37:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 37.

*38. On September 4, 2020, Hi-Crush included the Sand Purchase Agreement on the Notice of Cure Amounts (ECF No. 344) for agreements it intended to assume pursuant to the Joint Plan of Reorganization for Hi-Crush Inc. and its Affiliate Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (the "**Plan**"). Two weeks later, EOG filed an Objection to Assumption of the Sand Purchase Agreement ("**Cure Objection**") (ECF No. 386), contending that the agreement had been terminated pre-petition and could not be assumed.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 38:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 38.

*39. On September 23, 2020, the Court entered an order ("**Confirmation Order**") confirming the Plan. Paragraph 62 of the Confirmation Order preserved the Parties' dispute regarding whether Hi-Crush could assume the Sand Purchase Agreement.[7] Thus, instead of litigating the validity of EOG's Notice of Termination during the pendency of Hi-Crush's bankruptcy proceedings, Hi-Crush and EOG agreed to delay resolution until after Plan confirmation. Hi-Crush now commences this action to address this unresolved issue by seeking a declaratory judgment that Hi-Crush properly assumed the Sand Purchase Agreement and that it remains in full force and effect.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 39:** EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring this action described in Paragraph 39, but specifically denies that the action has any merit. EOG admits the remaining allegations in Paragraph 39.

**F. Answer to "EOG Should Not Be Able to Avoid its Contractual Obligations"**

*40. Upon information and belief, EOG's end goal in attempting to terminate the Sand Purchase Agreement was to avoid its fixed, long-term obligations to Hi-Crush so that EOG would be free to purchase lower quantities of frac sand on more favorable terms. While EOG was happy to commit to fixed pricing in 2017 (when spot prices greatly exceeded $[redacted] per ton), EOG now apparently seeks to avoid its firm obligations so that it can purchase frac sand for less than [redacted] per ton. In order to accomplish this objective, EOG seized upon and contorted a public disclosure in order to manufacture the claim that Hi-Crush was insolvent and unable to pay its debt as they came due. However, EOG's opportunistic attempts should not be rewarded, and certainly should not leave Hi-Crush penalized for disclosing a covenant default and forbearance agreement to the market.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 40:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 40.

[7] *See, e.g., Confirmation Order (ECF No. 420) ¶ 62 ("Notwithstanding any other provision in this Confirmation Order or the Plan to the contrary, nothing in this Confirmation Order or the Plan . . . shall eliminate, alter or impair any of the objections of EOG Resources Inc. . . . including, but not limited to EOG's position that the Sand Purchase Agreement . . . was properly terminated prior to the Petition Date.").*

*41. Simply put, EOG had no legitimate basis for its contention that Hi-Crush was insolvent or unable to pay its debts as they became due at the time it sent the Termination Notice. These contentions were false and, as a result, EOG's attempt to terminate the Parties' agreement was invalid. Hi-Crush has been damaged by EOG's refusal to perform its obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement, both for this year and in the [redacted] years to come. Accordingly, Hi-Crush asserts the following claims for relief to remedy the harm EOG has inflicted upon Hi-Crush.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 41:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 41.

**ANSWER TO "CLAIMS FOR RELIEF"**

**COUNT I**

***(Declaratory Judgment that EOG's Purported Termination Under Section 7(b) Was Invalid)***

*42. Hi-Crush realleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein the allegations contained in each of the preceding paragraphs.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 42:** EOG incorporates by reference its answers to the preceding Paragraphs as if set forth at length herein.

*43. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2201, "any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such."*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 43:** EOG admits that Paragraph 43 accurately quotes from 28 U.S.C. § 2201. EOG further states that 28 U.S.C. § 2201 speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein.

*44. An actual, justiciable controversy exists between Hi-Crush and EOG regarding (i) the validity of EOG's alleged termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement under Section 7(b), and (ii) whether Hi-Crush can assume the Sand Purchase Agreement under 11 U.S.C. § 365 notwithstanding EOG's Termination Notice. This dispute is evidenced by EOG's Termination Notice and Hi-Crush's Response Letter, each of which asserted contradictory positions as to the effect of EOG's Termination Notice, and EOG's Cure Objection.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 44:** Hi-Crush's declaratory judgment claims under Paragraph 46(i) and (v) were dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37. EOG admits that

EOG and Hi-Crush have taken different positions with respect the termination of Sand Purchase Agreement and Hi-Crush's ability to assume the agreement. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*45. EOG had no right to terminate the Sand Purchase Agreement under Section 7(b), and any attempts to do so were invalid. EOG contends that, at the time of the Termination Notice, Hi-Crush was insolvent or unable to pay its debts as they fell due. See Termination Notice. EOG pointed to Hi-Crush Inc.'s 10-Q filing as the sole support for these brazen claims. But, as described herein, EOG's reliance on the 10-Q was misplaced, and it shows that EOG used the 10-Q as a mere pretext for termination. Indeed, EOG's assertions regarding Hi-Crush's insolvency and inability to pay its debts were baseless assumptions, which were contrary to the then-existing facts and circumstances. In turn, EOG has no support in law for its attempts at terminating the Sand Purchase Agreement under Section 7(b), and Hi-Crush had the right to (and did) assume this agreement.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 45:** Hi-Crush's declaratory judgment claims under Paragraph 46(i) and (v) were dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37. EOG admits that at the time of the Termination Notice EOG contended that Hi-Crush was insolvent or unable to pay its debts as they fell due, and that the 10-Q provided support "at a minimum" for EOG's right to terminate. EOG further states that the Termination Notice speaks for itself, should be read as a whole, and provides only as stated therein. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*46. Accordingly, Hi-Crush requests that the Court enter a declaratory judgment holding that:*

*(i) EOG's attempted termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement under Section 7(b) was invalid;*

*(ii) The Sand Purchase Agreement remains in full force and effect for the remainder of its Primary Term, as defined therein;*

*(iii) Hi-Crush had the right to assume the Sand Purchase Agreement under 11 U.S.C. § 365 and did properly assume it during the course of the bankruptcy case;*

*(iv) The cure amount for Hi-Crush's assumption of the Sand Purchase Agreement is $0; and*

*(v) Hi-Crush is entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided for under Section 37.009 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided for by Section 17 of the Sand Purchase Agreement.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 46:** Hi-Crush's declaratory judgment claims under Paragraph 46(i) and (v) were dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37. EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring the claims described in Paragraph 46, but specifically denies that those claims have any merit. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**COUNT II**

***(Breach of Contract – Sand Purchase Agreement)***

*47. Hi-Crush realleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein the allegations contained in each of the preceding paragraphs.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 47:** EOG incorporates by reference its answers to the preceding Paragraphs as if set forth at length herein.

*48. The Sand Purchase Agreement was a valid, binding, and enforceable agreement between Hi-Crush and EOG.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 48:** EOG admits the allegations in Paragraph 48.

*49. Hi-Crush performed all of its obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement by selling and delivering sand to EOG, which EOG accepted.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 49:** EOG admits that for Contract Years 1 and 2, both parties fulfilled their contractual duties, with EOG purchasing and Hi-Crush selling and delivering the Annual Minimum of frac sand. EOG otherwise lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 49 and, therefore, denies such allegations.

*50. EOG breached the Sand Purchase Agreement by refusing to order the Annual Minimum of sand for Contract Year 3 or make requisite shortfall payments. See Sand Purchase Agreement, ¶¶ 1(a), 2(b).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 50:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 50.

*51. EOG also breached the Sand Purchase Agreement by purportedly terminating it under Section 7(b) without a valid basis to do so.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 51:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 51.

*52. EOG's breaches injured Hi-Crush, which has sustained damages of at least $5,360,000 for Contract Year 3, plus millions of additional damages that will accrue if the agreement is not assumed and EOG is not compelled to perform throughout the remaining term of the agreement.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 52:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 52.

*53. As pleaded herein, Hi-Crush has performed its obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement and remains ready, willing, and able to continue to perform under the Sand Purchase Agreement. Accordingly, Hi-Crush seeks specific performance of the Sand Purchase Agreement by EOG for the remainder of the Primary Term.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 53:** EOG lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 53 regarding Hi-Crush's performance under the Sand Purchase Agreement and whether Hi-Crush "remains ready, willing, and able to continue to perform" and, therefore, denies such allegations. EOG admits that Hi-Crush purports to bring the claims described in Paragraph 53, but specifically denies that those claims have any merit. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

*54. Alternatively, and should EOG not be ordered to specifically perform the remainder of the Primary Term of the Sand Purchase Agreement, then EOG's breach will result in damages of at least $45,000,000.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 54:** EOG denies all allegations in Paragraph 54.

*55. Because of EOG's breach, Hi-Crush seeks and is entitled to its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided for under Chapter 38 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided for by Section 17 of the Sand Purchase Agreement.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 55:** EOG admits that Chapter 38 of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code and Section 17 of the Sand Purchase Agreement include provisions

relating to a party's potential to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, but denies that Hi-Crush is entitled to same. EOG denies all allegations not specifically admitted in this Paragraph.

**COUNT III**

***(In the alternative, Avoidance of Constructively Fraudulent Transfer)***

*56. Hi-Crush realleges and incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein the allegations contained in each of the preceding paragraphs.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 56:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*57. As set forth above, Hi-Crush contends that EOG's purported termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement was invalid because Hi-Crush was solvent and able to pay its debts as they came due. However, presuming, arguendo, the Court finds that EOG had the right to terminate the Sand Purchase Agreement because Hi-Crush was insolvent, EOG's termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement should be avoided as a constructively fraudulent transfer. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 544, 548(a)(1)(B); Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code §§ 24.005(a)(2) and 24.006(a).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 57:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*58. The term "transfer" is broadly defined to encompass every mode, direct or indirect, absolute or conditional, voluntary or involuntary, of disposing of or parting with property or an interest in property, and the term includes the pre-petition termination of valuable contract rights. See In re EBC I, Inc., 356 B.R. 631, 634 (Bankr. D. Del. 2006).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 58:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*59. Hi-Crush had valuable contract rights under and property interests in the Sand Purchase Agreement, including the right to be paid an aggregate amount of over $45 million in shortfall payments during the remaining Primary Term if EOG chose not to order any more sand. See also 11 U.S.C. 541(c)(1)(B). These shortfall payments were necessary to ensure that Hi-Crush recouped a portion of the approximately $325 million in investments that it made, in part, in reliance on the Parties' commitments under the Sand Purchase Agreements.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 59:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*60. Hi-Crush consistently performed its obligations under the Sand Purchase Agreement and, at the time of termination, Hi-Crush stood ready, willing, and able to continue selling sand pursuant to its terms.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 60:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*61. EOG's termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement constitutes a transfer of Hi-Crush's interests in the Sand Purchase Agreement, depriving Hi-Crush of its right to continue fulfilling sand orders at fixed prices and/or receive shortfall payments if EOG failed to purchase the Annual Minimum.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 61:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*62. This transfer occurred on June 27, 2020, less than a month before the Petition Date and within the applicable statute of limitations.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 62:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*63. Hi-Crush received far less than reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement. Specifically, Hi-Crush received nothing, even though it made millions in capital expenditures in order to service and benefit EOG. And Hi-Crush lost valuable contract rights that would have generated at least $45 million during the remaining Primary Term.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 63:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*64. As noted above, Hi-Crush assumes for the purposes of this alternative cause of action that it was insolvent at the time of the transfer (as alleged by EOG) or became insolvent as a result of the transfer. Hi-Crush asserts this cause of action in the alternative if the Court denies the relief requested in the preceding causes of action.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 64:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

*65. Accordingly, the termination of the Sand Purchase Agreement is an avoidable fraudulent transfer. Hi-Crush is entitled to reinstatement of the Sand Purchase Agreement or, if*

*the Court so orders, return of the value of the agreement from EOG, which is no less than $45 million. See 11 U.S.C. § 550(a).*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 65:** Hi-Crush's claim for fraudulent transfer (Count III) was dismissed with prejudice. *See* AP ECF No. 37.

**CONDITIONS PRECEDENT**

*66. All conditions precedent to filing this suit have occurred or have been performed.*

**RESPONSE TO PARAGRAPH 66:** EOG denies that conditions precedent to filing this suit had occurred or been performed at the time the Complaint was filed. EOG did not receive an invoice for any amounts allegedly due under the Sand Purchase Agreement until April 20, 2021, after EOG filed its Original Answer. *See* SPA § 2(b). Further, EOG has not received an invoice for any amounts allegedly due under the Sand Purchase Agreement for 2021 or any subsequent years. *See id*.

**AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

By alleging the matters set forth below, EOG does not allege or admit that it has the burden of proof and/or the burden of persuasion with respect to any of these matters, or that Plaintiff is relieved of its burdens to prove each and every element of its claims. EOG has not had the opportunity to conduct discovery in this case; therefore, EOG, by failing to raise an affirmative defense, does not intend to waive any such defense, and EOG specifically reserves the right to amend its Answer to include additional affirmative defenses. As and for its affirmative defenses, EOG alleges as follows:

**FIRST DEFENSE**

The Complaint, in whole or in part, fails to state a claim against EOG upon which relief can be granted.

**SECOND DEFENSE**

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by Plaintiff's failure to mitigate their alleged damages.

**THIRD DEFENSE**

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by Plaintiff's failure to satisfy conditions precedent. EOG did not receive an invoice for any amounts allegedly due under the Sand Purchase Agreement until April 20, 2021, after EOG filed its Original Answer. *See* SPA § 2(b). Further, EOG has not received an invoice for any amounts allegedly due under the Sand Purchase Agreement for 2021 or any subsequent years. *See id*.

**FOURTH DEFENSE**

Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, as an unenforceable penalty.

[*Remainder of page intentionally left blank*]

Dated: May 14, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Sarah Link Schultz*

**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP**
Sarah Link Schultz
State Bar No. 24033047
David F. Staber
State Bar No. 18986950
Laura P. Warrick
State Bar No. 24079546
2300 N. Field Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 969-2800
Facsimile: (214) 969-4343

*Counsel for Defendant EOG Resources, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on May 14, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing pleading was served electronically via the Court's ECF system on all parties registered to receive such service and by email on the following:

Counsel to Plaintiff

| | |
|---|---|
| Joseph W. Buoni | josephbuoni@huntonak.com |
| Timothy A. ("Tad") Davidson II | taddavidson@huntonak.com |
| Ashley L. Harper | ashleyharper@huntonak.com |
| Ashley S. Lewis | ashleylewis@huntonak.com |

*/s/ Sarah Link Schultz*
Sarah Link Schultz