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PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. Are the parties ready to proceed?

MR. DURRER II: We are, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. DURRER II: This is Van Durrer, Your Honor, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher \& Flom, on behalf of the debtors. We're proceeding today with our omnibus agenda, which was filed at docket 868.

There are two matters on the agenda. The first one, which is Bank of Oklahoma's motion for allowance of an administrative expense claim, is docket number 823. That is resolved. We reached an agreement on the amount. We also agreed to include Bank of Oklahoma in the consensual releases that are set forth in the plan. I'll turn it over to Mr. Roach to see if he wants to add anything, but I believe that the certificate of no objection was already submitted to Your Honor, docket 861.

THE COURT: Okay. That resolution is fine with me.
MR. GWYNNE: Good morning, Your Honor. Kurt Gwynne, instead of Mr. Roach, from Reed Smith. Jared Roach, my partner, is on the phone as well. Our firm represents BOKF N.A. as successor indenture trustee.

We did file a certificate of no objection and revised proposed order, which is at docket item 861. That order has
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been agreed to, the form of order by both the debtor and creditors' committee, and we would ask that Your Honor enter that proposed order. We're happy to address any questions that Your Honor may have.

THE COURT: All right. I've seen the confirmation order. I'm not sure I've seen this particular settlement order, but certainly in concept everything sounds fine. When you submit the order we'll let you know if we have any issues as to the wording.

MR. GWYNNE: For the record Kurt Gwynne again from Reed Smith. The order, just so Your Honor knows, what it does is it allows the claim in the amount of 150,000. The prior order provided that our fees and expenses, as of the filing of the motion, were at least 158,000 , and we obviously incurred fees and expenses thereafter in the filing and negotiation of the motion. So that's what the proposed order at docket item 861 provides, and the order was emailed to Your Honor's chambers in Word form yesterday. Would you like us to resend that order after this hearing?

THE COURT: No. If my chambers has it then they'll forward it to me.

MR. GWYNNE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right, Mr. Durrer?
MR. DURRER II: Thank you, Your Honor.
Onto agenda item number two, this is confirmation of
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the debtors' plan of distribution. The original motion was filed at docket 785. As Your Honor knows, there were a handful of objections filed. What I'm going to do is provide a brief introduction and then I'll turn it over to Mr. Ortiz to go through some of the more specific changes that were made to resolve certain objections by the U.S. Trustee, which also got captured in other rejections -- other objections I should say -- and then, obviously, we'll address any questions you have.

Just in terms of the record, I'll start there first. We did file three declarations; they're listed on the agenda. The first is the declaration of Sean Harding. It's a comprehensive declaration that addresses all of the 1129 (a) factors; that's at docket number 828. We also filed the declaration of Andres Estrada from KCC, who's our voting agent, at docket 849 , which certifies the hundred percent favorable vote from Class III, which is our impaired accepting class. And then finally, due to an update that we had just last week, we submitted an additional declaration of Mr. Harding, regarding the resolution of the director and officer claims, which is at docket 865. Unless there's any objection, Your Honor, we would move those to be part of the record today.

THE COURT: Are there any objections?
All right. They are admitted into evidence. MR. DURRER II: Thank you, Your Honor. Let me start
with the update, then.

As Your Honor is familiar with the terms of the global committee settlement -- that's how we've been calling it, the committee settlement among the debtors, Chatam, and the UCC -late last month, there's basically three forms of consideration flowing through the plan to unsecured creditors. Specifically, there's an initial payment of a million dollars in cash, a portion of which is deferred pending a tax refund that the debtors are seeking for the year 2020. Then, there were the D\&O claims themselves, and then finally there was a sharing of seventy-seven-and-a-half percent of that same tax refund to general unsecured creditors through the general unsecured creditors' trust, with the balance of that tax refund being retained by Chatam and/or NewCo, the buyer of McClatchy's assets earlier this month.

The change that I wanted to update you on, Your Honor, was that the parties never stopped with respect to their efforts to mediate and settle the D\&O claims. As a matter of fact, we were all successful -- it was spearheaded, I should say, by the directors and officers themselves, the Great American Insurance company, and the UCC. They did reach a settlement in the amount of 4.875 -- $\$ 4.5875$ million late last week. We submitted a notice of that fact and then certain changes to the plan to memorialize that.

One important change to the plan, which $I$ just want to
eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250
highlight, is that Great American -- again, consensually -will receive a release in exchange for that payment, and basically among the three forms of consideration that $I$ outline, that middle form, the D\&O claims, would obviously be replaced with that amount of cash. And you'll find that change sprinkled throughout the revised plan as well.

With that, Your Honor, I'll pause to see if you have any questions, and then $I$ want to give $M r$. Fliman an opportunity to address what should happen with the existing standing motion, which you might recall had been continued to today in anticipation of favorable consideration of confirmation of the plan, but given the settlement, I think Mr. Fliman had a suggestion as to how we would carry that forward.

THE COURT: All right. I've seen the proposed
settlement. No objections. Let me just ask before Mr. Fliman talks if there are any objections to that settlement.

Okay. I hear none.
Why don't you proceed, Mr. Fliman?
MR. FLIMAN: Sure, Your Honor. For the record, Daniel

Fliman with Stroock, Stroock \& Lavan on behalf of the committee. Your Honor, just before I get to the mechanics with respect to the standing motion, we did just want to provide a little bit of context in connection with the settlement.

As Mr. Durrer walked through, following what we're calling the global committee settlement, we engaged in
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negotiations with the D\&O carrier and the counsel to D\&Os and Milbank. After much back-and-forth, we reached the agreement Mr. Durrer walked through, which is that $\$ 4.5878$ million in exchange for releases of the remaining estate causes of action. The UCC supports the settlement. While we believe in the claims that we brought in the standing motion, we do recognize the inherent challenges, the expenses, the delays that correspond with realizing value in any claims, including these, and so we support this number. We consent to this number, which was a requirement under the prior settlement reached in connection with the sale motion, and we request its approval.

The housekeeping item that we need to deal with is our standing motion still remains on the docket. We agreed to adjourn it in connection with the prior settlement with Chatam. What we would ask, Your Honor, is -- and we'll add this to the language to the confirmation order if it's acceptable to the Court -- is that given the settlement that we've reached on the D\&O claims, that our standing motion would be deemed automatically withdrawn on the effective date of the plan. I think in the interim we would continue to adjourn the motion, just so we have it out there if, for whatever reason, we don't get there, but I think what we would propose is that the motion be automatically withdrawn on the effective date of the plan.

THE COURT: Okay. And I take it nobody else has any
issue with that?

Okay. That sounds fine.

MR. FLIMAN: Thank you.

MR. DURRER II: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you. This is Van Durrer again. So just to walk through a couple resolutions of the objections, and then, as I said, Mr. Ortiz will address in more detail changes that we made with respect to issues surrounding discharge release, exculpated claims, et cetera.

First, with respect to Oracle, whose original objection was docket 850 , we made it clear that the releases in the plan are consensual releases by modifying the language relating to who are releasing parties, and that satisfied them and it -- it also addressed a number of other objections, and they've filed a withdrawal of their objection at docket number 869.

With respect to the Mississippi and Texas taxing authorities, they submitted to us informal comments, basically setting out some procedures, routine reservations of rights, and treatment of specific tax claims in those jurisdictions, and those changes are reflected in paragraphs 109 and 110 of the confirmation order, and I think Your Honor will find them to be relatively routine. We likewise received informal comments from Chubb, the insurance carrier.

Chubb had a fiduciary policy as well as certain worker's comp policies many, many years ago; as many as
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fourteen years ago. We couldn't locate any claims that were still being administered, but rather than have a litigated dispute, we accommodated, again, some reservation of rights language, and that's reflected in paragraph 111. Basically, it provides a certain notice function to Chubb in the event that distributions are about to be made and Chubb wants to make one last effort to identify any claims it may have. It has the opportunity to do that, and there's also a, sort of, belt and suspenders stay relief provision to make sure that Chubb can continue to administer whatever claims it is handling at this late date.

We also received informal comments from the SEC. We narrowly tailored our exculpation proposal in the plan in the confirmation order to post-petition conduct, and that addressed the SEC's concerns, and that is something that Mr. Ortiz will also touch on.

So unless there's any specific questions on those handful of matters, Your Honor, I will turn things over to Mr. Ortiz to walk through the larger U.S. Trustee comments and issues that we addressed.

THE COURT: I'm sure, based on prior cases, Mr. Ortiz knows what one of my questions is going to be.

MR. DURRER II: He's been a pretty good predictor of those, Your Honor, so yes. I will yield the podium. MR. ORTIZ: Thank you, Mr. Durrer.

Good morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. ORTIZ: Kyle Ortiz of Togut, Segal \& Segal for the debtors.

The good news is we've resolved all but one element of one of the plan objections, with modifications made to the first amended plan and the related proposed confirmation order. As Your Honor is aware, three objections were filed. As Mr. Durrer noted, Oracle's was withdrawn at docket 869. That leaves us with an objection filed by Beth Desmond at docket 852 and the objection filed by the United States Trustee at docket number 855.

Many of the issues raised in the U.S. Trustee and Desmond objections overlap, so if it is okay with Your Honor, we will run through the key modifications to the documents and address how each resolves issues raised by the objections, objecting parties, and also there's a couple places where edits to the plan didn't quite carry through to the order yet, and we'll identify those as well, so Your Honor is aware of changes that will be made.

I'll be making reference to the redlines of the plan and confirmation order that were filed as exhibits 1A and 2A, to the notice of first amended plan filed on September 21st, 2020 at docket 857 and referring to the ECF page numbers, ECF PDF page numbers, therein.

Do you have that document, Your Honor?
THE COURT: I've read it. I don't have it in front of me at the moment, but go ahead.

MR. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
Starting with the discharge issues raised by both objectors. The section of the plan providing for discharge pursuant to Section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code, which was formerly section 10.2 of the plan, has been removed, which Your Honor can see in the redline at ETF PDF page number 155.

Additionally, consistent with Your Honor's comments at other confirmation hearings related to liquidating debtors and edits made to other confirmation orders, we removed all language that had the effect of providing a discharge, including language regarding final or full satisfaction, release or settlement of claims, as we appreciate Your Honor's views that such language has the same effect as a discharge, just using different words.

THE COURT: I thought that that language was still there when I reviewed the most recent plan filing.

MR. ORTIZ: So it may have -- there were two different plan filings. There was one filed on Friday that had certain of the language still in, and we went through and then pulled out all of the additional language around those sorts of language. And then $I$ will also note that the mirror edits that are supposed to be in the confirmation order relating to
eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250
operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net
discharge were inadvertently not made in the version filed on Monday, but that we will be deleting the paragraph eighty-six of the confirmation order, which provides for a discharge prior to submission of the final order, and we do plan to go through both documents and make sure to do our best to scrub all such references to these sorts of language, which we do appreciate are just basically a discharge, wearing different clothing.

THE COURT: Very good.

In at least one of our other cases, rather than
looking for it everywhere it appears, I think we just put in the confirmation order something that dealt with it, so you could do it that way, if you prefer.

MR. ORTIZ: Yeah. I think there was specifics on them. We had language that essentially said anywhere that that appears it doesn't have effect, and made specific that it only applies to those consenting third-party releasers. So we'll take a crack at it as we send it down to Your Honor, because we are aware that you have another megacase that was just filed, and we'll make sure to do our best to do it all on our end.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ORTIZ: Moving on to third-party releases, Your
Honor. The definition of releasing parties no longer includes the language all other holders of claims, to the fullest extent permitted by law, which is reflected in the redline at PDF pages 111 through 112. With that edit, third-party releases
are only being granted by parties who have affirmatively consented to granting such releases.

The U.S. Trustee also raised an issue with prospective releases for entities that do not yet exist, and this was resolved through the deletion of reference to the winddown debtors, the plan administration trust, and the (indiscernible) recovery trust from the plan's release provision, which Your Honor will be able to see at redline PDF pages 156 through 58, which deleted those terms from the current debtor and third-party release provision in section 10.3 and 10.4 of the plan, respectively.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. CLARK: The U.S. Trustee's objection to the breadth of exculpation provision has also been resolved because the debtors removed reference to out of court restructuring efforts from the definition of exculpated claims, which Your Honor will be able to see at page 102 of the plan redline.

I'll also note, Your Honor that in preparing for the hearing, we saw that there's still some language in the exculpation definition using phrases like related to and arising from that Your Honor typically strikes, in favor of phrases like derived from and based upon. So we will make appropriate changes to the final version of the plan to comport with Your Honor's preferred language, which we understand better comports with the actual concept of exculpation.
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THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. ORTIZ: We also added to the exculpation provision at page 160 in section 10.5 of the plan. It calls out to the provision for governmental units, enforcing police, and regulatory powers with respect to pre-petition claims, based on informal comments received from the SEC and the Texas comptroller. We added language requested by the U.S. Trustee concerning post-confirmation operating reports and payment of statutory fees to both the plan and the confirmation order.

With regard to the Desmond objection specifically, we added new paragraph 112 to the confirmation order that makes clear that nothing in the confirmation order, or the plan, impairs the right of Ms. Desmond to the Desmond appeal bond or her right to prosecute the Desmond lawsuit, and also makes explicit that the Desmond appeal bond is not property of the estate.

Turning to the U.S. Trustee's concerns with payment of non-estate professionals as administrative expenses under the plan, the U.S. Trustee's concerns with regard to the Chatham and Brigade professionals was resolved through clarifying language that such fees are being paid consistent with orders already entered by the Court, specifically the DIP order and the sale order and not as administrative expenses under the plan. And this can be seen through the addition of new section 2.7 and the removal of the reference to administrative expenses
in section 2.2 of the plan.

The debtors do believe that this same argument applies with regards to the indenture trustee fees, which were addressed in the sale order and are an essential component of the sale and mediated plan settlement, which has already been approved pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019 at docket number 744.

I know that the committee council has more to say on this one last open issue, which is the indenture trustee fees. But we'll pause here before yielding the virtual podium to see if Your Honor has any comments to the edits made to address the Desmond objection and the balance of the U.S. Trustee's objection.

But really quickly, before $I$ do that, $I$ will also note that one change that $I$ know you'll ask for that we will make is for return distributions, that we will make reasonable efforts to find the claimants and not just sit on the return distributions.

THE COURT: Very good. First, on the Desmond objection, have you resolved that, or is there still any objection left?

MR. ORTIZ: My understanding is it's resolved, although Mr. Kohn is on the line, and if there's any open issues, he can address it.

MR. KOHN: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Samuel Kohn of Dorsey \& Whitney on behalf of Beth Desmond. My
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partner, Monica Clark, is also on the phone, as is North Carolina litigation Counsel, James Johnson, of DeMent Askew \& Johnson.

As Mr. Ortiz said, paragraph 112 as filed on docket 867 addresses and resolves our objection completely. And I just wanted to thank Mr. Ortiz for his efforts to resolve our objection and it preserves the status quo, and that's all we wanted. And thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I read that language yesterday, and it looked fine to me.

MR. ORTIZ: Thank you, Your Honor. And of course, we appreciate Mr. Kohn's efforts as well to also reach a resolution. And with that, unless Your Honor has any questions, I'll yield the podium to, I believe Ms. Martin -- it will either be Ms. Martin or Mr. Hansen who have some further comments with regard to the open indenture trustee fee question.

THE COURT: Before we do that and before we forget, there's a paragraph in the proposed confirmation order. It was paragraph 84, which $I$ read, that said that my order constitutes all required government consents. Whose consent am I granting here? I don't think I have power to do that, do I?

MR. ORTIZ: Let me find the order. I'm not aware of any -- obviously, Mr. Durrer can speak up if he's aware of any. I remember we had this issue in Westinghouse, and there it was
there were additional government consents that we all knew were still out there and being waited for. But I'm not aware of anything specific and don't necessarily see an issue with taking it out.

THE COURT: Even if there in, I'm not sure $I$ have the power to give it to you, to take -- for some governmental agency's possible regulatory review of something, right?

MR. DURRER: Yeah. This is Van Durrer, Your Honor. We're happy to strike that language. We're not aware of any rules that would apply.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the only issue is the indenture trustee fees, and I read the responses, and I understand that they were provided for in the settlement that I already approved. So what's the issue, then?

MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, this is Ben Higgins for the U.S. Trustee. I can address that, if I may be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, Your Honor. The issue is that the sale order provides for the -- you're correct, the sale order does provide for the approval of the settlement, which provides for the payment of the professional fees for the indentured trustee.

But the sale order also provides that to the extent any provisions of the settlement agreement are to be implemented through the plan, those would be subject to
confirmation of the plan and approval through confirmation, so.

And if you look at the specific provision providing for the fees of the indenture trustees professionals in the settlement, it provides that the fees shall be paid on the effective date. And the U.S. Trustee would submit that these are fees that are to be paid -- or excuse me, this is a provision to be implemented through the plan. And accordingly, our ability to object to it is preserved, at least at this stage.

And our argument on the merits are set forth in the papers, Your Honor, but it's essentially, that to the extent that they're being paid as an administrative expense or effectively as an administrative expense, they need to satisfy 503 (b). So that's the argument, Your Honor. I can address any additional questions you may have.

THE COURT: You know, indentured trustees that are hired pre-petition or engaged pre-petition, they represent note-holders, but they do so for the convenience of the company and usually at the expense of the company. And that role continues post-bankruptcy, so what's the big deal about paying their fees?

MR. HIGGINS: Well, Your Honor, to the extent that they're being paid as administrative expenses, our position is that they need to demonstrate some entitlement under 503 (b), whether it's $503(\mathrm{~b}) 1$ or 503 (b) 3 . And the record is -- it
doesn't demonstrate that entitlement at this point. So that's what the objection is based off.

THE COURT: How much are we talking about?
MR. HIGGINS: I should let either committee Counsel or the trustee Counsel speak to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Hansen or Mr. Fliman, who wishes to address this?

MR. HANSON: Your Honor, it's Kris Hanson with Stroock on behalf of the official committee. My colleague, Samantha Martin, is going to handle this issue for us, so she's on.

THE COURT: Okay.
Ms. Martin?

I see Ms. Martin listed, but I don't see her.

MS. MARTIN: Good morning, Your Honor. This is

Samantha Martin at Stroock \& Stroock \& Lavan on behalf of the official committee. I believe the amount is in the low 300,000-dollar range.

MR. ASHMEAD: Your Honor, it's John Ashmead. Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ASHMEAD: Yeah. Hi, Your Honor. Good morning.

It's John Ashmead, Seward \& Kissel, Counsel to Wilmington Savings Fund Society. Ms. Martin is correct. That is a combination of my firm's fees, which were around 200,000, and the client's fees in this matter. I'll turn it back to Ms.
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Martin, and then I can answer any other questions or add on. Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you.
Your Honor, we agree with you that this is included in the settlement, which was approved as part of the sale order. While Ben notes that there was a proviso that any provisions that need to be implemented in the plan will be incorporated and subject to plan confirmation, we don't believe that this is one of the provisions that was necessary to implement in the plan. This was simply something that included as a matter of timing because we wanted to make the payment on the effective date.

But I think once the settlement was approved as part of a sale order, we certainly could have paid these amounts as part of the sale closing. And in fact, they actually are effectively payments being made by a third party to a third party, which is really coming from Chatham for the benefit of WSFS and Seward \& Kissell

The purchaser, as you know, bought substantially all of the debtor's assets, including all the debtor's cash except for a specific amount that's to be used as prescribed in the APA and the settlements schedules. And one of the specific uses of cash was the payment of these indenture trustee fees and expenses. And if these amounts were not going to be used for this very specific purchase -- or for this very specific
purpose, the purchaser would have swept the cash from the estates at closing.

If you do feel, as a technical matter, that these payments are being made by the debtors because they're coming from the debtors' accounts now, there is ample authority in this district and elsewhere providing that the payment of indentured trustee fees and expenses and are permitted under Bankruptcy Code section $363(\mathrm{~b})$ and Bankruptcy Rule 9019. And we would submit that that reasoning is applicable here and that 503 is not required.

And the debtors under $363(\mathrm{~b})$ can use funds for non-ordinary-course transactions with bankruptcy court approval and with a sound business reason, and the business judgment rule would apply here. The debtors determined in their business judgment that this was an appropriate use of cash into the settlement and that the global settlement is fair, appropriate, and in the best interests of the estates and all parties in interest.

And under rule 9019 , the standard is whether the settlement is fair and equitable and whether it falls below the lowest point in the range of reasonableness. And here, I think the settlement is fair, equitable, and is eminently reasonable. It's the product of a long-term, hard-fought, extensive negotiations, as you've heard a lot about through court-ordered mediation. It's full supported by the debtor's key
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The settlement eliminated the risk of contentious and costly litigation that would have really impacted the debtors' ability to close this sale, and it also would have put their ability to pursue a plan gravely at risk. It significantly improved their recoveries for unsecured creditors. And it created a clear path with almost no obstacles for the potential emergence from bankruptcy.

And Your Honor, we believe the settlement terms cannot be picked apart piecemeal. This payment is one of many addressed in the global settlement, and there is significant approval -- or significant support for approval of the entire transaction.

And as I mentioned, courts in this district have approved payments to indenture trustees under section 363 (b) and rule 9019 before, including very recently in Windstream and Stars (sic) Holdings. And for these reasons, Your Honor, we would respectfully request that you overrule the U.S. Trustee's objection, authorize the payments, or find that they were authorized in the sale order, and confirm the plan. Thank you.

MR. GWYNNE: Your Honor, this is Kurt Gwynne from Reed Smith, Counsel for BOKF. May I also be heard on this?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. GWYNNE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm not sure if the U.S. Trustee's objection applies to BOKF as well as

Wilmington Savings Fund Society, but to the extent that it does, I'd like to address it. Some arguments will apply to BOKF and WSFS, some just to BOKF.

But first of all, in the case called Aegean Marine, Your Honor requested that going forward, debtors and indenture trustees focus on the means by which they're seeking approval of indentured trustees fees and expenses in the case. And as Your Honor noted at the record of that hearing, that there are a number of ways that a debtor and indenture trustee can agree to the payment of the fees and expenses.

Here, because there wasn't previously an agreement, BOKF filed a motion for allowance and payment of administrative expense claim. That was not objected to by the U.S. Trustee. We did submit a declaration of James Lewis of BOKF at docket item 824 and a declaration of Jaren Roach, a partner at Reed Smith, at docket number 825.

So it wouldn't make sense for BOKF to have an administrative expense claim having filed a motion, submitted evidence in support thereof, and there being no objection, and not to have that administrative claim paid under the plan. The plan provides for the payment of all administrative expense claims, and there shouldn't -- there's no exception in the code for an administrative expense claim of an indenture trustee.

But in this case, I also want to point out that BOKF's fees and expenses -- not only were they incurred post-petition,
but here, BOKF was not the indenture trustee on the petition date. In fact, twelve days after the petition date, the debtor, as the issuer of the notes, Bank of New York Mellon -as the prior and resigning indentured trustee and BOKF as the successor -- entered into a resignation and appointment agreement.

That was on February 25th, approximately twelve days after the February 13th, 2020, petition date. So here we have a post-petition agreement. Prior to that, BOKF had no involvement as trustee, had no obligation to provide any services under the indenture.

As provided in that resignation and appointment agreement, the debtor accepted Bank of New York Mellon's resignation, and the debtor appointed BOKF because it needed to have an indentured trustee. And as the inducement for serving as successor trustee, the registration and appointment agreement provides that BOKF is entitled to all the rights of the indenture trustee under the indenture. One of those, of course, in the right for compensation under section 707 of the indenture.

Interestingly, the indenture, although it doesn't bind Your Honor, in section 10.01 specifically provides that the parties contemplated that the indenture trustee fees and expenses would be cost of administration under section 503 (b).

As Your Honor pointed in the Aegean case, indenture
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trustees serve a commercial function. And in fact, when the Trust Indenture Act was enacted shortly after the Great Depression, Congress specifically required the appointment of an indentured trustee at all times to provide that commercial function because it served the national public interest of providing information and facilitating communications to the noteholders.

So here, we believe the services provided by BOKF were provided to the debtors and are an incident to the operation of a business that issues public debt. In Redding v. Brown, the Supreme Court case held in 1978 -- but interpreting the language "actual and necessary cost" under the former Bankruptcy Act -- that costs ordinarily incident to the operation of a business include or constitute administrative expense claims and that actual and necessary costs are not limited to those costs without which rehabilitation would be impossible.

So as Your Honor also recognized in Aegean, if you didn't pay trustees fees, eligible trustees would refuse to serve as replacement trustees and existing trustees would resign. And in those instances, a debtor would either be in violation of the indenture or potentially in violation of the trust indenture act because the debtor does not have an indenture trustee at all times.

So for those reasons, many of which apply to both BOKF
and WSFS, BOKF asks Your Honor to confirm the plan and approve the payment of indentured trustees' fees and expenses including those of their Counsel. And that's all I have unless Your Honor has any questions.

THE COURT: No. I don't.
Mr. Higgins, why wasn't this already decided when I approved the settlement?

MR. HIGGINS: Your Honor, when you approved -- can I just have clarification? Why wasn't it decided when you approved the settlement -- the global settlement with the sale order? Is that the question that you're asking?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. HIGGINS: Well, Your Honor, our position on that would be that the language of the sale order reserves for portions of the settlement that need to be implemented through the plan and the payment of an administrative expense would be something that has to be implemented through the plan. If Your Honor will permit me, may I response briefly to the points raised by Ms. Martin and Counsel for BOKF?

THE COURT: Yes. Before you proceed though, you know, didn't I say in the settlement that the indenture trustee fees would be paid? Wasn't that part of the deal?

MR. HIGGINS: It did, Your Honor. It said a language is that it will be paid -- it shall be paid on the effective date.

THE COURT: Well, that doesn't suggest that the possibility was left open for the plan. The plan may have had to be confirmed, but it sounds like it was resolved already. What was the point of saying that if the issue still remained open?

MR. HIGGINS: Understood, Your Honor. I understand what Your Honor is saying, and certainly, to the extent Your Honor is prepared to rule on that basis, I won't get back into the reply and the other points. But if it's an open issue, I'm happy to go back into those points.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, why don't you go ahead and make the record as to anything else you wanted to put on.

MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. ASHMEAD: Your Honor, if I may. This is John Ashmead for WSFS. I just don't want to be out of order and then be precluded from saying anything. I thought the podium was turning to me after Ms. Martin. It's fine that Mr. Gwynne spoke, and I'll be very brief. If I could just -- to try to keep the, sort of, cars on the train in order here. Would that be all right? I'll just take thirty seconds.

THE COURT: Well, let Mr. Higgins finish, and then you can go ahead.

MR. ASHMEAD: Okay. Fine. Thank you.
MR. HIGGINS: So Your Honor, just with respect to
BOKF, I think what BOKF did here is what we're asking for.
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It's for -- to the extent the parties believe that they're entitled to $503(\mathrm{~b})$ treatment, to demonstrate that some way. And they put in an application with competent evidence and explanations that are not in the confirmation papers demonstrating why they think they're entitled to 503 (b) treatment. So that is effectively what we're looking for with respect to, I guess, Wilmington, the trustee that is also getting paid.

And very briefly, just with respect to the two points Ms. Martin made, one about how this payment is effectively coming through Chatham or the purchaser, you know, we're working off the language of the plan, and it's -- the payments are being paid through the plan. So even if it's money that originally came from Chatham, to the extent it's being allowed under the plan as a plan payment, that is something that we believe $503(\mathrm{~b})$ controls.

And to the last point, just that other courts have approved this type of payment under 363 or 9019, we've essentially briefed that issue in the argument, Your Honor. We understand we've been overruled in other cases on this issue. We respectfully disagree that 363 is appropriate, and the rationale is that 503 (b) specifically controls administrative expenses and 363 is a general provision of the bankruptcy Code and -- as is 9019 of the rules.

And to the extent the specific controls the general,
we believe 503 (b) controls what administrative expenses are. And to the extent someone is being treated as an administrative expense, they need to satisfy $503(\mathrm{~b})$. That's it for me, Your Honor, unless you have further questions.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
And who else wants to be heard now?
MR. ASHMEAD: Yes, Your Honor. John Ashmead of Seward on behalf of Wilmington Savings Fund Society, just very briefly, Your Honor. Wilmington Savings Fund Society is the trustee on two indentures, was co-chair of the committee. You know, we join in the comments made by the debtors and the committee and added on by BOKF Counsel here, you know, so I'm not going to re-cover in any detail.

But just to reiterate, you know, the high points, the WSFS fees and expenses were agreed to as part of the settlement that you approved. I could be corrected, but I don't believe BOKF was part of that settlement. So you know, the fact that they've filed a claim for payment of administrative expense is just -- it's distinguishable on that ground. So it's already approved.

And as you've heard, it's more than fairly usual and customary for a Chapter 11 plan to provide for the payment of the reasonable fees and expense of indenture trustees for a host of reasons including the underlying contract, postpetition, effective date and post-effective date, obligations
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that they have to fulfil as well as their charging lien rights.
And like BOKF here, WSFS came on a week after the filing. It was pursuant to an agreement executed by the debtors after the filing date. So in short, Your Honor, as part of a settlement, but even if there were not a settlement, there are a host of reasons that these should and typically would be paid under a Chapter 11 plan.

And of course, there are countless, countless examples of that in Chapter 11 plans. And just fairly recently, three judges have spoken to these issues in one or way or another, including Your Honor in Aegean, Judge Drain in Windstream just a month or so ago, and Judge Hoffman in Murray Energy just two or three weeks ago where they approved such fees in this context. And with that, Your Honor, I'll stop speaking and thank you for your patience.

THE COURT: Okay.
Anything else?
All right. Well, $I$ think as $I$ said in Aegean, that the indenture trustees would be well-served to think in advance about specifically how the fees are going to be justified, but I believe I already approved these payments here. And if the indenture trustee at issue was hired post-petition, that sounds sufficiently ordinary course to me to not require a specific application of the kind that's being requested.

Maybe I'll revisit that issue sometime in the future,
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maybe not, but given what I've already done here and the settlement I've already approved, I'm fine with it as it is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?
MR. DURRER: Your Honor, Van Durrer for the debtors. At the risk of taking another moment of everybody's time, I wanted to underscore something and express our gratitude, not only on behalf the debtors but also on behalf of myself and my firm.

We live in a very different world than on Valentine's Day, when we started this Chapter 11 case, give or take twentyfour hours. And everyone has been extraordinary in terms of their professionalism, their responsiveness, their collaborativeness (sic), and I really wanted to thank everybody, their advisors in particular, for the way that they've comported themselves throughout this process.

At the risk of offending some people, I did want to specifically call out a handful of names that really went above and beyond with respect to chambers. Of course, Lorraine Evevarria and Ron Howard have been terrific. Judge Carey, that's our mediator, was very helpful throughout the process and never gave up on us; I appreciate that. Ben Higgins for the U.S. Trustee's office has been terrific and a great professional, and we appreciate his conduct.

And then, selfishly, I did want to mention a couple of people -- notwithstanding that we all live in four different cities -- my team has really impressed me with their ability to work as a team under really trying circumstances. That includes Jennifer Madden, Ben Strucklick (phonetic), Destiny Almogue, Moshe Jacob, and Jackie Dakin as well as our great paralegals, Andrea Bates (phonetic), Chris Heaney (phonetic), and Wanda Romano (phonetic).

So again, with apologies for indulging in a few moments, $I$ did want to thank everybody for that. It's a really strange world, but you all made it as normal as it could conceivably be. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay. Is there anything else that anybody wishes to add?

All right. If you'll, Mr. Ortiz, finish making those modifications on the confirmation order and submit it in Word format, we'll take a look at it and let you know if we have any additional comments. But otherwise, I'm sure we will confirm the plan.

MR. ORTIZ: Certainly, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you all very
much. We are adjourned.
(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded)
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