Case 21-10670-KBO Doc 961 Filed 07/21/22 Page 1 of 9 | Docket #0961 Date Filed: 7/21/2022

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE			
IN RE:	. Chapter 11		
TECT AEROSPACE GROUP HOLI	. Case No. 21-10670 (KBO)		
INC., et al.,	. (Jointly Administered)		
	. Courtroom No. 3 . 824 North Market Street		
	. Wilmington, Delaware 19801		
Debtors			
mp an	ICCDIDE OF HEADING		
TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE KAREN B. OWENS			
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE			
<u>APPEARANCES</u> :			
For Boeing:	Alan Smith, Esquire PERKINS COIE		
	1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900		
	Seattle, Washington 98101		
For Stony Point:	William Price, Esquire QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017		
Audio Operator:	Lisa Brown		
Transcription Company:	Reliable		
	1007 N. Orange Street Wilmington, Delaware 19801		
	(302)654-8080 Email: gmatthews@reliable-co.com		
Proceedings recorded by a	electronic sound recording, transcript		
produced by transcription	_		
	IN RE: TECT AEROSPACE GROUP HOLI INC., et al., Debtors. TRAN BEFORE THE UNITED S APPEARANCES: For Boeing: For Stony Point: Audio Operator: Transcription Company:		

25



Case 21-10670-KBO Doc 961 Filed 07/21/22 Page 2 of 9

1		INDEX	
2	MOTION GOING FORWARD AS A STATUS CONFERENCE:		
3	Agenda		
4	Item 3:	The Boeing Company and Central Kansas Aerospace Manufacturing, LLC's Motion	3
5		to: (I) Enforce the Order Approving the Sale of the Debtors' Kansas Assets Free and Clear of Liens, Claims, Interests and	
6		Encumbrances, and the Asset Purchase Agreement Dated July 12, 2021; and (II)	
7		Grant Related Relief [D.I. 947 - filed June 24, 2022]	
9		Court's Ruling:	3, 5
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18 19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	1		

(Proceedings commenced at 2:03 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Judge Owens. We're gathered for a hearing in the TECT Aerospace case.

We have one matter, I believe, scheduled to go forward. So I will turn the podium over to Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

This is our motion. We did receive the court's communication from the clerk that this would not be an evidentiary hearing and instead would be primarily a status and scheduling hearing. We appreciate that and are not about to try to talk the court out of that.

We do thank Your Honor that the motion is ripe for decision today on the basis of undisputed facts and we don't need any more evidence. I don't want to get ahead of the court, but if the court's willing to address that I would like to do that first; otherwise, I think this will be a very brief scheduling conference.

THE COURT: Well maybe I should just elaborate what I'm thinking after reading the papers because we could be going down the long path that's not necessary.

I read all the papers and I don't think that this can go forward as a motion to enforce the sale order. I think this needs to be an adversary proceeding. I think the nature of the relief that's being sought here is more akin to

a declaratory judgment.

So I wasn't prepared to hear this motion and that is what I wanted to talk to you all about today. That is why I sent the email saying we don't need evidence because, quite frankly, I don't think this is a matter that is ripe and properly teed up.

So I am sorry that I'm taking the wind out of your sails, Mr. Smith, and I'm just jumping right to the merits here, but we had this discussion earlier in the case when Mr. Price filed something and I said its more akin to -- it needs to be filed as a complaint and I have to hold your feet to the same standard and I do think after reading this that this is more appropriate for a complaint.

So I don't think we need to move forward on it.

I'm not sure if there would be any threshold legal issues or anything that would really -- that I could resolve by motion practice at this point.

MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I do think that, in fact, our motion is different from Mr. Price's earlier motion in the sense that this really is interpreting your order and there's a fair amount of precedent, I think, in the Delaware courts that support this as a motion proceeding.

Having said that, Your Honor, honestly I don't think that its, you know, the process. While we do think what we selected was the correct root I don't want to spend a

lot of time on procedure and process. I do think we ought to get to the merits and if it's the court's determination that that's best done through an adversary proceeding well then, obviously, you know, we will do that and move forward.

Whatever the vehicle, though, I do think we are in a posture, Your Honor, of having a pretty clear, I think -- again, I know you don't want to get into the facts, but there really is only one set of facts because the Stony Point folks didn't provide any evidence that these are all issues that could and should have been raised a long time ago, that they are barred by the order, by latches and by the fact that they, in fact, ultimately consented to the sale order.

We understand the court's procedural ruling and will, of course, follow whatever root you feel is appropriate, but we do think that under these circumstances it doesn't matter where we are. We've got a pretty clean, and clear, and, frankly, undisputed factual record that would justify a grant of the motion today. Again, it is interpreting, in part, your order. That is the ground on which we think the ruling would be appropriate today.

THE COURT: Okay. Well I disagree, quite frankly, as I read on the papers. I don't want to make Mr. Price's arguments for him, but to me I didn't authorize you selling other people's property. Now you may have arguments as to why you think that's appropriate, but I will tell you that if

there is a dispute before me I would have ordered adequate protection until we resolve the issue of whose property it was.

So to me I feel as if the fundamental threshold question, unless I am misunderstanding the pleadings and in an adversary proceeding I allow the parties to argue otherwise, but to me the real question is whose property was this as an initial point and then, of course, you're going to have all your other arguments, but that jumped out at me as a key question because were not in the business here of allowing debtors to sell other people's property. Mr. Price's client has argued that it was their property.

So, yes, there is an interpretation point, I guess, of the APA, but when I looked at the APA and I read it, and I know what my understanding was as of the sale hearing which was I was authorizing the debtors to sell their rights and interest in property, not Stony Point's property.

So, listen, all rights are reserved, but I see that really as the fundamental issue and you have defenses, of course. You have raised defenses, you have raised other issues, and we will deal with them; a court will deal with them. I'm sure that Mr. Price might move to transfer venue, who knows. I don't know, but I think it has to be filed as a complaint.

Mr. Price, I don't want to cut you off. I'm

putting words in your mouth. So I'm happy to hear from both of you.

MR. PRICE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. William Price on behalf of the Stony Point entities related to this matter.

Your Honor, we agree with your procedural interpretation. Either party could file an action here. And there is items that teh federal rules of bankruptcy procedure contemplate adversary proceedings when there needs to be a more robust process and for determining ownership here I think the full rights of discovery would be helpful for both parties to get to the bottom line of whose assets were these and whether or not the order was implicated or not.

We may file an action, they may file an action and the issue will be addressed. We're hopeful to resolve it before litigation gets to that extent, but if we can't resolve it then that is what we can do.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I appreciate what you just said. I appreciate what Mr. Price just said. Obviously, we will govern ourselves that way.

I do feel compelled, Your Honor, to point out that the heart of what we are suggesting is ripe for decision today is, in fact, foreshadowed by something you said which is if somebody had raised this and there was something before

me at the time of the sale hearing we would have had a discussion at that time about adequate protection and probably lots of other things. The point is nobody raised it including Stony Point. That is why we do think it's appropriate for decision.

Look, I hear the Judge's ruling. I get it. We will go forward, but I can't ignore that, I think, basic point that lies behind this whole dispute today.

If I say I'm going to say my house and someone left something there at my house, you know, do they have to come in and actually object when it's clearly their property. I don't know. I mean it raises very interesting issues. They can be briefed at the appropriate time and we will discuss them about whether Mr. Price's client needed to actually come in when it was their position that you were only seeking authorization to sell your or the debtors were only seeking authorization to sell their items.

So, you know, I don't know the answers to these interesting questions, but I do know I think that it should be done through an adversary proceeding.

MR. SMITH: Well we will go forward on that basis, Your Honor. We understand.

THE COURT: Okay. Good. All right. Then I will leave you to it.

I will ask, should we discuss anything else before 1 2 we part ways today? MR. PRICE: Nothing, Your Honor. 3 4 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I assume it just means somebody 5 will file an adversary proceeding here and we will follow the rules of bankruptcy procedure. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Good. Well, listen, it was very nice to see you all even though it was a short period of 8 9 time. I hope everyone and their families are well, and 10 continue to be well, and I look forward to seeing you either 11 in person or by zoom in the future. We will consider ourselves adjourned for today. 12 Thank you all very much. Take care. 13 (Proceedings concluded at 2:13 p.m.) 14 15 16 CERTIFICATION 17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct 18 transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my 19 20 knowledge and ability. 21 22 /s/ Mary Zajaczkowski July 20, 2022 23 Mary Zajaczkowski, CET-531 24 Certified Court Transcriptionist 25 For Reliable