

# Case 2:18-bk-20151-ER Doc 1311 Filed 01/21/19 Entered 01/21/19 20:24:01 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 4

Verity Health System Of California, Inc. and the above-referenced affiliated debtors (collectively, the "Debtors"), the debtors and debtors in possession in the above-captioned chapter 11 bankruptcy cases (collectively, the "Cases"), hereby file this reply (the "Reply") in support of *Second Stipulation to Adjourn Hearing on Motion for Amendment Findings in Final Order (I) Authorizing Postpetition Financing* [...] (the "Second Stipulation") by and between the Debtors and Swinerton Builders ("Swinerton") [Dkt. No. 1280] and reply specifically to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Objection to Second Stipulation to Adjourn Hearing on Motion for Amendment Findings in Final Order (I) Authorizing Postpetition Financing [...] [Dkt. No. 1306]. The Debtors respectfully state the following:

### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

The Second Stipulation seeks to accommodate the desires of Swinerton's Seattle based counsel that appeared at the hearing on October 5, 2018, and argued the limited objection filed by Swinerton [Dkt. No. 269] to the Debtors' request for entry of a final order approving its debtor in possession financing agreement with Ally Bank N.A. The Debtors' request was granted per the Court's *Final Order (I) Authorizing Postpetition Financing*, (ii) Authorizing Use of Cash Collateral, (III) Granting Liens and Providing Superpriority Administrative Expense Status, (IV) Granting Adequate Protection, (v) Modifying Automatic Stay, and (VI) Granting Related Relief (the "Final Order") [Dkt. No. 409]. Thereafter, the Debtors and Swinerton accommodated both the scheduling issues generated by the Court's calendar and hearing date change from December 3 to December 5 and the distinct possibility that an asset sale or other disposition of Seton Medical Center might obviate some or all of the concerns of Swinerton by entry into the first Stipulation [Dkt. No. 968]. This Court approved the first Stipulation on December 4, 2018, by Order Approving Stipulation to Continue Hearing [Dkt. No. 974]. The Second Stipulation, filed on January 17, 2018 [Dkt. No. 1280], anticipated the possibility that the

## Case 2:18-bk-20151-ER Doc 1311 Filed 01/21/19 Entered 01/21/19 20:24:01 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 4

Debtors would file a stalking horse bid involving Seton Medical Center, the property against which Swinerton asserted a prepetition mechanic's lien.

### II ARGUMENT

The dispute between Swinerton and the Debtors' is not manufactured. Through its Rule 7052 Motion [Dkt. No. 564], Swinerton sought specific relief akin to that negotiated with certain the Prepetition Secured Creditors (as defined in the Final Order), relief which the Debtors' opposed. [Dkt. No. 732]. However, it is also always been clear to the Debtors that a non-judicial resolution of the dispute could be achieved with an appropriate disposition of Seton Medical Center. The Debtors also realized that such a practical resolution might take time. As this Court and the Creditors Committee are well aware, the Debtors had hoped that the hospitals not subject to the sale to Santa Clara County would be the subject of a bidding procedures motion as early as December, 2018.

Unfortunately, the Debtors were unable to file a bidding procedures motion affecting Seton until the evening of January 17, 2018. However, the logic for an additional delay for the parties to Swinerton Dispute remains intact. The bidding procedures motion ("Second Bid Procedures Motion") [Dkt. No. 1279] and the accompanying stalking horse asset purchase agreement with Strategic Global Management ("SGM Agreement"), establish the possibility of a \$610 million sale of the remaining four hospitals, including Seton. While the SGM Agreement is entirely supportive of the Debtors' assertions, and Court's findings' of value made at the hearing on Final Order, additional effort will need to be undertaken by the parties to achieve the possibility of a consensual resolution.

Consensual resolutions are obviously preferable to litigated resolutions. The Debtors' efforts to accommodate Swinerton and to avoid unnecessary appearances and argument generally should be lauded not criticized. That a delay in the Court's judicial resolution of the Swinerton motion may delay the Creditors Committee's prosecution of its appeal from the Final Order does not prejudice the Debtors' Estates. Indeed, any delay in the Creditors Committee's prosecution of its appeal from the

### Case 2:18-bk-20151-ER Doc 1311 Filed 01/21/19 Entered 01/21/19 20:24:01 Desc Main Document Page 4 of 4

Final Order arising from the impact of the Swinerton Motion saves the estates related administrative expenses arising from counsel for the (i) Debtors, (ii) the Prepetition Secured Creditors whose position under the Final Order is being challenged and for which the Debtors' estates will have to pay through adequate protection, and (iii) the Creditors Committee in the likely event there is value for unsecured creditors at each of the estates.

#### III CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, the Debtors request this court (a) overrule the *Objection of the Official Creditors Committee to the Second Stipulation to Continue Hearing on Motion for Amendment of Findings In Final Order (I) Authorizing Postpetition Findings* [...] [Dkt. No. 1306], (b) approve the *Second Stipulation to Continue Hearing on Motion for Amendment of Findings In Final Order (I) Authorizing Postpetition Findings* [...] [Dkt. No. 1380], (c) fix a date for the adjourned hearing to February 20, 2019 or such other date as the Court's calendar will permit and (d) grant such other relief as the Court may deem necessary or appropriate.

Dated: January 21, 2019 DENTONS US LLP

By: /s/ Claude D. Montgomery

Samuel R. Maizel Tania M. Moyron

Claude D. Montgomery (Admitted pro hac vice)

Attorneys for Chapter 11 Debtors and Debtors in Possession