Case 7:20-cv-04276-VB Document 56 Filed 09/18/20 Page 1 of 2 Docket #0056 Date Filed: 9/18/2020

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

AND AFFILIATED PARTNERSHIPS

Stephen E. Hessler, P.C. To Call Writer Directly: +1 212 390 4800 shessler@kirkland.com 601 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022 United States

+1 212 446 4800

Facsimile: +1 212 446 4900

www.kirkland.com

September 18, 2020

By Electronic Filing

The Hon. Vincent L. Briccetti U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York United States Courthouse 300 Quarropas St., Room 360 White Plains, NY 10601

Re: U.S. Bank National Association v. Windstream Holdings, Inc., et al., No. 20-cv-04276 (VB), and consolidated cases

Dear Judge Briccetti:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 8014(f), Appellees Windstream Holdings, Inc. and its debtor subsidiaries ("Debtors") respectfully submit this letter to inform the Court that the bankruptcy court has now denied the "request" by Appellant U.S. Bank, National Association ("U.S. Bank") for a stay pending appeal. Attached are the transcript of the bankruptcy court's oral ruling on September 16, Bankr.Dkt.2520 (Attachment 1) ("Tr."), and its subsequent written order on September 17, Bankr.Dkt.2519 (Attachment 2).

Appellants' motion in this Court for a stay pending appeal (Dkt.44, No.20-cv-4276) should be denied for the same reasons that the bankruptcy court gave below. As the bankruptcy court recognized, U.S. Bank's "request" for a stay below was "a sham and a procedural gambit" that "was not properly made as a motion," did not comply with Rule 8007, and appears to have been filed "either for some tactical reason" or "simply to increase the fees and costs of this case." Tr.21:14-19, 26:5-10, 28:4-7; see also Tr.19:12-20:11; Tr.21:13-22:1 (noting that a stay "should have been sought before [the bankruptcy court] well before [Appellants] sought it in front of [this Court]"); Tr.24:9-11 (noting that "there's been plenty of time to seek a stay"). Setting aside those procedural defects, the court correctly concluded that the request also failed on the merits, because U.S. Bank cannot satisfy any of the four stay factors. Tr.20:12-21:7, Tr.22:2-28:11. First, U.S. Bank conceded that it would not suffer irreparable harm, which "in and of itself, should defeat the motion." Tr.23:18-24:2. Second, there was "no discussion of potential harm to other parties," even though staying the plan on the cusp of consummation "would have substantial potential harm to the Debtor[s] and other parties in interest" by extending the Debtors' bankruptcy, and U.S. Bank

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

September 18, 2020 Page 2

proposed no bond for that injury. Tr.24:3-26:3. Third, U.S. Bank failed to address the "strong public interest" in allowing the Debtors to consummate the plan and emerge from bankruptcy. Tr.26:12-15. Fourth, U.S. Bank showed no likelihood of success on appeal, because the challenged rulings "were correct." Tr.26:16-28:1. This Court should deny Appellants' stay motion for the same reasons.

Respectfully submitted,

C. HARKER RHODES IV KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004 (202) 389-5000 harker.rhodes@kirkland.com s/Stephen E. Hessler
STEPHEN E. HESSLER, P.C.
Counsel of Record
MARC KIESELSTEIN, P.C.
EVELYN BLACKLOCK
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 446-4800
shessler@kirkland.com

JAMES H.M. SPRAYREGEN, P.C. ROSS M. KWASTENIET, P.C. (pro hac vice) KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 300 North LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60654 (312) 862-2000

Counsel for the Debtors

All counsel of record (by CM/ECF)

cc:

ATTACHMENT 1

	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 19-22312-rdd
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	WINDSTREAM HOLDINGS, INC.,
8	
9	Debtor.
10	x
11	
12	United States Bankruptcy Court
13	300 Quarropas Street, Room 248
14	White Plains, NY 10601
15	
16	September 16, 2020
17	10:07 AM
18	
19	
20	
21	BEFORE:
22	HON ROBERT D. DRAIN
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	ECRO: JUSTIN WALKER

	Page 2
1	HEARING re Notice of Agenda/ Agenda for September 16, 2020
2	Telephonic Hearing
3	
4	HEARING re Debtors Motion Establishing Procedures in
5	Furtherance of Plan Distributions (related document(s)2469)
6	
7	HEARING re Response of U.S. Bank National Association, as
8	Indenture Trustee, to the Debtors' Motion Establishing
9	Procedures in Furtherance of Plan Distributions and Request
LO	for Stay Pending Appeals (related document(s)2469) filed by
L1	J. Christopher Shore on behalf of US Bank National
L2	Association (ECF 2482)
L3	
L 4	
L5	
L 6	
L 7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	MORRISON FOERSTER LLP
4	Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured
5	Creditors
6	250 West 55th Street
7	New York, NY 10019
8	
9	BY: STEVEN RAPPOPORT (TELEPHONICALLY)
10	
11	WHITE & CASE LLP
12	Attorneys for U.S. Bank
13	1221 Avenue of the Americas
14	New York, NY 10020
15	
16	BY: CHRISTOPHER SHORE (TELEPHONICALLY)
17	
18	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
19	Attorneys for the Debtor
20	300 North LaSalle
21	Chicago, IL 60654
22	
23	BY: BRAD WEILAND (TELEPHONICALLY)
24	
25	

		Page 4
1	DAVI	S POLK & WARDWELL LLP
2		Attorneys for JP Morgan
3		450 Lexington Avenue
4		New York, NY 10017
5		
6	BY:	BRIAN RESNICK (TELEPHONICALLY)
7		
8	KILP.	ATRICK TOWNSEND
9		Attorneys for Ankura Trust Company, LLC
10		1100 Peachtree Street
11		Atlanta, GA 30309
12		
13	BY:	TODD MEYERS (TELEPHONICALLY)
14		
15	ROPE	S & GRAY LLP
16		Attorneys for Elliot Investment Management L.P.
17		1211 Avenue of the Americas
18		New York, NY 10036
19		
20	BY:	KEITH WOFFORD (TELEPHONICALLY)
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
Page 5
    SULLIVAN LAW
1
2
          Attorneys for iQor
3
          1633 Broadway
4
          New York, NY 10019
5
6
    BY:
         JEFFREY GLEIT (TELEPHONICALLY)
7
8
    ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:
9
10
    JULIA WINTERS
11
    EVELYN FANNERON
12
    BRIAN HOCKETT
13
    CHARLES KOSTER
14
   FRANCIS PETRIE
15
   DARRELL CLARK
16
    TRACEY OHM
17
    SHAYA ROCHESTER
18
    GRACE THOMPSON
19
    ESTHER CHUNG
20
    ROSA EVERGREEN
21
    PHILIP BRENDEL
22
    JOANNA MCDONALD
23
    MATTHEW MASARO
24
    NOVA ALINDOGAN
25
    PAUL GUNTHER
```

	Page 6
1	WILLIAM HOLSTE
2	CHELSEY ROSENBLOOM
3	STEPHANIE WICKOUSKI
4	CELINE BUEHL
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 7 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good morning, this is Judge Drain. We're here in In re: Windstream Holdings Inc. on the 3 Debtor's motion for an order establishing procedures in 4 5 furtherance of plan distributions to Class 4, the so-called 6 Midwest Notes class. This is a wholly telephonic hearing. 7 I'll ask you to identify yourself and your client the first 8 time you speak. It's probably a good idea to do so if you 9 speak later, just in case the court reporter can't put 10 together your voice with your name. 11 There's one authorized recording of this hearing. 12 It's taken by Court Solutions. If you want a transcript you can order it from the clerk's office or for it to be 13 14 prepared from the clerk's office. Court Solutions provides 15 a copy on a daily basis to our clerk's office. 16 So, with that introduction, why don't we proceed 17 to the motion? Thank you, Your Honor. 18 MR. WEILAND: 19 morning. How are you? 20 THE COURT: Fine, thanks. 21 MR. WEILAND: This is, for the record, Brad 22 Weiland of Kirkland & Ellis, LLP, here for the Windstream 23 Debtors. Appreciate the time this morning, Your Honor. Your Honor, just a little bit of background before getting 24 25 to the motion. The motion is really an outgrowth of the

efforts the Debtors have taken since confirmation in June to prepare for emergence from Chapter 11. Since confirmation, one of the things the Debtors have done is go out and obtain committed financing consistent with the parameters for the exit facility contemplated by the plan and approved by Your Honor in connection with confirmation.

Under the plan, the Midwest noteholders, Your

Honor, are to receive -- were to receive takeback debt in an equal -- in an amount equal to the current principal of their notes. And that takeback debt would be one piece of the greater exit facility.

What has happened as we've syndicated the exit facility is we're looking at two different types of debt and they're sort of two different animals. On the note side, for the Midwest notes, you have publicly traded notes, and we don't have today -- we've taken steps to try to develop, but we don't have today perfect visibility into the holders of those notes.

And on the other side -- and before moving on,

Your Honor -- and those holders could be anyone. They're

publicly traded notes. There's no obligation of the holder

to disclose who they are the way there would be with a bank

loan facility where there would be a lender list and an

agent that tracks that sort of thing.

On the other hand, you have the new exit facility,

which is -- there is a notes component of some of the exit debt but what we're talking about today is a bank facility, as spelled out in the plan. And under that facility that has been negotiated over the last few months, there are requirements for an entity to be a lender under that -- under that debt. And for an entity to satisfy those requirements they have to step forward, they have to provide "know your customer" information to the agent, and they have to meet certain requirements, most notably being a financial institution and not an individual person or an actual person.

And so what we developed and what led to the filing of the motion with the Midwest Notes Indenture

Trustee and with our exit facility agent, for procedures to go out and try to identify the holders of the Midwest Notes, we know a substantial majority of them today because they were part of a group that participated in the bankruptcy, but there remain, approximately, 20 percent of the holders that have not participated and haven't come forward. So, we want to send notices out to them. In fact, some notices have already gone out requesting some information and requesting that they make themselves known.

We also want to be able to deal with holders that may come forward. We don't know if there are any. We think that if there are, it's probably a small minority of the

Midwest Noteholders, but we want to be able to deal with holders that come forward and are not able to satisfy the lender requirements under the new exit facility while still getting them the recovery that they're entitled to under the plan.

And with that in mind, these procedures were developed to say, look, if a holder does come forward and is an individual person or otherwise doesn't satisfy the lender requirements, we will give them their recovery, which is 100 cent per recovery under the plan, but we can't give them debt because that's not permitted under the exit facility so we'll, in effect, prepay the debt that they would otherwise receive and we'll just -- we'll give them cash. And we think that's fair, we think that's consistent with the spirit of the plan, although certainly an additional gloss on giving them the debt in the first place. But that was -- that was the driving force behind these procedures.

The other thing that the procedures do which is permitted by the plan, they set a deadline for parties to come forward. And the plan talks about it in general terms. If someone can't be located to receive their distribution or if they never provide information or don't make themselves known, that distribution could go away. Here, all we've tried to do is sort of set that concrete date, which is one year from confirmation, for people to come forward. And

should they not come forward, then their loans that would've otherwise been allocated to them under the exit would just revert to the Debtor and be canceled. We think that's appropriate, given the additional notice that we're putting out now and will put out after these procedures are approved. But we think just from a practical and realistic standpoint, if someone does not come forward within a year to even make themselves known, then the Debtor should not be able to -- or should not be required to hold their distribution for a longer period of time than that and should be allowed to sort of cancel that out.

That, Your Honor, is in a long-story-short sort of version what this motion does or was intended to do and why we filed it. We are approaching the date where we think we'll be able to go effective under the plan. We've been working diligently, as has the company, as have a number of other parties who are supportive of the plan and working toward a closing with us to satisfy all the conditions to emergence. That includes, as Your Honor is aware, regulatory approval, given that we are a telecommunications company, we have state regulators in all states and have been proceeding through a regulatory approval process that we think is close to getting to a successful conclusion. And all of that is coming to a head and, hopefully, leading to the company being able to emerge very shortly.

So, we filed this motion in advance of emergence to try to set procedures that would govern this one wrinkle that developed post-confirmation. We think those procedures are completely appropriate and ought to be approved, Your Honor, but that's not really why we're here today, or it's not the only reason we're here today.

We're also here today to deal with the objection that was filed by U.S. Bank which we think is entirely inappropriate. I think this motion, which is, we think, completely appropriate, completely innocuous and should be approved, has been used by U.S. Bank to get in front of Your Honor to, one, mischaracterize what we're trying to do in the motion. Because whether through misunderstanding or mischaracterization, the objection says this motion is trying to do something inconsistent with the plan and make payments in advance of emergence, which is absolutely not what these procedures are trying to do. They're putting parameters around distributions that will be made under the plan on and after the effective date.

But then the objection goes further, Your Honor, and says that, in fact, because of the pending appeal, Your Honor should stay the confirmation order now, two-and-a-half months after confirmation, to let the appeals run their course. The motion, such as it is, was sort of shoehorned into the objection. We don't think that's appropriate and

we think gives Your Honor grounds to deny the motion without even reaching the merits. But on the merits, Your Honor, they don't satisfy what they would need to to obtain a stay.

Setting aside the fact that, you know, this is inappropriately late, in our view, they don't allege irreparable harm to U.S. Bank or its constituents, they don't credibly allege that there would be no harm to the Debtors -- there would, in fact, be significant harm. We've been working toward emergence for months now. We're on the cusp, we think, of emerging very shortly and we're spending over a million dollars a day between professional fees and fees under certain of the prepetition and post-emergence debt to get to that emergence. And that's ignored by U.S. Bank in its objection.

And -- but they don't even really try to allege grounds for a stay. They have not volunteered to post any sort of a bond. And we think, Your Honor, if you're going to consider that stay request as a properly filed motion on the merits -- again, we don't think it really is -- but we think it ought to be denied outright as completely inappropriate here.

So, with that, Your Honor, I'm happy to answer questions but I'll stop my rambling and answer your questions or cede the podium to Ms. Winters or Mr. Shore.

THE COURT: Okay. I do have some questions on the

motion itself and comments on the proposed form of order. But as you noted, the response, which is how it was couched by U.S. Bank, has kind of turned this hearing into a schizophrenic hearing in that the focus really isn't on the motion but on something else. So, maybe we should see where that response is at this point, now that the Debtors have clarified without any possibility of doubt that they're not looking to prepay before the effective date any portion of the new Midwest facility notes, to see whether any portion of that response is still going forward. And then we can deal with that and then I'll come back to my questions on what the motion was really about.

So, that's a longwinded way of saying I guess I should hear from counsel for U.S. Bank.

MR. SHORE: Good morning, Your Honor. Chris Shore from White & Case on behalf of U.S. Bank. Let me give you a brief update and then I'll answer the question you put to me. The underlying appeal was fully briefed as of last week. The reply's in. We're just awaiting scheduling of argument or ruling by Judge Briccetti. He hasn't called for argument yet.

We did, after we filed this motion, file a stay request in the District Court as soon as we got the Debtor's opposition on the appeal where they were saying they were going to exit in mid-September and that would preclude any

relief. Our stay motion is now fully briefed as well. No word from the District Court as to whether he's going to hold argument or just rule on the papers. The last motion the Court handled without argument and an opinion issued a few days after the briefing closed. We have advised Judge Briccetti in that pleading of the pendency of our request to stay in this court and we'll update him as the rule requires as to what happens today.

Our original pleading was focused on the motion.

Our concern, as I think both Mr. Weiland and Your Honor noted, was that there was no temporal limitation on their ability to pay prior to the revision date and we were concerned about a scrambling of the eggs prior to the confirmation order. The Debtors did clarify that they weren't, but we did have an intervening event that I've tried to resolve and haven't been able to resolve with the Debtors.

In their opposition to the stay papers in front of Judge Briccetti, they have argued that he should not grant a stay until this court has considered the issue. I think they're misreading Rule 8007(a). In my experience, once a notice of appeal is filed in almost every case the District Court handles any stay requests. So, we tried to work this out with the Debtors and just said, look, don't -- if we withdraw the request and we can cancel the hearing, we just

don't want you to argue a foot fault saying that we should've had Judge Drain decide it. The Debtors refused and that's why we have the request still pending.

The Debtors -- I think that leaves three options. The Debtors have argued that the stay request is improperly noticed per the case management order. But in my experience, stay requests are often oral, but in any event, the pleading was filed and served. The Debtors noticed it for the hearing and put it on the agenda, so all interested parties have notice of our stay request. But the Court could require us to send it out on formal notice, effectively leaving it for Judge Briccetti to decide his motion in the next few days, which we would update Your Honor on.

Two, the Court could, as it did with the recent motion involving UM Bank and CQS, find that any notice defects were cured and go on to the merits. And one options is, of course, the Court to deny the motion. We'll let Judge Briccetti know, again, leaving it for him to decide.

And then, third, the Court could grant a stay for now and then let Judge Briccetti decide how long he needs to adjudicate the appeal. Again, the only thing we're trying to solve for is making the District Court's docket not what decides whether or not the appeal is or is not moot.

Honestly, I've never seen a Bankruptcy Court stay its own

order unless there's a discrete constitutional or key code issue that we certify up to the circuit. That's not what's happening here.

I will say this case is extraordinary at this stage. We're just awaiting Judge Briccetti's action, either scheduling argument or deciding. It seems odd, as I said, to let this appeal be decided before Judge Briccetti can make time on his docket. If that's what ends up happening, that's what ends up happening, but it doesn't seem like it's in the public interest to make the court's document what decides whether or not an appeal will be heard.

Two, the Debtors --

THE COURT: Well, didn't you move -- didn't you move for an expedited appeal? I mean, that issue's already been decided, right?

MR. SHORE: We did. And the judge has -- he has set the briefing schedule, which we all complied with. He did not, as part of that scheduling, set it for argument, reserving the right to determine whether argument was necessary. So, we're in a period that's not covered by the scheduling order.

He did rule, in connection with that, that there was no irreparable harm shown to expedite further than that because the risk of equitable mootness was not irreparable harm. But the Debtors here, unlike any Debtor I've ever

seen, have already moved to dismiss the appeal as equitably moot in their opposition papers, arguing before the effective date, that once they consummate, there can be no review. They did that after we filed our request in this court.

So, I think what the Debtors are doing now is saying -- going on the record that there will be no Article 3 review of the -- of the confirmation order unless it is heard and determined before they consummate, because once they consummate, there will be no relief that the Court can grant.

And then, third -- I'd like to work this out with an understanding as to when the Debtors are going to be going effective. Over time we've heard -- you know, they were saying mid-August earlier. Earlier in the case, they said the end of Q3. It's unclear when they would exit and whether a stay, if granted, will actually stop anything.

You know, I think they -- you know, some more clarity on that issue before this court and before Judge Briccetti as to what's holding up the plan effective date would be useful for determining the stay request here or the stay request there.

So, unless Your Honor has any questions, that's all I have.

THE COURT: When did you move for a stay pending

Page 19 1 appeal before Judge Briccetti? 2 MR. SHORE: Two days after they filed their opposition brief in which they said that the appeal will be 3 4 equitably moot as soon as we consummate because the Court 5 can't grant any relief. 6 THE COURT: So, what day was that? 7 MR. SHORE: But then our view --8 THE COURT: What day was that? I'm just looking 9 at the date of the response, which was September 1. 10 MR. SHORE: September 4th. We got their brief, I 11 think, on the 2nd. 12 THE COURT: Okay. I'm curious as to what you --13 how you complied with 8007(b) to (a), which says that as 14 part of an appeal -- I'm sorry, a request for a stay for the 15 District Court, contrary to what the rule says in 8007, 16 (a)(1), which is, quote: "Ordinarily, a party must move 17 first in the Bankruptcy Court for a stay." But that (b) says 18 that a motion for such relief may be made in the court where 19 the appeal is pending, and then says that the motion must, A 20 -- 2A, show that moving first in the Bankruptcy Court would 21 be impractical. But I guess that's really a question for 22 Judge Briccetti ultimately to ask you. 23 MR. SHORE: We did -- I'm sorry. 24 THE COURT: But I guess that may be one reason why 25 the Debtors aren't prepared to negotiate with you about some

disposition of this request.

Page 20

sort of agreement about the process for seeking the stay.

MR. SHORE: We did advise Judge Briccetti, as the rule requires, of a pending request in front of this Court when we filed that motion and, as I said, we'll update him, as the rule requires, with respect to the Court's

THE COURT: Okay. So, I guess there was nothing about it being impractical to seek relief first in the Bankruptcy Court?

MR. SHORE: No, we did the other -- the or, which is advise the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, I do have the Debtor's reply to your request. The request really lays out, as set forth in the request itself, a statement that U.S. Bank will not suffer irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and doesn't discuss harm to the Debtor or other parties in interest other than the speculation that Judge Briccetti may rule promptly on the appeal -- does not address the factor of substantial possibility of success on appeal, and does not address the public interest.

And, finally, does not make any offer with respect to posting a bond. And given that it was not filed as a motion, there's no attempt to develop a record as to whether a bond would appropriately offset the harm to other parties. So, given the factors that one needs to consider when

considering whether a movant for relief -- for a stay

pending appeal has carried what has been characterized as a

request for extraordinary relief or an extraordinary burden

-- it seems to me a pretty question to answer, which is that

the request should be denied. Right? I mean, there's no

attempt to establish any record here or even argue a record

for an appeal to be stayed.

MR. SHORE: Understood, Your Honor. We'll report to Judge Briccetti.

THE COURT: Well, let me give you a full ruling while we're at it then, so you can report that.

MR. SHORE: Okay.

THE COURT: Since this whole thing seems to have been a sham and a procedural gambit, having realized that the relief should have been sought before me well before you sought it in front of him, and the fact that it is pending in front of him.

It comes in the context of a, quote, "response" -not even an objection to a motion. And the ostensible
reason for seeking the stay in this context and the
objection is that somehow the motion itself alters the
aspects of the confirmation order there on appeal before
Judge Briccetti. Briefing on the appeal is nevertheless
proceeded in front of Judge Briccetti, notwithstanding the,
quote, "request for a stay pending appeal" under Rule 8007,

1 which ordinarily would be brought before the Court.

The decision as to whether or not to grant a stay in an order pending appeal lies within the sound discretion of the Court. See In re: Sabine Oil & Gas Corp., 548 B.R. 675, 681 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016). It's been well-recognized and particularly in the context of an appeal of a confirmation order that the movant for a stay pending appeal bears a heavy burden to obtain such a stay. See, for example, In re: General Motors Corp., 409 B.R. 24, 30 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2009).

The Court must consider four factors in exercising its discretion. One, whether the movants will suffer irreparable injury absent a stay. Two, whether a party will suffer substantial injury if a stay is issued. Three, whether the movant has demonstrated a substantial possibility, although less than a likelihood, of success on appeal. And, four, the public interest that may be affected. Again, see, In re: Sabine Oil & Gas Corp., 548 B.R. 581, quoting ACC Bondholder Group v. Adelphia Communications Corp., In re: Adelphia Communications Corp., 361 B.R. 337, 346 (S.D.N.Y. 2007). Appeal dismissed. Stay denied. Stay vacated. Writ of mandamus denied. 2007, U.S. App. 30722, 2d Cir., February 9, 2007.

As Judge Chapman notes in the Sabine opinion, Circuit Courts in this circuit have held if the inquiry

involves a balancing of the four factors and, quote, "the lack of any one factor is not dispositive to the success of the motion." While others have held that to be successful the party must show, quote, "Satisfactory evidence on all four criteria," neither she nor Judge Gerber in the General Motors case found that they needed to decide how to come out on that issue, although Judge Gerber noted that the trend is to permit balancing.

Judge Chapman notes in Sabine, as was again also noted in the General Motors case as well as numerous other cases including Triple Net Investments IX, LP v. DJK Residential, In re: DJK Residential, LLC (2008, W.L., 650389) at page 2, (S.D.N.Y., March 7, 2008) -- that "Where the movant seeks imposition of a stay without a bond, the applicant has the burden of demonstrating why the court should deviate from the ordinary full security requirements."

Here, in analyzing the four-factor test, I will note, as numerous have held, including the Sabine case at page 681, that a showing of probable irreparable harm is the principal prerequisite for the issuance of a stay, pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 8007. And such harm must be neither remote or speculative but actual and imminent. See also In re: Adelphia Communications Corp., 261 B.R. 347. Here, as I've already noted, the request itself states that there is

no irreparable harm here to the movant. That, in and of itself, should defeat the motion.

In addition, there's no discussion of potential harm to other parties, notwithstanding the fact that it's generally well-recognized, as noted in the Adelphia case, the Sabine case, the GMC case, and numerous other cases dealing with appeals of a confirmation order. And a stay pending appeal of confirmation where confirmation is relatively imminent -- and I will note here there's been plenty of time to seek a stay to avoid the imminence of the effective date occurring -- would have substantial potential harm to the Debtor and other parties in interest.

Here, I could certainly take judicial notice of the fee applications that have been filed in these cases before me that show the substantial accrual of fees on a weekly and monthly basis, as well as the adverse effect, as was testified to at the confirmation hearing, of the course of these Chapter 11 cases and the fact that the Debtors have remained in Chapter 11 as long as they have on the Debtor's business.

The Debtors are seeking regulatory approval to emerge from bankruptcy, if one can reasonably infer, informed he regulators that they intend to exit promptly. Any delay of that process could also further harm the Debtors and their business. As Judge Gerber noted in the

General Motors case, concern over potential harm to the

Debtor and third parties in such a context could potentially

be ameliorated by the issuance of a bond pending appeal to

address such harm. But, as I've noted, there's been no

offer of posting such a bond.

I will note that in the GMC case at Page 368,

Judge Gerber required the posting of a \$7.9 billion bond.

And in the Adelphia Communications Corp matter, Judge

Scheindlin required the posting of a bond in excess of a billion dollars, noting that they were fully aware in each case of the difficulty in obtaining such a bond but also noting that this merely highlights the potential risk to the Debtors and other parties in interest on the other side of the appeal in the event of the denial of the appeal and in the intervening time the harm to the Debtor's estates from their plan not going effective.

The only attempt to show that there's no meaningful harm to the Debtors is speculation as to when Judge Briccetti might rule on the appeal. Judge Briccetti has already considered the issue of an expedited appeal and has issued his ruling on that point declining the request. In addition, I will note again that there was no attempt to make a motion for stay pending appeal until the beginning of this month, notwithstanding that the confirmation was entered in substantial time before then in which one could

have developed a more complete record and dealt with all of these issues which, of course, has not happened because of the timing of the request to seek the appeal.

It appears to me then that the request before me is a mere procedural gambit either for some tactical reason that can be represented to Judge Briccetti -- and to make sure that the record is clear, I wanted to give you a full ruling so that there could be no doubt as to the basis for that ruling -- or simply to increase the fees and costs of the case by requiring a response by the Debtors, in addition to the briefing and response pending before Judge Briccetti.

As the courts have well recognized, there is a strong public interest in proceeding to conclude and permit a plan to go effective. And that has not been addressed at all in the motion.

Finally, as to the issue on the merits, the only statement by U.S. Bank in its motion is, quote, U.S. Bank submits that it has more than a substantial likelihood of succeeding on an appeal a wholly conclusory allegation. Of course, it is always awkward to argue the substantial possibility of success on appeal before the judge whose order is being appealed. However, judges routinely deal with such points and recognize that the substantial possibility of success test is an intermediate level between possible and probable and is intended primarily to eliminate

frivolous appeals, particularly when one is focusing on the request for a stay from the court whose order is being appealed.

As noted by Judge Chapman, there's a further element to the analysis, quote, the probability of success that must be demonstrated as inversely proportional to the amount of irreparable injury that the plaintiff will suffer absent the stay. In other words, more of one excuses less of the other. In re Sabine Oil & Gas Corp., 548 B.R. 683-84, quoting 473 West End Realty Corp., which in turn cites Mohammed v. Reno, 309 F.3d 95, 101 (2d. Cir. 2002). As I've already noted, there's been no attempt to show here irreparable injury to the appellant or, for that matter, any meaningful attempt to show lack of harm to the Debtor or other parties on the other side of the appeal.

But, in any event, I will note that the rulings that are being appealed from -- namely the ruling to approve the unity settlement and with respect to confirmation in large part derived from lengthy evidentiary hearings, and further my believe that my rulings with regard to matters of pure law were correct. But even giving the appellant and the movant here, or more accurately the requester here, the benefit of the doubt, it would appear to me that the balancing test, enunciated by Judge Chapman in Sabine and the Second Circuit in Reno, simply have failed given the

deficiencies in this motion.

So I will ask the Debtor's counsel to submit a separate order denying the so-called request for a stay pending appeal on those grounds. It is true that the request was not properly made as a motion, and that prevented any further discovery that the Debtors might want to take in the context of a motion. But, frankly, the movant made such a half-hearted attempt to prosecute it that discovery probably wouldn't have been warranted. So I've given you this ruling rather than standing on the procedural defect the Debtors have pointed out.

So let me turn then to the Debtor's motion that was the awkward procedural vehicle for the request for a stay. I'm really focusing on the order, so you should get out the order and have that in front of you.

MR. WEILAND: I have that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

MR. WEILAND: Thank you. Happy to go through this.

THE COURT: All right. So the order uses defined terms from the motion. And if I were -- I mean as you point out in the motion, a little under 75 percent of the claimants in this class, Class 4, are represented by capable counsel, Sherman & Sterling. They're not really covered by this order. They're really reaching the other 27 or 28

percent or trying to, some of whom may be individuals.

So I think it's important to have a clear order so that they know what they need to do as well as a clear script consistent with the order for whoever it is that's going to be dealing with them, assuming that they comply with the notice and contact the Debtors.

So my first question goes to the defined terms eligible holders as used in the motion -- in the order.

And, again, the order just incorporates the term from the motion. It's defined on Page 5 of the motion, and it's really defined fairly vaguely. It says it is those who are eligible to receive term loans. I think you need to drop a footnote in the order in Paragraph 2B and actually define what it is to be an eligible holder.

And when you were making your presentation in connection with this motion, Mr. Weiland, you said that it's based on the terms of the new Midwest facility itself. And I'm assuming that that probably dovetails with some exemption that requires one to be an accredited investor. But whatever the definition is, and it shouldn't be anything other than a legal requirement, I'm assuming -- well, let me just ask you. When you define eligible holders, it's only those who are barred from actually holding these new notes by law, correct, or regulation? You're not imposing any additional requirement on them.

Page 30 1 MR. WEILAND: Your Honor, we are not imposing any 2 additional requirements, but this is a bank credit facility. It's not dealing with securities. 3 4 THE COURT: Right. 5 MR. WEILAND: But one of the requirements under 6 the facility is that lenders must be eligible financial 7 institutions and not individuals. And that's something that 8 is --9 THE COURT: But I think that derives from 10 applicable law. I mean --11 MR. WEILAND: Same regulation. I believe --12 THE COURT: -- you're not saying --13 MR. WEILAND: -- I believe that's right, Your 14 Honor. 15 THE COURT: -- that they have to be --16 MR. WEILAND: No, we're not trying --17 THE COURT: Right. I'm sorry to talk over you. 18 You're not -- it's not saying, for example, that they have 19 to be only the following five banks, you know, needs to be 20 21 MR. WEILAND: No, Your Honor. No. 22 THE COURT: Right. So -- or, you know, a way that 23 limits the pool beyond those who would be properly able to 24 hold these types of notes. So I think you need to spell 25 that out in a footnote where you define eligible -- where

you actually first use the term eligible holders in the proposed order.

And I would have a problem approving this on this record if the definition imposes additional requirements that are, you know, not flowing from law or regulation. You know, for example, a financial institution that we don't like because they have a record of being difficult on consent issues, you know, that would be a problem.

And I think -- I mean, and "to know your customer practices," it's the same comment. When it says "practices," those are, again, requirements under applicable law or regulation that banks understand. It's not, you know, some excuse to add additional hurdles that aren't that way. I'm not assuming -- I'm not saying that that's what you were doing. I just want to make it clear that I wouldn't be approving that on this record.

MR. WEILAND: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then my other comments are just I think to make it clearer and then I have a question at the end. So the first -- let me just start on Page 2 then, Paragraph 2. It should say "the procedures as modified by this order," and then continue on with that sentence ending with "are hereby authorized and approved in all respects." And then I would move the last clause in Paragraph 2A to follow that sentence, and that clause says

Page 32 1 "for the avoidance of doubt, those holders of Midwest notes 2 claims represented by Sherman & Sterling, LLP, are all known holders and are not bound by the procedures." 3 So I guess they're also eligible holders, right? 4 MR. WEILAND: They are, Your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. 7 MR. WEILAND: All of the holders in that group are 8 eligible. 9 THE COURT: All right. So you should say, I 10 think, "are all eligible holders" -- I'm sorry -- "are all 11 known holders and eligible holders and are not bound by 12 these procedures." And then I'd just move that as a 13 sentence to follow the first sentence of Paragraph 2, and 14 then you'd continue on with the rest of that paragraph which 15 says "without limiting the generality of the foregoing." 16 And then Paragraph A, I think this needs to read 17 "The Debtors" not "are authorized" but "shall" because, 18 again, you're barring people if they don't respond to the 19 notice. So you need to give the notice. So "the Debtors shall use reasonable efforts included in the DTC notice to" 20 21 and then add in a parenthetical: "A) obtain the contact 22 information of currently known holders) -- I'm sorry --23 "currently unknown holders of Midwest notes claims" and then "B) to inform them of this order." So you'd strike 24 25 "pursuant to the procedures."

And then Paragraph B, again, you'd strike

"pursuant to the procedures" and it would just being

"eligible holders" and then you'd have the footnote which

defines eligible holders "will have the later of, one, the

reversion date" and then you should give that date here

because I'm contemplating that this order will be the script

for these folks and, in fact, you may want to give -- you

know, have it handy to give them a copy so they know what

they're supposed to do.

And then it continues on "or ii) two months from the date of contact." And then I think you need to add this proviso because, otherwise, two months from the date of contact could be years from now. It needs to say "provided that such contact occurs on or before the reversion date."

And then you continue on to complete after -- you know, there's a comma after date and then "to complete the necessary documentation confirming their eligibility to hold term loans provided under Midwest notes' new exit term facility."

And then C should read -- you would strike "as provided in the procedures, to the extent that." And instead, you'd say -- just put in the word "if." So it would begin "if a holder of a Midwest notes claim is not an eligible holder, the Debtor shall satisfy such Midwest notes claim in cash" and then add this phrase "on or as promptly

as practicable after the plan's effective date," and you'd capitalize "plan" and "effective date."

And then you'd add a semicolon and add "provided, that such holder has contacted the Debtors on or before the reversion date." Right? Because you need to have them contact you to let them know that they are who they are.

MR. WEILAND: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And then in D, again, I'd strike the introductory clause which is "as provided in the procedures" and then just say, beginning with "any holder of Midwest notes claims that does not contact the Debtors or the exit facility agent" -- well, now you've added the exit facility agent. I don't know whether that should be there or not. I mean everywhere else it's contact the Debtors. If you want to put in contact them, you should add them everywhere else, too, i.e., the exit facility agent "by the reversion date and any eligible holder that does not provide the necessary customer and tax information as provided" -- and then add this phrase "as provided in Paragraph 2B here of, will have their claims to distributions" and then add this phrase "on account of such claims" -- and that C should be capitalized -- "under the plan terminated."

And then you'd go to the third line down from the top, and it should say there -- that line begins "respective such claims will revest in the Reorganized Debtors and" --

and then you'd add this phrase -- "any Midwest new exit facility" and then continue on with "term loans that would have been distributed in respect of such claims" -- and "claims" should be capitalized -- "shall be cancelled.

And then E should -- again, delete the introductory clause that says "as provided in the procedures" and just begin "The Debtors are authorized to prepay in cash on a non-pro rata basis any" -- and, again, you should add "Midwest new exit facility term loans." So you add the phrase "Midwest new exit facility" before "term loans."

And then my only question here is on F. Why is the trading -- I'm assuming the trading is suspended while you're working through this process so that you know who the -- DTC and you know who the holders are. That's the reason?

MR. WEILAND: That's right, Your Honor. I mean technically under the plan, on the effective date the Midwest notes are canceled. All this is saying is that they're publicly-traded notes, they're traded today, they'll continue to be traded until the effective date but trading will be frozen on emergence by the company so that we're not chasing a moving target.

THE COURT: Right. So I think even though you and I understand that when you refer to Midwest notes, it's the old notes not the new exit facility, I think you should

probably drop a footnote here, too, because, again, you're trying to reach people -- maybe there aren't any -- individuals. And when you look at this, it's just not -- you're not really sure what this means if you put yourself in their shoes. Are they referring to trading in the new exit facility notes? You know, it's -- I think you should just define it as the old notes --

MR. WEILAND: Sure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- the notes that provide the basis for the claims in Class 4. And then the last point, and I've considered this in light of your motion and the reply, this relief, I think, is by in large not a modification of the plan under Section 1127 of the Code. Clearly, giving notice to holders so that they can get their new instruments is not a modification. I don't think setting a deadline for that is a modification. I don't think exercising the right to prepay is a modification because the notes have a prepayment feature.

But I do think the cashout to the ineligibles might be a modification. The plan has not gone effective so, clearly, there's not been substantial consummation. So a modification is warranted here. It's entirely consistent with the plan concept that these people are unimpaired or, you know, that they get 100 cents on the dollar. So I think you should add a paragraph that says to the extent that the

relief granted in this order would constitute a modification of the plan under Section 1127(b) of the Code -- of the Bankruptcy Code, such modification is granted.

The motion recites that the holders of 73 percent have had notice of this. It really doesn't change the fundamental treatment under the plan to anybody. So I don't have any problem granting that relief, but I think you should put it in here so that there's no argument later that it should have been granted and wasn't.

I agree with the Debtor's statement in the reply to U.S. Bank's response that this modification would have nothing to do whatsoever with the appeal before the District Court, which is on or in respect of the treatment of a completely different class on completely different issues and, therefore, is as the Debtors note in their reply consistent with the case law on the so-called divestiture rule under which a lower court is divested of jurisdiction when there's a pending appeal of those aspects of the case involved in the appeal as opposed to either issues that are collateral to the appeal or where the Court that is being appealed from is merely deciding issues and proceedings that are different from the appeal or to implement the order being appealed as opposed to altering or expanding the order.

See, for example, In re Winimo Realty Corp., 270

Page 38 1 B.R. 99,105 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2001), in re Sabine Oil & Gas 2 Corp., 548 B.R. 674,679 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016), and the cases cited therein, including In re Board of Directors of 3 Hopewell International Insurance Limited, 258 B.R. 580,583 4 5 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2001). 6 So I went through all of those. I didn't really 7 give you a chance to response. But if I -- if you think 8 I've gone too far or directed that a change be made to the 9 order that shouldn't be made, you should let me know. 10 Otherwise, I'll grant --11 MR. WEILAND: No, not at all, Your Honor. 12 you for the guidance, and we're happy to make those changes 13 and submit a revised order. The one point I would make just 14 for the sake of clarity, that while the plan does talk about 15 new exit term loans being earmarked for distribution to the 16 Midwest noteholders, I do just want to be clear that there's 17 not a separate Midwest notes facility or issuance post-18 emergence. That will all be part of the single exit 19 facility term loan credit, just to make that point clear. 20 But I think with respect to all of the language 21 changes you just walked through, we're happy to make changes 22 and make clarifying additions in the form of footnotes or 23 otherwise. And we'll do that today and submit --24 THE COURT: Okay. Well --25 MR. WEILAND: -- the revised order as soon as we

Page 39 1 can. 2 THE COURT: All right. Well, then that would mean that you should not use the term "Midwest notes new exit 3 term facility" where I told you to use it. You should use 4 whatever it is that they're getting, although I'll note that 5 6 the motion used that term. So if they're getting instead 7 their pro rata share of a facility that isn't called that, 8 has a different name but that's what they're getting on 9 account of the Class 4 treatment, then you should use that 10 term instead of the "Midwest notes new exit term facility" 11 wherever I told you to use it in the motion. 12 MR. WEILAND: We can make that change, as well, 13 Your Honor. 14 I'm sorry, wherever I told you to use THE COURT: 15 it in your order, not the motion. 16 Okay. Very well. So I'll look for that order. 17 So what I'll be getting is two orders, the order denying the 18 request for a stay pending appeal and the -- secondly, the 19 order granting the motion to establish procedures in 20 furtherance of plan distributions. 21 MR. WEILAND: Absolutely, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Anything else in 23 Windstream Holdings? 24 MR. WEILAND: Not today, Your Honor. Thanks very 25 much for the time.

```
Page 40
 1
                THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Thank you.
 2
                MR. WEILAND: Take care.
 3
                THE COURT: Bye bye.
                (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
 4
 5
     11:13 AM)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Page 41
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing
4	transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.
5	
6	Songa M. deslarshi Hyde
7	words to . Our was
8	Sonya Ledanski Hyde
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Veritext Legal Solutions
21	330 Old Country Road
22	Suite 300
23	Mineola, NY 11501
24	
25	Date: September 17, 2020

[& - appeal] Page 1

&	2482 2:12	6	added 34:12
& 3:11,18 4:1,15	250 3:6	60654 3:21	addition 24:3
7:22 14:16 22:4	258 38:4	650389 23:13	25:22 26:10
22:18 27:9 28:24	261 23:24	674,679 38:2	additional 10:15
32:2 38:1	27 28:25	675 22:5	11:4 29:25 30:2
1	270 37:25	681 22:5 23:20	31:4,13
	28 28:25	683 27:9	additions 38:22
1 19:9,16	2a 19:20 31:25	7	address 20:19,20
100 10:9 36:24	2b 29:13 34:19		25:4
10017 4:4	2d 22:23 27:11	7 23:13	addressed 26:14
10019 3:7 5:4	2nd 19:11	7.9 25:7	adelphia 22:19,20
10020 3:14	3	73 37:4	23:24 24:5 25:8
10036 4:18	3 18:8	75 28:22	adjudicate 16:22
101 27:11	30 22:9	8	advance 12:1,16
10601 1:14	300 1:13 3:20	8007 15:21 19:13	adverse 24:16
10:07 1:17	41:22	19:15 21:25 23:22	advise 20:2,11
11 8:2 24:18,19	30309 4:11	84 27:10	advised 15:5
1100 4:10	30722 22:23	9	agenda 2:1,1 16:9
1127 36:13 37:2	309 27:11		agent 8:24 9:8,14
11501 41:23	330 41:21	9 22:23	34:12,13,16
11:13 40:5	337 22:21	95 27:11	agree 37:10
1211 4:17	346 22:21	99,105 38:1	agreement 20:1
1221 3:13	347 23:24	a	alindogan 5:24
16 1:16 2:1	361 22:21	ability 15:12	allegation 26:19
1633 5:3	368 25:6	able 9:23 10:1,2	allege 13:5,7,15
17 41:25	4	11:9,15,25 15:16	allocated 11:2
19-22312 1:3		30:23	allowed 11:11
2	4 7:5 28:23 36:10	absent 22:13 27:8	altering 37:23
2 23:13 31:20,21	39:9	absolutely 12:16	alters 21:21
32:13	409 22:9	39:21	ameliorated 25:3
20 9:18	450 4:3	acc 22:19	americas 3:13
2001 38:1,5	473 27:10	account 34:21	4:17
2002 27:11	4th 19:10	39:9	amount 8:9 27:7
2007 22:21,22,23	5	accredited 29:19	analysis 27:5
2008 23:12,13	5 29:10	accrual 24:15	analyzing 23:18
2009 22:10	548 22:4,18 27:9	accurate 41:4	animals 8:14
2016 22:5 38:2	38:2	accurately 27:22	ankura 4:9
2020 1:16 2:1	55th 3:6	action 17:5	answer 13:22,23
41:25	580,583 38:4	actual 9:10 23:23	14:17 21:4
24 22:9	581 22:19	add 31:13 32:21	anybody 37:6
2469 2:5,10		33:11,25 34:3,3	app 22:23
248 1:13		34:15,19,20 35:1	appeal 12:21
		35:9,10 36:25	14:18,24 15:22

[appeal - cashout] Page 2

17:14 18:1 19:1,3 19:14,19 20:18,20	arguing 18:2 argument 14:20	14:16 16:16 20:15 26:17,17 30:2	brief 14:17 19:3
21:2,7,22,23,25	14:21 15:3,4 17:6	bank's 37:11	briefed 14:18 15:1
22:3,6,7,17,21	17:18,19 37:8	bankr 22:5,10	briefing 15:5
24:8 25:3,14,14	article 18:7	38:1,2,5	17:17 21:23 26:11
25:19,20,23 26:3	aside 13:4	bankruptcy 1:1	broadway 5:3
26:19,21 27:15	aspects 21:22	1:12,23 9:17	brought 22:1
28:4 37:12,18,19	37:18	16:25 19:17,20	buehl 6:4
37:20,22 39:18	association 2:7,12	20:9 23:22 24:22	burden 21:3 22:8
appealed 26:22	assuming 29:5,18	37:3	23:15
27:3,17 37:21,23	29:21 31:14 35:13	banks 30:19 31:12	business 24:20,25
appeals 2:10	atlanta 4:11	barred 29:23	bye 40:3,3
12:23 24:7 27:1	attempt 20:23	barring 32:18	c
appear 27:23	21:6 25:17,22	based 29:17	c 3:1 7:1 33:20
appears 26:4	27:12,14 28:8	basis 7:15 24:16	34:21 41:1,1
appellant 27:13	attorneys 3:4,12	26:8 35:8 36:9	called 7:5 14:20
27:21	3:19 4:2,9,16 5:2	bears 22:8	28:3 37:16 39:7
applicable 30:10	august 18:15	beginning 25:23	cancel 11:11
31:11	authorized 7:11	34:10	15:25
applicant 23:15	31:23 32:17 35:7	begins 34:24	canceled 11:3
applications	avenue 3:13 4:3	behalf 2:11 14:16	35:18
24:14	4:17	believe 27:20	cancelled 35:4
appreciate 7:23	avoid 24:10	30:11,13	can't 7:9 10:10,21
approaching	avoidance 32:1	benefit 27:23	19:5
11:14	awaiting 14:19	beyond 30:23	capable 28:23
appropriate 11:4	17:5	billion 25:7,10	capitalize 34:2
12:4,10,25	aware 11:19	bit 7:24	capitalized 34:22
appropriately	25:10	board 38:3	35:4
20:24	awkward 26:20	bond 13:17 20:22	care 40:2
approval 11:20,22	28:13	20:24 23:14 25:3	carried 21:2
24:21	b	25:5,7,9,11	case 1:3 3:11 7:9
approve 27:17	b 1:21 19:13,17	bondholder 22:19	14:16 15:22 16:6
approved 8:5 11:6	32:24 33:1 37:2	bound 32:3,11	17:4 18:15 23:6
12:4,11 31:23	b.r. 22:4,9,19,21	brad 3:23 7:21	23:10,19 24:5,6,6
approving 31:3	23:24 27:9 38:1,2	brendel 5:21	25:1,6,11 26:10
31:16	38:4	brian 4:6 5:12	37:16,18
approximately	back 14:11	briccetti 14:20	cases 23:11 24:6
9:18	background 7:24	15:6,19 16:12,19	24:14,18 38:3
aren't 19:25	balancing 23:1,8	16:21 17:7 18:19	cash 10:13 33:25
argue 16:1 21:6	27:24	19:1,22 20:2,18	35:8
26:20	bank 2:7,11 3:12	21:9,23,24 25:19	cashout 36:19
	Dank 2.7,11 3.12	25:19 26:6,11	

[cede - courts] Page 3

cede 13:24	clark 5:15	component 9:1	contemplating
celine 6:4	class 7:5,6 28:23	concept 36:23	33:6
cent 10:10	28:23 36:10 37:14	concern 15:10	context 21:18,20
cents 36:24	39:9	25:1	22:6 25:2 28:7
certain 9:9 13:12	clause 31:24,25	concerned 15:13	continue 31:22
certainly 10:15	34:9 35:6	conclude 26:13	32:14 33:15 35:2
24:13	clear 26:7 29:2,3	concluded 40:4	35:20
certified 41:3	31:15 38:16,19	conclusion 11:23	continues 33:10
certify 17:2	clearer 31:19	conclusory 26:19	contrary 19:15
chance 38:7	clearly 36:13,21	concrete 10:24	copy 7:15 33:8
change 37:5 38:8	clerk's 7:13,14,15	conditions 11:18	corp 22:4,9,18,20
39:12	client 7:7	confirmation 8:1	22:20 23:24 25:8
changes 38:12,21	close 11:23	8:2,6 10:25 12:3	27:9,10 37:25
38:21	closed 15:5	12:22,23 15:14	38:2
chapman 22:24	closing 11:18	18:8 21:22 22:7	correct 27:21
23:9 27:4,24	code 17:1 36:13	24:7,8,8,17 25:24	29:24
chapter 8:2 24:18	37:2,3	27:18	costs 26:9
24:19	collateral 37:20	confirming 33:17	couched 14:2
characterized	come 9:19,24 10:2	connection 8:6	counsel 14:14
21:2	10:7,20,25 11:1,7	17:22 29:16	28:2,24
charles 5:13	14:11 23:6	consent 31:8	country 41:21
chasing 35:22	comes 21:18	consider 13:18	course 12:24
chelsey 6:2	coming 11:24	20:25 22:11	16:18 24:17 26:2
chicago 3:21	comma 33:16	considered 15:20	26:20
chris 14:15	comment 31:10	25:20 36:11	court 1:1,12 7:2,9
christopher 2:11	comments 14:1	considering 21:1	7:12,14,20 13:25
3:16	31:18	consistent 8:4	14:23 15:2,4,7,20
chung 5:19	committed 8:4	10:14 29:4 36:22	15:23 16:10,15,18
cir 22:23 27:11	committee 3:4	37:16	16:20,25 17:13
circuit 17:2 22:25	communications	constituents 13:6	18:5,10,19,25
22:25 27:25	22:20,20 23:24	constitute 37:1	19:4,6,8,12,15,17
cited 38:3	25:8	constitutional	19:18,20,24 20:3
cites 27:10	company 4:9	17:1	20:7,9,11,12
claim 33:23,25	11:16,21,25 35:21	consummate 18:3	21:10,13 22:1,4
claimants 28:23	complete 26:1	18:9,10 19:4	22:11 23:15 27:2
claims 32:2,23	33:15,16	consummation	28:17,20 30:4,9
34:11,20,21,25	completely 12:4	36:21	30:12,15,17,22
35:3,4 36:10	12:10,10 13:20	contact 29:6	31:18 32:6,9 34:8
clarified 14:7	37:14,14	32:21 33:11,13,14	35:23 36:9 37:13
clarify 15:14	complied 17:17	34:6,11,14,15	37:17,20 38:24
clarifying 38:22	19:13	contacted 34:4	39:2,14,22 40:1,3
clarity 18:18	comply 29:5	contemplated 8:5	courts 22:25
38:14			26:12

[court's - effective] Page 4

court's 16:23	debtor 1:9 3:19	demonstrating	district 1:2 14:23
17:10 20:5	11:3,8 17:25	23:15	15:2,22 16:23
covered 17:20	20:16 24:12 25:2	denial 25:14	19:15 37:12
28:24	27:14 33:24	denied 13:20 21:5	divested 37:17
cqs 16:16	debtor's 24:19	22:22,22	divestiture 37:16
credibly 13:7	25:15 28:2,12	deny 13:1 16:18	djk 23:11,12
credit 30:2 38:19	37:10	denying 28:3	docket 16:23 17:8
creditors 3:5	debtors 2:4,8 7:23	39:17	document 2:5,10
criteria 23:5	8:1,3 13:8 14:6	derived 27:19	17:10
cured 16:17	15:14,17,24 16:2	derives 30:9	documentation
curious 19:12	16:4,5,8 17:12,25	determine 17:19	33:17
current 8:9	18:6,13 19:25	determined 18:9	doesn't 10:8 17:9
currently 32:22	24:18,21,25 25:13	determining	20:16
32:23	25:18 26:10 28:6	18:21	doing 18:6 31:15
cusp 13:10	28:11 29:6 32:17	develop 8:16	dollar 36:24
customer 9:8 31:9	32:19 34:4,11,14	20:23	dollars 13:11
34:18	34:25 35:7 37:15	developed 9:12	25:10
d	debtor's 7:4 14:23	10:7 12:3 26:1	don't 7:16 8:16,17
d 1:22 7:1 34:8	20:13	deviate 23:16	9:24 10:22 12:25
daily 7:15	decide 16:2,12,19	didn't 17:13,13	13:3,5,7,15,19
darrell 5:15	16:21 23:6	different 8:13,14	15:24 16:1
date 10:24 11:14	decided 17:7,15	37:14,14,22 39:8	doubt 14:7 26:8
12:19 14:8 15:12	decides 16:24	difficult 31:7	27:23 32:1
18:3,20 19:9	17:11	difficulty 25:11	dovetails 29:18
24:11 33:5,5,11	deciding 17:6	diligently 11:16	drain 1:22 7:2
33:12,14,16 34:1	37:21	directed 38:8	16:2
34:2,5,17 35:17	decision 22:2	directors 38:3	driving 10:17
35:20 41:25	declining 25:21	disclose 8:22	drop 29:12 36:1
davis 4:1	defeat 24:2	discovery 28:6,9	dtc 32:20 35:15
day 13:11 19:6,8	defect 28:11	discrete 17:1	e
days 15:5 16:13	defects 16:17	discretion 22:3,12	e 1:21,21 3:1,1 7:1
19:2	deficiencies 28:1	discuss 20:16	7:1 35:5 41:1
deadline 10:19	define 29:13,22	discussion 24:3	earlier 18:15,15
36:15	30:25 36:7	dismiss 18:1	earmarked 38:15
deal 9:23 10:1	defined 28:20	dismissed 22:21	ecf 2:12
12:7 14:11 26:22	29:7,10,11	disposition 20:6	ecro 1:25
dealing 24:7 29:5	defines 33:4	dispositive 23:2	effect 10:12 24:16
30:3	definition 29:20	distributed 35:3	effective 11:15
dealt 26:1	31:4	distribution 10:21	12:19 14:8 18:3
debt 8:8,10,13 9:2	delay 24:24	10:23 11:10 38:15	18:14,20 24:11
9:6 10:11,12,16	delete 35:5	distributions 2:5	25:16 26:14 34:1
13:13	demonstrated	2:9 7:5 12:18	34:2 35:17,20
	22:15 27:6	34:20 39:20	36:20

effectively 16:12	evidence 23:4	factors 20:25	foot 16:1
efforts 8:1 32:20	evidentiary 27:19	22:11 23:1	footnote 29:13
eggs 15:13	example 22:9	failed 27:25	30:25 33:3 36:1
either 17:5 26:5	30:18 31:6 37:25	fair 10:14	footnotes 38:22
37:19	excess 25:9	fairly 29:11	force 10:17
element 27:5	excuse 31:13	fanneron 5:11	foregoing 32:15
eligibility 33:17	excuses 27:8	far 38:8	41:3
eligible 29:8,12,14	exemption 29:19	fault 16:1	form 14:1 38:22
29:22 30:6,25	exercising 22:11	feature 36:18	formal 16:11
31:1 32:4,8,10,11	36:16	february 22:23	forth 20:14
33:3,4,24 34:17	exit 8:5,11,12,25	fee 24:14	forward 9:7,19,24
eliminate 26:25	9:1,14 10:3,11	fees 13:11,12	10:2,7,20,25 11:1
elliot 4:16	11:2 14:25 18:16	24:15 26:9	11:7 14:10
ellis 3:18 7:22	24:23 33:18 34:12	file 14:22	found 23:6
emerge 11:25	34:12,16 35:1,9	filed 2:10 11:14	four 22:11,17
24:22	35:10,25 36:6	12:1,8 13:18	23:1,5,18
emergence 8:2	38:15,18 39:3,10	14:22 15:22 16:8	francis 5:14
11:19 12:1,16	expanding 37:23	18:4 19:2 20:4,22	frankly 28:7
13:9,12,13 35:21	expedite 17:23	24:14	frivolous 27:1
38:18	expedited 17:14	filing 9:13	front 12:11 15:18
emerging 13:10	25:20	finally 20:21	20:3 21:16,17,24
ends 17:8,9	experience 15:21	26:16	28:15
entered 25:25	16:7	financial 9:9 30:6	frozen 35:21
entirely 12:8	extent 33:21	31:6	full 21:10 23:16
36:22	36:25	financing 8:4	26:7
entitled 10:4	extraordinary	find 16:16	fully 14:18 15:1
entity 9:5,6	17:4 21:3,3	fine 7:20	25:10
enunciated 27:24	f	first 7:7 10:16	fundamental 37:6
equal 8:9,9		19:17,20 20:8	further 12:20
equitable 17:24	f 1:21 35:12 41:1	29:7 31:1,20	17:23 24:24 27:4
equitably 18:1	f.3d 27:11	32:13	27:20 28:6
19:4	facility 8:5,11,13	five 30:19	furtherance 2:5,9
establish 21:6	8:23,25 9:2,3,14	flowing 31:5	7:5 39:20
39:19	10:3,11 14:9	focus 14:4	
establishing 2:4,8	29:17 30:2,6	focused 15:9	<u>g</u>
7:4	33:19 34:12,13,16	focusing 27:1	g 7:1
estates 25:15	35:2,9,10,25 36:6	28:14	ga 4:11
esther 5:19	38:17,19 39:4,7	foerster 3:3	gambit 21:14 26:5
evelyn 5:11	39:10	folks 33:7	gas 22:4,18 27:9
event 15:15 16:7	fact 9:20 12:21	follow 31:25	38:1
25:14 27:16	13:4,8 21:16 24:4	32:13	general 10:20
evergreen 5:20	24:18 33:7	following 30:19	22:9 23:5,10 25:1
5,015100H 5.20	factor 20:19 23:2	30.17	generality 32:15
	23:18		

			I
generally 24:5	guess 14:13 19:21	holder 8:21 10:7	imposes 31:4
gerber 23:5,7	19:24 20:7 32:4	29:14 33:23,24	imposing 29:24
24:25 25:7	guidance 38:12	34:4,10,17	30:1
getting 7:24 10:4	gunther 5:25	holders 8:17,20	imposition 23:14
11:23 39:5,6,8,17	h	9:15,18,23 10:2	impractical 19:21
give 10:9,10,13	half 12:22 28:8	29:8,22 31:1 32:1	20:8
14:16 21:10 26:7	hand 8:25	32:3,4,7,10,11,11	improperly 16:5
32:19 33:5,7,8	handled 15:4	32:22,23 33:3,4	inappropriate
38:7	handles 15:23	35:15 36:14 37:4	12:9 13:21
given 11:4,20	handy 33:8	holding 18:20	inappropriately
20:22,25 27:25	•	29:23	13:5
28:10	happened 8:12 26:2	holdings 1:7 7:3	included 32:20
gives 13:1		39:23	includes 11:19
giving 10:16	happening 17:3,8	holste 6:1	including 23:11
27:21 36:13	17:9	hon 1:22	23:19 38:3
gleit 5:6	happens 15:8	honestly 16:25	inconsistent 12:15
gloss 10:15	happy 13:22	honor 7:18,23,24	incorporates 29:9
gmc 24:6 25:6	28:18 38:12,21	8:6,8,20 11:12,19	increase 26:9
go 8:3 9:15 10:23	harm 13:6,7,8	12:5,12,20,22	indenture 2:8
11:15 16:17 26:14	17:23,25 20:15,16	13:1,2,17,22	9:13
28:18 34:23	20:24 23:20,22	14:15 15:10 16:14	individual 9:10
goes 12:20 29:7	24:1,4,12,24 25:1	18:23 21:8 28:16	10:8
going 13:17 14:10	25:4,15,18 27:14	30:1,14,21 31:17	individuals 29:1
14:25 15:2 18:7	hasn't 14:20	32:5 34:7 35:16	30:7 36:3
18:13,14 25:16	haven't 9:19	36:8 38:11 39:13	ineligibles 36:19
29:5	15:16	39:21,24	infer 24:22
good 7:2,8,18	head 11:24	hopefully 11:24	inform 32:24
14:15 28:17	hear 14:14	hopewell 38:4	information 9:8
govern 12:2	heard 17:11 18:9	hurdles 31:13	9:21 10:22 32:22
grace 5:18	18:14	hyde 2:25 41:3,8	34:18
grant 15:19 16:20	hearing 2:1,2,4,7	_	informed 24:23
18:11 19:5 22:2	7:6,11 14:3,4	i	injury 22:13,14
38:10	15:25 16:9 24:17	i.e. 34:16	27:7,13
granted 18:17	hearings 27:19	idea 7:8	innocuous 12:10
20:16 37:1,3,9	hearted 28:8	identify 7:7 9:15	inquiry 22:25
granting 37:7	heavy 22:8	ignored 13:13	institution 9:10
39:19	held 22:25 23:3	ii 33:10	31:6
gray 4:15	23:19	il 3:21	institutions 30:7
greater 8:11	he's 15:2	imminence 24:10	instruments 36:14
grounds 13:1,16	highlights 25:12	imminent 23:23	insurance 38:4
28:4	hockett 5:12	24:9	intend 24:23
group 9:17 22:19	hold 11:9 15:3	implement 37:22	intend 24.23
32:7	30:24 33:17	important 29:2	26:25
34.1			20.23
	TT to T	ral Solutions	I

[interest - midwest] Page 7

interest 17:10	i'm 13:22 19:8,12	1	located 10:21
20:17,20 22:17	19:14,23	l.p. 4:16	long 11:12 16:21
24:12 25:13 26:13	i've 15:15 16:25	lack 23:2 27:14	24:19
interested 16:9	17:25 23:25	language 38:20	longer 11:10
intermediate	j	large 27:19 36:12	longwinded 14:13
26:24		lasalle 3:20	look 10:7 15:24
international 38:4	•	late 13:5	36:3 39:16
intervening 15:15	jeffrey 5:6	law 5:1 27:21	looking 8:13 14:8
25:15	joanna 5:22	29:24 30:10 31:5	19:8
introduction 7:16	jp 4:2	31:12 37:16	lower 37:17
introductory 34:9	judge 1:23 7:2	lays 20:13	lp 23:11
35:6	14:20 15:5,19	leading 11:24	m
inversely 27:6	16:2,12,19,21	leaves 16:4	
investment 4:16	17:5,7,16 18:19		majority 9:16
investments 23:11	19:1,22 20:2,17	leaving 16:12,19 led 9:12	making 16:23
investor 29:19	21:9,23,24 22:24		29:15
involved 37:19	23:5,7,9 24:25	ledanski 2:25 41:3	management 4:16
involves 23:1	25:7,8,19,19 26:6	41:8	16:6
involving 16:16	26:11,21 27:4,24	legal 29:21 41:20	mandamus 22:22
iqor 5:2	judges 26:22	lender 8:23 9:5	march 23:13
irreparable 13:6	judicial 24:13	10:3,8	masaro 5:23
17:23,24 20:15	julia 5:10	lenders 30:6	matter 1:5 25:8
22:13 23:20 24:1	june 8:1	lengthy 27:19	27:13
27:7,13	jurisdiction 37:17	level 26:24	matters 27:20
isn't 14:4	justin 1:25	lexington 4:3	matthew 5:23
issuance 23:21	k	lies 22:3	mcdonald 5:22
25:3 38:17	keith 4:20	light 36:11	mean 17:14 21:5
issue 15:20 17:2	key 17:1	likelihood 22:16	28:21 30:10 31:9
18:19 23:7 25:20	kilpatrick 4:8	26:18	34:14 35:16 39:2
26:16	kind 14:3	limitation 15:11	meaningful 25:18
issued 15:4 22:14	kirkland 3:18	limited 38:4	27:14
25:21	7:22	limiting 32:15	means 36:4
issues 26:2 31:8	know 9:8,16,24	limits 30:23	meet 9:9
37:14,19,21	13:4 16:19 18:14	line 34:23,24	mere 26:5
issue's 17:14	18:18,18 29:3	list 8:23	merely 25:12
it's 7:8,12 9:25	30:19,22 31:5,6,8	little 7:24 28:22	37:21
12:5 17:9 18:16	31:9,13 33:8,8,15	llc 4:9 23:12	merits 13:2,2,19
	34:6,13 35:14,15	llp 3:3,11,18 4:1	16:17 26:16
22:5 24:4	36:6,24 38:9	4:15 7:22 32:2	meyers 4:13
ix 23:11	known 9:22 10:23	loan 8:23 38:19	mid 14:25 18:15
i'd 18:12		loans 11:1 29:12	midwest 7:6 8:7
i'll 7:7 13:23	11:8 32:2,11,22 koster 5:13	33:18 35:2,9,11	8:15 9:13,15 10:1
14:11,17	KUSICI J.13	38:15	14:9 29:17 32:1
			32:23 33:18,23,24
			<u> </u>

[midwest - ought] Page 8

	T		_
34:11 35:1,9,10	39:19	27:16 37:15 39:5	occurs 33:14
35:18,24 38:16,17	motors 22:9 23:6	noted 14:2 15:11	odd 17:6
39:3,10	23:10 25:1	23:7,10,25 24:5	offer 20:21 25:5
million 13:11	movant 21:1 22:7	24:25 25:4 27:4	office 7:13,14,15
mind 10:6	22:15 23:14 24:1	27:12	official 3:4
mineola 41:23	27:22 28:8	noteholders 8:7	offset 20:24
minority 9:25	movants 22:12	10:1 38:16	ohm 5:16
mischaracteriza	move 17:13,14	notes 7:6 8:10,15	oil 22:4,18 27:9
12:14	18:25 19:16 31:24	8:15,18,21 9:1,13	38:1
mischaracterize	32:12	9:15 14:9 22:24	okay 13:25 19:12
12:12	moved 18:1	23:9 29:23 30:24	20:7,12 21:12
misreading 15:21	moving 8:19	32:1,23 33:18,23	28:17 31:18 34:8
misunderstanding	19:20 35:22	33:24 34:11 35:18	38:24 39:16,22
12:13	n	35:19,24,25 36:6	40:1
modification	n 3:1 7:1 41:1	36:7,9,17 38:17	old 35:25 36:7
36:12,15,16,17,20	name 7:10 39:8	39:3,10	41:21
36:22 37:1,3,11	national 2:7,11	notice 2:1 11:4	once 15:21 18:3,9
modified 31:22	·	15:22 16:10,11,16	opinion 15:4
mohammed 27:11	necessary 17:20 33:17 34:18	24:13 29:6 32:19	22:24
month 25:24		32:19,20 36:14	opposed 37:19,23
monthly 24:16	need 13:3 29:3,12 30:24 32:19 33:11	37:5	opposition 14:24
months 9:4 12:23	30:24 32:19 33:11	noticed 16:6,8	15:18 18:2 19:3
13:9 33:10,12	needed 23:6	notices 9:20,20	options 16:4,17
moot 16:24 18:2	needs 16:21 20:25	noting 25:10,12	oral 16:7
19:4	30:19 32:16 33:13	notwithstanding	order 7:4,13
mootness 17:24		21:24 24:4 25:24	12:22 14:1 15:14
morgan 4:2	negotiate 19:25	nova 5:24	16:6 17:1,21 18:8
morning 7:2,19	negotiated 9:4	number 11:16	21:22 22:3,7 24:7
7:23 14:15	neither 23:5,22	numerous 23:10	26:22 27:2 28:3
morrison 3:3	net 23:11	23:19 24:6	28:14,15,20,25
motion 2:4,8 7:4	never 10:22 16:25	ny 1:14 3:7,14 4:4	29:2,4,8,9,13 31:2
7:17,25,25 9:13	nevertheless	4:18 5:4 41:23	31:22 32:24 33:6
11:13 12:1,9,13	21:23	0	37:1,22,24 38:9
12:14,24 13:1,18	new 1:2 3:7,14 4:4		38:13,25 39:15,16
14:1,5,12,22 15:1	4:18 5:4 8:25 10:3	o 1:21 7:1 41:1	39:17,19
15:3,9 16:13,16	14:9 29:17,23	objection 12:7,14	orders 39:17
16:18 19:18,19	33:18 35:1,9,10	12:20,25 13:14	ordinarily 19:16
20:4,23 21:19,21	35:25 36:5,14	21:19,21	22:1
23:3 24:2 25:23	38:15 39:3,10	obligation 8:21	ordinary 23:16
26:15,17 28:1,5,7	non 35:8	obtain 8:3 13:3	original 15:9
28:12,21,22 29:8	north 3:20	22:8 32:21	ostensible 21:19
29:10,10,16 36:11	notably 9:9	obtaining 25:11	ought 12:4 13:20
37:4 39:6,11,15	note 8:14 23:19	occurring 24:11	6
	24:9 25:6,22		
L	·	·	

outgrowth 7:25	percent 9:18	possible 26:24	10:18 11:5 12:2,3
outright 13:20	28:22 29:1 37:4	post 12:3 13:12,16	12:17 31:21 32:3
	perfect 8:17	38:17	32:12,25 33:2,21
p	period 11:10	posting 20:22	34:10 35:7 39:19
p 3:1,1 7:1	17:20	25:5,7,9	proceed 7:16
page 23:13,20	permit 23:8 26:13	potential 24:3,11	proceeded 21:24
25:6 29:10 31:20	permit 25.8 20.15	25:1,12	proceeding 11:22
papers 15:3,18	10:19	potentially 25:2	26:13
18:2	person 9:10,11	practicable 34:1	proceedings
paragraph 29:13	10:8	practical 11:6	37:21 40:4 41:4
31:21,25 32:13,14	petrie 5:14	practices 31:10,11	process 11:22
32:16 33:1 34:19	philip 5:21	preclude 14:25	20:1 24:24 35:14
36:25	phrase 33:25	prepare 8:2	professional
parameters 8:4	34:19,21 35:1,10	* *	13:11
12:18	piece 8:10	prepared 7:14 19:25	
parenthetical	place 8:10 place 10:16	prepay 10:12 14:8	promptly 20:18 24:23 33:25
32:21	plains 1:14	35:8 36:17	properly 13:18
part 9:17 17:18	plaintiff 27:7		28:5 30:23
19:14 27:19 38:18	-	prepayment 36:18	
participated 9:17	plan 2:5,9 7:5 8:5		proportional 27:6
9:19	8:7 9:3 10:5,10,15	prepetition 13:12	proposed 14:1 31:2
particularly 22:6	10:19,20 11:15,17	prerequisite 23:21	
27:1	12:15,19 18:20		prosecute 28:8
parties 10:19	25:16 26:14 34:2	present 5:8	provide 9:7 10:22
11:17 16:10 20:17	34:22 35:17 36:13	presentation	34:17 36:9
20:24 24:4,12	36:20,23 37:2,6	29:15	provided 33:13,18
25:2,13 27:15	38:14 39:20	pretty 21:4	33:21 34:3,9,18
party 19:16 22:13	plan's 34:1	prevented 28:6	34:19 35:6
23:4	pleading 15:6,9	primarily 26:25	provides 7:14
paul 5:25	16:8	principal 8:9	proviso 33:12
pay 15:12	plenty 24:10	23:21	public 17:10
payments 12:16	podium 13:24	prior 15:12,13	20:20 22:17 26:13
peachtree 4:10	point 14:6 25:21	pro 35:8 39:7	publicly 8:15,21
pendency 15:6	28:21 36:10 38:13	probability 27:5	35:19
pending 2:10	38:19	probable 23:20	pure 27:21
12:21 16:3 18:25	pointed 28:11	26:25	pursuant 23:21
19:19 20:3 21:2	points 26:23	probably 7:8 9:25	32:25 33:2
21:16,25 22:3,7	polk 4:1	28:9 29:18 36:1	put 7:9 11:5 14:17
24:8 25:3,23	pool 30:23	problem 31:3,8	16:9 33:22 34:15
26:11 28:4 37:18	portion 14:8,9	37:7	36:4 37:8
39:18	possibility 14:7	procedural 21:14	putting 11:4
people 10:25	20:19 22:16 26:21	26:5 28:10,13	12:17
32:18 36:2,23	26:23	procedures 2:4,9	
ĺ		7:4 9:14 10:6,17	
		rol Colutions	

[q3 - scheduling] Page 10

		20.2 5 12 20 10	22.4 (0 24 5
q	record 7:21 18:7	28:3,5,13 39:18	32:4,6,9 34:5
q3 18:16	20:23 21:6,6 26:1	requester 27:22	35:16,23 36:16
quarropas 1:13	26:7 31:4,7,16	requesting 9:21	39:2
question 14:17	41:4	9:22	risk 17:24 25:12
19:21 21:4 29:7	recording 7:11	requests 15:23	road 41:21
31:19 35:12	recovery 10:4,9	16:7	robert 1:22
questions 13:23	10:10	require 16:11	rochester 5:17
13:24,25 14:11	refer 35:24	required 11:9	room 1:13
18:23	referring 36:5	25:7,9	ropes 4:15
quote 19:16 21:18	refused 16:2	requirement	rosa 5:20
21:25 23:1,4	regard 27:20	29:21,25	rosenbloom 6:2
26:17 27:5	regulation 29:24	requirements 9:5	routinely 26:22
quoting 22:19	30:11 31:5,12	9:7,9 10:3,9 23:17	rule 15:3,7,21
27:10	regulators 11:21	30:2,5 31:4,11	17:22 19:15 20:3
r	24:23	requires 15:7 20:3	
	regulatory 11:20	20:5 29:19	23:22 25:19 37:17
r 1:21 3:1 7:1 41:1	11:22 24:21	requiring 26:10	ruling 14:20
rambling 13:23	related 2:5,10	reserving 17:19	21:10 25:21 26:8
rappoport 3:9	relatively 24:9	residential 23:12	26:9 27:17 28:10
rata 35:8 39:7	relief 15:1 18:10	23:12	rulings 27:16,20
rdd 1:3	19:5,18 20:8 21:1	resnick 4:6	run 12:23
reach 36:2	21:3,15 36:12	resolve 15:16,16	S
reaching 13:2	37:1,7	respect 20:5,21	s 2:5,10 3:1 7:1
28:25	remain 9:18	27:18 35:3 37:13	s.d.n.y. 22:5,10,21
read 32:16 33:20	remained 24:19	38:20	23:13 38:1,2,5
realistic 11:6	remote 23:23	respective 34:24	sabine 22:4,18,24
realized 21:14	reno 27:11,25	respects 31:24	23:9,19 24:6 27:9
really 7:25 12:5	reorganized	respond 32:18	27:24 38:1
13:15,19 14:4,12	34:25	response 2:7 14:2	sake 38:14
19:21 20:13 28:14	reply 20:13 36:11	14:6,10 19:9	satisfactory 23:4
28:24,25 29:11	37:10,15	21:18 26:10,11	satisfy 9:6 10:2,8
36:4 37:5 38:6	reply's 14:19	37:11 38:7	11:18 13:3 33:24
realty 27:10 37:25	report 21:8,11	rest 32:14	saying 14:13,24
reason 12:6 19:24	reporter 7:9	reversion 33:5,14	16:1 18:7,15
21:20 26:5 35:15	represented 26:6	34:5,17	30:12,18 31:14
reasonable 32:20	28:23 32:2	revert 11:3	35:18
reasonably 24:22	request 2:9 13:18	revest 34:25	says 12:14,21
receive 8:8,8	14:23 15:6,25	review 18:4,8	19:13,15,17,19
10:13,21 29:12	16:3,5,10 18:4,21	revised 38:13,25	29:11 31:10,25
recites 37:4	18:21 19:14 20:3	revision 15:12	32:15 35:6 36:25
recognize 26:23	20:6,13,13,14	right 17:15,19	schedule 17:17
recognized 22:5	21:3,5,25 23:25	20:12 21:5 28:20	
24:5 26:12	25:21 26:3,4 27:2	30:4,13,17,22	scheduling 14:19
			17:6,18,21
	**	ral Solutions	

[scheindlin - thank] Page 11

scheindlin 25:9	21:8,12	start 31:20	successful 11:23
schizophrenic	short 11:12	state 11:21	23:3
14:4	shortly 11:25	statement 20:14	suffer 20:15 22:12
scrambling 15:13	13:10	26:17 37:10	22:14 27:7
script 29:4 33:6	should've 16:2	states 1:1,12	suite 41:22
second 27:25	show 19:20 23:4	11:21 23:25	sullivan 5:1
secondly 39:18	24:15 25:17 27:12	stay 2:10 12:22	supportive 11:17
section 36:13 37:2	27:14	13:3,16,18 14:22	supposed 33:9
securities 30:3	showing 23:20	15:1,7,18,20,23	sure 26:7 36:4,8
security 23:16	shown 17:23	16:5,7,10,20,25	suspended 35:13
see 14:5,9 22:4,8	side 8:14,19 25:13	18:17,21,21,25	syndicated 8:12
22:18 23:23 37:25	27:15	19:14,17 20:1,15	t
seek 20:8 24:10	significant 13:8	21:1,20,25 22:2,7	-
26:3	simply 26:9 27:25	22:8,13,14,21,22	t 41:1,1
seeking 20:1	single 38:18	23:14,21 24:7,10	tactical 26:5
21:20 24:21	small 9:25	25:23 27:2,8 28:3	take 24:13 28:7
seeks 23:14	solutions 7:12,14	28:14 39:18	40:2
seen 16:25 18:1	41:20	stayed 21:7	takeback 8:8,10
semicolon 34:3	solve 16:23	step 9:7	taken 7:12 8:1,16
send 9:20 16:11	sonya 2:25 41:3,8	stephanie 6:3	talk 30:17 38:14
sentence 31:23,25	soon 14:23 19:4	steps 8:16	talking 9:2
32:13,13	38:25	sterling 28:24	talks 10:20
separate 28:3	sorry 19:14,23	32:2	target 35:22
38:17	30:17 32:10,22	steven 3:9	tax 34:18
september 1:16	39:14	stop 13:23 18:17	technically 35:17
2:1 14:25 19:9,10	sort 8:14,24 10:24	story 11:12	telecommunicat
41:25	11:11,12 12:24	street 1:13 3:6	11:20
served 16:8	13:17 20:1	4:10	telephonic 2:2 7:6
set 10:19,24 12:2	sought 21:15,16		telephonically 3:9
17:17,18 20:14	sound 22:3	33:20 34:9	3:16,23 4:6,13,20
setting 13:4 36:15	southern 1:2	strong 26:13	5:6,8
settlement 27:18	speak 7:8,9	submit 28:2 38:13	temporal 15:11
sham 21:14	speculation 20:17	38:23	term 29:9,12 31:1
share 39:7	25:18	submits 26:18	33:18,18 35:2,9
shaya 5:17	speculative 23:23	substantial 9:16	35:10 38:15,19
sherman 28:24	spell 30:24	20:19 22:14,15	39:3,4,6,10,10
32:2	spelled 9:3	24:11,15 25:25	terminated 34:22
shoehorned 12:24	spending 13:10	26:18,20,23 36:21	terms 10:20 28:21
shoes 36:5	spirit 10:15	succeeding 26:19	29:7,17
shore 2:11 3:16	stage 17:5	success 20:19	test 23:18 26:24
13:24 14:15,15	standing 28:10	22:16 23:2 26:21	27:24
17:16 19:2,7,10	standing 28.10 standpoint 11:7	26:24 27:5	testified 24:17
19:23 20:2,10	Seanwpoint 11./	20.2127.3	thank 7:18 28:18
17.23 20.2,10			38:11 40:1
L	Vanitarit I a	zal Solutions	I

[thanks - working] Page 12

thanks 7:20 39:24	tracey 5:16	understanding	weekly 24:16	
that's 10:11,14,14	tracks 8:24	18:13	weiland 3:23 7:18	
11:3 12:5,25	traded 8:15,21	understood 21:8	7:21,22 15:10	
13:13 14:13 16:3	35:19,19,20	31:17	28:16,18 29:16	
17:2,8,9,20 18:23	trading 35:13,13	unimpaired 36:23	30:1,5,11,13,16	
19:21	35:20 36:5	united 1:1,12	30:21 31:17 32:5	
there's 7:11 8:21	transcribed 2:25	unity 27:18	32:7 34:7 35:16	
17:1 20:23 21:5		unknown 32:23	36:8 38:11,25	
	transcript 7:12 41:4		/	
24:3,9		unsecured 3:4	39:12,21,24 40:2	
they're 8:14,20 10:4 12:17 14:7	treatment 37:6,13	update 14:17 15:7 16:13 20:4	went 38:6	
	39:9		weren't 15:15	
15:21	trend 23:7	use 31:1 32:20	west 3:6 27:10	
thing 8:24 10:18	tried 10:24 15:16	39:3,4,4,9,11,14	we'll 10:12,13,13	
16:22 21:13	15:23	useful 18:20	11:15 15:7 16:18	
things 8:3	triple 23:11	uses 28:20	20:4 21:8	
think 9:24 10:14	true 28:4 41:4	V	we're 7:3 8:13 9:2	
10:14 11:3,6,14	trust 4:9	v 22:19 23:11	11:4 12:5,6,7,12	
11:23 12:3,8,9,9	trustee 2:8 9:14	27:11	13:9,10 14:19	
12:25 13:1,10,17	try 8:16 9:15 12:2	vacated 22:22	16:22 17:5,20	
13:19,20 15:10,20	13:15	vaguely 29:11	21:11	
16:4 18:6,18	trying 12:12,15	vehicle 28:13	we've 8:12,16	
19:11 29:2,12	12:17 16:22 29:1	veritext 41:20	10:23 11:15 13:8	
30:9,24 31:9,19	30:16 36:2	version 11:13	18:14	
32:10,16 33:11	turn 27:10 28:12	view 13:5 19:7	whatsoever 37:12	
35:23,25 36:6,12	turned 14:3	visibility 8:17	what's 17:2 18:20	
36:15,16,19,24	two 8:13,14 12:22	voice 7:10	white 1:14 3:11	
37:7 38:7,20	16:15 17:12 19:2	volce 7.10 volunteered 13:16	14:16	
third 16:20 18:12	22:13 33:10,12	volunteered 15.10	wholly 7:6 26:19	
25:2 34:23	39:17	W	wickouski 6:3	
thompson 5:18	types 8:13 30:24	w.l. 23:12	william 6:1	
three 16:4 22:14	u	walked 38:21	windstream 1:7	
time 7:8,23 11:10		walker 1:25	7:3,22 39:23	
17:8 18:14 24:10	u.s. 1:23 2:7 3:12	want 7:12 9:20,23	winimo 37:25	
25:15,25 39:25	12:8,11 13:6,13	10:1 16:1 28:6	winters 5:10	
timing 26:3	14:3,14,16 20:15	31:15 33:7 34:15	13:24	
today 8:16,17 9:2	22:22 26:17,17	38:16	withdraw 15:25	
9:16 12:5,6,7 15:8	37:11	wanted 26:7	wofford 4:20	
35:19 38:23 39:24	ultimately 19:22	wardwell 4:1	word 15:2 33:22	
todd 4:13	um 16:16	warranted 28:9	words 27:8	
told 39:4,11,14	unclear 18:16	36:22	work 15:23 18:12	
top 34:24	underlying 14:18	way 8:22 14:13	working 11:16,17	
townsend 4:8	understand 31:12	30:22 31:14	13:9 35:14	
townsenu 4.0	35:24	week 14:19	13.7 33.14	
		11.17		

[would've - you're]

Page 13

[would've - you're]				
would've 11:1				
wrinkle 12:2				
writ 22:22				
X				
x 1:4,10				
y 10.25.11.7				
year 10:25 11:7 years 33:13				
york 1:2 3:7,14				
4:4,18 5:4				
you're 13:17				

ATTACHMENT 2

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTO	\mathbf{Y}	COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEV	N Y	ORK

In re:	j	Chapter 11
WINDSTREAM HOLDINGS, INC., et al., 1)	Case No. 19-22312 (RDD)
Debtors.)	(Jointly Administered)
)	

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL

Upon consideration of the request by U.S. Bank National Association for a stay pending appeal [Docket No. 2482] (the "Request"); and upon the objections to the Request; and this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a)-(b) and 1334(b); and upon the record of the hearing held by the Court on the Request on September 16, 2020; and, after due deliberation and for the reasons stated by the Court in its bench ruling at the hearing, the Court having determined that U.S. Bank National Association has not carried its burden with respect to the Request, it is hereby ORDERED that

- 1. The Request is denied.
- 2. The Court retains jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or related to this Order.

White Plains, New York Dated: September 17, 2020

/s/Robert D. Drain

United States Bankruptcy Judge

The last four digits of Debtor Windstream Holdings, Inc.'s tax identification number are 7717. Due to the large number of Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, for which joint administration has been granted, a complete list of the debtor entities and the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers is not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the Debtors' claims and noticing agent at http://www.kccllc.net/windstream. The location of the Debtors' service address for purposes of these chapter 11 cases is: 4001 North Rodney Parham Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72212.