1 NANCY A. MITCHELL (pro hac vice pending) MARIA J. DICONZA (pro hac vice pending) THOMAS H. FELL, NV Bar # 3717 2 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, NV Bar # 9605 The MetLife Building **GORDON SILVER** 3 200 Park Avenue 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, 9th flr. Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 New York, New York 10166 4 Telephone: 212-801-9200 Telephone: 702-796-5555 5 Facsimile: 212-801-6400 Facsimile: 702-369-2666 Email: mitchelln@gtlaw.com Email: ggarman@gordonsilver.com 6 diconzam@gtlaw.com tfell@gordonsilver.com tpilatowicz@gordonsilver.com 7 Proposed Counsel for the Debtors and Debtors in Possession 8 9 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 10 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 11 In re: Case No.: BK-S-14-12524-abl Chapter 11 12 TELEXFREE, LLC, [PROPOSED] 13 Affects this Debtor Jointly Administered with: 14 Affects all Debtors 14-12525 TelexFree, Inc. 15 14-12526 TelexFree Financial, Inc Affects TELEXFREE, INC. 16 17 Affects TELEXFREE FINANCIAL, INC Date: OST REQUESTED Time: OST REQUESTED 18 19 EMERGENCY MOTION OF THE DEBTORS FOR ENTRY OF INTERIM AND FINAL ORDERS PURSUANT TO SECTION 105(a) AND 366 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE 20 (I) PROHIBITING UTILITIES FROM ALTERING, REFUSING, OR DISCONTINUING SERVICE, (II) DEEMING UTILITIES ADEQUATELY ASSURED OF FUTURE 21 PERFORMANCE, AND (III) ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING 22 **ADEQUATE ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT** 23 The above-captioned debtors and debtors-in-possession (collectively, the "Debtors")¹ 24 hereby move the Court (the "Motion"), pursuant to sections 105(a) and 366 of chapter 11 of title 25

The Debtors in these Chapter 11 Cases, along with the last four (4) digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: TelexFree, LLC (0853), TelexFree, Inc. (1309) and Telexfree Financial, Inc (7555). The Debtors' business address is 225 Cedar Hill Street, Suite 200, Marlborough, Massachusetts 01752.



11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532 (the "Bankruptcy Code"), for entry of an interim order, attached hereto as Exhibit 2 (the "Interim Order") and a final order, attached hereto as Exhibit 3 (the "Final Order", together with the Interim Order, the "Procedures Order"): (a) prohibiting their Utility Providers (as defined below) from altering, refusing, or discontinuing service; (b) deeming Utility Providers adequately assured of future performance; and (c) establishing procedures for determining adequate assurance of payment. In addition, the Debtors request that the Court set a final hearing (the "Final Hearing") on the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures. In support of this Motion, the Debtors respectfully state as follows:

Status of the Case and Jurisdiction

- 1. On April 13, 2014 (the "Petition Date"), the Debtors commenced these cases (the "Chapter 11 Cases") by filing voluntary petitions for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 2. The Debtors have continued in possession of their properties and are operating and managing their businesses as debtors-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 3. No request has been made for the appointment of a trustee or examiner, and a creditors' committee has not yet been appointed in the Chapter 11 Cases.
- 4. The Court has jurisdiction over this Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1408. This matter is core within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2).
- 5. The statutory bases for the relief requested herein are sections 105(a) and 366 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 6. Pursuant to LR 9014.2, Debtors consent to entry of final order(s) or judgment(s) by the bankruptcy judge if it is determined that the bankruptcy judge, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution

2

3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27

28

Gordon Silver Ninth Floor oward Hughes Pkwy egas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Background

- 7. TelexFree, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company ("TelexFree Nevada"), TelexFree, Inc., a Massachusetts corporation ("TelexFree Massachusetts") and TelexFree Financial, Inc, a Florida corporation ("TelexFree Florida" and together with TelexFree Massachusetts and TelexFree Nevada, "TelexFree," the "Debtors" or the "Company") are a telecommunications business that uses multi-level marketing to assist in the distribution of voice TelexFree's retail VoIP product, over internet protocol ("VoIP") telephone services. 99TelexFree, allows for unlimited international calling to approximately seventy countries for a flat monthly rate of \$49.90. Customers of the Debtors' VoIP product ("Customers") used approximately 11 million minutes of the 99TelexFree VoIP service in February 2014. Since 99TelexFree was introduced in 2012, Customer usage increased on a monthly basis until March 2014.
- 8. TelexFree is operated as a multi-level marketing company, and currently has over 700,000 associates or promoters (the "Promoters") worldwide. Prior to the filing of these Chapter 11 Cases, TelexFree compensated Promoters for the sales of the VoIP product, the placing of advertisements and the recruitment of other Promoters down line. Because questions were raised about its compensation plan, the Company on March 9, 2014, discontinued its original compensation plan (the "Original Comp Plan") and replaced the Original Comp Plan with a revised compensation plan (the "Revised Comp Plan" and together with the Original Comp Plan, the "Pre-Petition Comp Plans"). At the time of the roll-out of the Revised Comp Plan, the Company decided to honor certain discretionary payments to Promoters under the Original Comp Plan. These discretionary payments quickly became a substantial drain on the Company's liquidity. The Company discontinued the Pre-Petition Comp Plans and ceased making discretionary payments under the Original Comp Plan prior to the Petition Date.
- 9. The Company believes the sales of the 99TelexFree product, the TelexFree "app," and other new products will ultimately prove successful and profitable. The Company is struggling, however, with several factors that required it to seek chapter 11 protection by filing these Chapter 11 Cases. First, the Company experienced exponential growth in revenue between

14

15

12

16 17

19

18

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Gordon Silver

Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor

(702) 796-5555

2012 and 2013 (from de minimus amounts to over \$1 billion), which put tremendous pressure on the Company's financial, operational and management systems. Second, although the Company revised its Original Comp Plan in order to address certain questions that were raised regarding such plan, the Company believes that the Pre-Petition Comp Plans need to be further revised. Finally, the trailing liabilities arising from the Original Comp Plan are difficult to quantify and have resulted in substantial asserted liabilities against the Company, a number of which may not be valid.

- 10. As a result, the Company filed these Chapter 11 Cases to obtain the breathing room to address its operational and regulatory issues, revise the Pre-Petition Comp Plans, and quantify and address the claims against it. The Debtors believe that a restructuring of its debt, adoption of a post-petition revised compensation plan, unveiling of new products (including the TelexFree app), and return to growing its Customer base will allow the Company to realize its full potential and generate significant value for its constituents.
- A detailed factual background of the Debtors' businesses and operations, as well 11. as the events precipitating the commencement of these Chapter 11 Cases, is more fully set forth in the Omnibus Declaration of William H. Runge III in Support of the Debtors' Chapter 11 Petitions and Requests for First Day Relief (the "First Day Declaration") filed contemporaneously herewith and incorporated herein by reference.

Utility Providers

- 12. In connection with the operation of their businesses and management of their properties, the Debtors obtain telephone services and internet provider services (collectively, the "Utility Services") from certain utility companies (collectively, the "Utility Providers"), including those listed on Exhibit 1 hereto (the "Utility Provider List").²
- In the ordinary course of business, the Debtors regularly incur utility expenses for 13. Utility Services provided by the Utility Providers. The Debtors have a long and established

The inclusion of any entity on, as well as any omission of any entity from, **Exhibit 1** is not an admission by the Debtors that such entity is, or is not, a utility within the meaning of section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code, and the Debtors reserve all rights with respect thereto.

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

payment history with the Utility Providers. The Debtors' aggregate average monthly cost for utility services is approximately \$18,500.

- 14. Uninterrupted utility services are essential to the preservation of the Debtors' estates and assets, and therefore, to the success of these Chapter 11 Cases. Should a Utility Provider refuse or discontinue service, even for a brief period, the Debtors' ability to preserve and maximize the value of their estates could be severely and irreparably harmed. For example, a lack of telephonic or internet services would render the Debtors' services inoperable, effectively corrupting the good-will of the Debtors' businesses with end users of the Debtors' products. Such a result could jeopardize the Debtors' reorganization efforts and ultimately, value and creditor recoveries. It is therefore critical that utility services continue uninterrupted.
- 15. The relief requested herein is for all Utility Providers providing Utility Services to the Debtors, and is not limited to those listed on **Exhibit 1**. The Debtors reserve the right to supplement Exhibit 1 by filing a notice (a "Supplemental Notice") at a later date with the Court.

Relief Requested

- 16. Section 366(a) of the Bankruptcy Code prohibits utility companies from discontinuing, altering, or refusing service to a debtor during the first twenty (20) days of a chapter 11 case. 11 U.S.C. § 366(a). However, pursuant to section 366(c)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, in a chapter 11 context, a utility provider may refuse or discontinue service to a debtor after the first thirty (30) days if the debtor has not furnished the utility provider with "adequate assurance of payment" within the meaning of section 366(c)(1)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code. 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(2). Upon expiration of such period, a utility provider cannot terminate its services if a debtor has furnished "adequate assurance of payment." Id.
- 17. By this Motion, pursuant to sections 105(a) and 366 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors seek entry of the Procedures Order:
 - determining that their Utility Providers have been provided with (A) adequate assurance of payment within the meaning of section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code;

- (B) approving the Debtors' proposed offer of adequate assurance and procedures governing Utility Providers' requests for additional or different adequate assurance;
- (C) prohibiting the Utility Providers from altering, refusing, or discontinuing services on account of prepetition amounts outstanding or on account of any perceived inadequacy of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance;
- (D) establishing procedures for the Utility Providers to seek to opt out of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures; and
- (E) determining that the Debtors are not required to provide any additional adequate assurance beyond what is proposed by this Motion.
- 18. Uninterrupted utility services are essential to the preservation of the Debtors' estates and assets, and therefore, to the success of the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases. Should any Utility Provider refuse or discontinue service, even for a brief period, the Debtors' ability to preserve and maximize the value of their respective estates could be severely and irreparably harmed. It is therefore critical that utility services continue uninterrupted.

A. Adequate Assurance

- 19. Section 366(a) of the Bankruptcy Code prohibits utilities from altering, refusing, or discontinuing service to a debtor for the first twenty (20) days of a bankruptcy case. However, pursuant to section 366(c)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, in a chapter 11 context, a utility provider may refuse or discontinue service to a debtor after the first thirty (30) days if the debtor has not furnished the utility provider with adequate assurance of future payment.
- 20. In light of the severe consequences to the Debtors of any interruption in services by the Utility Providers, but recognizing the right of the Utility Providers to evaluate the Proposed Adequate Assurance (as defined below) on a case-by-case basis, the Debtors propose that the Procedures Order approve and adopt the Adequate Assurance Procedures (as defined below).
- 21. The Debtors intend to pay all post-petition obligations and expect that revenues generated from the business operations, as well as existing cash, will be sufficient to pay all

18

19

20

21

22

23 24 25

26 27

28

undisputed post-petition obligations owed to the Utilities in a timely manner. However, to provide adequate assurance of payment for future services to the Utility Providers as set forth in section 366(c) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors propose to deposit an initial sum equal to the Debtors' estimated average cost for two (2) weeks of Utility Services (the "Adequate Assurance Deposit"), into a segregated account (the "Adequate Assurance Account") within twenty (20) days of the Petition Date, pending further order of this Court. Because the Debtors' two-week spending on Utility Services is approximately \$9,300, the Adequate Assurance Deposit will be approximately \$9,300.

- 22. The Debtors further propose to maintain the Adequate Assurance Account with a minimum balance equal to the Debtors' estimated average two-week cost of Utility Services through the final hearing on the Motion. Thereafter, the Debtors propose to adjust the amount in the Adequate Assurance Account to reflect the following factors: (i) the termination of Utility Services by the Debtors regardless of any Additional Assurance Requests (as defined below), and (ii) agreements with the Utility Providers. These adjustments will permit the Debtors to maintain the Adequate Assurance Account with an amount that consistently provides the Utility Providers that do not otherwise hold deposits or security for their Utility Services with a twoweek deposit on account of such services.
- 23. The Debtors submit that the Adequate Assurance Deposit, taken together with the facts and circumstances of the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases (together, the "Proposed Adequate Assurance"), constitutes sufficient adequate assurance to the Utility Providers. Specifically, the Debtors have sufficient cash that they believe will meet their needs during the Chapter 11 Cases. As a result, the Debtors are objectively very likely to continue paying their obligations to the Utility Providers post-petition.
- 24. These protections ensure that all Utility Providers will have adequate assurance of payment throughout the Chapter 11 Cases, and the Debtors believe that no other or further assurance is necessary. However, if any Utility Provider believes adequate assurance is required beyond the protections described herein, it must request such assurance pursuant to the procedures described below (the "Adequate Assurance Procedures"):

- a. As adequate assurance of future payment to the Utility Providers, Debtors propose to deposit an initial sum equal to the Debtors' estimated average cost for two (2) weeks of Utility Services into the Adequate Assurance Account within twenty (20) days of the Petition Date, pending further order of this Court. The Debtors estimate the aggregate amount of all Adequate Assurance Deposits will not exceed \$9,300;
- b. If a Utility Provider is not satisfied with the assurance of future payment provided by the Debtors, the Utility Provider must serve a written request (the "Additional Assurance Request") upon the Debtors setting forth, to the extent applicable, the locations(s) for which Utility Services are provided, the account number(s) for such locations(s), the outstanding balance for each account, a summary of the Debtors' payment history on each account, and an explanation of why the Adequate Assurance Deposit is inadequate assurance of payment;
- c. The Additional Assurance Request must actually be filed with the Court and received by (i) the Debtors, Attn: Stuart MacMillan, 225 Cedar Hill Street, Marlborough, MA 01752, and (ii) the Debtors' counsel, Gordon Silver, 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, 9th Floor, Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (Attn: Thomas H. Fell, Esq.), and Greenberg Traurig, LLP, MetLife Building, 200 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10166 (Attn: Zachary A. Polidoro, Esq.) (collectively, the "Notice Parties");
- d. In the event that the Debtors receive any Additional Assurance Request in compliance with the procedures in the Motion, the Debtors shall have five (5) days after the Request Deadline date (collectively, the "Resolution Period") to negotiate with the Utility Provider to endeavor to resolve that Utility Provider's request for additional assurance of payment; and that during this period, Utility Providers may not terminate any of the services they provide to the Debtors on account of the bankruptcy filing or any unpaid charges for prepetition services;
- e. The Debtors may, in their discretion, resolve any Additional Assurance Request by mutual agreement with the Utility Provider and without further order of the Court, and may, in connection with any such agreement, in their discretion, provide a Utility Provider with additional adequate assurance of future payment including, but not limited to, cash deposits, prepayments, and/or other forms of security, without further order of this Court, if the Debtors believe such additional assurance is reasonable;
- f. If the Debtors determine that an Additional Assurance Request is not reasonable and are not able to reach an alternative resolution with the Utility Provider during the Resolution Period, the Debtors, during or immediately after the Resolution Period, will request a hearing before this Court to determine the adequacy of assurances of payment with respect to a particular Utility Provider (the "Determination Hearing") pursuant to section 366(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code;

13

14

27

25

26

- Pending resolution of any such Determination Hearing, such particular Utility g. Provider shall be restrained from discontinuing, altering, or refusing service to the Debtors on account of unpaid charges for prepetition services or the Debtors' bankruptcy filing;
- h. A Utility Provider shall be deemed to have adequate assurance of payment unless and until (i) the Debtors, in their sole discretion, agree to an Additional Assurance Request or agree to an alternative assurance of payment with the Utility Provider during the Resolution Period, or (ii) this Court enters an order requiring that additional adequate assurance of payment be provided;
- i. Any Utility Provider that fails to make an Additional Assurance Request shall be deemed to be satisfied that the Adequate Assurance Deposit provided to it supplies adequate assurance of payment; and
- j. At any time, the Debtors may terminate service from any of the Utility Providers, such termination being effective immediately upon Debtors' notice to the Utility Provider. At such time, Debtors shall no longer be required to make any more payments to such Utility Provider for any services provided after such termination, and any excess shall be returned forthwith.

В. Subsequent Modifications of Utility Provider List

22. Although the Debtors have made an extensive and good-faith effort to identify all the Utility Providers, certain Utility Providers that currently provide Utility Services to the Debtors may not be listed on **Exhibit 1**. To the extent that the Debtors identify additional Utility Providers, the Debtors will file a Supplemental Notice and will serve the Interim Order or the Final Order, as applicable, and the Supplemental Notice on all Utility Providers listed in such Supplemental Notice via facsimile or, if such information is not available, via electronic mail. The Debtors request that the Interim Order and the Final Order be binding on all Utilities, including any Utility Provider set forth on any Supplemental Notice; provided, however, that any party included on a Supplemental Notice shall be provided twenty (20) days from the date of service of any Supplemental Notice to object to its inclusion in the Interim Order and the Final Order. If an objection is received within such twenty (20) day period, a hearing shall be heard on such objection at the next regularly scheduled hearing date, or on such date as mutually agreed to by the parties.

23. Nothing on the Interim Order or the Final Order will constitute a finding that any entity is or is not a Utility Provider under section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code, whether or not such entity is included in the Utilities List.

Basis for Relief Requested

- 24. Congress enacted section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code to protect debtors from utility service cutoffs upon a bankruptcy filing while, at the same time, provide utility companies with adequate assurance that the debtors will pay for post-petition services. *See* H.R. REP. No. 95-595, at 350 (1978), *reprinted in* 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5963, 6306. Accordingly, section 366 protects debtors by enjoining utilities from altering, refusing, or discontinuing services solely on account of unpaid prepetition amounts for a period of thirty (30) days after the bankruptcy filing, and it protects utilities by permitting them to alter, refuse, or discontinue service after thirty (30) days if the debtor has not furnished "adequate assurance" of payment in a form "satisfactory" to the utility. 11 U.S.C. § 366.³
- 25. Section 366(c), which was enacted as part of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (the "2005 Act"), significantly modified the existing statutory framework. It has two primary purposes: first, it permits a utility to alter, refuse, or discontinue utility service if a debtor has not provided "satisfactory" adequate assurance within thirty (30) days of its bankruptcy filing, subject to the court's ability to modify the amount of adequate assurance. It also restricts the factors that a court can consider when determining whether an adequate assurance payment is, in fact, adequate. Specifically, courts may no longer consider (a) the absence of a security deposit before the debtor's petition date, (b) the debtor's history of timely payments, or (c) the availability of an administrative expense priority when determining the amount of a deposit. Notwithstanding these noteworthy changes, Congress did

³ Section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code applies to entities that are traditionally viewed as utilities, such as those that provide electricity, telephone service or water, and to any entity that supplies services that cannot be readily obtained or replaced elsewhere, or which constitutes a monopoly with respect to the services that it provides to the debtor. See, e.g., One Stop Realtour Place, Inc. v. Allegiance Telecom of Pennsylvania, Inc. (In re One Stop Realtour Place, Inc.), 268 B.R. 430, 436-37 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2001) (provider of telephone service is a utility regardless of whether telephone service may be available from another provider); In re Coastal Dry Dock & Repair Corp., 62 B.R. 879, 883 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1986) (landlord of the Brooklyn Navy Yard "occupies 'a special position with respect to the debtor in its rose as the [debtor's] utility supplier").

8 9

10

11

7

121314

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

not abrogate the bankruptcy court's right to determine the amount of adequate assurance necessary or change the fundamental requirement that assurance of payment must simply be "adequate."

- 26. First, while section 366(c) does limit the factors a court can consider when determining whether a debtor has provided adequate assurance of payment, it does not limit the court's ability to determine the amount of payment necessary, if any, to provide such adequate assurance. Instead, section 366(c) gives courts the same discretion in determining the amount of payment necessary for adequate assurance as they previously had under section 366(b). Compare 11 U.S.C. § 366(b) (2005) ("On request of a party-in-interest and after notice and a hearing, the court may order reasonable modification of the amount of the deposit or other security necessary to provide adequate assurance") with 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(3)(A) (2005) ("On request of a party-in-interest and after notice and a hearing, the court may order modification of the amount of an assurance payment under paragraph (2)"). Section 366(b) permits a court to find that no adequate assurance payment at all is necessary to provide a utility with adequate assurance of payment under certain circumstances. See In re Steinebach, 303 B.R. 634, 641 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 2004) ("Bankruptcy courts are afforded reasonable discretion in determining what constitutes adequate assurance including discretion to determine that no deposit or other security is necessary."); In re Caldor, 117 F.3d 646, 650 (2d Cir. 1997) ("Even assuming that 'other security' should be interpreted narrowly, a bankruptcy court's authority to 'modify' the level of the 'deposit or other security' provided for under § 366(b) includes the power to require 'no deposit or other security' where none is necessary to provide a utility supplier with 'adequate assurance of payment"). This may be particularly true in cases where the debtor has made prepetition deposits or prepayments for services that utilities will ultimately render post-petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(I)(A)(v) (recognizing a prepayment for post-petition services as adequate assurance). Accordingly, courts continue to have discretion to determine the amount of adequate assurance payments and, where appropriate, to determine that no such payment is necessary.
- 27. Additionally, section 366(c), like section 366(b), simply requires that a utility's assurance of payment be "adequate." Courts have long recognized that adequate assurance of

26

27

28

performance does not constitute an absolute guarantee of a debtor's ability to pay. See In re Steinebach, 303 B.R at 641 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 2004) ("Adequate assurance of payment is not, however, absolute assurance . . . all § 366(b) requires is that a utility receive only such assurance of payment as is necessary to protect its interests given the facts of the debtor's financial circumstances"). Courts have also recognized that in determining the amount of adequate assurance, bankruptcy courts should focus "on the need of the utility for assurance, and to require that the debtor supply no more than that, since the debtor almost perforce has a conflicting need to conserve scarce financial resources." In re Caldor, 117 F.2d at 650 (emphasis in original); see also In re Penn. Cent. Transp. Co., 467 F.2d 100, 103-04 (3d Cir. 1972) (affirming bankruptcy court's ruling that no utility deposits were necessary where such deposits would likely "jeopardize the continuing operating of the [debtor] merely to give further security to suppliers who are already reasonably protected"). Accordingly, demands by a utility for a guarantee of payment when they already have adequate assurance of payment in light of the Debtors' specific circumstances should be refused.

- 28. Based upon the foregoing, the Debtors believe that the proposed Adequate Assurance Deposits are sufficient adequate assurance of payment within the meaning of section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code. The proposed Adequate Assurance Deposits are cash deposits, a listed form of assurance of payment in section 366(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtors thus believe that they will be able to pay their operating costs, including utility costs, as they come due. Moreover, the Debtors have a powerful incentive to stay current on their utility obligations because of their significant reliance on utility services to maintain their business operations. These factors - which the Court should consider when considering the amount of any adequate assurance payments -- justify a finding that the Proposed Adequate Assurance is more than sufficient to assure the Utility Providers of future payment.
- If the Utility Providers disagree with the Debtors' analysis, however, the 29. procedures proposed in this Motion will enable the parties to negotiate and, if necessary, seek this Court's intervention without jeopardizing the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases, while still protecting the rights of the Utility Providers under section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code.

- 30. The Court has authority to approve the proposed procedures under section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that the Court "may issue any order, process or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." The purpose of section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code is "to assure the bankruptcy courts [sic] power to take whatever action is appropriate or necessary in aid of the exercise of their jurisdiction." 2 Collier on Bankruptcy ¶ 105.01, at 105-5 to 105-6 (15th ed. rev. 2001). Thus, section 105 essentially codifies the bankruptcy court's inherent equitable powers. See In re Rainbow Magazine, Inc., 77 F.3d 278, 284 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing In re Courtesy Inns, Ltd. (Jones v. Bank of Santa Fe), 40 F.3d 1084, 1089 (10th Cir. 1994) and Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 33 (1991)) (stating that section 105 is intended to give the bankruptcy court the inherent power recognized by the Supreme Court in Chambers; see also Management Tech. Corp. v. Pardo, 56 B.R. 337, 339 (Bankr. D. N.J. 1985) (noting that the court's equitable power is derived from section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code).
- 31. The proposed procedures set forth a fair process that will enable all parties to negotiate their respective positions and, where necessary, seek Court intervention without jeopardizing the Debtors' chapter 11 cases, but while preserving the Utility Provider's rights under section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code. In fact, this Court and other courts have approved similar procedures in other chapter 11 cases filed after the 2005 Act became effective. See In re Jerry's Nugget, Inc., Case No. 12-19387-mkn, ECF No. 50 (Bankr. D. Nev. August 17, 2012); In re Ahern Rentals, Inc., Case No. 11-53860-btb, ECF No. 34 (Bankr. D. Nev. February 6, 2012); In re Spanish Trail Country Club, Inc., Case No. 11-23466-bam, ECF No. 28 (Bankr. D. Nev. Sept. 2, 2011); In re 155 East Tropicana, LLC, 11-22216-bam, ECF No. 62 (Bankr. D. Nev. August 8, 2011).
- 32. Accordingly, the Debtors believe that the proposed procedures should be approved.

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Bankruptcy Rule 6003 Satisfied and Request for Waiver of Stay

- 33. The Debtors further submit that because the relief requested in this Motion is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm to the Debtors for the reasons set forth herein and in the First Day Declaration, Rule 6003 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "Bankruptcy Rules") has been satisfied and the relief requested herein should be granted.
 - 34. Specifically, Bankruptcy Rule 6003 provides:

Except to the extent that relief is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm, the court shall not, within 21 days after the filing of the petition, grant relief regarding the following: . . . (b) a motion to use, sell, lease, or otherwise incur an obligation regarding property of the estate, including a motion to pay all or part of a claim that arose before the filing of the petition, but not a motion under Rule 4001.

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 6003.

- 35. One court in the Ninth Circuit has, in an unpublished opinion, addressed the "immediate and irreparable harm" language in the context of Bankruptcy Rule 6003. That courted noted "that Rule 6003 allows the court to authorize payments on prepetition debt if necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm, but does not require that such harm be to the bankruptcy estate. The court finds that a delay in payment would result in immediate and irreparable harm to both the dairy farmers and the debtor, and for this reason authorizes payment now." *In re Humboldt Creamery, LLC*, 2009 Bankr. LEXIS 2477, 3 n. 3 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2009). However, the harm must be shown to be actual and imminent, not speculative or unsubstantiated. *See, e.g., Acierno v. New Castle County*, 40 F.2d 645, 653-55 (3d Cir. 1994).
- 36. The Debtors further seek a waiver of any stay of the effectiveness of the order approving this Motion. Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h) "[an] order authorizing the use, sale, or lease of property other than cash collateral is stayed until the expiration of ten (10) days after entry of the order, unless the court orders otherwise." As set forth above, the payments proposed herein are essential to prevent irreparable damage to the Debtors' operations and the value of their estates. Accordingly, the Debtors submit that ample cause exists to

justify a waiver of the ten (10) day stay imposed by Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h), to the extent it applies.

Notice

37. Notice of this Motion has been given to the following parties or, in lieu thereof, to their counsel, if known: (a) the Office of the United States Trustee for the District of Nevada; (b) creditors holding the thirty (30) largest unsecured claims as set forth in the consolidated list filed with the Debtors' petitions; (c) those parties requesting notice pursuant to Rule 2002; (d) the Office of the United States Attorney General for the District of Nevada; (e) the Massachusetts Securities Division; (f) the Internal Revenue Service; (g) the Securities and Exchange Commission; and (h) the Nevada Department of Employment, Training & Rehab, Employment Security Division; (i) the Nevada Department of Taxation, Bankruptcy Section; and (j) the Utility Providers⁴ listed on **Exhibit 1** hereto. The Debtors submit that, in light of the nature of the relief requested, no other or further notice need be given.

No Prior Request

38. The Debtors have not previously sought the relief requested herein from this or any other court.

27

28

⁴ The Debtors intend to provide notice to the Utility Providers via facsimile. However, to the extent that the Debtors have been unable to obtain a Utility Provider's facsimile number, the Debtors propose to provide notice via electronic mail.

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

1011

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

Conclusion

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully request that this Court enter an order granting the relief requested herein and that it grant the Debtors such other and further relief as is just and proper.

GORDON SILVER

DATED this day of April, 2014.

D--- 6

GREGORY E. GARMAN, ESQ. THOMAS H. FELL, ESQ.

TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ. 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

AND

NANCY A. MITCHELL (pro hac vice pending) MARIA J. DICONZA (pro hac vice pending) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP The MetLife Building 200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166

Proposed Counsel for the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Description

Internet and

Telephone Service

Provider

Internet Bandwidth

Provider

Internet Service

Provider

1

2

Exhibit 1

Utility Providers

Address

500 Technology

Dr. Suite 550

Weld Spring, MO

63304

34 St Martin Dr.

Marlborough, MA

01752

PO Box 84023

Seattle, WA 98124-8423

Telephone

636-793-1100

917-610-7783

415-967-0258

Proposed Adequate

Assurance Amount

\$200.00

\$3,500

\$3,500

3

Provider Name

Verizon

Access Northeast

Amazon Web

Services, Inc.

10 11

1213

1415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

28

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

104590-001/2260714_2.doc

Exhibit 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NANCY A. MITCHELL (pro hac vice pending) GREGORY E. GARMAN, NV Bar # 6654 MARIA J. DICONZA (pro hac vice pending) THOMAS H. FELL, NV Bar # 3717 8 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, NV Bar # 9605 The MetLife Building **GORDON SILVER** 9 200 Park Avenue 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, 9th flr. New York, New York 10166 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 10 Telephone: 702-796-5555 Telephone: 212-801-9200 11 Facsimile: 212-801-6400 Facsimile: 702-369-2666 Email: mitchelln@gtlaw.com Email: ggarman@gordonsilver.com 12 diconzam@gtlaw.com tfell@gordonsilver.com tpilatowicz@gordonsilver.com 13 Proposed Counsel for the Debtors 14 and Debtors in Possession 15 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 16 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 17 In re: Case No.: BK-S-14-12524-abl 18 Chapter 11 TELEXFREE, LLC, 19 [PROPOSED] Affects this Debtor Jointly Administered with: 20 Affects all Debtors 14-12525 TelexFree, Inc. 21 14-12526 TelexFree Financial, Inc 22 Affects TELEXFREE, INC. 23 Affects TELEXFREE FINANCIAL, INC 24 INTERIM ORDER UNDER SECTION 366 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE 25 (A) PROHIBITING UTILITY PROVIDERS FROM ALTERING, REFUSING, OR DISCONTINUING SERVICE, (B) DEEMING UTILITIES ADEQUATELY 26 ASSURED OF FUTURE PERFORMANCE, AND (C) ESTABLISHING 27 PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING ADEQUATE ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT 28

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

104590-001/2260714_2.doc

Upon the motion (the "Motion") filed by the above-captioned debtors and debtors-inpossession (collectively, the "Debtors") seeking entry of interim and final orders: (a) determining that their Utility Providers have been provided with adequate assurance of payment within the meaning of section 366 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532. (the "Bankruptcy Code"); (b) approving the Debtors' proposed offer of adequate assurance and procedures governing Utility Providers' requests for additional or different adequate assurance; (c) prohibiting the Utility Providers from altering, refusing, or discontinuing services on account of prepetition amounts outstanding or on account of any perceived inadequacy of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance; (d) establishing procedures for the Utility Providers to seek to opt out of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures; (e) determining that the Debtors are not required to provide any additional adequate assurance beyond what is proposed by this Motion; and (f) setting a final hearing on the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures; the Court, having reviewed the Motion and having heard the statements of counsel in support of the relief requested in the Motion at the hearing before the Court (the "Hearing"), finds that the Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334, this is a core matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), notice of the Motion and the Hearing were sufficient under the circumstances and that no further notice need be given, and the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion and at the Hearing establish just cause for the relief granted herein,

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Motion is GRANTED on an interim basis.
- 2. Until such time that the Final Order is entered by the Court, all Utility Providers are prohibited from discontinuing, altering, or refusing service to the Debtor on account of any unpaid prepetition charges, or discriminating against the Debtors, or requiring payment of a deposit or receipt of any other security for continued service as a result of the Debtors'

24

25

26

27

¹ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Motion.

bankruptcy filing or any outstanding prepetition invoices other than as set forth in the Motion, provided the Debtors are in compliance with the terms of this Order.

- 3. The Motion and this Interim Order shall be served, via first-class mail, on each Utility Providers listed on **Exhibit 1** to the Motion within two (2) business days of entry of this Interim Order.
- 4. The Debtors will deposit an initial sum equal to the Debtors' estimated average cost for two (2) weeks of Utility Services into the Adequate Assurance Account within twenty (20) days of the Petition Date, pending further order of this Court. The Debtors estimate the aggregate amount of all Adequate Assurance Deposits will not exceed \$9,300.
- 5. If a Utility Provider is not satisfied with the assurance of future payment being provided by the Debtors pursuant to the Motion, the Utility Provider must serve a written request upon the Debtors setting forth, to the extent applicable, the locations(s) for which Utility Services are provided, the account number(s) for such locations(s), the outstanding balance for each account, a summary of the Debtors' payment history on each account, and an explanation of why the Adequate Assurance Deposit is inadequate assurance of payment.
- 6. In the event the Debtors default post-petition in respect of any of their obligations under this Order to any Utility Provider, such Utility Provider may seek additional adequate assurances in this Court upon motion and appropriate notice to the Debtors and interested parties.
- 7. The Additional Assurance Request must be filed by _______ (the "Request Deadline") with the Court and received by (i) the Debtors, Attn: Stuart MacMillan 225 Cedar Hill Street, Marlborough, MA 01752, and (ii) the Debtors' counsel, Gordon Silver, 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, 9th Floor, Las Vegas, Nevada 89169, and Greenberg Traurig, LLP, MetLife Building, 200 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10166 (Attn: Zachary A. Polidoro, Esq.) (collectively, the "Notice Parties").
- 8. The deadline by which objections to the Motion and the Final Order must be filed is ______, 2010, at _:____.m. (Prevailing Eastern Time). A final hearing, if required, on the Motion will be held on ______, 2010, at ______ (Prevailing Eastern Time). If no

objections are filed to the Motion, the Court may enter the Final Order without further notice or hearing.

- 9. Notwithstanding the relief granted herein any actions taken pursuant thereto, nothing herein shall be deemed: (i) an admission as to the validity of any claim against the Debtors; (ii) a waiver of the Debtors' right to dispute any claim on any grounds; (iii) a promise or requirement to pay any claim; (iv) an implication or admission that any particular claim is of a type specified or defined hereunder; (v) a request or authorization to assume any agreement, contract or lease pursuant to section 365 of title 11 of the Bankruptcy Code; or (vi) a waiver of the Debtors' rights under the Bankruptcy Code or any other applicable law.
- 10. Consistent with Bankruptcy Rule 6003 and the relief requested in the Motion, the Debtors are authorized to pay within twenty (20) days following the Petition Date those payments which become due and owing during such period and those payments which became due prior to the Petition Date.
- Notwithstanding Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h), 7062 and 9014 the terms and 11. conditions of this Order shall be immediately effective upon its entry.
- 12. The Debtor shall fund the Adequate Assurance Deposits within twenty (20) days of the entry of this Interim Order.

27

28

loward Hughes Pkwy /egas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Case 14-12524-abl Doc 7-1 Entered 04/13/14 23:35:36 Page 6 of 11

13. The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or 1 2 related to the implementation of this Bridge Order. 3 Submitted by: 4 5 GORDON SILVER 6 By: 7 GREGORY E. GARMAN, ESQ. THOMAS H. FELL, ESQ. 8 TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ. 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor 9 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 10 **AND** 11 NANCY A. MITCHELL (pro hac vice pending) 12 MARIA J. DICONZA (pro hac vice pending) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 13 The MetLife Building 14 200 Park Avenue New York, New York 10166 15 Proposed Counsel for the Debtors 16 and Debtors in Possession 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

Gordon Silver Attorneys At Law Ninth Floor 3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 (702) 796-5555

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Upon the motion (the "Motion") filed by the above-captioned debtors and debtors-inpossession (collectively, the "Debtors") seeking entry of interim and final orders: (a) determining that their Utility Providers have been provided with adequate assurance of payment within the meaning of section 366 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1532 (the "Bankruptcy Code"); (b) approving the Debtors' proposed offer of adequate assurance and procedures governing Utility Providers' requests for additional or different adequate assurance; (c) prohibiting the Utility Providers from altering, refusing, or discontinuing services on account of pre-petition amounts outstanding or on account of any perceived inadequacy of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance; (d) establishing procedures for the Utility Providers to seek to opt out of the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures; (e) determining that the Debtors are not required to provide any additional adequate assurance beyond what is proposed by this Motion; and (f) setting a final hearing on the Debtors' proposed adequate assurance procedures; the Court having reviewed the Motion and having heard the statements of counsel in support of the relief requested in the Motion at the hearing before the Court (the "Hearing"), finds that the Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334, this is a core matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), notice of the Motion and the Hearing were sufficient under the circumstances and that no further notice need be given, and the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion and at the Hearing establish just cause for the relief granted herein,

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Motion is GRANTED on a final basis.
- 2. Absent compliance with the procedures set forth in the Motion, the Utility Providers are (a) forbidden to discontinue, alter, or refuse service on account of any unpaid prepetition charges, and (b) deemed to have received adequate assurance of payment in compliance with section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 3. Any Utility Provider who has accepted an Adequate Assurance Deposit and did not make an Additional Assurance Request is hereby deemed to have stipulated that the Adequate Assurance Deposit constitutes adequate assurance of future payment to such Utility Provider, and such Utility Provider is further deemed to have waived any right to seek additional

adequate assurance during the course of these chapter 11 proceedings, provided, however, that in the event the Debtors default post-petition in respect of any of their obligations under this Order to any Utility Provider, such Utility Provider may seek additional adequate assurances in this Court upon motion and appropriate notice to the Debtors and interested parties.

- 4. The procedures for determining additional adequate assurances, as provided in the Motion, are hereby approved.
- 5. Any Utility Provider who failed to file its Adequate Assurance Request is hereby:
 (a) forbidden to discontinue, alter, or refuse service on account of any unpaid pre-petition charges, or require additional adequate assurance of payment other than the Proposed Adequate Assurance described in the Motion; and (b) deemed to have received adequate assurance of payment in compliance with section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code.
- 6. In the event that the Debtors receive any Additional Assurance Request in compliance with the procedures in the Motion, the Debtors shall have five (5) days after the Request Deadline date (collectively, the "Resolution Period") to negotiate with the Utility Provider to endeavor to resolve that Utility Provider's request for additional assurance of payment; and that during this period, Utility Providers may not terminate any of the services they provide to the Debtors on account of the bankruptcy filing or any unpaid charges for pre-petition services.
- 7. The Debtors may, in their discretion, resolve any Additional Assurance Request by mutual agreement with the Utility Provider and without further order of the Court, and may, in connection with any such agreement, in their discretion, provide a Utility Provider with additional adequate assurance of future payment including, but not limited to, cash deposits, prepayments, and/or other forms of security, without further order of this Court, if the Debtors believe such additional assurance is reasonable.
- 8. If the Debtors determine that an Additional Assurance Request is not reasonable and are not able to reach an alternative resolution with the Utility Provider during the Resolution Period, the Debtors, during or immediately after the Resolution Period, will request a hearing before this Court to determine the adequacy of assurances of payment with respect to a particular

Utility Provider (the "Determination Hearing") pursuant to Section 366(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code.

- 9. Pending resolution of any such Determination Hearing, such particular Utility Provider shall be restrained from discontinuing, altering, or refusing service to the Debtors on account of unpaid charges for pre-petition services or the Debtors' bankruptcy filing.
- 10. A Utility Provider shall be deemed to have adequate assurance of payment unless and until (a) the Debtors, in their sole discretion, agree to an Additional Assurance Request or agree to an alternative assurance of payment with the Utility Provider during the Resolution Period, or (b) this Court enters an order requiring that additional adequate assurance of payment be provided.
- 11. Any Utility Provider who failed to timely file an objection to the Motion is deemed to consent to the Adequate Assurance Procedures and shall be bound by the Adequate Assurance Procedures. The sole recourse of all Utility Providers that do not timely file objection to the Motion shall be to submit an Additional Assurance Request pursuant to the Adequate Assurance Procedures, and such Utility Providers shall be enjoined from ceasing performance pending any Determination Hearing that may be conducted pursuant to the Adequate Assurance Procedures.
- 12. Utility Providers that currently provide Utility Services to the Debtors' are listed on Exhibit 1 to the Motion. However, all Utility Services may not be listed on Exhibit 1 to the Motion. To the extent that the Debtors identify additional Utility Providers, the Debtors shall promptly file amendments to the Utility Provider List, and shall serve copies of the Proposed Procedures Order on such newly-identified Utility Providers. Following the Debtors' filing and service of such amendment to the Utility Provider List (which shall include a copy of the final order approving this Motion), the Utility Providers identified thereon shall have twenty (20) days therefrom to serve an Additional Assurance Request. Thereafter, the above-described procedures shall govern if and until any such resulting Adequate Assurance Requests are timely made. This Order is binding on all Utility Providers, regardless of when such Utility Provider was added to the Utility Provider List.

1	13. At any time, Debtors may terminate service from any of the Utility Providers,
2	such termination being effective immediately upon Debtors' notice to the Utility Provider. At
3	such time, Debtors shall no longer be required to make any more payments to such Utility
4	Provider for any services provided after such termination.
5	14. Consistent with Bankruptcy Rule 6003 and the relief requested in the Motion, the
6	Debtors are authorized to pay within twenty days following the Petition Date those payments
7	which become due and owing during such period and those payments which became due prior to
8	the Petition Date.
9	15. Notwithstanding Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h), 7062 and 9014 the terms and
10	conditions of this Order shall be immediately effective upon its entry.
11	16. The Debtors are authorized and empowered to take all actions necessary to
12	implement the relief granted in this Order.
13	17. The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or
14	related to the implementation of this Order.
15	Submitted by:
16	GORDON SILVER
17	
18	By: GREGORY E. GARMAN, ESQ.
19	THOMAS H. FELL, ESQ. TERESA M. PILATOWICZ, ESQ.
20	3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy., 9th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
21	
22	AND
23	NANCY A. MITCHELL (pro hac vice pending) MARIA J. DICONZA (pro hac vice pending)
24	GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
25	The MetLife Building 200 Park Avenue
26	New York, New York 10166
27	Proposed Counsel for the Debtors and Debtors in Possession
28	