

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JANUARY 2019

**EDITOR'S NOTE: INTERNATIONAL HAPPENINGS**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**CRYPTOCURRENCIES IN INSOLVENCY: EVASIVE REALITY**

Polina Lyadnova, Ekaterina Dorokhova, and Hannah Whitney

**\$1.2B ORDER ENTERED AGAINST PETRÓLEOS de VENEZUELA: Q&As FOR PDVSA AND CITGO COMMODITY COMMERCIAL AND TRADING COUNTERPARTIES**

Robert J. Gruendel, Mark A. Waite, and Deanna R. Reitman

**EGYPT'S NEW BANKRUPTCY LAW: A STEP FORWARD IN THE BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE REFORM PROCESS**

Mohamed Taha

**INVESTOR PROTECTIONS IN ENGLAND: THE NON-RECOGNITION OF THE FOREIGN DISCHARGE OF ENGLISH LAW-GOVERNED DEBT**

James Brady

**THE MATERIAL ADVERSE EFFECT LANDSCAPE AFTER  
*AKORN v. FRESENIUS***

Richard W. Slack and Joshua M. Glasser

**FIFTH CIRCUIT HOLDS LEASE TO BE A SECURED LOAN**

Michael L. Cook

**SIXTH CIRCUIT WEIGHS IN ON THE MEANING OF "GOVERNMENTAL UNIT"**

Laura E. Appleby, James Heiser, Scott A. Lewis, and Franklin H. Top III

**PASSIVE INVESTOR, BEWARE!**

Stephen B. Selbst

**MY COMPANY WENT THROUGH BANKRUPTCY AND ALL I GOT WAS THIS LOUSY RELEASE—HOW TO GET A NON-CONSENSUAL RELEASE OF THIRD PARTIES IN A CHAPTER 11 PLAN**

William J. Easley

**ARE YOU THREATENING ME? NORTHERN DISTRICT SAYS NO IN DEBT COLLECTION CASE**

Ryan M. Holz and Douglas R. Sargent



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 15

NUMBER 1

JANUARY 2019

---

**Editor's Note: International Happenings**

Victoria Prussen Spears

1

**Cryptocurrencies in Insolvency: Evasive Reality**

Polina Lyadnova, Ekaterina Dorokhova, and Hannah Whitney

4

**\$1.2B Order Entered Against Petróleos de Venezuela: Q&As for PDVSA and Citgo  
Commodity Commercial and Trading Counterparties**

Robert J. Gruendel, Mark A. Waite, and Deanna R. Reitman

11

**Egypt's New Bankruptcy Law: A Step Forward in the Business Legislative Reform  
Process**

Mohamed Taha

17

**Investor Protections in England: The Non-Recognition of the Foreign Discharge of  
English Law-Governed Debt**

James Brady

22

**The Material Adverse Effect Landscape After *Akorn v. Fresenius***

Richard W. Slack and Joshua M. Glasser

29

**Fifth Circuit Holds Lease to Be a Secured Loan**

Michael L. Cook

45

**Sixth Circuit Weighs In on the Meaning of "Governmental Unit"**

Laura E. Appleby, James Heiser, Scott A. Lewis, and Franklin H. Top III

49

**Passive Investor, Beware!**

Stephen B. Selbst

54

**My Company Went Through Bankruptcy and All I Got Was This Lousy Release—  
How to Get a Non-Consensual Release of Third Parties in a Chapter 11 Plan**

William J. Easley

57

**Are You Threatening Me? Northern District Says No in Debt Collection Case**

Ryan M. Holz and Douglas R. Sargent

60



LexisNexis®

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Kent K. B. Hanson, J.D., at ..... 415-908-3207  
Email: ..... kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

---

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

**Example:** Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.

Copyright © 2019 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**BOARD OF EDITORS**

**SCOTT L. BAENA**

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP*

**LESLIE A. BERKOFF**

*Moritt Hock & Hamroff LLP*

**TED A. BERKOWITZ**

*Farrell Fritz, P.C.*

**ANDREW P. BROZMAN**

*Clifford Chance US LLP*

**MICHAEL L. COOK**

*Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP*

**MARK G. DOUGLAS**

*Jones Day*

**MARK J. FRIEDMAN**

*DLA Piper*

**STUART I. GORDON**

*Rivkin Radler LLP*

**PATRICK E. MEARS**

*Barnes & Thornburg LLP*

PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2019 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, please access [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844.

Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, No. 18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, Attn: Customer Service, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342-9907.

# Fifth Circuit Holds Lease to Be a Secured Loan

By **Michael L. Cook**\*

*The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently held that a purported conditional sale agreement “created a security interest rather than a lease.” The author of this article explains the decision and offers comments.*

A purported conditional sale agreement “created a security interest rather than a lease,” held the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on August 7, 2018.<sup>1</sup> Affirming the lower courts’ finding “that the relevant agreements were not ‘true leases,’” the court rejected a bank’s “motion to compel payment under [its] contract as an unexpired lease or an administrative expense.”<sup>2</sup> The economic substance, not the form of the transaction, was decisive.

## RELEVANCE

*Pioneer* confirms why lessors fare better in bankruptcy cases than secured lenders. Although the lender documented the transaction in *Pioneer* as a lease to get better treatment in any later bankruptcy, the court relied on its economic substance.

Bankruptcy Code (“Code”) § 365(d)(3) requires a trustee or Chapter 11 debtor-in-possession (“DIP”) to perform its lease obligations pending assumption or rejection of a lease. In contrast, the DIP need not assume a security agreement within a fixed period of time to obtain the benefits of the property it covers.<sup>3</sup> A borrower on a secured loan may retain the property “without paying the full agreed price,” and need only “pay enough to give the lender the value of the security interest; if this is less than the balance due on the loan, the difference is an unsecured debt.”<sup>4</sup> When distinguishing a lease from a secured loan, “every appellate court [ruling on] the issue [holds] . . . that substance

---

\* Michael L. Cook, of counsel at Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP and a member of the Board of Editors of *Pratt’s Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, has served as a partner in the firm’s New York office for the past 16 years, devoting his practice to business reorganization and creditors’ rights litigation, including mediation and arbitration. He may be contacted at michael.cook@srz.com.

<sup>1</sup> *In re Pioneer Health Servs. Inc.*, 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 21958 (5th Cir. Aug. 7, 2018).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Pacific Express Inc. v. Teknekron Infoswitch Corp.*, 780 F.2d 1482, 1487 (9th Cir. 1986).

<sup>4</sup> *In re United Airlines Inc.*, 416 F. 3d 609, 610 (7th Cir. 2005) (Easterbrook J.).

controls and that only a 'true lease' counts as a 'lease' under [Code] §365.”<sup>5</sup> According to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, “[i]t is unlikely that the Code makes big economic effects turn on the parties' choice of language rather than the substance of their transaction; why bother to distinguish transactions if these distinctions can be obliterated at the drafter's will?”<sup>6</sup>

## FACTS

The debtor healthcare provider in *Pioneer* entered into three agreements with the bank's predecessor (“Bank”) to finance its purchase of equipment and related software to maintain its electronic health records.<sup>7</sup> Two agreements with the Bank were called “conditional sales agreements,” providing “that upon completion of the installment payment plan, title to” the purchased equipment transferred to the debtor. Until it received full payment, the Bank would “retain title to the Equipment for legal and security purposes,” and the debtor authorized the Bank to file appropriate financing statements under state law. Other provisions of these two agreements provided that the debtor was “leasing (and not financing) any software and . . . upon default,” the debtor was required to delete the software, enabling the Bank to terminate any license and disable the software. A third agreement, though, acknowledged that “[the debtor] has entered into a financing agreement” with the Bank. Finally, the Bank filed an appropriate financing statement under applicable state law.<sup>8</sup>

When the debtor sought Chapter 11 relief, the Bank moved to compel payment from the debtor under the purported leases, arguing that payments were also “actual, necessary costs of preserving the estate” and “actual, necessary costs and expenses of preserving or transferring patient records during the closing [of the debtor's] healthcare business.”<sup>9</sup> The bankruptcy court denied the motion, reasoning that the relevant agreements were not “true leases.” The district court affirmed.

---

<sup>5</sup> *United Airlines Inc.*, 416 F.3d at 612, citing *In re PCH Associates*, 804 F.2d 193, 198–200 (2d Cir. 1986); *In re Pillowtex Inc.*, 349 F.3d 711, 716 (3d Cir. 2003).

<sup>6</sup> *United Airlines Inc.*, 416 F.3d at 612.

<sup>7</sup> 2018 U.S. App. LEXIS 21958.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

## THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

### Security Interest, Not a Lease

First, the court applied Utah’s version of the Uniform Commercial Code (“UCC”) to “determine whether [the] contract is in fact a lease.”<sup>10</sup> “If a lease is merely a disguised sale and security interest, Code § 365 [governing leases] will not be applicable.”<sup>11</sup> Under Utah law, when the agreement is “in the form of a lease,” it will be a secured transaction if it “is not subject to cancellation by the lessee,” and “the lessee . . . is bound to become the owner of the goods.”<sup>12</sup>

The Bank relied on language in its “Conditional Sales Agreements”; it “is leasing (and not financing) the software” and has “the right to end its use of the software if [the debtor] fails to pay.”<sup>13</sup> But the “lease” was “non-cancellable” and could not be “terminated for any reason.” On “completion of the payment plan,” title to the “Equipment” would pass to the debtor. Because “Utah law elevates substance over form, moreover, the parties’ labels are not the key consideration,” and “no further analysis is required” to find “a security interest rather than a lease.”<sup>14</sup> And without “further analysis,” the Fifth Circuit affirmed the lower courts’ finding of a security interest in *Pioneer*.

### No Administrative Expense

Code § 503(b)(i)(A) gives a creditor an administrative priority claim for “the actual, necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate.” But the Fifth Circuit, like other courts “impose[s] a temporal limitation: the costs and expenses must have arisen post-[bankruptcy] through a transaction with the” DIP.<sup>15</sup> The Bank’s transaction with *Pioneer* “arose years before . . . bankruptcy.”<sup>16</sup> And because the transaction was “a financing arrangement,” not a lease, the Bank’s claim was “an old expense to be adjusted” under a Chapter 11

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, quoting *Norton Bankruptcy Law & Practice*. § 127:8 (3d ed. 2018 update).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, at \*3, quoting Utah Code § 70-1a-203(2)(b) and *LMV Leasing Inc. v. Conlin*, 805 P. 2d 189, 194 (Utah Ct. App. 1991).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, quoting *Bd. of Equalization of Salt Lake City v. First Sec. Leasing Co.*, 881 P.2d 877, 878 (Utah 1994). See *United Airlines*, 416 F. 3d at 617 (“Reversion without additional payment is the UCC’s per se rule for identifying secured credit”).

<sup>15</sup> *In re Jack/Wade Drilling Inc.*, 258 F.3d 385, 387 (5th Cir. 2001).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

reorganization plan.<sup>17</sup>

## COMMENTS

- The Seventh Circuit explained why courts disregard form for economic substance in the lease context. “. . . [R]ent that represents the cost of funds for capital assets or past operations rather than ongoing inputs into production has the quality of debt, and to require such obligations to be assumed under [Code] § 365 to retain an asset would permit financial distress from past operations to shut down a firm that has a positive cash flow from current operations.”<sup>18</sup>
- The Seventh Circuit also explained in *United Airlines* what was at stake in *Pioneer*: “The question under § 365 is whether [the DIP] must pay in full to enjoy contained [use] or whether, instead, it may reduce payments to the value of the interest secured by the leasehold and treat the residue as unsecured debt.” As in *United Airlines*, the Fifth Circuit in *Pioneer* held the Bank’s secured claim subject to treatment under the debtor’s Chapter 11 reorganization plan.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, citing *United Airlines*, 416 F.3d at 613 (each payment on a true lease is a “new expense [that] pay[s] for new inputs”).

<sup>18</sup> *United Airlines*, 416 F. 3d at 613.