

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

MAY 2022

## **EDITOR'S NOTE: RULES, REGULATIONS AND RELEASES**

Victoria Prussen Spears

## **REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS ARE FINCEN TARGETS: FAR-REACHING IMPACT OF TWO PROPOSED RULES**

Aurelie Ercoli, Katrina A. Hausfeld and Deborah R. Meshulam

## **FEDERAL RESERVE RELEASES REPORT ON CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY**

Donald J. Mosher, Kara A. Kuchar, Jessica Sklute, Melissa G.R. Goldstein, Adam J. Barazani, Jessica Romano, Hadas A. Jacobi and Steven T. Cummings

## **REGULATION OF DECENTRALIZED FINANCE IN THE UNITED STATES: WHAT TO EXPECT IN CRYPTO**

Evan Koster and Adam Lapidus

## **DOJ ENFORCEMENT AGAINST CRYPTOCURRENCY EXCHANGES**

Kara L. Kapp

## **OVERDRAFT FEES CONTINUE TO INVITE NEW LEGAL CHALLENGES AND REGULATORY SCRUTINY**

Sameer Aggarwal and Andrew Soukup

## **CISA ISSUES JOINT CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY ON RANSOMWARE TRENDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Micaela McMurrough, Ashden Fein and Caleb Skeath

## **36 HOURS: WHAT BANKS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE NEW REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPUTER SECURITY INCIDENTS**

Christopher Queenin, Christopher M. Mason and Jason C. Kravitz

## **THIRD-PARTY RELEASES UNDER CONTINUED FIRE IN ASCENA RETAIL GROUP RULING**

Adam C. Harris, Douglas S. Mintz, Abbey Walsh and Kelly (Bucky) Knight

## **PART 26A RESTRUCTURING PLAN PROPOSED BY A NON-ENGLISH COMPANY FOR THE FIRST TIME EXCLUDES "OUT OF THE MONEY" CREDITORS AND SHAREHOLDERS FROM VOTING**

Phillip D. Taylor and Anna Nolan

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

VOLUME 139

NUMBER 5

May 2022

---

<b>Editor's Note: Rules, Regulations and Releases</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	241
<b>Real Estate Transactions Are FinCEN Targets: Far-Reaching Impact of Two Proposed Rules</b> Aurelie Ercoli, Katrina A. Hausfeld and Deborah R. Meshulam	244
<b>Federal Reserve Releases Report on Central Bank Digital Currency</b> Donald J. Mosher, Kara A. Kuchar, Jessica Sklute, Melissa G.R. Goldstein, Adam J. Barazani, Jessica Romano, Hadas A. Jacobi and Steven T. Cummings	256
<b>Regulation of Decentralized Finance in the United States: What to Expect in Crypto</b> Evan Koster and Adam Lapidus	262
<b>DOJ Enforcement Against Cryptocurrency Exchanges</b> Kara L. Kapp	269
<b>Overdraft Fees Continue to Invite New Legal Challenges and Regulatory Scrutiny</b> Sameer Aggarwal and Andrew Soukup	272
<b>CISA Issues Joint Cybersecurity Advisory on Ransomware Trends and Recommendations</b> Micaela McMurrrough, Ashden Fein and Caleb Skeath	275
<b>36 Hours: What Banks Should Know About the New Reporting Requirements for Computer Security Incidents</b> Christopher Queenin, Christopher M. Mason and Jason C. Kravitz	280
<b>Third-Party Releases Under Continued Fire in Ascena Retail Group Ruling</b> Adam C. Harris, Douglas S. Mintz, Abbey Walsh and Kelly (Bucky) Knight	287
<b>Part 26A Restructuring Plan Proposed by a Non-English Company for the First Time Excludes "Out of the Money" Creditors and Shareholders from Voting</b> Phillip D. Taylor and Anna Nolan	292

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

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

Matthew T. Burke at ..... (800) 252-9257  
Email: ..... matthew.t.burke@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

---

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

---

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 Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2022 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**

**BARKLEY CLARK**

*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP*

**CARLETON GOSS**

*Counsel, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP*

**MICHAEL J. HELLER**

*Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP*

**SATISH M. KINI**

*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**DOUGLAS LANDY**

*White & Case LLP*

**PAUL L. LEE**

*Of Counsel, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**TIMOTHY D. NAEGELE**

*Partner, Timothy D. Naegele & Associates*

**STEPHEN J. NEWMAN**

*Partner, Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP*

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2022 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. 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 customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail [Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com](mailto:Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com). Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. 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 THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW, Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

# Third-Party Releases Under Continued Fire in Ascena Retail Group Ruling

*By Adam C. Harris, Douglas S. Mintz, Abbey Walsh and Kelly (Bucky) Knight\**

*In recent months, courts have asserted clear push-back on third-party releases, after years of uncertainty. The authors of this article discuss a decision which represents another potential blow against the long-used bankruptcy tool.*

A U.S. district court has questioned the authority of bankruptcy courts to issue non-consensual third-party releases as part of a plan of reorganization. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia vacated the confirmation order in the Mahwah Bergen Retail Group, Inc. (f/k/a Ascena Retail Group, Inc.) Chapter 11 cases on the grounds that the plan contained impermissible non-consensual third-party releases.<sup>1</sup> The court attributed its ruling, in part, to the fact that the “ubiquity of third-party releases in the Richmond Division demands even greater scrutiny of the propriety of such releases.”

The *Mahwah Bergen* holding follows shortly after U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York Judge Colleen McMahan reversed confirmation of Purdue Pharma’s plan of reorganization due to its inclusion of non-consensual third-party releases.

The *Purdue Pharma* holding found that third-party releases are not permissible under the Bankruptcy Code at all. *Mahwah Bergen*, in line with applicable U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit precedent, does not ban third-party releases, but it imposes stringent limitations on their availability. The decision holds that third-party releases should be granted only “cautiously

---

\* Adam C. Harris (adam.harris@srz.com) is a partner at Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP and co-chair of the firm’s Business Reorganization Group. His practice includes corporate restructurings, workouts and creditors’ rights litigation, with a particular focus on the representation of investment funds and financial institutions in distressed situations. Douglas S. Mintz (douglas.mintz@srz.com) is a partner at the firm and co-chair of the Business Reorganization Group. His practice focuses on the representation of creditors in financial restructurings, including secured and unsecured lenders, ad hoc committees of noteholders, equity sponsors and distressed investors. Abbey Walsh (abbey.walsh@srz.com), special counsel at the firm practicing in the Business Reorganization Group, represents and advises a wide range of domestic and foreign clients in all aspects of Chapter 11 and 15 cases out-of-court restructurings, and U.S. insolvency laws. Kelly (Bucky) Knight (kelly.knight@srz.com) is an associate at the firm practicing in the Business Reorganization Group.

<sup>1</sup> *Patterson, et al. v. Mahwah Bergen Retail Group, Inc.*, Civ. No. 3:21cv167 (DJN) (E.D. Va. Jan. 13, 2022).

and infrequently” and sets up an onerous process for their consideration and approval, which may make many third-party releases practically unavailable, particularly if a plan seeks to release non-core claims.

## SUMMARY

Ascena Retail Group was a publicly held retailer of apparel for women and girls that filed for bankruptcy in 2020. Ascena owned brands such as Ann Taylor, LOFT, Lane Bryant and Lou & Grey. The debtors liquidated their assets through a series of sales. The debtors then proposed a plan that provided for the distribution of the remaining cash in the estate and the bankruptcy court confirmed the plan.

The Plan included broad third-party releases, covering any type of claim that existed or could have been brought against anyone associated with the debtors as of the effective date of the plan, including a securities fraud class action lawsuit that was pending against certain prepetition executives of Ascena. The releases bound anyone that did not affirmatively “opt out” of such releases.

Due to the ability of parties to opt out of the third-party releases, the bankruptcy court treated the releases as consensual and conducted little to no analysis of:

- (i) Whether it had the Constitutional power to grant the releases (non-consensually);
- (ii) The nature of the claims being released and whether the claims were core or non-core;
- (iii) Whether notice of the right to opt out was actually received by the releasing parties (of which the district court estimated there may have been thousands); and
- (iv) Whether the releases were permissible under the standard set forth in *Behrmann v. Nat'l Heritage Found.*,<sup>2</sup> the Fourth Circuit's binding precedent on third-party releases.

The U.S. Trustee appealed the confirmation of the plan and challenged the legality of the plan's third-party releases and exculpation provisions, arguing that the bankruptcy court erred in the manner it conducted the plan's approval process and in approving the releases. The district court agreed with the U.S. Trustee and vacated the confirmation order, remanding the case to a bankruptcy judge outside of the Richmond Division. The district court ordered the new

---

<sup>2</sup> 663 F.3d 704, 712 (4th Cir. 2011).

court to redraft the exculpation provisions and then confirm the Plan without the third-party releases, which the district court found to be severable from the remainder of the Plan.

The district court's holding creates a two-pronged process for review of third-party releases.

- First, the content of any proposed third-party releases must be analyzed to determine whether they have any relationship with or effect on the bankruptcy proceeding. As per the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Stern v. Marshall*,<sup>3</sup> if they do not, then they are non-core issues over which the bankruptcy court lacks the Constitutional authority to issue a final order, unless the parties involved consent to the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court over such claims.
  - The district court held that a party's failure to opt out of a third-party release does not constitute knowing and voluntary consent to the bankruptcy court's jurisdiction over a non-core claim (or to the release of the claim itself). As such, without consent by action (as opposed to by inaction), a bankruptcy court will not have jurisdiction over non-core claims. Non-core releases approved by the bankruptcy court over which the bankruptcy court does not have jurisdiction will be treated as an advisory opinion subject to *de novo* review by a district court.
- Second, whether a third-party release relates to a core or non-core claim, if the release is non-consensual, then its permissibility must be determined using the seven-factor analysis set forth in the Fourth Circuit's *Behrmann* ruling, which requires consideration of factors such as whether there is an identity of interests between the debtor and the released third parties, whether the released third parties are making a substantial contribution to the reorganization, whether the releases are essential to the reorganization, whether the class or classes of claims or interests affected by the releases have voted in favor of the plan and will be substantially paid under the plan.

In applying this test to the facts in *Mahwah Bergen*, the district court rejected the debtors' argument that Constitutional authority to grant the third-party releases stemmed from the inclusion of the releases in the Plan. The district court held that "jurisdiction over confirmation proceedings [does not] cure[] any jurisdictional defects within those proceedings. . . . Article III simply does not allow third-party non-debtors to bootstrap any and all of their disputes into a bankruptcy case to obtain relief."

---

<sup>3</sup> 564 U.S. 462 (2011).

The district court further rejected the bankruptcy court's holding that the releases were consensual because parties had the ability to opt out of them. As such, the district court treated the third-party releases as non-core and non-consensual, thereby depriving the bankruptcy court of the authority to grant them. Accordingly, the district court reviewed the confirmation order *de novo* as a Report and Recommendation with proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. In conducting its review, the district court noted that the bankruptcy court did not conduct the *Behrmann* analysis, but that if it had, there was ample evidence to support the rejection of the third-party releases.

In response to the district court's decision, the debtors announced that, although they disagreed with portions of the district court's opinion, they would seek reconfirmation of the Plan without the third-party releases in accordance with the decision. As a result, we do not expect the *Mahwah Bergen* opinion to be appealed.

## PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In recent months, courts have asserted clear push-back on third-party releases, after years of uncertainty. This case represents another potential blow against the long-used bankruptcy tool. At least within the Eastern District of Virginia, there are several takeaways from this decision for debtors, creditors and other estate constituents to note:

- While this case does not outright eliminate third-party releases, it imposes a significant barrier to their implementation. The need for a bankruptcy court to determine whether every claim released by third-party releases is a core or non-core claim will require that a debtor specifically identify each claim to be released and provide an explanation of how the claim relates to the bankruptcy case. And, the bankruptcy court will be required to conduct a full *Behrmann* analysis for non-consensual third-party releases (and consent cannot be obtained by a failure to opt out). In the face of these evidentiary burdens, debtors may well be forced to more narrowly tailor any third-party releases contained in a plan.
- Narrowly tailored and specifically articulated release provisions will also allow a bankruptcy court to parse the requested releases and approve those that are permissible under *Behrmann*. In *Mahwah Bergen*, the debtors drafted the releases in a vague and general manner such that the bankruptcy court could neither identify nor analyze each of the claims to be released. As a result, the district court summarily rejected all of the third-party releases, including any that may have been permissible had they been specifically identified and subjected to the analysis set forth

above. Parties seeking to obtain permissible third-party releases in a plan should ensure that the released claims are specifically identified in the plan so that they can be considered individually, rather than having the bankruptcy court approve or reject the releases as a whole.

- Parties seeking an expeditious confirmation process should note that the inclusion of third-party releases of non-consensual, non-core claims in a plan will mean that the plan cannot be confirmed until after a district court review of the bankruptcy court's order. This will extend the amount of time needed to confirm a plan. Parties could require that the plan not include any releases of non-consensual, non-core claims to avoid the risk of undue delay in the confirmation process. However, this could reduce the post-confirmation protection for those parties.