

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JUNE 2022

**EDITOR'S NOTE: NEW RULES?**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**WILL WE HAVE NEW RULES FOR CORPORATE BANKRUPTCIES?  
RECENTLY PROPOSED LEGISLATION THAT COULD REFORM CHAPTER 11 PRACTICE**

Matt Barr, Lauren Tauro and Furqaan Siddiqui

**NON-PERFORMING LOANS THROUGH THE ESG LOOKING GLASS:  
APPLYING ESG CONSIDERATIONS TO THE CREATION OF A NEW TYPE OF  
INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY FOR CREATIVE INVESTORS**

Andrew Petersen and Anna Nolan

**NEW YORK AMENDS CONTACT REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN DELINQUENT  
BORROWERS**

Morey Barnes Yost

**COUNTRY DANCING IN THE BANKRUPTCY COURT: THE "TEXAS TWO-STEP"**

Michael J. Lichtenstein

**IN VACATING PURDUE PHARMA'S CONFIRMATION ORDER, DISTRICT COURT  
DETERMINES THAT PLAN'S NONCONSENSUAL THIRD-PARTY RELEASES ARE NOT  
STATUTORILY AUTHORIZED**

Jessica Liou and Brian Morganelli

**FIFTH AND SIXTH CIRCUITS REJECT INEXCUSABLE LATE FILINGS**

Michael L. Cook

**TWO RECENT CHAPTER 15 CASES CLARIFY JUST HOW LOW THE BAR IS FOR  
RECOGNITION**

Laura E. Appleby and Kyle R. Kistingner

**BANKRUPTCY BRIEFS**

Michael R. O'Donnell, Michael Crowley, Desiree McDonald and Kevin Hakansson



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 4

June 2022

---

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Editor's Note: New Rules?</b><br>Victoria Prussen Spears   | 151 |
| <b>Will We Have New Rules for Corporate Bankruptcies? Recently Proposed Legislation That Could Reform Chapter 11 Practice</b><br>Matt Barr, Lauren Tauro and Furqaan Siddiqui                           | 154 |
| <b>Non-Performing Loans Through the ESG Looking Glass: Applying ESG Considerations to the Creation of a New Type of Investment Opportunity for Creative Investors</b><br>Andrew Petersen and Anna Nolan | 163 |
| <b>New York Amends Contact Requirements for Certain Delinquent Borrowers</b><br>Morey Barnes Yost   | 173 |
| <b>Country Dancing in the Bankruptcy Court: The "Texas Two-Step"</b><br>Michael J. Lichtenstein   | 176 |
| <b>In Vacating Purdue Pharma's Confirmation Order, District Court Determines That Plan's Nonconsensual Third-Party Releases Are Not Statutorily Authorized</b><br>Jessica Liou and Brian Morganelli     | 183 |
| <b>Fifth and Sixth Circuits Reject Inexcusable Late Filings</b><br>Michael L. Cook  | 188 |
| <b>Two Recent Chapter 15 Cases Clarify Just How Low the Bar Is for Recognition</b><br>Laura E. Appleby and Kyle R. Kistingner   | 192 |
| <b>Bankruptcy Briefs</b><br>Michael R. O'Donnell, Michael Crowley, Desiree McDonald and Kevin Hakansson   | 195 |

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

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

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at ..... 513.257.9021  
Email: ..... ryan.kearns@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)  
ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)  
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 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**

**SCOTT L. BAENA**

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP*

**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 © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. 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 customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 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 Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. 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, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

# Fifth and Sixth Circuits Reject Inexcusable Late Filings

By *Michael L. Cook*\*

*Recent decisions by two circuit courts of appeals have made it clear that courts now have ample precedent to bar late claims and appeals.*

“Sixty-seven creditors [who] failed to file timely [claims] [a]fter an approximately two-year-and-nine-month delay . . . [thus] failed to meet their burden of providing excusable neglect” on their motion to file late claims, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently held in *In re CJ Holding Co.*<sup>1</sup> After reversing the district court, the Fifth Circuit “reinstated the judgment of the bankruptcy court,” stressing that it had not “abused its discretion by denying the Claimants’ motion for relief from the bar date.”

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in *In re Smith*,<sup>2</sup> also affirmed the lower courts’ denial of the debtor’s motion in another case for an extension of time to appeal, agreeing that counsel’s “miscalculation of the deadline was insufficient to establish excusable neglect.”

“The sole issue in *CJ Holding*,” said the Fifth Circuit, was “whether the bankruptcy court abused its discretion by denying the Claimants’ motion for leave to file late” claims. Resolution turned on “whether the Claimants’ failure to file timely proofs of claim was the result of excusable neglect.”

## THE APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARD

Both circuits in *CJ Holding* and *Smith* closely followed the U.S. Supreme Court’s four criteria for “excusable neglect” in *Pioneer Inv. Services Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. Partnership*:<sup>3</sup>

- The “danger of prejudice to the debtor”;
- The “length of the delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings”;

---

\* Michael L. Cook, of counsel to Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP, devotes his practice to business reorganization and creditors’ rights litigation, including mediation and arbitration. His clients include professional firms, lenders, acquirers, trustees, creditors’ committees, troubled companies and other parties. Mr. Cook may be contacted at michael.cook@srz.com.

<sup>1</sup> *In re CJ Holding Co.* (5th Cir. Mar. 10, 2022).

<sup>2</sup> *In re Smith* (6th Cir. Feb. 28, 2022).

<sup>3</sup> *Pioneer Inv. Services Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. Partnership*, 507 U.S. 380 (1993).

- The “reason for the delay, including whether it was within the reasonable control of the movant,” and
- Whether the movant “acted in good faith.”

Courts make an “equitable” inquiry, with the burden of showing “excusable neglect” on the movant.

### **Prejudice to the Debtor**

The Fifth Circuit rejected the bankruptcy court’s finding of “prejudice” in *CJ Holding*. In its view, “the prejudice factor favors the Claimants because the debtors had notice of the Claimants’ claims” when they “negotiated and formulated” their reorganization plan and “had at least some expectation of those claims.” They also “participated in a global mediation with” those “claims in mind.” Nor would “additional litigation costs and other legal fees” incurred by the debtors “constitute prejudice.” And “a disputed claims reserve [here] mitigate[d] against the risk of “unexpected losses.” Still, said the court, the prejudice criterion “is *not* entitled to any kind of disproportionate weight.”<sup>4</sup>

### **Length of Delay**

The Fifth Circuit accepted the bankruptcy court’s holding in *CJ Holding* that “the length of delay”—“*two years and nine months after the bar date passed*”—would delay “resolution of the case.”<sup>5</sup> The reorganization plan had “explicitly” provided for the disallowance of late claims. And many courts in other cases have denied motions to file late claims “after far shorter delays than the one here.” Further, the Claimants had failed to present to the bankruptcy court any “evidence regarding the delay’s impact on” the case.

### **Reason for the Delay**

The Fifth Circuit also agreed with the bankruptcy court in *CJ Holding* that the reason for delay “was within the movant’s reasonable control.” It rejected the “Claimants’ counsel’s argument that he did not have contact information” for each Claimant. Counsel gave no explanation for this assertion or why the Claimants “could not themselves file individual” claims “once they received the bar-date notice.” “Twenty-seven” other similarly situated claimants, in fact, “took it upon themselves to file individual proofs of claim.” The delay here, said the court, “was not beyond the reasonable control of the Claimants, whose duty it was to file timely” claims.

### **Good Faith**

Finally, the Fifth Circuit agreed with the bankruptcy court in *CJ Holding* that the Claimants’ counsel’s actions “verged on malpractice” or “both a lack of

---

<sup>4</sup> Emphasis in text.

<sup>5</sup> Emphasis in text.

diligence or misunderstanding of bankruptcy procedure.” If not “bad faith,” said the court, the Claimants’ failure here did them no “favors for purposes of meeting their burden to show good faith.” And “mere inadvertence or mistake . . . does not constitute excusable neglect under *Pioneer*.”

## THE SIXTH CIRCUIT’S *SMITH* DECISION

The bankruptcy court in *Smith* had entered a nondischargeability judgment in favor of a creditor. The debtor “missed the fourteen-day deadline to appeal the judgment” and waited three weeks before seeking permission to file a late notice of appeal.” He argued that his counsel had “miscalculated the deadline to appeal by one day and had communicated that erroneous deadline to [the debtor] and the new attorney he had obtained for appeal.”

Although the bankruptcy court had “discretion to extend that deadline by 21 days ‘if the party shows excusable neglect’ ” under Bankruptcy Rule 8002(d)(1), the bankruptcy court reasoned that counsel’s “miscalculation of the deadline was insufficient to establish excusable neglect.” It also found “no allegations or evidence of bad faith,” but that the 3-week delay was “within the movant’s reasonable control.” The bankruptcy court had not abused its discretion, said the Sixth Circuit, because “excusable neglect is a ‘flexible’ and ‘elastic’ concept.”<sup>6</sup> In particular, the debtor “waited until the very last day to file his motion despite learning immediately that he had missed the deadline to file his appeal.”

## COMMENTS

The Fifth Circuit applied an “exceptionally deferential standard of review” in *CJ Holding* when considering the bankruptcy court’s exercise of discretion.<sup>7</sup>

The Fifth Circuit also noted in *CJ Holding* that the Claimants’ counsel, “[o]n multiple occasions before the district court . . . attributed the untimeliness of the Claimants’ proofs of claim to inadvertence and mistake.”

Obvious lesson for creditors and their counsel: Pay attention to claim-filing and appeal-filing bar dates. *CJ Holding* and *Smith* are hardly outliers. Courts now have ample precedent to bar late claims and appeals.

<sup>6</sup> Citing *Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 392, 395 n. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Citing *In re Enron Corp.*, 419 F.3d 115, 129 (2d Cir. 2005) (“[W]e are particularly reluctant—absent evident arbitrariness—to substitute our judgment for that of the bankruptcy judge who has presided over the proceedings . . . [and] who is most familiar with the parties and the potential impact of any late-filed claim[.]”)

Deadlines to watch:

- *Unsecured Claims*: Court-ordered under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002–3005;
- *Administrative Priority Claims*: By court order; often within 30 days after any Chapter 11 reorganization plan becomes effective.
- *Notice of Appeal from Bankruptcy Court*: Generally “within 14 days after entry of the judgment, order or decree being appealed.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8002(a)(1); *In re Tennial* (6th Cir. 2020) (rule-based “appeal deadline is mandatory”).