

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

IN RE:)
NORTHWEST TERRITORIAL MINT, LLC,)
Debtor.) 16-11767-CMA

TRANSCRIPT OF THE DIGITALLY RECORDED PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER M. ALSTON
NOVEMBER 18, 2016

PREPARED BY: SHARI L. WHEELER, CCR NO. 2396

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE:

BRIAN T. PETERSON

K&L Gates

925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900

Seattle, Washington 98104

206.623.7580

brian.peterson@klgates.com

FOR RETT, LP:

DANIAL D. PHARRIS

Lasher Holzapfel Sperry & Ebberson, PLLC

601 Union Street, Suite 2600

Seattle, Washington 98101

pharris@lasher.com

1 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; NOVEMBER 18, 2016

2 --oOo--

3

4 THE COURT: All right. Let's hear the Northwest
5 Territorial Mint matter next.

6 Good morning, gentlemen. Mr. Peterson, and
7 Mr. Pharris, this is the trustee's motion to approve a
8 settlement. I know there were no objections, but the Court
9 has a number of questions and some issues.

10 So let me start with you, Mr. Peterson. In
11 Mr. Calvert's declaration, he says that RETT says -- RETT is
12 the landlord -- RETT says that the damage to the property
13 during the removal period is substantial. What does that
14 mean, if you know? What does "substantial" mean?

15 MR. PETERSON: Well, what I can tell you is, you
16 know, after this Court held a hearing on the motion -- I
17 believe it was RETT's motion for allowance of an
18 administrative claim -- and ordered an evidentiary hearing,
19 the parties then began to negotiate the terms of a settlement,
20 in part, to avoid the cost of that evidentiary hearing.
21 During those discussions, it came to -- and Mr. Pharris'
22 client raised this issue of damage to the property that had
23 occurred during the removal period.

24 What does it mean by "substantial," in
25 Mr. Calvert's declaration? I don't know if I can quantify

1 that with a dollar amount. We were sent photographs and
2 pictures of the premises. I believe there was an estimate of
3 the cost. We did not engage an expert of our own to travel to
4 Tomball and evaluate the amount of that damage. We looked at
5 the pictures that were provided to us and their estimates of
6 the cost.

7 THE COURT: Do you know what those estimates
8 were?

9 MR. PETERSON: Off the top of my head, no.
10 Mr. Pharris could certainly speak to that.

11 THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask Mr. Pharris.

12 MR. PETERSON: It was -- I guess it was
13 substantial enough, in relation to the amount of the claim,
14 that it made, you know, this settlement even more reasonable
15 than we think.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Looking at the settlement
17 agreement itself, can I confirm that under the settlement
18 agreement, RETT is keeping a \$36,000 security deposit?

19 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

20 THE COURT: So in addition to the \$50,000 in
21 cash that the trustee proposes to give to what I'll call the
22 Tucker/Cook parties, they're also keeping another \$36,000 in
23 cash?

24 MR. PETERSON: Correct.

25 THE COURT: So they're getting \$86,000; isn't

1 that fair to say?

2 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. That would be the total
3 benefit to them.

4 THE COURT: Well, you're also waiving your --

5 MR. PETERSON: In addition to the waiver of some
6 releases.

7 THE COURT: -- offset claim, which was \$13,000,
8 right? You asserted an offset claim, at that last hearing, of
9 \$13,000 for payment of an obligation that the debtor really
10 was not obligated to pay.

11 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. That's correct.

12 THE COURT: And you're going to give up any
13 claim for the landlord's obvious and blatant violations of the
14 stay, right?

15 MR. PETERSON: Correct.

16 THE COURT: Okay. And you won on the motion
17 for -- I denied the motion for relief from stay and adequate
18 protection. You had asked for your attorney's fees in
19 responding to that. You're giving up your claim to that, too,
20 are you not?

21 MR. PETERSON: Correct.

22 THE COURT: So I guess you can tell where I'm
23 going. It's far more than \$50,000. It seems to the Court
24 that the consideration is in excess of \$100,000 that is being
25 conveyed to the Tucker/Cook group.

1 So let me then turn to paragraph 4 of the
2 settlement. That has a requirement that RETT give to the
3 trustee information regarding the -- I guess fixing the
4 alleged damages. So what's the purpose behind that
5 information?

6 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. So paragraph 3 -- you
7 know, the intent of paragraph 3 is to confirm -- and part of
8 the reason why we agreed to this settlement agreement was --
9 and why we believe it's reasonable, is because of this issue
10 of environmental damage to the property. They were very
11 serious in their claims of what they say were spills -- and
12 Mr. Pharris, again, can speak more to this than I can -- that
13 took place at the premises and the fact that there may have
14 been seepage into soil there. We wanted to resolve any claim
15 that would arise based on that potential environmental
16 contamination.

17 We knew we could get a release from RETT, which
18 is contained in this settlement agreement, right? They
19 released any and all claims, including any claims arising from
20 that damage.

21 The purpose of paragraphs 3 and 4 are to make
22 sure that with the settlement funds, RETT uses those to
23 actually clean up the premises. And we want proof of that, in
24 the way of documentation, as to what they have done to
25 remediate the damage on the premises, so that the trustee can

1 be assured that no third party, in the future, whether it be a
2 future owner of the property or a governmental agency, later
3 comes back and asserts an environmental claim against the
4 estate, which could be significant if the allegations that the
5 contamination is actually seeping in the soil -- you know, the
6 problem could expand to a bigger one than it is presently.

7 THE COURT: And the idea is that if there is any
8 claim for cleanup damage, it's all going to be on RETT? I
9 guess if you're saying that there may be some future cleanup
10 exposure, RETT is going to pay for that?

11 MR. PETERSON: Correct. What they're
12 representing in this agreement is that the only environmental
13 contamination that they're aware of is what exists presently,
14 that they've put us on notice of, and that they're going to
15 clean that contamination up. And, you know, all the
16 environmental agencies of Texas aren't parties to this
17 agreement, right?

18 THE COURT: Right.

19 MR. PETERSON: So we can't get waivers from
20 them.

21 THE COURT: Right.

22 MR. PETERSON: But we can ensure that they'll
23 clean it all up. And they've represented and warranted that
24 this is the only contamination that they're aware of. And so
25 the focus of this agreement -- one of the important aspects of

1 this agreement, for the trustee and the estate's benefit, is
2 to ensure that there will be no contribution claims and
3 potentially no claims from third parties asserted in the
4 future. And so we've done everything we can to make sure that
5 that's the case in the agreement.

6 THE COURT: All right. Well, this is helpful,
7 but I'm reading now paragraph 3. So RETT is representing and
8 warranting that the only hazardous substances that it is aware
9 of are: (a) the substances RETT believes were spilled by Ira
10 Green, and (b) certain potentially hazardous materials
11 contained in a drum that RETT believes Ira Green failed to
12 remove.

13 MR. PETERSON: Uh-huh.

14 THE COURT: So the rep and warranty is that
15 that's all the environmental hazardous substances issues that
16 RETT is aware of at the moment.

17 MR. PETERSON: Correct.

18 THE COURT: In paragraph 4, it says: Within 15
19 days of receipt of the settlement payment, RETT is going to
20 provide this information to the trustee.

21 So it's expected that within 15 days, all the
22 costs to clean up have been incurred?

23 MR. PETERSON: That's a fair point. You know,
24 it's our hope that, and I believe -- I mean, Mr. Pharris can
25 confirm this, too -- but that RETT has already undertaken the

1 efforts to clean up the property, and it's -- you know, it
2 will be completed by then. I don't know. I mean, he can
3 speak to that. I can't speak to that.

4 THE COURT: Yeah. Because I actually didn't
5 understand the purpose, and what you've just told me is
6 helpful in understanding it. I mean, the way I read that,
7 potentially, is that the trustee wants this information so it
8 can then look to Ira Green for contribution. The trustee
9 isn't going to turn around and sue Ira Green?

10 MR. PETERSON: That's not the trustee's
11 intention. No.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's good to hear.

13 I guess I'll ask Mr. Pharris. I want to know if
14 it's RETT's intention to sue Ira Green. Maybe I'll turn to
15 Mr. Pharris now. You've been on the hot seat for a while.

16 Mr. Pharris, you've heard some of my questions.
17 Tell me about the damages, to the extent you can, that your
18 client alleges Ira Green caused. And let me be clear. It's
19 just damages during the removal period, right? Is that what
20 this is limited to, what we're calling the "removal period"?

21 MR. PHARRIS: I believe that's the only period
22 of time that Ira Green was in possession of the property.

23 THE COURT: Right.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Let me start with this, Your
25 Honor. If these issues have to be litigated and we have to

1 hire experts, I think both the trustee and RETT see clearly
2 that we're talking about litigation costs alone that are going
3 to exceed the amount of this settlement.

4 THE COURT: Well, why would you then spend them?
5 That wouldn't make a lot of sense, would it? Why would you
6 spend more in litigation costs than what's at issue?

7 MR. PHARRIS: Well, that's why we're settling
8 for the amount that's before the Court.

9 THE COURT: Right. That's what I'm trying to
10 understand. When you say "substantial" or "significant"
11 property damages, are we talking 5,000? 50,000? 500,000?

12 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. Yeah. Let me -- I'm happy
13 to address that. We sent a lot of information -- we already
14 hired a -- RETT hired a remediation service. They went over
15 the property. We sent pictures to the trustee. They've
16 identified all the places on the property where there's toxic
17 waste. We sent pictures of the -- and I'm holding up one of
18 those right now. I don't know. It looks like there's about a
19 dozen spots on the property. And then they also sent more
20 detailed pictures showing where the grass was dead, and all
21 the vegetable material was dead in those locations.

22 We also provided information as to our
23 estimates. RETT believes that this could easily exceed -- be
24 in the six figures. So it easily can exceed a hundred
25 thousand.

1 Now, we've done a little bit -- they've started
2 a little bit of the work. But, you know, they're waiting to
3 get the money -- to finalize the contract with the remediation
4 service and do the work until we get the money from the
5 settlement.

6 So the problem was -- and, actually, I advocated
7 to the trustee, initially, that all this information be
8 provided to the Court. And the trustee said, Are you kidding?
9 You want to put evidence in the record that some federal
10 agency would potentially use to bring a claim against both of
11 our clients?

12 And so over -- and so I foresaw that the Court
13 might have problems with this issue, but --

14 THE COURT: You are correct.

15 MR. PHARRIS: But my client had the same concern
16 that the trustee did about making all these things -- putting
17 all these things in the record, and so we decided not to do
18 that.

19 THE COURT: But you're cleaning it up. I mean,
20 that's what I'm being told, is that it's all going to be
21 cleaned up. So what's going to be the problem?

22 MR. PHARRIS: That would be -- you know, there's
23 been plenty of cleanups where people got sued after the fact
24 and, you know, the cleanup wasn't --

25 THE COURT: So what if your client gets sued

1 after the fact? Are you going to turn around and then sue the
2 debtor? I mean, are we not done?

3 MR. PHARRIS: We give them a release under this
4 settlement.

5 THE COURT: So there's not going to be any
6 claims going forward. And if the environmental agencies
7 decide to sue the former tenant, you guys are each going to --

8 MR. PHARRIS: Well, we can't control that.

9 THE COURT: Right.

10 MR. PHARRIS: And, you know, we may get sued as
11 well.

12 THE COURT: Right. Well, as the owner,
13 presumably, that would be where any environmental agencies
14 would start.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

16 THE COURT: You said "up to a hundred thousand."
17 I mean, as you've --

18 MR. PHARRIS: No, no. I think it could be over
19 a hundred thousand. But, you know, what we'll do is, we'll
20 get the money. We'll finalize the contract. We'll know
21 exactly how much is going to be paid. They've already done --
22 I mean, we've already given estimates. That's why I could
23 give you, you know, an estimate in a pretty close range. And
24 then we'll have further documents to provide to the trustee.

25 THE COURT: But it's not hundreds of thousands.

1 It's "could exceed a hundred thousand"?

2 MR. PHARRIS: If it's hundreds of thousands,
3 RETT has to bear that burden. And it could be hundreds of
4 thousands. We don't know.

5 THE COURT: Well, that's just it. I don't have
6 anything in the record. I don't know either. I just have --

7 MR. PHARRIS: Well, I think what you do know is
8 it's likely to exceed a hundred.

9 THE COURT: I don't have that in the record.

10 MR. PHARRIS: No.

11 THE COURT: I have you telling me that. But the
12 time to put evidence in the record was with the motion, and
13 all I got was a "it's substantial." That's not helpful and
14 not sufficient. And given --

15 MR. PHARRIS: But we do know that the cost of
16 litigating the issue alone could exceed -- would likely exceed
17 the settlement amount.

18 THE COURT: If you litigate inefficiently,
19 that's correct. But I would expect the parties would not
20 spend more than what's at stake. It would just not make any
21 sense for the parties to do that.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Well, if they couldn't get a
23 settlement approved, my client may feel that it doesn't have
24 any choice. I don't know.

25 THE COURT: Well, it wouldn't make a whole lot

1 of sense for your client to spend \$100,000 litigating to get
2 \$100,000 back.

3 MR. PHARRIS: Well, that's not all we have on
4 the table here. We've got the \$25,000 break-up fee. At the
5 last hearing, the trustee acknowledged that that was agreed
6 to, and they support that.

7 THE COURT: But the Court does not support it.

8 MR. PHARRIS: All right.

9 THE COURT: And I made that clear at the last
10 hearing. So the break-up fee, as far as the Court is
11 concerned, is zero.

12 You're going to need to convince me why there
13 should be a break-up fee. Because break-up fees are awarded
14 to parties to keep them into the bidding through auction.
15 Your client stayed in the bidding through auction without a
16 break-up fee. The case law is very clear. They don't get
17 one. So as far as I'm concerned, the break-up fee is likely
18 zero. So that's your first claim.

19 Now, let's turn to the administrative claim,
20 which was 34,000. It was 21,000 by the time of the hearing.
21 I said, at the time of the hearing, that I believe that monies
22 paid for insurance prepetition were not entitled to
23 administrative priority. Well, that's half of the 10,000 --

24 MR. PHARRIS: But monies weren't paid
25 prepetition.

1 THE COURT: That's not what your client said in
2 his declaration.

3 MR. PHARRIS: Well, they weren't paid
4 prepetition. That's what I --

5 THE COURT: Okay. That's what the evidentiary
6 hearing was going to be about. You were going to --

7 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

8 THE COURT: That's right. That's \$20,000. Then
9 that leaves --

10 MR. PHARRIS: I had it as 30.

11 THE COURT: Right. But if you read your reply
12 brief that you filed before the last hearing, you had knocked
13 it down to 21.

14 MR. PHARRIS: All right.

15 THE COURT: So that then comes back to your
16 environmental damages claim.

17 MR. PHARRIS: No. There was a couple thousand
18 of late fees that --

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MR. PHARRIS: You seemed to support that at the
21 time, and --

22 THE COURT: And then the \$10,000 on the taxes,
23 which the trustee had two arguments as to why that should not
24 be allowed. So there was some significant exposure to the
25 Tucker/Cook group that that claim would be allowed, maybe, in

1 the 1- to \$2,000 range, not 34. So that takes us back to the
2 damages. So that's why I'm asking you the number.

3 MR. PHARRIS: Well, the estate is still going to
4 have to litigate the break-up fee, even though --

5 THE COURT: And so is your client, too.

6 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

7 THE COURT: So --

8 MR. PHARRIS: That's why we settle these things.

9 THE COURT: The Court is ready to rule. I'm
10 going to deny the motion. Here are my findings of fact:

11 On May 6, 2016, the trustee filed a motion for
12 approval of the sale of its assets related to the Graco
13 business located at the premises. That's at Docket Number
14 200.

15 The sale motion requested that the Court approve
16 the sale of the Graco assets to Tom Tucker and Larry Cook,
17 representing a to-be-formed entity. In the sale motion, the
18 trustee requested that the Court approve a break-up fee for
19 Tucker/Cook in the amount of \$25,000. In support of that
20 motion, the trustee submitted a declaration from Tom Tucker,
21 in which Mr. Tucker swore under oath: "I believe that the
22 proposed break-up fee of \$25,000 is reasonable in relation to
23 the size of this transaction and the amount of fees and costs
24 the buyer has expended in relation to the investigation of
25 Graco and the negotiation of the purchase agreement." See

1 Docket Number 202 at paragraph 6.

2 Notably, the purchase and sale agreement
3 executed by the trustee and Tucker/Cook did not mention any
4 break-up fee. But the agreement did have an integration
5 clause which stated that the agreement supersedes all prior
6 agreements or understandings, written or oral, of the seller
7 and buyer relating to any form of acquisition of the seller or
8 the business and incorporates the entire understanding of the
9 parties with respect thereto.

10 At the hearing on the trustee's sale motion, the
11 Court approved the sale to another entity, Ira Green, Inc.,
12 but refused to approve the break-up fee at the time and
13 continued the request to a later date.

14 On June 2, the trustee noted a hearing for
15 approval of a break-up fee in the amount of \$25,000 and set
16 the hearing for June 17. See Docket Number 370.

17 On July 1, Graco Awards filed a memorandum
18 asserting that Graco was entitled to a break-up fee of
19 \$52,111, plus costs and attorney's fees not to exceed \$6,000.
20 That's Docket Number 479.

21 The memorandum relied on the declaration by
22 Larry Cook, who detailed many expenses that Graco asserted
23 were related to their transaction costs. See Docket Number
24 480.

25 The trustee filed a vigorous opposition to this

1 request, stating in the response: "Hell hath no fury like a
2 bidder scorned." The trustee noted that the prior Tucker
3 declaration, in which he asserted \$25,000, was the reasonable
4 figure for the transaction costs.

5 The trustee further asserted that the vast
6 majority of the over \$52,000 that Tucker/Cook requests is
7 based on an invoice that Larry Cook generated and submitted to
8 his business partner, Tom Tucker, for "professional services"
9 rendered by his public accounting firm.

10 The trustee asserted: "The Tucker/Cook request
11 is especially absurd given that Tucker/Cook only incurred
12 out-of-pocket expenses of approximately \$6,000 in connection
13 with its stalking-horse bid. See Docket Number 488.

14 The Tucker/Cook group was clearly surprised by
15 the trustee's vociferous opposition. Because in reply, they
16 supplied several emails from the trustee that include the
17 following: From Mark Calvert, on June 3rd, 2016, to Tom
18 Tucker: "I am here to help you and take care of you. It is
19 okay if it is next week. I am just wanting to cut you a
20 check. You and Larry are true professionals. I appreciate
21 you and Larry. Just wanted to make sure we take care of you.
22 Just let me know. Mark."

23 Then on June 20, 2016, Mark Calvert sent an
24 email to Mr. Tucker, copying Larry Cook and copying Brian
25 Peterson of K&L Gates: "Tom, No. Talked with Brian and

1 called Larry and advised. You need to have your attorney file
2 for the 56k with the affidavit from Larry we discussed. Then
3 I will follow up with a supporting motion for 30k. The
4 hearing is scheduled for July 8th. So get it filed, and we
5 will push forward. Thanks, Mark. P.S. Please pass this to
6 your attorney to confirm he is going to file the motion.
7 Thanks." That's from the supplemental Tucker declaration at
8 Docket 495, Exhibits A and B.

9 The motion in support of the settlement does not
10 fairly or accurately portray what the trustee is giving up or
11 what he is getting in return.

12 First, the trustee does not reveal all of the
13 consideration flowing to the Tucker/Cook group. In addition
14 to the \$50,000 in cash, RETT is retaining a \$36,000 security
15 deposit. The trustee is also waiving a claim to recover from
16 the landlord \$13,177 for the erroneous payment of 2015 real
17 estate taxes. The trustee is also waiving its claim for
18 attorney's fees as the prevailing party under the lease on the
19 relief from stay motion in which the trustee prevailed. The
20 trustee did request fees as the prevailing party at Docket
21 Number 49. And the trustee is waiving its claims against the
22 landlord for two obvious and blatant violations of the
23 automatic stay that the Court identified at the last hearing.

24 On the other side of the equation, the trustee
25 overstates the potential recovery by Tucker/Cook. While RETT

1 did initially request an administrative claim of \$31,426, in
2 its reply brief, it reduced the claim to \$21,606. See Docket
3 Number 497.

4 At the last hearing on this matter, the Court
5 noted that the Tucker/Cook evidence showed that nearly \$9,000
6 of that amount was spent on insurance prepetition and,
7 therefore, was not an administrative claim. The trustee also
8 argued that another 10,000 of that claim was for real estate
9 taxes that were due prepetition and, therefore, not an
10 administrative claim. That leaves approximately \$2,000 on the
11 purported administrative claim.

12 While the Court did set an evidentiary hearing
13 on the issues, it was made clear to the parties that RETT
14 would likely not be allowed the amount sought. I reviewed the
15 transcript. And I said to counsel for RETT: "I mean, I've
16 kind of given my preliminary view on several of the requested
17 administrative expenses. I don't see that there is much of an
18 administrative expense claim your client might have."

19 RETT also did initially request \$44,000 for
20 damages to the premises but reduced that request to \$20,000 at
21 the time of the hearing. Again, that is in the transcript.
22 And the trustee argued previously that the entire claim for
23 damages could be considered a general unsecured claim under
24 *In re TreeSource Industries, Inc.*, 363 F.3d 994 (9th Cir.
25 2004). Therefore, on the record before the Court, the

1 potential recovery for an administrative claim for damages is
2 between zero and \$20,000.

3 With respect to the break-up fee, Graco did file
4 a request for a break-up fee of \$52,000, plus attorney's fees
5 of \$6,000. In this current motion, the trustee characterizes
6 Graco's request as a demand. However, the emails in the
7 record show that the trustee actively encouraged Graco to
8 submit an inflated claim and then promised to seek a
9 compromise of \$30,000.

10 At the last hearing, the Court reviewed the
11 requested amounts and made clear that the vast majority of the
12 amounts included in Graco's request were not proper due
13 diligence expenses and could not be recovered as part of the
14 break-up fee. The Court also made clear that the fee could be
15 zero, as Graco would need to convince the Court that it
16 proceeded in reliance of the break-up fee despite the lack of
17 any such provision in the purchase and sale agreement and the
18 presence of the integration clause in the agreement. Thus, on
19 this record, the potential recovery on the break-up fee is
20 between zero and 25,000.

21 According to the motion, the proposed settlement
22 includes \$25,000 for the break-up fee. Meaning the
23 Tucker/Cook group is not compromising at all but is getting
24 exactly what the trustee promised he would give them.

25 In support of the current motion, the trustee

1 declares that RETT asserts there has been more damage to the
2 premises caused by Ira Green's removal of property from the
3 premises. This is hearsay, and the Court has no evidence of
4 the amount of alleged damages.

5 The settlement agreement requires the
6 Tucker/Cook group to provide the trustee with all of its
7 evidence of damages. I now have clarification that that was
8 supposed to be proof of payment. I don't read the settlement
9 agreement to say that. But in any event, it's clear, based
10 upon that settlement provision, that the trustee does not have
11 all the evidence to conclude that there is potential
12 substantial damage to the premises.

13 The trustee asserts that if he litigates the
14 issue, the estate would be forced to incur significant
15 discovery and litigation expenses. The Court does not accept
16 this prediction.

17 The evidentiary issues the Court identified at
18 the last hearing were very limited: When did RETT pay
19 insurance? Are there facts that would support an agreement
20 for a breakup? What did Tucker/Cook spend on due diligence?
21 And what, if any, damage was caused by the removal?

22 The trustee should be able to conduct discovery
23 on these limited issues in an efficient manner.

24 As for the alleged damages caused by the move,
25 again, the Court has no evidence of those alleged damages, so

1 it's not possible to evaluate the trustee's assertion that
2 massive discovery would be needed.

3 The Court concludes as follows:

4 When evaluating a proposed settlement, the focus
5 of the Court's inquiry is whether the settlement entered into
6 by the trustee was reasonable, given the particular
7 circumstances of the case. In re Equity Funding Corp. of
8 America, 519 F.2d 1274 (9th Cir. 1975).

9 Specifically, to determine whether a compromise
10 is fair and equitable, the Court should consider: (1) the
11 probability of success in the litigation; (2) the
12 difficulties, if any, to be encountered in collection; (3) the
13 litigation's complexity and its attendant expense,
14 inconvenience, and delay; and (4) the paramount interest of
15 the creditors, with a proper deference to their reasonable
16 view. In re A&C Properties, 784 F.2d 1377 (9th Cir. 1986).

17 On this record, the trustee is attempting to
18 convey over \$100,000 in consideration to the Tucker/Cook group
19 to avoid an administrative claim that this Court calculates to
20 be between \$2,000 and \$75,000.

21 The Court concludes that this settlement is not
22 reasonable and does not satisfy the A&C factors. The debtor
23 would certainly do better than this proposal if he litigated
24 the matter, even after litigation costs. In the absence of
25 any evidence of significant damage that the estate might be

1 exposed to on an administrative expense basis, the trustee is
2 overpaying, and Tucker/Cook is not compromising at all.

3 Further, saving litigation costs is not a
4 sufficient basis to approve the settlement. If it were,
5 anyone could threaten to file an administrative expense claim,
6 and then the trustee would have to settle for litigation
7 costs. Moreover, it appears that the litigation may not be
8 ending, because, again, I can't really tell, from this
9 lawsuit, what the purpose of paragraph 4 is, even though I now
10 have some explanation.

11 It appears to the Court that getting this
12 information, at least gives the trustee the ability to go
13 after Ira Green for its damages. If that's not the case,
14 that's great. It would be preferable if the settlement
15 agreement stated that RETT is not suing Ira Green, and the
16 trustee is not suing Ira Green. I'm not going to tell the
17 parties that they need to include that. But unless Ira Green
18 is involved in the settlement, the Court is not convinced that
19 that litigation is done and completed by this settlement
20 agreement.

21 Given that Tucker/Cook filed an inflated request
22 for a break-up fee, albeit at the request of the trustee, the
23 Court will not consider any request to compromise an alleged
24 damages claim without declarations, based on personal
25 knowledge, that identifies the damages allegedly caused by the

1 removal of items from the premises.

2 The motion is denied. The Court will enter the
3 order.

4 Thank you, gentlemen.

5 If someone wants to reset the evidentiary
6 hearing, send a letter asking us to do so.

7 Anything further?

8 MR. PHARRIS: Not from us.

9 THE COURT: All right.

10 All right. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

11 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: I do need to say that those emails
13 are still very troubling.

14 MR. PETERSON: Understood, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: You need to convey that to your
16 client.

17

18 (The proceedings in this matter were concluded.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2

3 I, Shari L. Wheeler, court reporter and court-approved
4 transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct
5 transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the
6 proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Some editing
7 changes may have been made at the request of the Court.

8

9 These pages constitute the original or a copy of the
10 original transcript of the proceedings, to the best of my
11 ability.

12

13 Signed and dated this 1st day of December, 2016.

14

15

16 by /s/ Shari L. Wheeler

17 SHARI L. WHEELER, CCR NO. 2396

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AhearnAndAssoc@comcast.net