

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

FEBRUARY/MARCH 2020

EDITOR'S NOTE: RESOLUTION PLANNING

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**AGENCIES FINALIZE NEW STRUCTURE FOR RESOLUTION PLANNING:
MORE FOCUSED AND LESS FREQUENT**

Michael H. Krimminger, Katherine Mooney Carroll, Lisa M. Schweitzer,
Sarah M. Stanton, and Lauren Gilbert

**U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING ON FDCPA LIMITATIONS PERIOD
LEAVES ISSUES UNRESOLVED**

Stuart I. Gordon and Matthew V. Spero

**U.S. SUPREME COURT MAY DECIDE WHO GETS A CONSOLIDATED
GROUP'S TAX REFUND WHEN A BANKRUPTCY INTERVENES**

David Evan Otero

**FIRST CIRCUIT HOLDS SUN CAPITAL FUNDS NOT LIABLE FOR PORTFOLIO
COMPANY WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY**

Austin S. Lilling, André B. Nance, David C. Olstein, Eric Requenez,
Abbey L. Keppler, and Brian A. Friederich

**MEDICARE/MEDICAID PROVIDER AGREEMENTS RULED "STATUTORY
ENTITLEMENTS"—NOT "EXECUTORY CONTRACTS"—THUS LIMITING A BUYER'S
OBLIGATION TO ASSUME DEBTOR LIABILITIES IN A BANKRUPTCY SALE**

Terry D. Novetsky, Arthur J. Steinberg, Peter Montoni, Scott Davidson, and
Joshua Harris Saccurato

**ENFORCEMENT OF AN INSOLVENCY-RELATED JUDGMENT DOES NOT REQUIRE
RECOGNITION UNDER CHAPTER 15**

Michael B. Schaedle and Evan J. Zucker

**THE NEW EU RESTRUCTURING DIRECTIVE AND REFORMS IN THE
UNITED KINGDOM**

Matthew Thorn and Manhal Zaman

**ONTARIO APPELLATE COURT SETS SOME LIMITS ON SELLING FREE AND CLEAR
OF ENCUMBRANCES IN CANADA: *THIRD EYE CAPITAL CORPORATION
V. DIANOR RESOURCES INC.***

Evan Cobb



LexisNexis

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 16

NUMBER 2

FEB./MAR. 2020

Editor's Note: Resolution Planning

Steven A. Meyerowitz

51

Agencies Finalize New Structure for Resolution Planning: More Focused and Less Frequent

Michael H. Krimminger, Katherine Mooney Carroll, Lisa M. Schweitzer, Sarah M. Stanton, and Lauren Gilbert

54

U.S. Supreme Court Ruling on FDCPA Limitations Period Leaves Issues Unresolved

Stuart I. Gordon and Matthew V. Spero

64

U.S. Supreme Court May Decide Who Gets a Consolidated Group's Tax Refund When a Bankruptcy Intervenes

David Evan Otero

72

First Circuit Holds Sun Capital Funds Not Liable for Portfolio Company Withdrawal Liability

Austin S. Lilling, André B. Nance, David C. Olstein, Eric Requenez, Abbey L. Keppler, and Brian A. Friederich

77

Medicare/Medicaid Provider Agreements Ruled "Statutory Entitlements"—Not "Executory Contracts"—Thus Limiting a Buyer's Obligation to Assume Debtor Liabilities in a Bankruptcy Sale

Terry D. Novetsky, Arthur J. Steinberg, Peter Montoni, Scott Davidson, and Joshua Harris Saccurato

84

Enforcement of an Insolvency-Related Judgment Does Not Require Recognition Under Chapter 15

Michael B. Schaedle and Evan J. Zucker

87

The New EU Restructuring Directive and Reforms in the United Kingdom

Matthew Thorn and Manhal Zaman

92

Ontario Appellate Court Sets Some Limits on Selling Free and Clear of Encumbrances in Canada: *Third Eye Capital Corporation v. Dianor Resources Inc.*

Evan Cobb

97

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)

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 © 2020 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

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 2020 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 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, 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.

U.S. Supreme Court May Decide Who Gets a Consolidated Group's Tax Refund When a Bankruptcy Intervenes

*By David Evan Otero**

The U.S. Supreme Court may be ready to resolve a bankruptcy tax issue that has divided the circuit courts of appeals.

The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments on December 3, 2019 in *Simon E. Rodriguez v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.*¹ At dispute in the case is whether a \$4.1 million tax refund belongs to a failed bank (the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”), as receiver for defunct United Western Bank) or its corporate parent in bankruptcy (Rodriguez, as trustee for United Western Bancorp Inc.).

The Supreme Court granted *certiorari* in *Rodriguez* to decide whether state law or federal common law decides who owns the tax refund, but at oral argument, it became apparent that the issue may not be the subject of, in the words of Justice Ginsburg, “adversarial confrontation” and thus improper to decide in the context of this case.

At oral argument, it became immediately apparent that the Court may never reach the question for which *certiorari* was granted as neither side defended federal common law known as the *Bob Richards* rule. Instead, both sides merely argued the issue of whether the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit correctly applied state law.

Still, some of the justices seemed interested in proceeding nonetheless so it is impossible to tell at this time just what the Court will do. A substantive decision in the case would likely resolve the split between four circuit courts of appeal that have determined that ownership of a tax refund paid to an affiliated group belongs to the subsidiary even in the event of a parent bankruptcy (Fifth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh—although the Eleventh rejected the *Bob Richards* rule discussed below), and three circuits that have held that the refund is property of the parent company's bankruptcy estate (Second, Third, and Sixth).

If ultimately decided, the case could have a significant impact on whether a parent or its subsidiary receives a refund or pays a tax liability in the event of insolvency. The court's analysis on entitlement of the bank holding company or

* David Evan Otero, a tax partner in the Jacksonville office of Akerman LLP, can be reached at david.otero@akerman.com.

¹ *Simon E. Rodriguez v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.*, 18-1269 (Sup. Ct.).

its subsidiary to the refunds under prior Section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code (which allowed a corporation to carry back net operating losses for up to two taxable years) would apply to any corporate family bankruptcy filing and thus is currently very important. This same analysis could certainly be applied to allocating tax liabilities between corporate families as well. Many disputes in the past over tax refunds between a bank's holding company and the FDIC from the last financial crisis have been resolved, but this issue could become very important in the banking context again if we had another significant economic crisis. It is noteworthy, however, that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act eliminated the carry back on net operating losses, which will limit tax refunds by holding companies in the future.

THE CIRCUIT SPLIT

The seven circuit decisions that may be affected by *Rodriguez* all arose as a result of the last banking crisis. The facts and issue were essentially the same in those cases² as they are in *Rodriguez*: the bank holding company filed for bankruptcy and a trustee was eventually appointed. The holding company's operating bank subsidiaries were not eligible for bankruptcy and typically fell under FDIC receivership. During good times, the holding companies typically filed consolidated federal income tax returns for their subsidiaries, and administered the refunds and liabilities. Post-bank crash, tax refunds were often due to the consolidated banking family. The issue in these cases was which party gets the tax refund: the holding company that filed the consolidated tax return and received the refund, or the subsidiary that actually experienced the losses?

Usually, like there was in this case, there was a Tax Sharing Agreement (a "TSA," sometimes called a "TAA") between the holding company and its subsidiaries that might contain terms that bear on the ownership of the tax refunds, one way or the other. The subsidiary bank typically argues, like the FDIC does here, that the TSA establishes that the holding company acted on behalf of the bank subsidiary as a trustee or agent, and any ambiguity among the parties should be construed in its favor and therefore the refund attributable to the subsidiary's losses didn't become part of the holding company's bankruptcy estate and must be paid to the subsidiary. Further, if the TSA doesn't provide such guidance or is ambiguous, the subsidiaries and FDIC contend that court is required to ascertain the intent of the parties in entering into the TSA, and at least until now, had argued that the court should apply the

² They include a bankruptcy proceeding where we represented FDIC that eventually was decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. *In re NetBank*, 729 F.3d 1344 (11th Cir. 2013).

principle first enunciated in *In re Bob Richards Chrysler—Plymouth Corp.*,³ that “[a]bsent any differing agreement[,] a tax refund resulting solely from offsetting the losses of one member of a consolidated filing group against the income of that same member in a prior or subsequent year should inure to the benefit of that member.”

On the other hand, the holding company argues, like Rodriguez as trustee does in this case, that the TSA established a debtor-creditor relationship between the parties and the holding company is entitled to the refund, and the subsidiary must file a claim in the holding company's bankruptcy (which is likely worth only pennies on the dollar). Further, the bank holding companies and their trustee's like Rodriguez argue that the property of the bankruptcy estate under the bankruptcy code is construed broadly and includes the tax refund, and that *Bob Richards* is just federal common law that is not controlling or proper in this instance. The Bankruptcy Code defines “property of the estate” as “comprised of all the following property, wherever located: . . . all legal or equitable interests of the debtor in property as of the commencement of the case.”⁴ Federal law creates the bankruptcy estate, but state law defines the debtor's property rights.⁵ The Supreme Court also has held that section 541(a) should be construed broadly with respect to what constitutes property of the estate.⁶

In the *Rodriguez* case, the Colorado bankruptcy court ruled in favor of the bankruptcy trustee, finding that the TAA did not create a trust or agency under Colorado law, and instead finding the parent and subsidiary had a debtor/creditor relationship. The decision was reversed on appeal to the district court, however, finding that the Tenth Circuit had previously adopted the *Bob Richards* rule, and that the TAA on whole supported the subsidiary's (FDIC's) right to the refund. The Tenth Circuit affirmed the district court, also first saying that it had adopted *Bob Richards* previously, and that the terms of the TAA, the holding company was an agent for the subsidiary bank. It is unclear from the Tenth Circuit's opinion if it relied on the *Bob Richards* rule or not in reaching its decision in favor of the FDIC.

CONCLUSION

Procedurally, the Court now has at least three options.

³ *In re Bob Richards Chrysler—Plymouth Corp.*, 473 F.2d 262, 265 (9th Cir. 1973).

⁴ See 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(1).

⁵ *Butner v. United States*, 440 U.S. 48 (1979).

⁶ *United States v. Whiting Pools, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 198, 204 (1983).

First, and possibly most likely, the justices could dismiss the case because *certiorari* was improvidently granted (“DIG” the petition), in which event the Tenth Circuit’s decision in *Rodriguez* would stand, and the circuit split would continue.

Second, the Court could affirm based on the record before it, without overruling *Bob Richards*, which also may not truly resolve the circuit split.

Or, the Court could remand the case to the Tenth Circuit, either (i) with an instruction that *Bob Richards* is bad law/overruled and to review the case again, this time without any reliance on *Bob Richards*, or (ii) simply asking the Tenth Circuit to clarify whether it was relying on *Bob Richards* when it reached its decision.

In view of the foregoing intersection between federal tax and bankruptcy law, and the complex procedural issue, the result in *Rodriguez* should be quite interesting.

