

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

APRIL-MAY 2023

**EDITOR'S NOTE: CASE BY CASE BY CASE BY CASE**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**CRYPTO PLATFORMS IN CRISIS: BANKRUPTCY CONSIDERATIONS – PART II**

Kenneth Aulet

**THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS STEPS AWAY FROM THE TEXAS TWO STEP**

NallyAnn Scaturro

**“FATAL MEANS FATAL”: FIFTH CIRCUIT’S BROAD READ OF SECTION 363(m) CONTINUES TO MOOT SECTION 363 APPEALS AFTER THE SALE**

Mark E. Dendinger and Robert P. Grattan

**HOW MANY CONNECTIONS ARE TOO MANY? BANKRUPTCY COURT FINDS MULTIPLE ATTENUATED CONNECTIONS NOT ENOUGH TO WARRANT DISQUALIFICATION OF DEBTORS’ PROFESSIONAL**

Kelly DiBlasi, Lauren Tauro, Jason George and Jared Mezzatesta

**NON-DEBTOR AWARDED SANCTIONS FOR IMPROPER FILING OF INVOLUNTARY PETITION**

Shmuel Vasser and J.J. Moser

**ISDA AND SIFMA BACK DEALERS’ BANKRUPTCY INTEREST RATE SWAP TERMINATION CLAIMS OVER DEBTOR OBJECTION**

Daniel N. Budofsky, Hugh M. McDonald and Kwame O. Akuffo

**FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE AMENDED IN RESPONSE TO SMALL BUSINESS REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2019**

Travis Powers



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

---

VOLUME 19

NUMBER 3

April–May 2023

---

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Editor's Note: Case by Case by Case by Case</b><br>Victoria Prussen Spears  | 97  |
| <b>Crypto Platforms in Crisis: Bankruptcy Considerations – Part II</b><br>Kenneth Aulet  | 100 |
| <b>Third Circuit Court of Appeals Steps Away from the Texas Two Step</b><br>NallyAnn Scaturro  | 118 |
| <b>“Fatal Means Fatal”: Fifth Circuit’s Broad Read of Section 363(m) Continues to Moot Section 363 Appeals After the Sale</b><br>Mark E. Dendinger and Robert P. Grattan   | 124 |
| <b>How Many Connections Are Too Many? Bankruptcy Court Finds Multiple Attenuated Connections Not Enough to Warrant Disqualification of Debtors’ Professional</b><br>Kelly DiBlasi, Lauren Tauro, Jason George and Jared Mezzatesta | 127 |
| <b>Non-Debtor Awarded Sanctions for Improper Filing of Involuntary Petition</b><br>Shmuel Vasser and J.J. Moser  | 133 |
| <b>ISDA and SIFMA Back Dealers’ Bankruptcy Interest Rate Swap Termination Claims Over Debtor Objection</b><br>Daniel N. Budofsky, Hugh M. McDonald and Kwame O. Akuffo   | 136 |
| <b>Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure Amended in Response to Small Business Reorganization Act of 2019</b><br>Travis Powers   | 140 |

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

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

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at ..... 513.257.9021  
Email: ..... ryan.kearns@lexisnexus.com

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.lexisnexus.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 (2023)

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 © 2023 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.lexisnexus.com](http://www.lexisnexus.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 © 2023 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.

# “Fatal Means Fatal”: Fifth Circuit’s Broad Read of Section 363(m) Continues to Moot Section 363 Appeals After the Sale

*By Mark E. Dendinger and Robert P. Grattan\**

*In this article, the authors explain how decisions in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals broadly interpret a provision of the Bankruptcy Code that protects bankruptcy sales from being overturned on appeal.*

Recent rulings out of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and from its lower bankruptcy courts have emphasized the Fifth Circuit’s broad interpretation of Section 363(m) of the Bankruptcy Code, which protects bankruptcy sales from being overturned on appeal.

In her opinion in *In re Royal Street Bistro, LLC, et al.*,<sup>1</sup> District Judge Sarah S. Vance provided a comprehensive summary of the Fifth Circuit case law while mooting a debtor’s attempt to appeal a sale under Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code.

## THE BANKRUPTCY CASE

The *Royal Street* case arose when the owner of three properties on New Orleans’ Royal Street filed for bankruptcy protection in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. The properties were also subject to leases and occupied by tenants. A secured lender also held a lien on each property.

During the case, the court-appointed Chapter 11 trustee and the secured lender reached a settlement that required the properties be sold. In response, the tenants sought adequate protection of their interests in the properties and asked the court to require the debtor to explicitly assume or reject the leases. The bankruptcy court granted the trustee’s sale and settlement motion and its bidding procedures motion, and it denied the tenants’ motion for adequate protection and motion to require the debtor to assume or reject leases. The tenants appealed. They then sought a stay pending appeal of the order from the bankruptcy court, the district court, and ultimately a writ of mandamus from the Fifth Circuit. Each court rejected the request.

The bankruptcy court subsequently entered final orders approving the settlement and proposed sale of the properties, approving the bidding proce-

---

\* The authors, attorneys with Bracewell LLP, may be contacted at [mark.dendinger@bracewell.com](mailto:mark.dendinger@bracewell.com) and [bob.grattan@bracewell.com](mailto:bob.grattan@bracewell.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> *In re Royal Street Bistro, LLC, et al.*, No. 21-2285 (E.D. La. Sept. 23, 2022) (Opinion).

dures, and setting the auction sale of the property. The tenants appealed those orders to Judge Vance’s district court, and the appeals were consolidated.

At the auction, one property was sold to the secured lender and the other two to third parties. The proceeds from the sales were then used to pay off the secured lender and to cover the Trustee’s fees.

Judge Vance heard the consolidated appeal at the district court, where the Chapter 11 trustee moved for summary judgment dismissing the appeal as moot under Section 363(m). This section reads:

(m) The reversal or modification on appeal of an authorization under subsection (b) or (c) of this section of a sale or lease of property does not affect the validity of a sale or lease under such authorization to an entity that purchased or leased such property in good faith, whether or not such entity knew of the pendency of the appeal, unless such authorization and such sale or lease were stayed pending appeal.

The tenants responded that their appeal was not moot because it sought only to challenge the disposition of the sale proceeds under the settlement agreement, rather than the sale itself.

Specifically, as Judge Vance summarized, the tenants sought to “reverse the settlement between the Trustee and the [secured lender], but only as to the Trustee.”<sup>2</sup> The tenants also contended that they were entitled to damages from the trustee in connection with the sale and a lease repudiation.

## MOOT APPEAL

Judge Vance held that the appeal was moot. The Fifth Circuit’s precedent is clear, she reasoned, and failing to obtain a stay is “fatal to a challenge of a bankruptcy court’s authorization of the sale of property.”<sup>3</sup> She emphasized that in the Fifth Circuit “fatal means fatal: challenges to authorized bankruptcy sales are dismissed when the party challenging the sale fails to obtain a stay,” citing *Matter of Walker Cnty. Hosp. Corp.*<sup>4</sup>

Appellants’ argument that they sought to challenge the settlement and the distribution of sale proceeds rather than the sale itself was insufficient to save their appeal, Judge Vance concluded. The Fifth Circuit considers how closely linked a challenged settlement provision is to a sale itself to determine the

---

<sup>2</sup> See Opinion (internal quotations omitted).

<sup>3</sup> See Opinion (citing *In re Ginther Trs.*, 238 F.3d 686, 689 (5th Cir. 2001)).

<sup>4</sup> *Matter of Walker Cnty. Hosp. Corp.*, 3 F.4th 229, 234 (5th Cir. 2021).

applicability of Section 363(m), she wrote. When the sale is “integrally linked” to the settlement, both are mooted, she concluded.<sup>5</sup>

Judge Vance noted that other circuits, specifically the Seventh and Ninth, take a more forgiving view of Section 363(m), citing to *Trinity 83 Dev., LLC v. ColFin Midwest Funding, LLC*.<sup>6</sup> In *Trinity*, the Seventh Circuit held that “§ 363(m) does not make any dispute moot or prevent a bankruptcy court from deciding what shall be done with the proceeds of a sale or lease.”

Judge Vance also cited to a district court opinion from a court in the Seventh Circuit, *In re X-Treme Bullets, Inc.*, where Judge Miranda Du collected cases on how courts interpret Section 363(m). That opinion notes that the Sixth and Ninth Circuits appear to recognize a “narrower view” of Section 363(m) mootness that can preserve certain challenges on appeal after a sale. But *X-Treme Bullets* also recognizes that the “majority of circuits” read Section 363(m) to create “a *per se* rule automatically moots appeals for failure to obtain a stay of the sale at issue.”<sup>7</sup>

The Fifth Circuit’s reading of Section 363(m) is broader than the Seventh and Ninth Circuit interpretation, Judge Vance concluded. Ultimately, the distribution of the sale proceeds was “part and parcel of the sale – they ensured that the sale would accomplish its purpose” of satisfying the secured creditor’s claim while allocating funds to the trustee to administer the estate. This disposition of proceeds was “necessary to facilitate the transaction” and thus was “integrally linked to the underlying sale.”<sup>8</sup> Under the Fifth Circuit’s reading, an appeal of this distribution is moot.

## CONCLUSION

Potential purchasers and debtors considering a Section 363 sale should take note of this difference when planning the disposition of assets and proceeds. Additionally, the circuit split may be indirectly addressed when the U.S. Supreme Court decides *MOAC Holdings LLC v. Transform Holdco LLC*<sup>9</sup> and considers whether Section 363(m) limits the appellate courts’ jurisdiction over any sale order or order deemed “integral” to a sale order.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Opinion.

<sup>6</sup> *Trinity 83 Dev., LLC v. ColFin Midwest Funding, LLC*, 917 F.3d 599, 601 (7th Cir. 2019).

<sup>7</sup> *In re X-Treme Bullets, Inc.*, No. 18-50609-BTB (D. Nev. Aug. 3, 2020).

<sup>8</sup> See Opinion (internal quotations omitted).

<sup>9</sup> *MOAC Holdings LLC v. Transform Holdco LLC*, 21-1270 (Sup. Ct.).