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INTRODUCTION

Two brothers have dominated the film production industry since the late 1980s, playing a prominent role in blockbuster movies. Harvey and Bob Weinstein are New York natives that took an early interest in media entertainment.\(^1\) The two gained their initial experience by promoting rock concerts near the University of Buffalo.\(^2\) Realizing they had some skill in this field, the brothers formed Miramax Film Corporation ("Miramax") in 1979 for the purpose of buying movie rights.\(^3\) Miramax saw early success and by 1989 had proven itself as a market competitor with Harvey serving as the face of the company.\(^4\)

In 1993, the Walt Disney Company acquired Miramax for $60 million, leaving the brothers in charge of the main operations as co-chairmen.\(^5\) At this point, Miramax began work with Quentin Tarantino, who relied exclusively on the brothers for production of his films through 2017.\(^6\) At this time, Miramax was responsible for perpetually popular films, including *Pulp Fiction* and *Good Will Hunting*.\(^7\) The early 2000s proved to be a struggle for Miramax as the company tried to venture into other media forms, including magazines.\(^8\) Despite the critics, films produced by Miramax received 40 Academy Awards nominations in 2003, the most in over 60 years.\(^9\)

---


2. *Id.*

3. *Id.*

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.*


8. *Id.*

9. *Id.*
In 2005, the brothers took full control of their talent and their future by establishing The Weinstein Company.\textsuperscript{10} This decision was due to a volatile relationship with Disney, Miramax’s owner.\textsuperscript{11} The Weinstein’s desired to “make larger, more costly films,” and their new company would allow this.\textsuperscript{12} The brothers continued to produce blockbuster hits, continuously recognized by the Academy and at the Oscars. Notable works include \textit{Inglourious Basterds}, \textit{Django Unchained}, and \textit{The Imitation Game}.\textsuperscript{13} The Weinstein Company faced continuous success for the next 12 years, producing movies that grabbed headlines and dominated the box office.\textsuperscript{14}

In the pages that follow, we detail the crisis that took The Weinstein Company from its position of unparalleled success into Chapter 11, where substantially all of its assets were liquidated in an 11 U.S.C. § 363(b) & (f) process, and then into Chapter 7, for final liquidation under the supervision of a bankruptcy panel trustee. We begin, in the next sections, with a description of the crisis and its immediate fallout. We then consider its prepetition attempts to liquidate outside of bankruptcy. Next, we turn to commencement of the bankruptcy case and the retention of estate professionals that would drive and document the Chapter 11 sale process and DIP financing, which are in turn described chronologically as they played out. Finally, we describe the conversion to Chapter 7 and include some final notes on the individual story of Harvey Weinstein, once one of the most powerful men in Hollywood and in the international entertainment industry.”

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Id.}


\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Harvey Weinstein – American Film Producer}, supra note 1 [https://perma.cc/S3AQ-E6SK].

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Id.}
WHY DID THE WEINSTEIN COMPANY GO BANKRUPT?

In October of 2017, Harvey Weinstein was accused of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape as a flood of reports emerged, starting with the New York Times.\(^\text{15}\) These acts allegedly took place over numerous decades.\(^\text{16}\) The board of directors of The Weinstein Company ultimately terminated Harvey Weinstein’s employment at The Weinstein Company.\(^\text{17}\) On March 11, 2019, Harvey Weinstein was sentenced to 23 years in prison.\(^\text{18}\)

As the flood of reports continued to leak, The Weinstein Company began to feel the blowback in its business. In October 2017 alone, companies such as Netflix, Lexus, Apple, and Amazon terminated business relations with the company.\(^\text{19}\) Similar actions from companies, actors and actresses, and other business partners continued through the following months. In that same time, The Weinstein Company lost a majority of its Board members and 25% of its overall workforce by March 2018. Finally, weekly cash receipts plummeted from $2 million to $150,000 by March 2018.\(^\text{20}\) The company considered a sale to save the company at a time they were unable to operate and losing cash at an exponential rate.

*Colony Capital Acquisition, LLC*

TWC’s television assets caught the interest of private equity firm Colony Capital Acquisitions, LLC, and the two entered an exclusivity agreement on October 15, 2017.\(^\text{21}\) Colony’s involvement with TWC was essential because the prospective deal would include an “immediate capital infusion [to help] return the Company to its rightful iconic position in the independent film

\(^{15}\) Id.

\(^{16}\) Id.

\(^{17}\) Id.


\(^{20}\) Id. at 17.

\(^{21}\) Id. at 19.
and television industry.” Unfortunately for TWC, Colony declined to provide the company with the cash infusion on October 25. Ultimately, Colony ended its entire bid for TWC based on both a “disagreement on price” and “trying to effectuate a sale that [did]n’t benefit Harvey.”

**Fortress Credit Company, LLC**

As TWC’s negotiations with Colony faltered, Fortress Credit Company entered as a potential provider of rescue financing. Fortress’ help was needed, especially in the form of a $35 million “lifeline [that would have met TWC’s] cash needs for payroll and operations for about three months.” After ending negotiations without a final agreement, Fortress emphasized that it could re-enter into talks with TWC “during a bankruptcy process if the movie company [sought] protection from creditors.”

---


23 See Brooks Barnes and Rachel Abrams, *Weinstein Company Will Not Get Planned Cash Infusion*, N.Y. TIMES (Oct. 25, 2017), [https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/25/business/media/weinstein-company-colony-capital.html](https://perma.cc/FD7W-H7WY) (Explaining that “Colony found more disorder than it had expected — and less value — once it started closely examining the studio’s assets...Colony saw bankruptcy as the most likely near-term outcome for the studio.”) [https://perma.cc/D4WL-V4KC].


25 Declaration of Robert del Genio, *supra* note 19, 7.pdf at 19 (Explaining that “Specifically, Fortress expressed interest in acquiring Weinstein Domestic LLC’s outstanding debt under the UBE Facility and extending new loans. However, the refinancing did not materialize.”).


27 Id.
Sale of “Paddington Bear 2”

TWC was pushed to the financial brink due to the time wasted in prior failed negotiations. As a stop-gap measure to avoid bankruptcy, Moelis began marketing TWC’s film asset Paddington Bear 2 and received five offers from interested buyers.28 By mid-November, TWC sold the domestic rights of the film Paddington Bear 2 for $28.8 million to Warner Brothers, of which $13 million was designated as “immediate cash.”29

Miscellaneous Sales of Films During the “White Knight” Negotiation

On November 23, 2017, TWC “was able to sell War with Grandpa, to its producers, Marro WWG LLC, for $2.5 million.”30 On January 12, 2018, “in an effort to preserve cash” TWC sold its rights for the Six Billion Dollar Man to Warner Brothers for $7.2 million.31

“White Knight Bid” to Transform TWC

On November 8, 2017, the most significant prepetition sale opportunity came in the form of an offer letter from Maria Contreras-Sweet.32 The offer letter “attached a proposed term sheet, proposing to acquire the assets of the Company, to assume substantially all liabilities related to the Company’s business operations, to retain most (if not all) employees and to install a majority-female board of representatives.”33 Contreras-Sweet’s offer represented the intentions of Mediaco Acquisition, LLC, which was described as “a consortium of investors that includes the Yucipa Companies (“Yucaipa”), Lantern Asset Management LLC (“Lantern Capital”), Maria Contreras-Sweet and other investors.”34 Mediaco’s offer of $275 million far exceeded Colony’s $150 million-$175 million offer that was subsequently rejected by TWC’s board of directors.35 Throughout the

28 Declaration of Robert del Genio, supra note 19, 7.pdf at 20.
29 Id.
30 Id.
31 Id. at 21.
32 Id. at 20.
33 Id.
34 Id.
Mediacos negotiations, Moelis pitched and ultimately convinced TWC’s board to implement a strategy to “attract additional bidders”; however, this strategy proved ultimately to be unsuccessful. In fact, after deciding that making a deal with Mediacos was the best prospect for a sale outside of bankruptcy, TWC entered into a “20-day exclusivity and expense reimbursement agreement with Mediacos.”

**Exclusivity with Mediacos and Ultimate Collapse of Talks**

TWC and Mediacos exchanged fifteen draft Asset Purchase Agreements during the life of the exclusivity agreement. On February 11, 2018, the last day of the exclusivity agreement period, the Attorney General of the State of New York “commenced a civil lawsuit against [TWC] alleging that [TWC] had violated the New York Human Rights Law, New York Civil Rights Law and New York Executive Law in connection with Harvey Weinstein’s reported misconduct. After the filing of the A.G.’s lawsuit, TWC began “trying to salvage negotiations with Mediacos while seeking bidders for a potential in-court sale process.” TWC also began negotiations with Union Bank “regarding the terms of a potential debtor-in-possession financing arrangement.”

---


36 Declaration of Robert del Genio, *supra* note 19, 7.pdf at 20–21 (“Moelis distributed slide presentations regarding the Company’s saleable assets to 44 parties by mid-November 2017. Of these 44 parties, 30 signed preliminary letters of interest and gained access to a data room established for this purpose containing extensive documentation regarding the Company’s finances and asset holdings. On or around December 8, 2017, Moelis sent process letters to the 30 investors that had signed preliminary letters of interest. The letters provided for a bid deadline of December 20, 2017. In response, the Company received 10 proposals. Each proposal was for a purchase of some combination of the Company’s film library, television assets, and portfolio of unreleased films. Moelis recommended 8 of these proposals for a second round of negotiations, which remained ongoing until shortly before the Petition...The Board considered each of those proposals in detail and, after having detailed discussions and consulting their advisers, passed 8 bidders into the second round. However, of the 8, the Mediacos proposal presented the only real opportunity for a sale of the Company outside of bankruptcy. In fact, all other bidders either explicitly or verbally communicated their intention to acquire assets pursuant to a court-supervised bankruptcy 363 sale.”) (emphasis added).

37 *Id.* at 21–22.

38 *Id.* at 22.

39 *Id.*

40 *Id.* at 22–23.

41 *Id.* at 23.
The A.G.’s office “facilitated a productive meeting with Mediaco representatives” on February 21, 2018 that left TWC with the impression that “an out-of-court sale was still a feasible option to avoid a bankruptcy filing.” Though a second deal with Mediaco was imminent, the talks collapsed for a second and final time after Mediaco discovered additional liabilities and debts during the due diligence period. In response, on March 6, 2018, Mediaco “failed to make the first interim financing payment and instead terminated the Asset Purchase Agreement.” On the same day, TWC announced that it would be filing for bankruptcy. The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, along with 54 affiliated companies (collectively, the “Debtors”) sought relief under the Bankruptcy Code through a jointly administrated set of cases, as described below.

On March 19, 2019, the Debtors, having less than $500,000, filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware. The case was assigned to the Honorable Judge Mary F. Walrath. Judge Walrath received her undergraduate degree from Princeton University and her Juris Doctorate from Villanova University. Prior to becoming a judge, she was an associate at Clark Ladner Fortenbaugh & Young, and then as a partner at Walrath & Coolidge. During this time, Judge Walrath worked in debtor and creditor rights and commercial litigation.

---

42 Id.

43 Brooks Barnes, Planned Sale of Weinstein Company Collapses Again, N.Y. TIMES (Mar. 6, 2018), https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/06/business/media/weinstein-company-sale.html (“But once the buyers began looking deeper into the Weinstein Company’s finances, they discovered that it had more debt than they had been led to believe, according to two people briefed on the matter, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss confidential information. Additional liabilities totaling between $55 million and $65 million were discovered, including $27 million in unpaid residuals and profit participation; and $20 million in accounts payable.”) [https://perma.cc/2X3X-ZV8N].

44 Declaration of Robert del Genio, supra note 19, 7.pdf at 24.

45 Id. at 27.

46 Mary F. Walrath, BALLOTpedia, https://ballotpedia.org/Mary_F._Walrath [https://perma.cc/QAL7-C8XU].

47 Id.

48 Id.
49 Declaration of Robert del Genio, supra note 19, 7.pdf at 24.
FIRST DAY MOTIONS

Joint Administration

The Debtors first submitted to the court a motion for joint administration (“Joint Administration Motion”), supported by an incorporated declaration from chief restructuring officer Robert Del Genio, requesting that the court maintain one file and one docket for TWC and its affiliates.\(^ {50} \) In the Joint Administration Motion, TWC sought to combine the fifty-five chapter 11 cases “for procedural purposes only.”\(^ {51} \) Del Genio explained that “many of the motions, hearings and other matters involved in the chapter 11 cases will affect all of the Debtors (within TWC) [and t]herefore, [] believe[d] that the joint administration of these cases [would] avoid the unnecessary time and expense of duplicative motions, applications and orders, thereby saving considerable time and expense for [TWC] and resulting in substantial savings for their estates.”\(^ {52} \) The court granted the order authorizing joint administration of the case on March 20, 2018.\(^ {53} \)

Claims and Noticing Agent

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed an application to retain Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions, LLC (“Epiq”) as the claims and noticing agent and the administrative agent, effective \textit{nunc pro}

\(^{50} \) Motion For Joint Administration \textit{2.pdf} at 12, \textit{In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 19, 2018)} (hereinafter “Motion for Joint Administration”).


\(^{52} \) \textit{Id}.

\(^{53} \) Order Authorizing Joint Administration of the Debtors' Chapter 11 Cases \textit{69.pdf, In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 19, 2018)} (“An order has been entered in this case consolidating this case with the case of Avenging Eagle SPV (18-10602); Branded Partners (18-10607); Check Hook (18-10610); CTHD 2 (18-10615); Cues TWC (ASCAP) (18-10619); Current War SPV (18-10623); DRT Films (18-10627); DRT Rights Management (18-10631); FFPAD (18-10634); HRK Films (18-10639); Indirections (18-10642); Intelipartners (18-10644); Ised (18-10645); Marcotwo (18-10647); One Chance (18-10650); PA Entity 2017 (18-10652); Paddington 2 (18-10653); PS Post (18-10654); Scream 2 TC Borrower (18-10655); Small Screen Productions (18-10604); Small Screen Trades (18-10605); Spy Kids TV Borrower (18-10609); Team Players (18-10612); The Actors Group (18-10614); The Giver SPV (18-10617); The Weinstein Company (18-10620); Tulip Fever (18-10622); TWC Borrower 2016 (18-10625); TWC Domestic (18-10628); TWC Fearless Borrower (18-10630); TWC Library Songs (BMI) (18-10633); TWC Loop (18-10636); TWC Mist (18-10638); TWC Polaroid SPV (18-10641); TWC Production-Acquisition Borrower 2016 (18-10643); TWC Production (18-10646); TWC Replenish Borrower (18-10648); TWC Short Films (18-10649); TWC Untouchable SPV (18-10651); TWC Waco SPV (18-10603); Twenty O Five Holdings (18-10606); W Acquisition Company (18-10608); WC Film Completions (18-10611); Weinstein Books (18-10613); Weinstein Development (18-10616); Weinstein Global Funding (18-10618); Weinstein Global Film Corp (18-10621); Weinstein Productions (18-10624); Weinstein Television (18-10626); WTV Guantanamo SPV (18-10629); WTV JCPR Borrower 2017 (18-10632); WTV Kalief Browder Borrower (18-10635); WTV Scream 3 SPV (18-10637); WTV Yellowstone SPV (18-10640) for procedural purposes only and providing for its joint administration in accordance with the terms thereof. The docket in Case No. 18-10601 (MFW) should be consulted for all matters affecting this case. (related document 2) Signed on 3/20/2018”.

The claims and noticing agent motion was filed pursuant to Section 156(c) of the Judicial Code, title 28 of the U.S. Code, which provides “any court may utilize facilities or services . . . which pertain to the provision of notices, dockets, calendars, and other administrative information to parties in” chapter 11 cases. The Debtors also cited to Local Rule 2002-1(f), which provides that the Court may “authorize the retention of a notice and/or claims clerk under 28 U.S.C. § 156(c). The administrative agent motion was filed pursuant to Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code, as described below. Epiq was selected due to being “one of the country’s leading chapter 11 administrators, with significant experience in noticing, claims administration, soliciting, balloting, and facilitating other administrative aspects of the chapter 11 cases.”

Epiq’s retention was intended to expedite the claims filing and objection process and relieve the Debtors of “administrative burden,” and was in the best interest of the Debtors in order to preserve the estate throughout the reorganization. Epiq also asserted that they did not have any “interest materially adverse to the Debtors’ estates in connection with any matter on which it would be employed.”

As claims and noticing agent, Epiq was retained to facilitate the bankruptcy by handling all documents required by the Bankruptcy Code, maintain and organize mail, and disseminate

---

54 Debtors’ Application for Entry of an Order Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 156(c) and Local Rule 2002-1(f) Approving the Retention and Appointment of Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions, LLC as the Claims and Noticing Agent to the Debtors, Effective Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date 3.pdf at 1, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings, LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 20, 2018) [hereinafter Claims and Noticing Agent Application]; Debtors’ Application for Entry of an Order (A) Approving Employment and Retention of Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions, LLC as Administrative Advisor for Debtors, Effective Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date and (B) Granting Related Relief 131.pdf at 1, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et. al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 30, 2018) [hereinafter Epiq Application].

55 28 U.S.C. § 156(c) [https://perma.cc/F866-ZRLB].

56 Claims and Noticing Agent Application, supra note 54, 3.pdf at 7; see also Epiq Application, supra note 54, 131.pdf at 4–5.

57 Claims and Noticing Agent Application, supra note 54, 3.pdf at 7–8; see also Epiq Application, supra note 54, 131.pdf at 8.

58 Claims and Noticing Agent Application, supra note 64, 3.pdf at 9.
public information and releases.\textsuperscript{59} As administrative advisor, Epiq was retained to manage and assist with schedules of assets and liabilities, financial reports, and other claims.\textsuperscript{60}

For compensation, the Debtors requested that the “undisputed fees and expenses incurred by Epiq” be considered administrative expenses and to be paid in the ordinary course of business.\textsuperscript{61} The Debtors also provided Epiq with a retainer in the amount of $25,000, which was to be applied to “all pre-petition invoices” and then all other expenses until its exhaustion.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Id.} at 4–6. (Epiq was retained to provide numerous services as the claims and noticing agent, which included: (i) Preparation and service or required notices and documents required by the Bankruptcy Code and the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (“Bankruptcy Rules”); (ii) “Maintain . . . [copies] of the Debtors’ schedules of assets and liabilities and statements of financial affairs”; (iii) Maintain a list of potential credits, equity holder, and other parties in interest, as well as a mailing list of all parties that have filed a notice of appearance, and to update that list; (iv) Furnish notice to all potential creditors of the last date to file claims; (v) “Maintain a post office box or address” to receive claims and other mail; (vi) Filing an affidavit with the Clerk for all documents served; (vii) “Maintain the official claims register for each Debtor”; (viii) “Maintain an electronic platform for purposes of filing proofs of claim”; (ix) Implement measures to ensure “completeness and integrity of the Claims Registers and the safekeeping of the original claims”; (x) Record any claim transfers and provide the respective notices; (xi) Relocate court-filed proofs of claim to Epiq’s office; (xii) After docketing claims, provide copies to the Clerk of the Claims Register; (xiii) Keep up with the docket for any and all changes or duplications; (xiv) “Identify and correct any incomplete or incorrect addresses in any mailing or service lists”; (xv) Disseminate information to the public and respond to requests for information as directed by Debtors or the Court; (xvi) In the event of conversion to Chapter 7, “contact the Clerk’s office within three days of notice”; (xvii) “30 days prior to the close of these chapter 11 cases,” request the Debtors to submit a proposed order to the Court, which dismisses Epiq from its duties; (xviii) “Within 7 days of notice to Epiq of entry of an order closing” these cases, provide the Court a final Claims Register; (xix) At the close of the case, “box and transport all original documents” and send to the Philadelphia Federal Records Center, or any place requested by the Clerk’s office).

\textsuperscript{60} Epiq Application, \textit{supra} note 54, 131.pdf at 4 (Epiq was retained as administrative advisor to: (i) manage voting process and prepare reports for any chapter 11 plan; (ii) create an “official ballot . . . in support of the ballot tabulation results”; (iii) provide a confidential data room; (iv) assist with schedules of assets, liabilities, and other financial reports; (v) assist with “claims objections, exhibits, claims reconciliation and related matters”; (vi) manage distributions under any chapter 11 plan; and (vii) provide any other services as may be requested).

\textsuperscript{61} Claims and Noticing Agent Application, \textit{supra} note 54, 3.pdf at 8; \textit{see also} 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1)(A) (“After notice and a hearing, there shall be allowed administrative expenses . . . including the actual, necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate.”) [https://perma.cc/89K4-YLDJ].

\textsuperscript{62} Claims and Noticing Agent Application, \textit{supra} note 54, 3.pdf at 8; \textit{see} Epiq Application, \textit{supra} note 54, 131.pdf at 6–7.
The Court granted the application, effective *nunc pro tunc*, on March 20, 2018.63 Epiq was required to apply for compensation and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred.64

**Cash Management System**

The Debtors also made an administrative request to the court via a motion to continue using its cash management system.65 The Debtors moved to maintain its twenty bank accounts located at institutions like East West Bank, Bank of Hope, Bank Hapoalim, First Republic Bank, MUFG Union Bank, Comerica, and Opus Bank.66 They further requested that the court to provide relief for it to continue uninterrupted use of its “business forms” (checks, letterhead, invoices).67

Under § 363(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, a cash management system is permitted to continue because the debtor-in-possession may “use property of the estate in the ordinary course without notice or hearing.”68 Under § 363 and 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, the U.S. Trustee “has established operating guidelines for debtors in possession to supervise the administration of Chapter 11 cases.”69 The Debtors urged the court to grant relief based on the belief that “continued


64 Order (A) Approving Employment and Retention of Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions, LLC as Administrative Advisor for Debtors, Effective *Nunc Pro Tunc* to the Petition Date and (B) Granting Related Relief [257.pdf](#) at 2, *In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et. al.*, No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Apr. 18, 2018) [hereinafter Epiq Order].


66 *Id.* at 11.

67 *Id.* at 13–14.

68 *Id.* at 14.

69 *Id.* at 16 (These guidelines include: (i) close all existing bank accounts; (ii) open new bank accounts in a depository approved by the U.S. Trustee that are designated as DIP Accounts, with separate DIP Accounts established for an operating account, a tax account, and a payroll account; (iii) obtain and utilize new checks for all DIP Accounts that bear the designation “Debtor In Possession” and contain other information about the debtor’s Chapter 11 case; (iv) deposit all business revenues into the general operating DIP Account, with amounts needed to fund the other accounts being transferred to those accounts as necessary; and (v) deposit to the tax DIP Account sufficient funds to pay any tax liability (when incurred) associated with the debtor’s payroll).
use of the [Cash Management System would] prevent[] disruption . . . and facilitate[] speed of collection for accounts receivables.\textsuperscript{70} The Debtors did, however, reserved its right to open new accounts per the applicable notice requirements.\textsuperscript{71}

\textbf{Utilities}

On March 20, 2018, the Debtors filed a motion seeking continued use of their utilities, approval of adequate assurance payments, and procedures for resolving objections to the proposed adequate assurance.\textsuperscript{72} This motion was filed pursuant to Section 366 of the Bankruptcy Code, which provides that a “utility may not alter, refuse, or discontinue service to, or discriminate against, the trustee or the debtor solely on the basis of commencement of a case under [the Bankruptcy Code] or that a debt owed by the debtor to such utility for service rendered before the order for relief was not paid when due.”\textsuperscript{73} The Debtors maintained that the interim relief was necessary to “avoid immediate and irreparable harm” in the continuation of their business and the chapter 11 case.\textsuperscript{74} The Court has authority to grant this interim relief under Bankruptcy Rule 6003, which allows payment of a claim to the extent “relief is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm.”\textsuperscript{75}

The Debtors believed they had enough cash to pay for utilities during the chapter 11 case.\textsuperscript{76} Regardless, the Debtors proposed to have adequate assurance in the form of a cash deposit “equal

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Id.} at 17.

\textsuperscript{71} See \textit{id.} (“[TWC] request[s] the authority to open any new bank accounts or close any existing bank accounts as [it] may deem necessary and appropriate in the ordinary course, provided that [TWC] give[s] notice within 15 days after such opening of a new bank account or closing of an existing bank account to the U.S. Trustee and any statutory committees appointed in these Chapter 11 cases.”).

\textsuperscript{72} Debtors’ Motion for Entry of Interim and Final Orders (I) Prohibiting Utilities from Altering, Refusing, or Discontinuing Service; (II) Approving the Debtors’ Proposed Form of Adequate Assurance of Payment to Utilities; and (III) Establishing Procedures for Resolving Objection to the Debtors’ Proposed Form of Adequate Assurance at 1, \textit{In re} The Weinstein Company Holdings, LLC, \textit{et al.}, No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del.Filed Mar. 20, 2018) [hereinafter Utilities Motion].

\textsuperscript{73} 11 U.S.C. § 366(a) [https://perma.cc/7NRP-HCQ5].

\textsuperscript{74} Utilities Motion, \textit{supra} note 72, \texttt{4.pdf} at 10–11.

\textsuperscript{75} \textsc{Fed. R. Bankr. P.} 6003 [https://perma.cc/T432-MPF4].

\textsuperscript{76} Utilities Motion, \textit{supra} note 72, \texttt{4.pdf} at 4.
to one-half of the Debtors’ approximate monthly payment,” which averages $18,150. The Debtors believed this deposit, along with their cash on hand would be sufficient adequate assurance. Further, any utilities service has protection under Section 366 of the Bankruptcy code, which provides that “if during the 30-day period beginning on the date of the filing of the petition, the utility does not receive . . . adequate assurance of payment,” then they may alter, refuse, or discontinue the service. Adequate assurance can be made in many forms, which includes through a cash deposit.

The Court granted the motion on an interim basis, substantially in form to the proposed order, and then almost a month later, the motion was granted by a final order.

**Wages Motion**

On March 20, 2018, the Debtors moved for authorization to pay their employees their prepetition wages, maintain employee benefits, and grant financial institutions authority to honor the related checks and transfers. The Debtors had 85 full-time employees and 12 independent contractors on payroll. These employees performed technical, production, public relations,
management and back office functions. These employees engaged in work that was essential to the operations and maximization of profits for the Debtors. This was due to their skills and experience with vendors, relationships with customers, and knowledge of the Debtors’ business and infrastructure. During the interim period, the Debtors expected about $819,080 to become due related to these obligations. The Debtors sought to pay up to $12,850 per employee in the interim period, which is the cap amount set by the Bankruptcy Code. Upon the final order, the Debtors sought to pay the remaining obligations.

The Debtors had a variety of payments that are incurred monthly in relation to the employment of full-time employees and independent contractors. The following amounts were owed, and expected to become due in the interim period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Employee Compensation</td>
<td>$502,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Contractor Compensation</td>
<td>$254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$55,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable Expenses</td>
<td>$999,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Benefits</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Plans</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Benefits Program</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance Program</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401(k) Contributions</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 Id.
85 Id.
86 Id.
87 Id. at 4; see also 11 U.S.C. § 507(a) [https://perma.cc/5D7E-LT6R].
88 Wages Motion, supra note 82, 5.pdf at 4.
89 Id. at 6–12.
90 Id. at 6 (Debtors intended to pay $362,100 of this amount.).
91 Id. at 9 (This figure represents expenses incurred in the scope of employment.).
The Debtors asserted they should be granted authorization to pay these outstanding amounts under relevant provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. Under Section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, a debtor has the ability to use, sell, or lease, other than in the ordinary course of business, property of the estate.\(^{92}\) To do so, however, the Debtors had to show that they had a legitimate business purpose. The Debtors contention was that these expenses are pertinent to keeping their business as a going concern. Additionally, Section 105(a) permits the Court to allow payment of prepetition obligations when such payment is essential to the continued operation of the debtor’s business.\(^{93}\)

On March 20, 2018, the Court entered an interim order, which granted the Debtors the requested relief.\(^{94}\) Less than a month later, on April 17, 2018, the Court entered a final order, approving the Debtors’ motion.\(^{95}\)

\(^{92}\) 11 U.S.C. § 363(b) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].

\(^{93}\) 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) (This provision is commonly known as the Doctrine of Necessity.) [https://perma.cc/DEL4-WYWU].


\(^{95}\) Final Order (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Pay Certain Employee Compensation and Benefits and (B) Maintain and Continue Such Benefits and Other Employee-Related Programs and (II) Authorizing Financial Institutions to Honor and Process All Related Checks and Transfers 246.pdf at 2, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings, LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Apr. 17, 2018).
COMPENSATION OF PROFESSIONALS IN THE ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS

The Motion

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed a motion, which requested authorization “to retain and compensate certain professionals utilized in the ordinary course of . . . business, effective nunc pro tunc to the Petition Date,” along with related relief.96 This motion was filed pursuant to Sections 105, 327, 328, and 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, along with Rule 2014 of the Bankruptcy Rules.97 These professionals generally provided “legal, regulatory, and/or other related services” that directly impacted day-to-day operations.98 The Debtors contended that the retention and compensation of these ordinary course professionals (“OCPs”) was necessary to avoid a disruption of business operations and undue “cost, expense, and delay of securing replacement professionals.”99

Ordinary Course Professionals Procedures

The Debtors proposed “that the following procedures . . . govern the retention and payment of the OCPs”:100

(i) Each OCP completed a declaration stating their disinterested position and ultimately served it upon: (i) Sidley Austin LLP; (ii) Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor; (iii) Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones; (iv) and the U.S. Trustee (collectively, the “Reviewing Parties”);

(ii) The Reviewing Parties then had 14 days to object;

(iii) “If no objection [was] received, the Debtors [were] authorized to retain and pay that OCP”;

96 Debtors’ Motion for an Order Authorizing the Employment and Compensation of Professionals Utilized in the Ordinary Course of Business, Effective Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date at 1, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 30, 2018) [hereinafter Ordinary Course of Business Professionals].

97 Id. at 3.

98 Id.

99 Id.

100 Id. at 3–7.
“Once the Debtors [retained] an OCP . . ., they [could] pay such OCP . . . upon submission to, and approval by, the Debtors of an appropriate invoice setting forth in reasonable detail the nature of the services rendered and expenses actually incurred.” Each OCP’s compensation was limited to $35,000 per month (“Monthly Fee Limit”); however, payments could reach $50,000 per month (“Tier 1 Monthly Fee Limit”), provided those OCPs were identified as “Tier 1 OCP.”

If the Debtors elected to “designate a Tier 1 OCP not already designated as such,” they had to file and serve upon the Reviewing Parties a notice. The request was deemed approved if no objection was filed;

“If an OCP’s fees and expenses [exceeded] the Monthly Limit or Tier 1 Monthly Limit, as applicable, such OCP [had to] file a fee application on account of the excess amount”;

“Each fee application [had to] be served upon the Reviewing Parties. The Reviewing Parties . . . then [had] twenty (20) days to object to the Fee Application. If . . . no objection [was] filed, the fees requested . . . shall be deemed approved”

“At three-month intervals (each, a “Quarter”) during . . . the Chapter 11 cases, the Debtors [had to] file with the Court and serve on the Reviewing Parties no later than thirty (30) days after the end of such Quarter a statement that . . . [included] the following information for each OCP: (i) the name of the OCP; (ii) the amounts paid as compensation for services rendered and reimbursement of expenses incurred by that OCP during the reported Quarter broken down by month; (iii) all postpetition payments made to that OCP to such date; and (iv) a general description of the services rendered by that OCP”;

The Debtors were permitted to retain additional OCPs by filing with the Court and serving notice to the Reviewing Parties, and by having the OCP comply with the OCP Procedures.
Ordinary Course Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Services Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes &amp; Thornburg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – Insurance and Regulatory Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisner Jaffe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brull Law Firm</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – Intellectual Property Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw LLP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Legal Services – General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Silberberg &amp; Knupp LLP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – Guild Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloisters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – General U.K. Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrer &amp; Co.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Legal Services – General U.K. Counsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis for Relief

When determining whether an entity is considered a professional pursuant to the Bankruptcy Code, which then determines whether express court approval is needed for retention, “courts generally consider whether such entity is involved in the actual reorganization effort, rather than a debtor’s ongoing business operations.” Additionally, courts consider a variety of factors under to determine whether an entity is a professional pursuant to Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code.

The Debtors asserted that the OCPs they were seeking to retain did not fall under control of Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code. The work supplied by OCPs did not pertain to the

---


102 11 U.S.C. § 327 [https://perma.cc/Z58Q-Q639]; see also In re First Merchs. Acceptance Corp., No. 97-1599, 1997 WL 873551, at *3 (D. Del. Dec. 15, 1997) (factors include: “(a) whether the entity controls, manages, administers, invests, purchases, or sells assets that are insignificant to the debtor’s reorganization; (b) whether the entity is involved in negotiating the terms of a plan of reorganization; (c) whether the entity is directly related to the type of work carried out by the debtor or to the routine maintenance of the debtor’s business operations; (d) whether the entity is given discretion or autonomy to exercise his or her own professional judgment in some part of the administration of the debtor’s estate; (e) the extent of the entity’s involvement in the administration of the debtor’s estate; (f) the extent of the entity’s involvement in the administration of the debtor’s estate; and (g) whether the entity’s services involve some degree of special knowledge or skill, such that it can be considered a “professional” within the ordinary meaning of the term.) [https://perma.cc/LPS4-DZXJ].

103 Ordinary Course of Business Professionals, supra note 96, 133.pdf at 8.
Debtors’ bankruptcy case, but instead their ongoing business operations. The Debtors then reiterated that filing individual applications would be disruptive to business, inefficient, and costly. For these reasons, the Debtors requested authorization for employment and compensation of OCPs.

**Objection**

On April 17, 2018, the Debtors filed a certificate of no objection, which stated they had “received no answer, objection, or any other responsive pleading” regarding their motion to retain and compensate professionals in the ordinary course of business.

**Order**

On April 18, 2018, the Court granted the motion, effective nunc pro tunc to the Petition Date.

---

104 *Id.*

105 *Id.* at 9.


The Motion

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed a motion requesting an order which “[authorized] and [established] procedures for interim compensation for services rendered and reimbursement of expenses incurred by attorneys and other professionals” who were retained through other provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. This motion was filed pursuant to Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rule 2016(a), and Local Rule 2016-2.

The Retained Professionals that were under consideration included: “(i) Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP (“Cravath Swaine”), as bankruptcy co-counsel; (ii) Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. (“Richards Layton”), as bankruptcy co-counsel; (iii) Moelis & Company LLC (“Moelis”), as investment banker; and (iv) Epiq Bankruptcy Solutions, LLC (“Epiq”), as solicitation and administrative agent (collectively, the “Debtors’ Professionals”). The Debtors also retained Pachulski Stang Ziehl and Jones LLP (“Pachulski Stang”).

108 Debtors’ Motion for Entry of an Order Establishing Procedures for Interim Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses of Professionals 132.pdf at 1, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings, LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 30, 2018) [hereinafter Motion for Interim Compensation and Reimbursement]; 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) (permitting the Court to issue any order that is “necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title) [https://perma.cc/DEL4-WYWU]; FED. R. BANKR. P. 2016(a) (providing that “an entity seeking interim or final compensation for services or reimbursement of necessary expenses, from the estate shall file an application setting forth a detailed statement of (1) the services rendered, time expended, and expenses incurred, and (2) the amounts requested.”) [https://perma.cc/X9Q9-J6SP].

109 Id. at 3.

110 Id. at 7.

111 Id. at 4.
Proposed Procedures

The Debtors proposed methods for Monthly Fee Applications and Interim Fee Applications (collectively, “Compensation Procedures”). Worth noting, Retained Professionals were not permitted to file a fee application until the court approved their retention pursuant to Section 327 or 1103 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Monthly Fee Application Procedure

For Monthly Fee Applications, any Retained Professional “seeking interim allowance of its fees and expenses [could] file an application” on or after the 20th day of a month following the month for when those fees and expenses were earned. This application had to include “the relevant time entry and description and expense detail.” Each Monthly Fee Application had to be served upon: (i) the Debtors; (ii) Cravath Swaine and Richards Layton; (iii) the Office of the United States Trustee; (iv) Sidley Austin LLP and Young Conaway Stargatt, co-counsel to the DIP Agent and Pre-Petition Agent; and (v) Pachulski Stang. If a Retained Professional failed to file an application on any given month, they were permitted to consolidate applications in future months. Any objection to a Monthly Fee Application had to be filed “on the 20th day following the date the Monthly Fee Application [was] served.” The objection had to be written and served upon the respective Retained Professional and other Notice Parties. Once the objection deadline passed, the Retained Professional could file a certificate of no objection, and then pay 80% of fees

112 Id. at 4.
113 Id.
114 Id.
115 Id.
116 Id. at 4–5.
117 Id. at 5.
118 Id.
119 Id.
due and 100% of expenses requested.\textsuperscript{120} If any amounts were objected to, the Retained Professional could request Court approval or forego the payments until the next hearing.\textsuperscript{121}

\textit{Interim Fee Application Procedure}

For Interim Fee Applications, Retained Professionals could file, in three-month intervals, an application for “interim approval and allowance of compensation and reimbursement of expenses . . . , including any holdbacks.”\textsuperscript{122} These applications had to be filed “on or before the 45\textsuperscript{th} day . . . following the end of each Interim Fee Period.”\textsuperscript{123} The Interim Fee Application had to include the following: (i) The Monthly Fee Applications being requested; (ii) the amount requested; (iii) the amount paid to date or subject to an objection; (iv) the deadline for objection; and (v) any additional information requested or required.\textsuperscript{124} “Each attorney Retained Professional [had to] make a reasonable effort to comply with the U.S. Trustee’s requests for information and additional disclosures as set forth in the \textit{Guidelines for Reviewing Applications for Compensation and Reimbursement of Expenses Filed under 11 U.S.C. § 330 by Attorneys in Larger Chapter 11 Cases Effective as of November 1, 2013}, in connection with each Interim Fee Application and/or final application.”\textsuperscript{125} Notice to parties was limited to Monthly Fee Applications, Interim Fee Applications, final fee applications, and Hearing Notices.\textsuperscript{126} Any parties in interest that requested notice were entitled to Hearing Notices and final fee applications.\textsuperscript{127} Any objections had to be filed and served “so as to be received” on the 20\textsuperscript{th} day following service of the initial application.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{120} Id.
\textsuperscript{121} Id. at 5–6.
\textsuperscript{122} Id. at 6.
\textsuperscript{123} Id.
\textsuperscript{124} Id.
\textsuperscript{125} Id.
\textsuperscript{126} Id.
\textsuperscript{127} Id.
\textsuperscript{128} Id. at 7.
**Basis for Relief**

Section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code allows a Court to “award a professional person employed under Section 327 reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered . . . and reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses.” In determining the amount to award, the Court considers “the nature, extent, and value of such services” and will factor in the time spent, rates charged, necessity of the services for the case, efficiency of the performance, special certifications of the professional, and whether the compensation is reasonable.” Additionally, Section 331 of the Bankruptcy Code allows a Retained Professional to apply to the Court every 120 days after an order for relief for compensation. Based on how large the Debtors’ case was and the “amount of time and effort that will be required,” compensation is justified.

**No Objections and Order**

The Debtors filed a certificate of no objection on April 16, 2018, stating that no objections had been timely filed. With that, the Debtors requested for an order granting their motion. The next day the Court granted Debtors’ motion and proposed procedures.

---


132 Motion for Interim Compensation and Reimbursement, supra note 108, at 9.


134 Id. at 2.

Essential Rules Regarding Retention of Professionals

In bankruptcy cases, it is necessary for the debtor to retain professionals in various fields in order to streamline the bankruptcy process while also continuing to operate as a going concern. Under § 327 of the Bankruptcy Code, a debtor may employ “attorneys, accountants, . . . or other professional persons” that do not possess an adverse interest and that are disinterested in order to carry out duties.\(^\text{136}\) Disinterested persons include those that: (a) are not creditors, equity holders, or insiders of the Debtor; (B) were not, within the preceding two years, “directors, officers, or employees of the debtors”; and (C) do not have a material adverse interest of the debtor.\(^\text{137}\)

In their application to retain these professionals, the debtor is to provide specific facts, which show the “necessity for the employment, the name of the person to be employed, the reason for the selection, the professional services to be rendered, any proposed arrangement for compensation” and any conflicts of interest.\(^\text{138}\)

FTI Consulting, Inc. – Case Management Services

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed an application to retain FTI Consulting, Inc. ("FTI") to provide management services to the Debtors.\(^\text{139}\) Rather than applying under Section 327 of the Bankruptcy Code, the application was filed under Section 363.\(^\text{140}\) The purpose of this was to avoid the fee application and compensation requirements imposed by Sections 330 and 331, which apply to Section 327.\(^\text{141}\) The Debtors sought to retain FTI in order to have Robert Del Genio serve as

\(^\text{136}\) 11 U.S.C. § 327(a) [https://perma.cc/Z58Q-Q639].


\(^\text{140}\) Id. at 1.
Chief Restructuring Officer and Luke Schaeffer as Chief Strategy Officer. Additionally, FTI provided Transaction Support,\textsuperscript{142} aided in delivering information to Epiq, assisted in cash management and forecasting, provided financial analysis regarding “litigation involving the Transaction,\textsuperscript{143} the Services or as otherwise requested,” and other services as reasonably requested.\textsuperscript{144}

The Compensation and Expenses were provided as follows:\textsuperscript{145}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Managing Directors/Senior Advisors</th>
<th>$875 – 1,075/hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Directors</td>
<td>$780 – 855/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Directors</td>
<td>$715 – 795/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>$650 – 770/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$345 – 475/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>$135 – 265/hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{DIP Fee}

Upon closing of a Financing Transaction,\textsuperscript{146} Debtors owed FTI $350,000.

\textbf{Additional Fee}

Upon closing and funding of a Transaction, Debtors owed FTI $1,500,000 if the Report\textsuperscript{147} or other materials were provided to the third party when the Transaction was completed. It was agreed that if the DIP Fee was triggered and then followed by a transaction that

\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Id.} at 6 (\textit{Transaction Support} means the forecasting, valuation, and support related to a business transaction, involving all or most of the business, assets, or equity interests.).

\textsuperscript{143} “Transaction” is in reference to the 363-asset sale, which will be described below.

\textsuperscript{144} FTI Application, \textit{supra} note 139,\textsuperscript{129.pdf} at 6–7.

\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Id.} at 8–9.

\textsuperscript{146} \textit{Financing Transaction} means “establishing a debtor in possession credit facility.”

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Report} means “individually or collectively, FTI’s procedures, analyses and conclusions as documented in one or more written reports with, where appropriate, supporting schedules.”
| Reasonable Allocated and Direct Expenses | FTI billed for reasonable expenses incurred on Debtors’ behalf. These expenses include “reasonable and customary out of pocket expenses . . . such as certain telephone, overnight mail, messenger, pre-approved travel, pre-approved lodging, meals and other expenses.” If FTI employees were to testify or provide evidence in an proceeding, FTI would be compensated at that individual’s regular hourly rate. |

Prior to the Petition Date, FTI had been providing services to the Debtors and received $1,607,975 in compensation.\(^\text{148}\) “As of the Petition Date, FTI ha[d] an outstanding claim of $284,522.08 for pre-petition services and [held] a retainer of $100,000.”\(^\text{149}\) FTI applied the retainer to their subsequent services and waived the remaining outstanding balance.\(^\text{150}\)

In qualifying themselves, FTI believed it, nor any of its employees, held an adverse interest or any conflicts of interest.\(^\text{151}\) The Debtors contended that FTI’s retention was permissible under Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code, which states that a debtor “may use property of the estate other than in the ordinary course of business,” provided there is a sound business purpose underlying the decision.\(^\text{152}\) The Debtors maintained that the use of FTI would allow them to “preserve and maximize the value of the Debtor’s estates.”\(^\text{153}\) The Debtors also pointed to the

\(^{148}\) FTI Application, *supra* note 139, 129.pdf at 12.

\(^{149}\) *Id.*

\(^{150}\) *Id.*

\(^{151}\) *Id.*

\(^{152}\) 11 U.S.C. § 363(b) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].

Court’s power under Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code to allow the Debtors to retain FTI as a means to carry out the rest of the bankruptcy case.\textsuperscript{154}

On April 24, 2018, the Court granted the application pursuant to Sections 105(a) and 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code.\textsuperscript{155}

**Moelis & Company LLC – Investment Banker**

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed an application to retain Moelis & Company LLC (“Moelis”) as their investment banker.\textsuperscript{156} This application was filed pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a)\textsuperscript{157} of the Bankruptcy Code, as well as Rule 2014(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.\textsuperscript{158} Moelis is an investment bank with a substantial track record and capabilities in numerous financial services, especially in the bankruptcy environment.\textsuperscript{159} The Debtors selected Moelis for these reasons, as well as their extensive knowledge on the Debtors’ business, stemming from over two years of business.\textsuperscript{160} Significantly, some of this business includes assistance with the proposed asset purchase efforts from late 2017.\textsuperscript{161} It was necessary that this application be granted because “denial of relief . . . [would] deprive the Debtors of the assistance of uniquely qualified investment banking professionals.”\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{154} *Id.* at 16; see also 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) [https://perma.cc/DEL4-WYWU].


\textsuperscript{156} Application of Debtors for Order (I) Authorizing Retention and Employment of Moelis & Company LLC as Investment Banker to The Debtors for Specified Purposes *Nunc Pro Tunc* to the Petition Date Pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 2014(a) And (ii) Waiving Certain Information Requirements Imposed by Local Rule 2016-2 134.pdf at 1, *In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al.*, No 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 30, 2018) [hereinafter Moelis Application].

\textsuperscript{157} 11 U.S.C. § 328(a) (“The trustee . . . may employ or authorize the employment of a professional person under Section 327 . . . on any reasonable terms and conditions of employment.”) [https://perma.cc/GP7W-Y36S].

\textsuperscript{158} Moelis Application, *supra* note 155, 134.pdf at 1.

\textsuperscript{159} *Id.* at 3–4.

\textsuperscript{160} *Id.* at 5.

\textsuperscript{161} *Id.* at 6.
Moelis was contracted to supply many services, including: (i) assistance in business and financial analysis; (ii) identification and evaluation of candidates for a transaction; (iii) contact those that may be appropriate for a transaction, as well as meet with them for negotiations; (iv) preparation of marketing plan and information materials for potential acquirors; (v) identification of potential Lenders; (vi) assistance in creating a strategy for Transactions; (vii) assistance in structuring and negotiating the transactions; (viii) meet with the Board to discuss proposed transactions; and (ix) providence of other advisement and services as agreed upon.

Moelis’ compensation can be broken down into three components. The Debtors agreed to pay a “Monthly Fee” of $150,000, which started upon the execution of the agreement. The Debtors then agreed to pay a “Sale Transaction Fee,” which is 1.5% of the Transaction Value, with a minimum amount of $7,000,000. This amount was payable as of the closing of the first Sale Transaction. The Debtors also agreed to reimburse Moelis for reasonable, documented, out of pocket expenses pursuant to Section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code. “During the 90-day period immediately preceding the Petition Date, the Debtors paid Moelis $485,050.18 in the aggregate for fees and reimbursement of expenses. Moelis . . . waived any outstanding prepetition amounts not paid . . . and thus, the Debtors [did] not owe Moelis any fees . . . incurred . . . as of the Petition Date.”

---

162 Id. at 19.
163 Id. at 8.
164 Id. at 9.
165 Id.
166 Id.
167 Id. at 10; see also 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3)(C) (stating reasonable compensation may include expenses if they were necessary to the administration, or beneficial at the time, to a case.) [https://perma.cc/Z682-WBMT].
168 Declaration of Carlos Jimenez in Support of Application of Debtors for Order (I) Authorizing Retention and Employment of Moelis & Company LLC as Investment Banker to the Debtors for Specified Purposes Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date Pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 2014(a) and (II) the Waiving Certain Information Requirements Imposed by Local Rule 2016-2 at 14, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 30, 2018) [hereinafter Jimenez Declaration.]
On April 24, 2018, the Court granted the application to retain Moelis as the investment banker.\(^{(169)}\)

**Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP – Co-Counsel**

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors applied to retain Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP (“Cravath”) as bankruptcy counsel.\(^{(170)}\) This application was filed with reference to Sections 327(a), 328(a), 329, and 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, as well as rules 2014 and 2016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.\(^{(171)}\) Cravath was selected because of their “extensive experience and knowledge in the fields of in-court and out-of-court restructuring transactions, mergers and acquisitions, post-petition financing and debtors’ and creditors’ rights, as well as its ability to respond quickly to emergency hearings and other emergency matters.”\(^{(172)}\) Additionally, the Debtors had extensive history with Cravath and had grown to trust and rely on their professional services.\(^{(173)}\) To the best of Cravath’s knowledge, they did not have any detrimental conflicts of interest.\(^{(174)}\) Cravath was retained to provide all legal services required throughout the chapter 11 process.\(^{(175)}\)

---

169 Order (I) Authorizing Retention and Employment of Moelis & Company LLC as Investment Banker to the Debtors for Specified Purposes Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date Pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 2014(a) and (II) Waiving Certain Information Requirements Imposed by Local Rule 2016-2 413.pdf at 3, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Apr 24, 2018).


171 Id.; see also 11 U.S.C. § 329 (providing that attorneys can be retained to represent a debtor in a chapter 11 case.).

172 Cravath Application, supra note 170, 135.pdf at 4 [https://perma.cc/TD7U-PRWD].

173 Id.


175 Id. at 3–4 (These services included: (i) advise the debtors of their legal obligations, duties, and rights throughout the Chapter 11 case; (ii) protect and preserve the Debtors’ estate; (iii) preparation of “all motions, applications, answers, orders, reports and other papers”; (iv) prosecution and assistance with any sale or other disposition of the Debtors’ assets; (v) “taking all necessary actions in connection with any Chapter 11 plan and related disclosure statement and all related documents, and seeking approval of all transactions contemplated therein and in any amendments thereto; and (vi) performing other legal services related to the chapter 11 case.).
For compensation, the “Debtors do not owe Cravath any amount for services rendered or expenses incurred prior to the Petition Date, and thus Cravath is not a prepetition creditor.”\textsuperscript{176} The following chart was the proposed compensation structure, with payment accruing on an hourly basis, plus reimbursement of actual, necessary expenses.\textsuperscript{177}

Cravath’s General Hourly Billables:\textsuperscript{178}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Range of Current Hourly Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>$1,000 – $1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>$585 – $905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals</td>
<td>$255 – $355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On April 24, 2018, the application to retain Cravath as Bankruptcy Counsel was granted.\textsuperscript{179}

\textbf{Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. – Co-Counsel}

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors applied to retain Richards, Layton & Finger P.A. (“Richards Layton”) as bankruptcy co-counsel.\textsuperscript{180} This application was filed with reference to Sections 327(a), 328(a), 329, and 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, as well as rules 2014 and 2016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.\textsuperscript{181} Richards Layton was selected due to their

\textsuperscript{176} \textit{Id.} at 10.

\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Id.} at 12.

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Id.} (Specific professionals and their rates are as follows: Michael Goldman - $1,400; George E. Zobitz - $1,400; Karin A. Demasi - $1,360; Paul H. Zumbro - $1,360; Andrew E. Elken - $1,000; Lauren R. Kennedy - $905; Paul Sandler - $835; Andrew Wark - $835; Sanjay Murti - $805; David Kumagi - $790; Stephanie Marshak - $705; Evan Schladow - $705; Catriela Cohen - $585; Daniel Lin - $585; Claire O’Brien - $585; Rachel Klein - $315; James Curbow - $290; Andrew Adler - $270).


“extensive experience in the field of debtors’ and creditors’ rights and business reorganizations and liquidations under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code.”  

Richards Layton was hired to provide the following services: (i) protection and preservation of the Debtors’ estate; (ii) advise the Debtors of their legal rights, powers and duties; (iii) preparation of “all motions, applications, answers, orders, reports and other papers”; (iv) assist with the 363 Asset Sale; (v) “take all necessary or appropriate actions in connection with a chapter 11 plan(s)”; (vi) prosecution and assistance with any sale or other disposition of the Debtors’ assets; and (vii) performance of all other necessary legal actions. Further, Richards Layton may work in coordination with Cravath as the Debtors’ co-counsel. To the best of Richard Layton’s knowledge they do not have a detrimental conflict of interest.

Compensation was to be provided to Richards Layton as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Range of Hourly Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>$545 - $925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>$575 - $625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>$330 - $625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

181 *Id.*


184 *Id.* at 4.

185 *Id.* at 6 (Specific professionals and their rates are as follows: Mark D. Collins - $925; Paul N. Heath - $750; Zachary I. Shapiro - $610; Brett M. Haywood - $450; David T. Queroli - $385; M. Lynzy McGee - $255).
Prior to the Petition Date, the Debtors had paid a $600,000 retainer to Richards Layton. The firm immediately drew down this amount as they expected to earn it in relation to “services performed and anticipated to be performed through the petition date.”

On April 23, 2018, the Court granted the Debtors’ application to retain Richards Layton as co-counsel.

**Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann, LLP – Special Litigation Counsel**

On May 1, 2019, the Debtors applied to retain Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann (“Bernstein Litowitz”) as special litigation counsel. This application was filed pursuant to Section 327(e) of the Bankruptcy Code, which allows for employment of an attorney “for a specified purpose.” This was application was also filed pursuant to Sections 328(a) and 330 of the Bankruptcy Code and Rules 2014(a) and 2016 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. Section 328(a) and 330 allow compensation to be paid to professional persons for services provided. One of the last remaining assets in the estates of the Debtors were against Directors and Officers (“D&O Claims”) and the Debtors believed pursuing these would be in the best interest of the estate and creditors. Bernstein Litowitz was selected due to their presence as one of the “leading law firms worldwide . . . related to corporate governance, shareholder rights, and

---


187 *Id.*


190 11 U.S.C. § 327(e) [https://perma.cc/Z58Q-Q639].


securities litigation.” Also, they have had a significant uptick in work related to sexual harassment claims. Bernstein Litowitz did not have a detrimental conflict of interest.

Bernstein Litowitz was retained to perform the following services: (i) advise with respect to D&O Claims, along with representation regarding those claims; and (ii) interaction and coordination with other retained professionals in furtherance of those claims.

Bernstein Litowitz was to be compensated on a contingency-fee basis. If recovery were to take place within six months from when Bernstein Litowitz provided “notice of the intent to mediate or arbitrate,” then they would be entitled to 25%. If recovery took place after that, Bernstein Litowitz would be entitled to 30%. “However, if the Debtors [chose] to accept a settlement offer without [Bernstein Litowitz’s] consent, then [Bernstein Litowitz] [would] be entitled to the greater of 40% of any such recovery . . . or five times [Bernstein Litowitz’s lodestar] amount.” Lastly, if this case converts to a chapter 7 bankruptcy and Bernstein Litowitz is not retained for that process, then they would be entitled to “a final fee application for all work performed up to that date at three-quarters” of their typical hourly rates.

194 Id.
195 Id.
196 Id. at 8.
197 Id. at 5.
198 Id.
199 Id.
200 Id. at 4–5.
201 Lodestar Method Law and Legal Definition, US LEGAL (March 8, 2020, 1:52 PM), https://definitions.uslegal.com/l/lodestar-method/ (“The ‘lodestar method’ is a method adopted for calculating attorneys’ fees where the court multiplies a reasonable hourly rate by a reasonable number of hours expended.”) [https://perma.cc/H8QD-XVUE].
202 Bernstein Litowitz Application, supra note 189, 2337.pdf at 6.
203 Id. (In fact, the case did convert to a chapter 7. See section below.).
Two objections arose to the application to retain Bernstein Litowitz. First, the group of plaintiffs with “actions against Harvey Weinstein . . . and their officers and directors” who asserted that there had been extensive mediation and negotiations, totaling over 130 hours of time, and the plaintiffs claimed the parties were “literally days away from receiving a proposed global resolution.” It was proposed that the granting of that application would end any chance of the resolution, would waste years of litigation, and deplete resources of the estates. The second objection came from the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors. This objection sought to reject the retention of Bernstein Litowitz if a resolution of the D&O claims was reached prior to the hearing.

The Debtors responded, maintaining that retention of Bernstein Litowitz was necessary for a few reasons. First, the Debtors would not agree to any resolution of the D&O claims without representation by counsel in relation to those claims. With that, it had been determined that Bernstein Litowitz was best to take on that responsibility. Finally, the Debtors contended that there was no indication that resolution of the D&O Claims was in the immediate future. The

204 Objection of the New York State Attorney General and Tort Claimants to, and Request to Adjourn for 30 Days, Debtors’ Application Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 327(e) and 328(a) to Retain and Employ Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann, LLP as Special Litigation Counsel to the Debtors Nunc Pro Tunc to May 1, 2019 2362.pdf at 3, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed May. 15, 2019).

205 Id. at 3–4.

206 Id. at 4.


208 Id. at 2.


210 Id. at 2–3.

211 Id. at 3.
Debtors did, however, revise their proposed order, addressing the objection to the contingency fee, and applied instead a flat rate.\textsuperscript{212}

Ultimately, the Court granted the motion to retain Bernstein Litowitz.\textsuperscript{213} The Court also provided that compensation was to be a “flat fee of $400,000.00” and Bernstein Litowitz would file an fee application for reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses.\textsuperscript{214}

**Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP – Counsel for Unsecured Creditors**

On April 24, 2018, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “Committee”) of the Debtors filed an application to retain Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP (“Pachulski Stang”) as counsel to the Committee.\textsuperscript{215} This application was filed pursuant to Sections 328(a) and 1103(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Rule 2014 of the Bankruptcy Rules, and Rule 2014-1 of the Local Rules of Bankruptcy.\textsuperscript{216} Section 1103 simply provides that a committee can select certain professionals to represent them or perform services throughout a Chapter 11 case.\textsuperscript{217} Pachulski Stang is a mid-size firm that has “extensive experience representing creditors’ committees” in bankruptcy cases.\textsuperscript{218} Pachulski Stang believed that they did not have any detrimental conflicts of interest.\textsuperscript{219}


\textsuperscript{214}Id.


\textsuperscript{216}Id.

\textsuperscript{217}11 U.S.C. § 1103(a) [https://perma.cc/UB76-Q5HN].

\textsuperscript{218}Pachulski Stang Retention, supra note 215, 421.pdf at 3.

\textsuperscript{219}Id. at 5.
They were retained to aid administration of the chapter 11 from the viewpoint of the Committee, as well as advise the Committee on their powers and duties.\textsuperscript{220}

Pachulski Stang was compensated “on an hourly basis, plus reimbursement of actual, necessary expenses.”\textsuperscript{221} The hourly rates were charged as follows:\textsuperscript{222}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rate Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>$650 - $1,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>$595 - $1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>$495 - $595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals</td>
<td>$350 - 375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On May 29, 2018, the Court granted the application to retain Pachulski Stang.\textsuperscript{223}

**Berkeley Research Group, LLC – Financial Advisor**

On April 24, 2018, the Debtors filed an application to retain Berkeley Research Group, LLC (“Berkeley”), as financial advisor, effective \textit{nunc pro tunc} to March 30, 2018.\textsuperscript{224} This application was filed pursuant to Sections 328(a), 330, and 1103 of the Bankruptcy Code, \textit{id.} at 4–5 (The services that were provided include the following: (i) assistance and advise in consultation with “Debtors regarding the administration of these Cases”; (ii) assistance and advisement regarding “Debtors’ retention of professionals and advisors”; (iii) assistance and advisement in “analyzing the Debtors’ assets and liabilities, . . . validity of liens,” and participation in any transactions; (iv) assistance and advisement regarding any of Debtors’ rights and obligations; (v) assistance and advisement in “investigating the acts, conduct, assets, liabilities, and financial condition of the Debtors, the Debtors’ operations and the desirability of the continuance of . . . those operations, and any other” relevant matters; (vi) assistance and advisement with any asset sales; (vii) assistance and advisement in the Committee’s “participation in the negotiation, formulation, or objection to any plan of liquidation or reorganization”; (viii) assistance and advisement to the Committee in knowing their powers and duties; (ix) assistance and advisement with claims and litigation matters; and (x) any other necessary services.).

\textsuperscript{220} Id. at 4–5

\textsuperscript{221} Id. at 7.

\textsuperscript{222} Id.


Bankruptcy Rules 2014(a) and 2016(a), and Local Rule 2014-1. Berkeley is competent in a variety of financial services, including “senior financial, management consulting, accounting, and other professionals who specialize in providing restructuring, transaction advisory, litigation support, solvency, and valuation assistance” to companies under financial distress. They have extensive experience assisting parties in bankruptcy cases and believe they will effectively assist the Debtors in their 363 sale. Berkeley was retained to provide financial analysis and reports, including evaluation on transactions, cash-flow, and general cash management.

Berkeley charged their “standard hourly rate, plus reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.”

The standard hourly rates were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>$675 - $995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$505 - $740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>$260 - $510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

225 Id.
226 Id. at 4.
227 Id.
228 Id. at 5–7 (Their specific services included: (i) advisement and analysis on financial affairs; (ii) development of reports to evaluate financial performance relative to projections; (iii) “evaluating relief requested in cash management motion, debtor-in-possession financing arrangements, or other use of cash collateral arrangements negotiated”; (iv) analyzing transactions on a historical and current basis, while also monitoring cash disbursements; (v) analyzing assets and “possible recoveries to creditor constituencies under various scenarios and developing strategies to maximize recoveries; (vi) review and analyze the bankruptcy plan and any disclosure statements, and, if needed, development of a bankruptcy plan; (vii) assist with the 363 sale; (viii) evaluate the staking horse agreement; (ix) analyze valuations on film and TV property; (x) evaluation of lien claims; (xi) assist in employee needs and costs; (xii) monitor claims management process; (xiii) work with other retained professionals in monitoring prior sales processes and transactions; (xiv) advisement on any potential avoidance actions; (xv) assist with “assumption and or rejection of executory contracts and or leases; (xvi) work with tax advisors to minimize tax liabilities; (xvii) perform any other matters as requested by Debtors.).
229 Id. at 9.
230 Id. at 10 (Specific professionals charged the following rates: Jay Borrow - $995; R. Todd Neilson - $800; David Judd - $750; Kyle Herman - $750; Joseph Vizzini - $740; Vernon Calder - $710; Matthew Babcock - $585; Joseph Woodmansee - $550; Kevin Cho - $390).
On May 29, 2018, the Court granted the application, effective *nunc pro tunc* to March 30, 2018.²³¹

**Seyfarth Shaw LLP – Special Litigation Counsel**

On July 13, 2018, the Debtors filed an application to retain Seyfarth Shaw LLP (“Seyfarth Shaw”) as special litigation counsel.²³² This application was filed pursuant to Sections 327(e), 328, and 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, Rules 2014(a) and 2016 of the Bankruptcy Rules, and Rules 2014-1 and 2016-1 of the Local Rules.²³³ Seyfarth Shaw had already done extensive work with the Debtors in pre-petition matters, including civil suits regarding Harvey Weinstein’s sexual misconduct and “certain governmental proceedings.”²³⁴ With that, Seyfarth Shaw had already been permitted to serve as a professional in the ordinary course of business.²³⁵ This application was filed to allow Seyfarth Shaw to continue representation in matters related to pre-petition matters, which have been ongoing since November of 2017.²³⁶ Seyfarth Shaw was retained to represent the Debtors in any and all prepetition matters.²³⁷


²³³ *Id.*

²³⁴ *Id.* at 3.

²³⁵ *Id.*

²³⁶ *Id.* at 6.

²³⁷ *Id.* at 7 (These services included: (i) representing the Debtors in connection with any prepetition matter and any related litigation; (ii) “responding to discover and information requests”; (iii) “defending against any claims that have been raised or may in the future be raised” related to prepetition matters; (iv) “drafting and filing dispositive motions and other pleadings or documents”; (v) “interacting and coordinating with the Debtors’ other professionals and personnel in furtherance of the foregoing.”).
Seyfarth Shaw charged their standard hourly rate per position, plus expenses.\(^\text{238}\) Seyfarth Shaw did not hold a retainer, but the “Debtors owed Seyfarth Shaw $1,198,982.47 for prepetition services.”\(^\text{239}\)

The following represents the standard hourly rates charged for Seyfarth Shaw’s professionals:\(^\text{240}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>$525 - $1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Counsel</td>
<td>$285 - $1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$235 - $640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Attorney</td>
<td>$195 - $550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>$65 - $570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On August 13, 2018, the Court authorized the Debtors to retain Seyfarth Shaw as special litigation counsel, effective nunc pro tunc to June 18, 2018.\(^\text{241}\)

**WithumSmith+Brown, PC – Tax Services Provider**

On July 23, the Debtors filed an application to retain WithumSmith+Brown, PC (“Withum”) as their tax services provider.\(^\text{242}\) This application was filed pursuant to Sections

\(^{238}\) *Id.* at 7–8.

\(^{239}\) *Id.* at 9; see also Motion of Seyfarth Shaw LLP for an Order (I) Modifying the Automatic Stay for Cause to Permit Seyfarth Shaw LLP to Recover its Fees and Disbursements Under the Debtors Insurance Policies or, in the Alternative, (II) Determining that the Coverage Under the Insurance Policies for Defense Costs is not Property of the Debtors’ Estates 768.pdf at 2-4, *In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al.,* No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed May 4, 2018) (Seyfarth Shaw sought relief for representation in 14 pre-petition matters, which Debtors maintained insurance policies designated to cover expenses of such representation.); Order (I) Modifying the Automatic Stay for Cause to Permit Seyfarth Shaw LLP to Recover its Fees and Disbursements Under the Debtors Insurance Policies or, in the Alternative, (II) Determining that the Coverage Under the Insurance Policies for Defense Costs is not Property of the Debtors’ Estates 1000.pdf at 1, *In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al.,* No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed June 8, 2018) (The Court granted the motion.).


\(^{242}\) Debtors’ Application to Retain and Employ WithumSmith+Brown, PC as Tax Services Provider Pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rules 2014(a) and 2016 and Local Rule 2014-1,
327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, rules 2014(a) and 2016(a) of the Bankruptcy Rules, and rule 2014-1 of the Local Rules. 

Withum is a nationally recognized certified public accounting firm” and is rated as one of the top firms in the country. 

Withum was retained in order “to prepare the state and federal income tax returns” for 2017, which assisted with federal and state law compliance, as well as administration of the bankruptcy proceedings.

Withum was provided with a retainer in the amount of $75,000 and was not owed for any prepetition obligations as they had not previously engaged with the Debtors. This retainer was drawn down to exhaustion as services were provided, at which point they began to apply for compensation as required. Withum estimated that services would cost between $300,000 and $350,000, noting, however, that charges would be based on the following hourly rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hourly Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>$450 - $595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>$280 - $440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/Supervisors</td>
<td>$210 - $275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors/Staff</td>
<td>$145 - $195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>$75 - $110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On August 9, the Court granted the application to retain Withum as tax services provider, effective *nunc pro tunc* to June 18, 2018.


243 *Id.*

244 *Id.* at 3.

245 *Id.*

246 *Id.* at 5.

247 *Id.*

248 *Id.* at 3–4.
REJECTION OF UNEXPIRED REAL PROPERTY LEASES

Motion One – NYC Office Lease

On March 30, 2018, the Debtors filed a motion to “reject an unexpired lease of non-residential real property effective nunc pro tunc (retroactively) . . . and . . . authorizing the Debtors to abandon any remaining personal property thereat.” This was filed pursuant to Sections 105(a), 365, and 554 of the Bankruptcy Code. Additionally, Bankruptcy Rules 6006 and 6007 are applicable.

The Lease

The lease was the former office for The Weinstein Company LLC, which was an office space located in New York City. The monthly rental payment was $37,237, and the lease had nearly three years remaining. As of March 5, 2018, the Debtors received a notice of default, accruing since December 2017, which resulted in $147,864 past due.

The Debtors argued it was in their best interest to reject the lease as it would “avoid the incurrence of additional administrative expenses for property that is of no value to the Debtors.”

249 Order Authorizing the Debtors to Retain and Employ WithumSmith+Brown, PC as Tax Services Provider Pursuant to Sections 327(a) and 328(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rules 2014(a) and 2016 and Local Rule 2014-1, Nunc Pro Tunc to June 18, 2018 1338.pdf at 2, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Aug. 9, 2018) (Withum was entitled to seek reimbursement only for actual and necessary expenses.).


251 Id; 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) (permitting the Court to issue any order that is “necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title) [https://perma.cc/MZD6-JNQ8]; 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) (permitting a trustee in bankruptcy to “assume or reject any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor.”) [https://perma.cc/YQ5Q-Z3TX]; 11 U.S.C. § 554(a) (providing that a trustee, after request, “may abandon any property of the estate that is burden some to the estate or that is of inconsequential value and benefit to the estate.”) [https://perma.cc/H6UH-CR3R]; Fed. R. BANKR. P. 6006(c) (requiring that notice of a motion to assume, reject, or assign an executory contract or unexpired lease be provided to other parties in interest) [https://perma.cc/NS6C-HAKV]; Fed. R. BANKR. P. 6007 (allowing a party to object to the foregoing motions within 14 days of service) [https://perma.cc/U94Z-T86H].

252 Id. at 3.

253 Id.

254 Id.
Additionally, the Debtors had vacated the office, “unequivocally surrendered and relinquished the Leased Premises to the Landlord on or before March 31, 2018,” returned the keys to the landlord, and provided written notice to the landlord of intention to file this motion. Finally, it would have cost more in storage fees for the property that has been left in the office space (“Abandoned Property”) than would be realized from a sale of that property. Accordingly, the Debtors sought rejection of the lease and abandonment of the Abandoned Property.

*Basis for Relief*

Pursuant to Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors asserted that this request was based on sound business judgment with respect to preservation of the estate. This was because the office space was no longer needed by the Debtors. Also, Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code bars creditors from setting of debt owed that arose before the commencement of a bankruptcy case; therefore, “if any of the Debtors have deposited amounts with the landlord as a security deposit . . . or if the landlord owes any of the debtors . . . pursuant to the Lease or other agreements . . . the landlord shall not be permitted to set off . . . the amounts from such deposit.”

The Debtors asserted that *nunc pro tunc* relief effective as of March 31, 2018 was appropriate “based on the equities of the circumstances.” The Debtors no longer occupied the office space and had surrendered it back to the landlord. If the Court allowed relief *nunc pro tunc*, the Debtors would avoid paying rent for a period of time that they did not use the property.

---

255 *Id.* at 4.

256 *Id.*

257 *Id.*

258 *Id.*

259 *Id.* at 5; see also 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) [https://perma.cc/R3QT-CPDW].


261 *Id.*; see also 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(7) [https://perma.cc/Z59F-7L5M].


263 *Id.* at 6–7.

264 *Id.* at 7.
Finally, the Debtors explained this would not prejudice the landlord since they provided their intent to reject the lease when they surrendered the premises.  

Again, in the abandonment of property pursuant to Section 554(a), the Debtors merely had to show that the decision was made with sound business judgment. This rule is only superseded when “abandonment of property will contravene laws designed to protect public health and safety or . . . abandonment of the property poses an imminent threat to the public’s welfare.” Neither of these situations were present. Lastly, the Debtors claimed that the amount of Abandoned Property was insignificant and did not have any real value to the estate.

The Debtors asserted they satisfied Bankruptcy Rule 6004(a), established cause to “exclude such relief from the 14-day stay period under Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h) any other applicable Bankruptcy Rule.”

265 Id.

266 Id.; see also 11 U.S.C. § 554(a) [https://perma.cc/7ZCR-3ZPP].

267 Motion to Reject NYC Office Lease and Abandon Property, supra note 250, 130.pdf at 7.

268 Id.

269 Id. (The Debtors asserted they satisfied Bankruptcy Rule 6004(a), established cause to “exclude such relief from the 14-day stay period under Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h) any other applicable Bankruptcy Rule.”).
No Objection and Order

As of April 17, 2018, the Debtors “received no answer, objection, or any other responsive pleading” to their motion to reject their lease of an office space and abandonment of Abandoned Property.270 On April 18, the Court granted the motion.271

Motion Two – Beverly Hills Office

On August 31, 2018, the Debtors filed to “reject an unexpired lease of non-residential real property effective nunc pro tunc to August 31, 2018.272 This was filed pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Sections 105(a), 365, and Bankruptcy Rule 6006.273

The Lease

The lease here was an office space utilized by The Weinstein Company, LLC, located in Beverly Hills, California. Originally, the Debtors entered into an agreement for Lantern to sublease the office space and pay the rental obligations, but Lantern had since decided to terminate the sublease and enter into a direct lease with the landlord.274 With that, the Debtors filed this motion to reject.275

---

270 Certificate of No Objection Regarding Debtors’ Motion Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a), 365, and 554 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 6006 and 6007 for Authority to (I) Reject an Unexpired Real property Lease Effective Nunc Pro Tunc to March 31, 2018 and (II) Abandon A


273 Id.

274 Id. at 3.

275 Id. at 4.
Basis for Relief

Pursuant to Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors asserted this request was based on its sound business judgment. 276 The Debtors provided the following support that this motion was filed with sound business judgment: (i) the Debtors no longer operated their business and, thus, did not need the office space; (ii) the landlord stated that if the lease were not rejected, then they would not enter into a new lease with Lantern; and (iii) “[rejection of] the lease pursuant to the terms of the Motion facilitates Lantern entering into the New Lease and any payments that Lantern makes pursuant to such lease will mitigate the landlord’s rejection damages claim for the benefit of the Debtors and their estates.” 277 Additionally, the Debtors requested that the landlord not be permitted to offset any amounts owed from the security deposit or under the lease agreement. 278

Similar to the New York City office, rejection nunc pro tunc was asserted as appropriate based upon the equities of the circumstances. 279 In this motion, however, the Debtors were in agreement with all relevant parties that this rejection was necessary. 280 Finally, the landlord was not prejudiced due to the new lease with Lantern. 281

Objection – Douglas Emmett

Douglas Emmett 2008, LLC, (“Douglas Emmett”), the landlord of this property, filed a limited objection on September 14, 2018. 282 Douglas Emmett did not object to the rejection of the lease, but did reject being “prohibited from ‘setting off or otherwise utilizing any amounts

276 Id. at 5; see also 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) [https://perma.cc/YQ5Q-Z3TX].
277 Motion to Reject Beverly Hills Office Lease, supra note 272, 1435.pdf at 6.
278 Id. at 6–7; see also 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(7) [https://perma.cc/Z59F-7L5M].
279 Motion to Reject Beverly Hills Office Lease, supra note 272, 1435.pdf at 7.
280 Id.
281 Id.
deposited by the Debtors as a security deposit or pursuant to any other similar arrangement . . . without further order of this court.”

Douglas Emmett was the beneficiary of an irrevocable standby Letter of Credit, which was obtained to support the Debtors lease obligations. Douglas Emmett asserted that without protection, “drawdown against the Letter of Credit would be precluded by the automatic stay.” It was then asserted that the Letter of Credit was not an asset within the Debtors’ estate, and was therefore not subject to an automatic stay. With that, Douglas Emmett claimed that they were “entitled to draw down the Letter of Credit in accordance with the terms and conditions” of that letter.

Order

On October 11, 2018, the Court granted the motion, subject only to allowing Douglas Emmett to retain all rights under the Letter of Credit, which was not subject to the automatic stay. This means that if Lantern defaults under their new lease, Douglas Emmett has remedial rights against the Debtors for the time that would have remained under their contract. Additionally, Douglas Emmett would not have to wait until the close of the bankruptcy case to seek remedies.

---

283 Id.

284 Ron Borcky, Understanding and Using Letters of Credit, Part II, CREDIT RESEARCH FOUNDATION, https://www.crfonline.org/orc/cro/cro-9-2.html (A standby letter of credit “is a payment or performance guarantee . . . used as a backup should the buyer fail to pay as agreed.” They are used to “establish a rapport” between the parties and indicate all obligations will be fulfilled. “The beneficiary to a standby letter of credit can cash it on demand.”) [https://perma.cc/KK8P-4YCE].


286 Id.

287 Id.

THE 363 SALE

Legal Background
Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes the debtor-in-possession to “use, sell, or lease” assets within the estate. To effectuate the motion for sale, the debtor will deliver adequate notice to creditors, provide protection for the first bidder (hereinafter referred to as the “stalking horse”), and ensure that a breakup fee is in place for the benefit of the stalking horse bidder.

Factual Background
TWC faced financial turmoil in 2010 that led to a restructuring agreement that kept it out of bankruptcy. Then, on October 5, 2017, the New York Times published an article detailing several allegations of sexual assault against Harvey Weinstein. This created a domino effect that would ultimately trigger TWC’s prepetition sale efforts. Following a “thorough and independent investigation,” TWC’s Board of Directors removed Harvey Weinstein and subsequently suffered a rash of cancellations and employee turnover.

290 Id. at 249–250.
293 Id. at 15.
294 Id. 15–16.
295 Id. 16–18.
Post-Petition Sale Process

Motion to Approve Sale Procedures

On the petition date, the Debtors filed a motion to seeking approval for a § 363(b) and (f) sale process for all or substantially all of its assets. The first order sought was a Bidding Procedures Order that proposed authorizing bidding procedures, stalking horse protections, and scheduling a hearing for May 4, 2018. In addition, the motion included a request for authorizing the assumption and assignment of contracts and leases held by the Debtors. The sale motion also sought approval for the final Sale Order including selling its assets free and clear without encumbrances. 

The Stalking Horse Agreement

The Debtors sought to ensure that the Lantern Capital, the Stalking Horse Bidder, was protected throughout the bidding process. In the event of Lantern being outbid at the sale hearing, the Debtors included a breakup fee that would be coupled with an additional reimbursement fee that would cover miscellaneous fees leading up to the sale.

The Stalking Horse Agreement provided that the purchase price would be “an amount equal to...$310,000,000.” In addition, the agreement would include “Purchased Assets” (including all


297 Id.

298 Id. at 5. “[T]he sale of all or substantially all, or a portion of, the Assets to the Successful Bidder free and clear of all liens, claims, interests and encumbrances, except certain permitted encumbrances as determined by the Debtors and the Successful Bidder; ii. [T]he assumption and assignment of certain Contracts and Leases in connection with the proposed Sale; and iii. [G]ranting related relief.”

299 Id. at 11–12. “[I]n particular (a) the payment of a break-up fee in an amount equal to three percent (3%) of the Cash Purchase Price...and (b) reimbursement in an amount up to two percent (2%) of the Cash Purchase Price for reasonable and documented out-of-pocket costs, fees and expenses.”

300 Id. at 12–14.
JV Equity Securities, Seller’s right, title and interest in Title Rights and Covered Titles, and various rights to accounts and leases) and “Assumed Liabilities” (including various television series with outstanding lenders and guarantors).\textsuperscript{301} Notably, the agreement did not contemplate agreements with “[m]anagement or [k]ey [e]mployees” presumably because the arrangement would not see TWC continuing as a going concern.\textsuperscript{302} The agreement did, however, contemplate an auction with limitations placed “on the Debtors’ ability to shop the Assets until...fifteen (15) days after the Execution Date.\textsuperscript{303} With respect to the agreement’s “Good Faith Deposit,” Wilmington Trust was designated as an escrow agent that would hold the Stalking Horse Bidder’s $15,500,000 deposit.\textsuperscript{304} The sale’s record retention practices were crafted to comply with Local Rule 6004-1(b)(iv)(J).\textsuperscript{305}

The agreement also sought to insulate the prospective buyer of successor liability consistent with Local Rule 6004-1(b)(iv)(L).\textsuperscript{306} With respect to credit bidding, the agreement stated that it “[did] not seek to allow, disallow or affect in any manner credit bidding pursuant to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{301} \textit{Id.} at 13–14.
\textsuperscript{302} \textit{Id.} at 14.
\textsuperscript{303} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{304} \textit{Id.} at 15.
\textsuperscript{305} See \textit{id.} (Stating that “[u]ntil the third (3\textsuperscript{rd}) anniversary of the Closing Date (or, in the case of any Tax Returns (and books and records and other documents relating thereto), the seventh (7\textsuperscript{th}) anniversary of the Closing Date), the Stalking Horse Bidder shall provide each Seller Party and a reasonable number of their respective attorneys, accountants, representatives and agents, at the Seller Parties’ cost and expense, during ordinary business hours and upon reasonable prior notice, at a location determined at the reasonable discretion of the Stalking Horse Bidder, in such manner as to not disrupt or interfere with the normal operation of the business by the Stalking Horse Bidder, with reasonable access to the books, records, Tax Returns and other information (including supporting documents) of the Business relating to all periods through the Closing (including periods commencing prior to and concluding after the Closing) to the extent reasonably requested for accounting, audit, legal or Tax matters, or performing any of the Seller Parties’ obligations under this Agreement or any Ancillary Agreement.

If, at any time within three (3) years after the Closing Date (or within seven (7) years after the Closing Date with respect to Tax Returns (and books and records and other documents relating thereto), the Stalking Horse Bidder proposes to dispose of any of such books or records (including supporting documents), the Stalking Horse Bidder shall first offer to deliver the same to the Seller Parties (or their respective representatives) at the sole cost and expense of the Seller Parties.”).

\textsuperscript{306} See \textit{id.} (“The Seller Parties seek to sell the Purchased Assets to the Stalking Horse Bidder on the terms set forth in the Stalking Horse Agreement and free and clear of all Liens (other than included in the Assumed Liabilities and the Permitted Liens) and find that the Stalking Horse Bidder is not a successor of any of the Seller Parties.”).
section 363(k) of the Bankruptcy Code.” Rounding off the end of the agreement, the Debtors “anticipated that the proposed Sale Order [would] seek relief from the fourteen-day stay imposed by Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h)” so that the sale could close immediately after its approval.

**Bidding Procedures**

The Stalking Horse Agreement provided instructions for both the qualification or bidders and what would constitute a qualified bid. For bidder qualification, each party (other than the Stalking Horse Bidder) would need to provide to the Notice Parties “written disclosure of the identity of each entity” participating, “an executed confidentiality agreement,” and “a Potential Bidder that delivers the documents and information [required]” to the Consultation Parties.

With respect to qualified bids, the agreement provided a bid deadline of April 30, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. EST, established that the sale would be conducted without contingencies or conditions precedent placed on any “qualified bidder,” and clearly addressed that all qualified bidders would provide financial disclosures demonstrating an ability to purchase at the conclusion of the sale hearing. The bidding procedures further clarified that each qualified bidder had the chance to conduct due diligence regarding the assets, relied “solely upon its own independent review” of all documents, and were explicitly “not entitled to any expense reimbursement, break-up fee, or similar type of payment in connection with its bid.” In an attempt to foster certainty and legitimate interest, TWC included a “Good Faith Deposit” provision within the procedures that

---

307 Id. at 16; see also 11 U.S.C. § 363(k) (“At a sale...that is subject to a lien that secures an allowed claim, unless the court for cause orders otherwise the holder of such claim may bid at such sale, and, if the holder of such claim purchases such property, such holder may offset such claim against the purchase price of such property.”) (emphasis added) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].

308 Motion for Approval of Sale, supra note 296, 8.pdf at 16; see Fed. R. Bankr. P. 6004(h) (“Stay of Order Authorizing Use, Sale, or Lease of Property. An order authorizing the use, sale, or lease of property other than cash collateral is stayed until the expiration of 14 days after entry of the order, unless the court orders otherwise.”) [https://perma.cc/ASK4-6PUE].

309 Motion for Approval of Sale, supra note 296, 8.pdf at 17.

310 Id. at 19.

311 Id.
would equal 5% of the purchase price.\footnote{Id. (“[Qualified bids are to be] accompanied by a good faith deposit in the form of a wire transfer (to a bank account specified by the Debtors), certified check or such other form acceptable to the Debtors, payable to the order of the Debtors (or such other party as the Debtors may determine) in an amount equal to five percent (5%) of the purchase price provided for in the bid (a ‘Good Faith Deposit.’”).)"

Lastly, the Debtors sought to ensure that every bidder waived “any right to a jury trial.”\footnote{Id. (“Any final judgment [by the Bankruptcy Court], including all appeals, shall be conclusive and may be enforced in other jurisdictions (including any foreign jurisdictions) by suit on the judgment or in any other manner provided by applicable law.”).} In fact, any bidder with a concern or claim arising during the bidding would be bound to “bring any such action or proceeding in the Bankruptcy Court” without the opportunity to appeal its final decree.\footnote{Id.}

\textit{Go-Shop and Initial Overbid}

To ensure a “fair and open bidding process,” the agreement’s bidding procedures included a Go-Shop Provision that made clear that the Debtor’s ability to shop its assets to other potential buyers was not limited.\footnote{Id. at 20.} Specifically, the provision made clear that the Debtors could take an active approach in driving the sale towards the highest possible purchase price. The procedures went further with an “initial overbid and bidding increments” provision that provided a “Minimum Initial Overbid Amount of $1,000,000 over and above the aggregate of the Stalking Horse Purchase Price...[with] minimum bid increments thereafter [of] $1,000,000.”\footnote{Id.}

\textit{Modification of Procedures}

The Debtors included a modification provision that allowed them, “in consultation with the Consultation Parties, [to] extend the Bid Deadline...[along with the ability to] modify, employ and announce at the Auction additional or amended procedural rules that are reasonable.”\footnote{Id.} These modifications were, however, required to “not [be] materially inconsistent with the Bidding Procedures [or the Code],” “not purport to abrogate or modify the Stalking Horse Protections,” and ensure disclosure to every bidder at the auction.\footnote{Id.}
**Back-Up Bidder Protection**

The Debtors included a provision for “Closing with Alternative Back-Up Bidders” that required the “Qualified Bidder(s) [w]ith the next highest or otherwise best Qualified Bid...to serve as a back-up bidder [] and keep its bid open and irrevocable.”³¹⁹ This back-up bidder provision would remain effective “until the earlier occur of (i) thirty (30) days after the Sale Hearing and (ii) closing on the Successful Bid(s) with Successful Bidder(s).”³²⁰

**Dates and Deadlines**

The Debtors provided that the sale process would proceed as follows³²¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On or before April 3, 2018</td>
<td>Hearing to consider approval of the Bidding Procedures and entry of the Bidding Procedures Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, at 4:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)</td>
<td>Deadline to object to the Stalking Horse Bidder and the Sale to the Stalking Horse Bidder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)</td>
<td>Bid Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)</td>
<td>Deadline for Debtors to notify Potential Bidders of their status as Qualified Bidders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, at 10:00 a.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)</td>
<td>Auction to be held at the offices of Richard, Layton &amp; Finger, P.A. (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2018</td>
<td>Target date for the Debtors to file with the Court the Notice of Auction Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, at 4:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)</td>
<td>Deadline to object to conduct of the Auction and the Sale to the Successful Bidder (other than the Stalking Horse Bidder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2018</td>
<td>Target date to file proposed Sale Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
<td>Proposed date of the Sale Hearing to consider approval of Sale and entry of Sale Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notice Procedures-Sale and Notice Publication**

The motion by the Debtors also included the specific methodology they would use to provide notice to the US Trustee, secured and unsecured creditors, and the counsel for all included parties.³²² Furthermore, the Debtors made clear that they would comply with publication

³¹⁸ *Id.*

³¹⁹ *Id.*

³²⁰ *Id.*

³²¹ *Id.* at 21.

³²² *Id.* at 21-22 (The Bidding Procedures provided that, within two days of entering the Bidding Procedures Order, TWC “shall serve the Sale Notice by first-class mail” to the US Trustee, the committee of the unsecured creditors, all other known creditors, counsel for the Stalking Horse Bidder (Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP and Pepper Hamilton LLP), counsel to the Pre-petition and DIP Agents (Sidley Austin LLP and Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor LLP), the New York Attorney General, the IRS, all applicable state and local taxing authorities, the FTC, the SEC, the US Attorney in Delaware, the US Attorney General/antitrust Division of the DOJ, the other offices of the attorneys general for the states in which TWC operates, all potential buyers that have expressed prior interest in TWC’s...
requirements by advertising the estate’s sale in the Wall Street Journal, the USA Today, or any other necessary organizations.\(^{323}\)

**Notice Procedures-Notice of Determination of Qualified Bids**

The Debtors, after consulting with the Consultation Parties, were to determine “which bids qualify as a Qualified Bid and [ ] notify Potential Bidders whether they [were] selected as Qualified Bidders by no later than May 1, 2018.”\(^{324}\)

**Notice Procedures-Notice of Hearing if Auction Not Held**

In the event that the Stalking Horse bid stood alone, the Debtors would be required to provide the Sale Notice Parties with a notice indicating “that the Auction for the Assets [had] been canceled,” “that the Stalking Horse Bidder [was] the Successful Bidder [for the assets],” and ultimate set a date and time for the Sale Hearing.\(^{325}\)

**Notice Procedures-Notice of Auction Results**

If the auction went ahead as planned, the Debtors would be required to “file a notice of the Successful Bid(s) and Back-up Bid(s)” in a Notice of Auction Results that would be published on the Case Information Website.\(^{326}\)

**Assumption and Assignment Procedures**

Pursuant to section 365(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors sought approval of its proposed Assumption and Assignment Procedures that would:\(^{327}\)

\(^{323}\) *Id.* (In addition, by April 6, 2018, the Sale Notice was to be published in the Wall Street Journal or the USA Today along with any other appropriate publications.).

\(^{324}\) *Id.*

\(^{325}\) *Id.*

\(^{326}\) *Id.*

\(^{327}\) *Id.* at 23.
Outline the process by which the Debtors will serve notice to all Counterparties regarding the proposed assumption and assignment, related Cure Amounts, if any, and information regarding the Stalking Horse Bidder’s or such other Successful Bidder’s adequate assurance of future performance and (b) establish objection and other relevant deadlines and the manner for resolving disputes relating to assumption and assignment of the Contracts and Leases.

The procedures required the Debtors to include “each of the Contracts and Leases that may be assumed or assigned” and “the proposed Cure Amount” for each in the assumed contracts schedule. The procedures are also provided for the objection deadlines, resolution of objections, and what happens in the event of a “failure to file timely assumption and assignment objection.” The proposed procedures concluded with modification of assumed contracts schedule, the post-auction objection, and the reservation of rights for the Debtors.

Rationale for Approving the Sale Procedures as Proposed

The Debtors defended its request for approval based on the “Best Interests of the Debtors and Their Economic Stakeholders.” The Debtors’ rationale varied from the fairness of the bidding procedures to defending the break-up fee based on its “sound business purpose.”

In addition, the Debtors justified the No-Shop provision of the Stalking Horse Agreement on the basis that it served as “the result of good faith, arm’s-length negotiations” because it contemplated a “finite period of time...fifteen [] days...in order for [the Debtors] to enter bankruptcy with little distraction” and with the subsequent stalking horse established. In fact,

---

328 Id.
329 Id. at 24–25.
330 Id. at 25–26.
331 Id. at 27.
332 Id.
333 Id. at 28.
334 Id. at 32–33.
the Debtors implored the court to grant its motion based on the length of time it spent “shopping segments of the Assets for more than a year.”

The Debtors also addressed the requirements of the proposed sale under Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code. First, the Debtors explained that the entire sale contained “sound business justification” based on the theory of value preservation. Next, the Debtors described its reasonably calculated noticing procedures as adequate and timely with respect to the sale, bidding, auction and sale hearing. Thereafter, the Debtors defended the sale process based on the inevitable production of a “fair and reasonable purchase price for the Assets” after “extensive prepetition marketing” and the Stalking Horse Bid “serv[ing] as a floor.” Lastly, the Debtors addressed the good faith purchaser’s protection by noting that the deal would provide a “fair and transparent competitive bidding process” that would satisfy 11 U.S.C. § 363(m). With respect to Section 363(k) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors defended the agreement’s provision allowing secured parties to credit bid.

The Debtors addressed the assumption and assignment of executor contracts and unexpired leases by arguing that the assumption merely indicated an exercise of sound business judgment because “[t]he consummation of the Sale is critical...to maximize value for [the] estates.” With respect to the issue of providing adequate protection, the Debtors simply explained that such an

335 See id. at 34 (“[TWC] and their advisors have shopped segments of the Assets for more than a year (i.e., the Television Business) and all of the Assets for nearly half that time.”).

336 Id. at 36.

337 Id.

338 Id.

339 Id. at 38.

340 See id. at 41 (“[T]he holder of a claim secured property that is subject of a sale ‘may bid at such sale, and, if the holder of a claim purchases such property, such holder may offset such claim against the purchase price of such property.’”); See also 11 U.S.C. § 363(k) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].

341 Motion for Approval of Sale, supra note 296, 8.pdf at 42.
“adequate assurance of future performance information can be obtained from counsel...upon request.”

Objections & Adversary Proceedings

Following the motion for approving the sale and its procedures, Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company filed an objection because it believed that the assumption and assignment would compel it to provide both group and dental insurance to the Debtors and the subsequent buyer without adequate assurance. Wind River Productions, LLC and Acacia Entertainment LLC later moved to be joined in the proceeding and argued to reject the bidding procedures on the same ground for lack of adequate assurance.

Adversary Proceeding # 18-50397

Hotel Mumbai Ltd. brought one of the more contentious objections to the motion for sale. Pre-petition, Hotel Mumbai had a production and distribution agreement for a film titled “Hotel Mumbai” that detailed the 2008 terrorist attacks in Mumbai, India and claimed 166 lives. Hotel Mumbai objected on two grounds including a claim of pre-petition rescission of contract and licensing rights for an upcoming film. In addition, Hotel Mumbai ensured that it reserved its

342 Id. at 44.


344 Joinder of Wind River Productions, LLC and Acacia Entertainment LLC to the Objection of Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company to the Debtors Bidding Procedures (related document(s)[8], [136]) Filed by Acacia Filmed Entertainment, LLC, Wind River Productions, LLC. (Attachments: # (1) Certificate of Service) (Desgroseilliers, Mark [137.pdf In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Apr. 2, 2018)).


346 Objection and Reservation of Rights of Hotel Mumbai Pty Ltd. and Related Affiliates to Debtors’ Motion for Entry of Orders (I)(A) Approving Bidding Procedures for Sale of Substantially All of the Debtors’ Assets, (B) Approving
rights with respect to later objection under Section 365(f) for inadequate protection during the sale process. The objection later moved towards an adversary proceeding and a subsequent compromise between the Debtors and Hotel Mumbai.

**Adversary Proceeding # 18-50487**

Several guilds representing directors (DGA), screen actors (SAG-AFTRA), and writers (WGA West) filed an objection together seeking “residual payments” that were owed under prior collective bargaining agreements. Ultimately, a settlement was reached that secured $11 million to be paid to satisfy the claims.

**Adversary Proceeding #18-50486**

Following the actual sale of substantially all of the Debtors’ assets, AI International Holdings brought a claim against MUFG Union Bank claiming it improperly benefited from the

Stalking Horse Bid Protections, (C) Scheduling Auction for, and Hearing to Approve, Sale of Substantially All of the Debtors’ Assets, (D) Approving Form and Manner of Notices of Sale, Auction and Sale Hearing, (E) Approving Assumption and Assignment Procedures and (F) Granting Related Relief and (II)(A) Approving Sale of Substantially All of the Debtors’ Assets Free and Clear of All Liens, Claims, Interests and Encumbrances, (B) Approving Assumption and Assignment of Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases and (C) Granting Related Relief.

347 Id. at 3–4.

348 See Debtors’ Motion Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9019 for Approval of Settlement Stipulation with Hotel Mumbai Pty Ltd. and Lantern Entertainment LLC 1022.pdf, In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed June 15, 2018) (“Material terms of the stipulation include: ‘i. Provision by HMPL of a confidential ‘Settlement Amount’ (as defined in the Stipulation), which Settlement Amount will be provided to the Debtors in the event the Sale has not closed when such funds become due or to Lantern in the event the Sale has closed; ii. Lantern and the Debtors relinquish, waive and release unto HMPL any and all rights, title, and interest they may have in the Picture and/or the License Agreement, except for the entitlements set forth in the Stipulation; iii. The Parties, on behalf of themselves and certain other affiliates, agree to mutual releases of any and all claims related to the License Agreement, the Picture, the Adversary Proceeding, the PI Motion, HMPL’s Objections and Paragraph 60 of the Sale Order; iv. The discontinuance with prejudice of the Adversary Proceeding, the PI Motion, the First Objection and the Sale Objection’”).


sale and should ultimately disgorge itself of $46 million. Following unsuccessful attempts at reconciling and reaching a settlement, both parties sought and received an approval for court-supervised mediation. Even after mediation, both parties remained entrenched and ultimately both entered a motion for a stipulation that the adversary proceeding to be dismissed with prejudice and that each side would be responsible for its subsequent legal cost.

**Adversary Proceeding #18-50924**

The final confrontation that led to an adversary proceeding was between Lantern Entertainment, the successful buyer of the company, and producer Bruce Cohen concerning whether his “Talent Party Agreement” was transferable. After the court granted Lantern’s motion for summary judgment, the District Court of Delaware affirmed on appeal finding that Cohen’s agreement was not executory because “[Although] ancillary performance is due on both

---

351 Adversary case 18-50486. Complaint by AI International Holdings (BVI) Ltd. against MUFG Union Bank, N.A., Union Bancal Equities, Inc.. Fee Amount $350 (21 (Validity, priority or extent of lien or other interest in property)). AP Summons Served due date: 08/31/2018. (Attachments: # (1) Exhibit A # (2) Exhibit B # (3) Exhibit C # (4) Exhibit D # (5) Exhibit E # (6) Exhibit F # (7) Exhibit G # (8) Exhibit H # (9) Exhibit I # (10) Exhibit J # (11) Exhibit K # (12) Exhibit L # (13) Exhibit M # (14) Exhibit N # (15) Exhibit O # (16) Exhibit P) (Wright, Davis) 2, In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed June 15, 2018).


353 Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice of Adversary Proceeding No. 18-50486 (MFW) related document(s)[969] Filed by AI International Holdings (BVI) Ltd.. (related document(s)[1], [969]) (Donilon, Gregory) 1, In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed June 15, 2018).

354 Adversary case 18-50924. Complaint for Declaratory Judgment Against Bruce Cohen Productions and Bruce Cohen by Lantern Entertainment LLC against Bruce Cohen Productions, Bruce Cohen. Fee Amount $350 (91 (Declaratory judgment). AP Summons Served due date: 01/15/2019. (Meltzer, Evelyn) (Entered: 10/17/2018) 2, 8-9, In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed June 15, 2018) (“The Weinstein Company entered into a contract with Bruce Cohen regarding Cohen’s production of a motion picture entitled Silver Linings Playbook (the “Picture”). The contract specified that Cohen was to provide production services for the Picture in exchange for, in essence, compensation and film credits. Production of the Picture was completed in 2012, and the Picture was released in November of that year. . . because the parties have materially performed under the Agreement, the Agreement is not executory. Cohen has completed performing his production services of the Picture, and The Weinstein Company completed performance by providing Cohen with compensation and other forms of consideration, such as film credit rights, during the production period as per the terms of the Agreement. The Picture was produced and released in November 2012 and no material obligations remain for either party to perform. A declaratory judgment would settle the controversy, ensure that the Agreement is not considered executory, and therefore may be properly assigned to Lantern pursuant to Bankruptcy Code section 363, and aid the Debtors in their reorganization efforts.”).
sides...the primary purpose of a work-for-hire contract in the industry is the completion of the project.”\textsuperscript{355}

The U.S. Trustee objected because the “superpriority status for termination payment...improperly [gave] superpriority status to the break-up fee and expense reimbursement.”\textsuperscript{356}

The Committee of Unsecured Creditors provided its response stating that “[t]he Bidding Procedures, as originally proposed were overreaching...[and] would be value-destructive.”\textsuperscript{357} Nevertheless, a formal objection was not raised and the court approved the bidding procedures along with the order for sale on April 6, 2018.\textsuperscript{358} Lantern Entertainment, as the only qualified bidder, successfully purchased the Debtors’ assets for $289 million.\textsuperscript{359}


**DIP FINANCING**

**What is DIP Financing?**

DIP Financing is a form of financing utilized by companies undergoing a chapter 11 bankruptcy.\(^{360}\) The main use is to assist the company in its reorganization “by allowing it to raise capital to fund its operations as its bankruptcy case runs its course.”\(^{361}\)

DIP Financing is obtained by filing for bankruptcy and then receiving court approval of the plan.\(^{362}\) The Debtors are obligated to inform their vendors, suppliers, and customers that they are obtaining this financing and expect to remain in business and provide payments.\(^{363}\)

Those who act as lenders in DIP Financing start by making a determination as to whether or not the company is “worth of credit after examining its finances” and if it will be able to successfully reorganize.\(^{364}\) Those lenders that decide to provide the DIP Financing then ensure that their loan package is secured by first priority liens on their collateral.\(^{365}\) Finally the DIP lender will work in coordination with the debtors to create an approved budget. This budget forecasts a “company’s receipts, expenses, net cash flow, and outflows.”\(^{366}\) It also considers the timing of required due payments throughout the reorganization.\(^{367}\)


\(^{361}\) *Id.*

\(^{362}\) *Id.*

\(^{363}\) *Id.*

\(^{364}\) *Id.*

\(^{365}\) *Id.*

\(^{366}\) *Id.*

\(^{367}\) *Id.*
The Motion

I. Key Terms


DIP Agent – MUFG Union Bank, N.A., as administrative agent

DIP Facility – Secured, superpriority post-petition loans, advances, and other financial accommodations.

DIP Credit Agreement – Debtor-In-Possession Loan and Security Agreement.

DIP Credit Parties – DIP Agent, DIP Lenders, and other Secured Parties

DIP Lender(s) – MUFG Union Bank, N.A.

DIP Loan Documents – DIP Credit Agreement and all other related documents and agreements, including security agreements, guaranties, and promissory notes

Permitted Priority Liens – liens secured under Section 364(d)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code by “valid, binding, continuing, enforceable, fully perfected, first priority, senior priming security interests”

---


369 Id. at 2.

370 Id. at 1.

371 Id. at 2.

372 Id.

373 Id.

374 Id.
on all DIP Collateral, subordinate only to the liens on Pre-Petition Collateral that “are not subject to avoidance, reduction, allowance, disgorgement, counterclaim, surcharge or subordination.”

II. Debtors’ Request

On March 20, 2018, the Debtors filed a motion for approval of postpetition financing (“DIP Financing”). Within this filing, the Debtors requested approval to obtain DIP Financing with a priority interest in the amount of $7.5 million in the interim and $25 million upon final order.

III. Debtors’ Secured Prepetition Indebtedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Agreement</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Creditor</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUFG Secured Credit Facility</td>
<td>TWCD</td>
<td>Union Bank, N.A. (now MUFG) as Administrative Agent</td>
<td>$156,411,347, plus accrued and unpaid interest.</td>
<td>First priority lien on substantially all of TWCD’s assets and a senior pledge of TWC’s equity in TWCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Pre-Petition Credit Agreement”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnionBanCal Equities Junior Credit Facility</td>
<td>TWCD</td>
<td>UnionBanCal Equities, Inc. (“UBE”)</td>
<td>$15,600,000</td>
<td>Junior lien on substantially all of TWCD’s assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“UBE Credit Agreement”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Credit Facility</td>
<td>Weinstein Television LLC (“WTV”)</td>
<td>Bank of America, N.A.</td>
<td>$18,100,000</td>
<td>Project Runway franchise, Fashion, Inc. series, assets of WTV and its subsidiaries, TWC’s rights in television products. All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Bank of America”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

375 *Id.* at 1.

376 *Id.* at 1–3 (The Debtors requested: (i) Authorization to obtain secured, superpriority postpetition DIP Financing; (ii) Authorization to execute and deliver the DIP Credit Agreement and all other related documents and to perform all things necessary in connection; (iii) Prior to a Final Order, to borrow from the DIP Facility in an amount up to $7,500,000 (the “Interim Financing”); (iv) Entry of an order approving the Interim Financing; (v) Granting of superpriority administrative expenses; (vi) Authorization to use Cash Collateral; (vii) Granting of valid, enforceable, nonavoidable, and fully perfected security interests and liens to the DIP Agent on all DIP Collateral, subject to and subordinate to only to those pre-existing security interests and liens on DIP Collateral; (viii) Authorization to pay the principal, interest, fees, expenses, and other amounts payable under each of the DIP Loan Documents as they become due; (ix) The provision of adequate protection to the Pre-Petition Lenders to the extent set forth in the Interim Order; (x) Vacating and modifying the automatic stay provisions imposed to the extent necessary to implement and effectuate the terms and provisions of the DIP Loan Documents and Interim Order; (xi) Scheduling a final hearing and the entry of a Final Order; and (xii) Granting any related relief.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Agreement</th>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Lender</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Industries Credit Facility (“AI Note”)</td>
<td>TWC Borrower 2016, LLC</td>
<td>AI International Holdings Ltd.</td>
<td>$45,500,000</td>
<td>Certain foreign distribution rights, subordinated pledge of TWCH’s equity in WTV, pledge of TWC’s equity in Weinstein Global Film Corporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWC Production Facility</td>
<td>TWC Production LLC</td>
<td>MUFG Union Bank, N.A.</td>
<td>$42,500,000</td>
<td>First priority lien on substantially all of TWC Production’s assets, pledge of TWC’s equity in TWC Production, subordinated pledge of TWC’s equity in TWCBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCP Credit Agreement</td>
<td>WTV JCP Borrower 2017, LLP</td>
<td>Bank Hapoalim</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>Lien on all of WTV JCP’s assets, including their right to receive royalty payments in relation to <em>Project Runway</em> and its spinouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaroid Credit Agreement</td>
<td>TWC Polaroid SPV, LLC (“Polaroid”)</td>
<td>First Republic Bank</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>Lien on substantially all of Polaroid’s assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spy Kids Credit Agreement</td>
<td>Spy Kids TV Borrower, LLC (“Spy Kids”)</td>
<td>MUFG Union Bank, N.A.</td>
<td>$13,400,000</td>
<td>Lien on substantially all of Spy Kid’s assets to the extent derived from, related to, or in connection to the first and second seasons of TV Series <em>Spy Kids</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mist Credit Agreement</td>
<td>TWC Mist, LLC (“Mist”)</td>
<td>Comerica Bank</td>
<td>$12,400,000</td>
<td>Lien on substantially all of Mist’s assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchable Credit Agreement</td>
<td>TWC Untouchable SPV, LLC</td>
<td>First Republic Bank</td>
<td>$8,900,000</td>
<td>Lien on substantially all of Untouchable’s assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco Credit Agreement</td>
<td>TWC Waco SPV, LLC</td>
<td>Opus Bank</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>Lien on substantially all of Waco’s assets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fearless Credit Borrower

| Borrower | TWC Fearless Borrower, LLC (“Fearless”) | First Republic Bank | $2,800,000 | Lien on substantially all of Fearless’ assets.\(^{378}\) |

### Current War Credit Agreement

| Agreement | Current War SPV, LLC (“Current War”) | East West Bank | $7,000,000 | Lien on substantially all of Current War’s domestic assets. |

### Other Debt\(^{379}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Desc.</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Creditor</th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scream Advances Agreement</td>
<td>WTV</td>
<td>Viacom Media Networks (“VMN”)</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>Lien on certain of WTV’s and Next Take Productions, Inc, rights to distribution of the <em>Scream</em> series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone Advances Agreement</td>
<td>WTV</td>
<td>VMN</td>
<td>$20,300,000</td>
<td>Lien on WTV’s rights to distribution of <em>Yellowstone</em>, <em>Mist</em>, and the documentary series <em>The Untitled Kalief Browder Project</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlabeled advance agreement</td>
<td>WTV</td>
<td>VMN</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast and Crew Payroll Advance</td>
<td>TWC</td>
<td>Next Take Productions, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>TWC is serving as guarantor of this obligation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{378}\) *Id.* (“As a condition to the full commitment under the Fearless Credit Agreement becoming available and as part of the sale of streaming rights to Amazon Digital Services, LLC (“Amazon Digital”), the Fearless Credit Agreement requires Amazon Digital to agree to make all payments to First Republic Bank.”).  

\(^{379}\) *Id.* at 11–12.
IV. DIP Financing Prerequisites

In order to obtain approval for DIP Financing, a debtor must demonstrate: (i) an immediate need for postpetition financing and use of cash collateral; (ii) a failed prepetition effort to obtain financing; (iii) that no credit is available on more favorable terms; and (iv) a proper use of the proceeds of the DIP Facility.\(^{380}\)

First, a debtor must show that postpetition financing is imperative to continue operations as a going concern. The Debtors intended to sell substantially all of their assets, but in the meantime, they must be capable of continuing operations as a going concern in an effort to “preserve the value of their estates” until completion of the 363 Asset Sale.\(^{381}\) Working in conjunction with FTI, the Debtors determined it could sustain operations for a short time without the aid of the DIP Facility, and only if they were to incur more debt through the withholding of certain payments.\(^{382}\) If the Court were to reject this application, the Debtors would be unable to maintain relationships, satisfy payroll, or protect the value of their remaining assets.\(^{383}\) Additionally, this would impair their ability to restructure in a manner that would maximize shareholder value.

A debtor must also demonstrate that they have made an effort to obtain another form of financing prior to structuring a DIP financing arrangement. Prior to the Petition Date, Debtors hired FTI as their Administrative Agent, making Robert Del Genio, a Senior Managing Director at FTI, the Chief Restructuring Officer.\(^{384}\) With FTI, the Debtors were to complete an Asset Sale as explained in the 363 Sale section herein.\(^{385}\) This ultimately led to extensive negotiations with

\(^{380}\) 11 U.S.C. § 364(d) [https://perma.cc/XUB9-XHVB]; see also FED. R. BANKR. P. 4001(c) [https://perma.cc/6BLU-G95X].

\(^{381}\) DIP Financing Motion, supra note 368, 11.pdf at 12.

\(^{382}\) Id.

\(^{383}\) Id.

\(^{384}\) Id. at 13.

\(^{385}\) Id.
MediaCo regarding the proposed Asset Sale. Unfortunately, terms that were favorable to both parties were never reached and the deal dissolved.\textsuperscript{386}

Next, a debtor must also demonstrate that they “were unable to obtain credit on more favorable terms.”\textsuperscript{387} The Debtors went to the extent of soliciting bids from potential lenders, and then made evaluations on numerous factors, including the terms of the agreement, certainty of the agreement, proposed restrictions on the Debtors, and restrictions on the proceeds, as well as what collateral would secure the loan.\textsuperscript{388} No prospective lenders could offer a DIP facility that was better than that of the DIP Credit parties.\textsuperscript{389} “Additionally, the DIP Credit Parties [were] familiar with the Debtors, giving them the ability to act more quickly and limiting diligence risk.” This is due to their previous debtor and creditor relations.\textsuperscript{390}

Finally, the DIP Facility proceeds were to be used for “working capital purposes of the debtors, current interest and fees under the facility, the payment of adequate protection payments to the Pre-Petition Agent and the Pre-Petition lenders, the payments of prepetition claims to the extent approved by this Court, and the allowed administrative costs and expenses of the cases.”\textsuperscript{391}

\textbf{V. Adequate Protection}

The Debtors need to consider the Pre-Petition Lenders’ interests as they moved forward with their Post-Petition Financing. Their interests in the Pre-Petition Collateral had declined in value as a result of the DIP Agent obtaining priming liens on the same collateral, the authorized use of Cash Collateral, and the automatic stay imposed upon their causes of action.\textsuperscript{392} For these

\textsuperscript{386} See discussion regarding pre-petition sale efforts.

\textsuperscript{387} DIP Financing Motion, supra note 368, \textit{11.pdf} at 13.

\textsuperscript{388} \textit{Id}.

\textsuperscript{389} \textit{Id}. at 14.

\textsuperscript{390} \textit{Id}.

\textsuperscript{391} \textit{Id}. at 14–15.

\textsuperscript{392} \textit{Id}. at 25.
reasons, the Debtors were required to pay these Pre-Petition Lenders 50% of the amounts arising in relation to that Pre-Petition Collateral.\textsuperscript{393}

Additionally, Pre-Petition Lenders were to receive five other concessions. First, a superpriority claim “over all administrative expense claims and unsecured claims,” subject only to the claims of the DIP Agent in relation to the DIP Facility, “any Permitted Third-Party DIP Liens, the Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens, and the Carve-Out.”\textsuperscript{394} They were also to receive “valid, enforceable, fully perfected security interests and replacement liens on the DIP Collateral,” subject only to those same parties.\textsuperscript{395} Next, the Pre-Petition Lenders were entitled to payment of reasonable “fees, costs and expenses” stemming from “any and all aspects of the chapter 11 cases.”\textsuperscript{396} Once the DIP Facility closed, the Pre-Petition Lenders would receive payment of “all accrued and unpaid pre-petition interests” that are due under the Pre-Petition Credit Agreement, adjusted at the non-default rate.\textsuperscript{397} Finally, Pre-Petition Lenders were entitled to “monthly adequate protection payments equal to 50% of funds on deposit in the Collection Account.”\textsuperscript{398}

\section*{VI. Basis for Relief}

\textit{Authorization of Adequate Protection for Prepetition Secured Creditors}

Pursuant to Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code, a debtor may enter into transactions in the ordinary course of business.\textsuperscript{399} If a prepetition secured creditor has a lien on a debtors‘ assets, they must be adequately protected if the debtors intend to use the assets in a manner which the creditor has not consented.\textsuperscript{400} The purpose is to protect the “diminution in the value” of assets

\begin{footnotes}
\item[393] \textit{Id.} at 26.
\item[394] \textit{Id.}
\item[395] \textit{Id.}
\item[396] \textit{Id.}
\item[397] \textit{Id.}
\item[398] \textit{Id.}
\item[399] 11 U.S.C. § 363(c) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].
\item[400] DIP Financing Motion, supra note 368, 11.pdf at 28 (citing \textit{Resolution Trust Corp. v. Swedeland Dev. Grp (In re Swedeland Dev. Grp)}, 16 F.3d 552, 564 (3d Cir. 1994)).
\end{footnotes}
which the creditor has an interest.\textsuperscript{401} The Debtors “[believed] that his form of adequate protection . . . [balanced] the Debtors’ need to use the Pre-Petition Collateral and the Pre-Petition Lenders right to adequate protection under the Bankruptcy Code.”\textsuperscript{402}

\textbf{Appropriate Under Section 364 of the Bankruptcy Code}

Section 364 of the Bankruptcy Code allows a debtor to obtain postpetition lending, which can be subjected to various liens.\textsuperscript{403} The Debtors’ asserted their cash collections would be insufficient to keep the business in operation and that expenses would exceed revenues.\textsuperscript{404} Additionally, the “DIP Facility provides the funding needed to get to a sale of substantially all of the Debtors’ assets.”\textsuperscript{405}

\textbf{Sound Business Judgment}

A court will typically accept a debtors’ business judgment regarding a need for funds.\textsuperscript{406} When a court analyzes a debtors’ request under Section 364, they “permit reasonable business judgment to be exercised so long as the financing agreement does not contain terms that leverage the bankruptcy process and powers or its purposes it not so much to benefit the estate as it is to benefit [another] party-in-interest.”\textsuperscript{407} The Debtors maintained that they had reasonable checks in place to manage the postpetition financing and any liens that creditors may have.\textsuperscript{408}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{401} \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{402} \textit{Id.} at 29.
\item \textsuperscript{403} 11 U.S.C. § 364(d) [https://perma.cc/XUB9-XHVB].
\item \textsuperscript{404} DIP Financing Motion, \textit{supra} note 368, 11.pdf at 30.
\item \textsuperscript{405} \textit{Id.} at 31.
\item \textsuperscript{406} \textit{Id.} at 32.
\item \textsuperscript{407} \textit{Id.} (citing \textit{In re Ames Dep’t Stores, Inc.}, 115 B.R. 34, 40 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1990)).
\item \textsuperscript{408} \textit{Id.} at 33 (The Debtors also asserted that financing was needed as soon as possible in order to “avoid immediate and irreparable harm to the . . . estate.”).
\end{itemize}
Objections and Reservations

I. Limited Objections – Portfolio Funding Company

On March 20, 2018, Professional Funding Company LLC I (“PFC”) filed an omnibus limited objection (the “PFC Omnibus”), including the Debtors’ DIP Financing Motion. PFC was in privity with Debtors for “a complex series of licensing arrangements.” “PFC’s contractual and property rights [were] protected by security interests[,]” which were granted by the Debtors.

PFC asserted that Paragraph 10(b) of the proposed interim order, regarding DIP Priming Liens, provided DIP Lenders a certain class of liens subject only to the kind PFC held; however, there were other portions of the proposed order that would result in DIP Lenders holding a lien superior to that of PFC on its collateral. These situations arose under: (i) paragraph 18, which required the Debtors to turn over proceeds derived from any DIP Collateral to the DIP Agent, pursuant to junior liens under Section 364 of the Bankruptcy Code; (ii) section 6.18(a) of the DIP Credit Agreement, which required proceeds from a sale to be used to pay DIP Obligations and Pre-Petition Obligations before PFC; and (iii) paragraph 20 of the Interim DIP Order provided de facto priming to Secured Lending Entities. PFC requested that the Interim Order be modified to have any proceeds deriving from PFC Collateral be applied to PFC’s claims.


410 Id. at 2.

411 Id.

412 Id. at 15.

413 Id. at 15.

414 Id. at 16.
PFC also asserted “paragraph 23 of the Interim DIP Order should be modified to provide
PFC with relief from the automatic stay to exercise any rights and remedies . . . against the PFC
Collateral.” Along with that PFC requested that they be provided 5 days’ written notice of the
occurrence of an Event of Default. Finally, PFC requested that they should “receive notice and
the ability to object to any non-material modification or amendment to the DIP Loan Documents
in Paragraph 29.”

PFC followed up the PFC Omnibus with a limited objection due to what they considered
an unsatisfactory response in the DIP Financing Interim Order. It essentially reiterated their
requests, which were further acknowledged in the Final Order, which is described below.

II. Conditional Objection – MUFG Union Bank, N.A.

On April 16, 2018, MUFG Union Bank, N.A. (“MUFG”) filed a conditional objection to
the Debtors’ DIP Financing Motion. They filed this objection on behalf of their role as
Administrative Agent for two loans. First, the TWCP Facility was for $105 million as a
revolving credit facility, set to mature on February 6, 2019. The TWCP Facility granted MUFG
a “first-priority security interest in all foreign distribution/exploitation rights with respect to each
Project funded.” Next, there was a credit agreement for $15,583,775 million (“SK Loan”) related

415 Id.
416 Id.
417 Id.
418 Limited Objection and Reservation of Rights of Portfolio Funding Company LLC I to Debtors’ Motion for Entry
of Interim and Final Orders (I) Approving Postpetition Financing, (II) Authorizing Use of Cash Collateral, (III)
Providing Superpriority Administrative Expense Status, (IV) Granting Adequate Protection, (V) Modifying Automatic
Stay, (VI) Granting Related Relief, and (VII) Scheduling a Final Hearing 220.pdf at 9-11, In re The Weinstein
419 Conditional Objection and Reservation of Rights of MUFG Union Bank, N.A. to Debtors’ Motion for Orders (I)
Approving Postpetition Financing, (II) Authorizing Use of Cash Collateral, (III) Providing Superpriority
Administrative Expense Status, (IV) Granting Adequate Protection, (V) Modifying Automatic Stay, (VI) Granting
Related Relief, and (VII) Scheduling Final Hearing 159.pdf at 1, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al.,
No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed April 16, 2018) [hereinafter MUFG DIP Objection].
420 Id.
421 Id. at 2.
to the development of an animated series entitled “Spy Kids.” MUFG was granted a “first-priority security interest in SK’s assets including, but not limited to, the SK Project, the teleplays for the SK Project, and all distribution and exploitation rights.” Further, the Debtors granted MUFG “a security interest in 100% of the equity in SK.” At the time MUFG filed this objection, they had not seen the Proposed Final Order. “Out of an abundance of caution,” MUFG stated that they “[did] not consent, and object to, any proposed priming of the liens or any relief that would prejudice, impair, or otherwise impact [MUFG’s] rights and remedies with respect” to their security interest. Lastly, MUFG reserved their rights to “amend, modify, or supplement” the objection, seek discovery, and object during the final hearing.

III. Limited Objection – Technicolor

On April 12, 2018, Technicolor USA, Inc., Technicolor, Inc., Technicolor Cinema Distribution, Technicolor Home Entertainment Services, Inc., Technicolor Videocassette of Michigan, Inc., and Technicolor Creative Services USA, Inc. (collectively, “Technicolor”) filed a limited objection to the Debtors’ DIP Financing Motion. Technicolor and the Debtors were parties to seven agreements related to “post-production film and television services, certain distribution services, and home delivery solution requirements” (the “Technicolor Agreements”).

---

422 Id. at 4.
423 Id.
424 Id.
425 Id. at 6.
426 Id. at 7.
427 Id.
429 Id. at 4–5.
Under the Technicolor Agreements, a lien was provided “on all materials deposited by, or on behalf of [the Debtors] with Technicolor that [were] owned and subject to the control of [the Debtor] . . . to secure payment of the entire outstanding balance.” Additionally, California laws “[grant] Technicolor a senior secured lien in the Collateral pursuant to California Civil Code, which provides “every person who . . . renders any service . . . has a special lien thereon.” Along with that, California Commercial Code provides that “a possessory lien on goods has priority over a security interest in the goods unless the lien is created by a statute that expressly provides otherwise.”

Technicolor objected to the DIP Financing Motion “only to the extent . . . it [would] (i) impair, prejudice, or otherwise affect the extent, validity, enforceability, or priority of the Technicolor Liens . . . (ii) grant to the DIP Agent any liens, claims, rights, or interests” upon Technicolor’s Collateral with a senior interest, and “(iii) grant to the DIP Agent or any other party any rights or remedies that could interfere with, impair or otherwise affect Technicolor’s rights, claims, or interests in the Technicolor Collateral.”

**IV. Guild of America Reservation of Rights**

On April 16, 2018, the Directors Guild of America, Inc., Screen Actors Guild-American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, and the Writers Guild of America, West, Inc. (collectively, the “Guilds”) filed a reservation of rights in relation to the DIP Financing Motion. “Each Guild [was] the collective bargaining representative for directors, performers or writers . . .

___________________________

430 Id. at 6.
431 CAL. CIV. CODE § 3051 [https://perma.cc/4CGP-EXUL].
432 CAL. COMM. CODE § 9333 [https://perma.cc/8MWZ-U6H4].
433 Technicolor Objection, supra note 428, 208.pdf at 8–9.
in the television and motion picture industry.” 435 Guild-represented employees receive compensation through “Residuals,” which are fees payable in coordination with production, but subject to Guild collective bargaining agreements. 436 Additionally, “each Guild Pension and health plan is a multi-employer ERISA fund, supported by contributions based on initial compensation and fringe payments calculated in the same fashion as Residuals.” 437 Typically, these collective bargaining agreements are secured with “valid and perfected security interests, intended to secure performance of collective bargaining obligations, including payment of Residuals.” 438 The Debtors had maintained these agreements throughout the years and paid millions of dollars related to these employee pension and health plans. 439

The Guilds were uncertain in whether or not their secured liens were adequately protected upon the chapter 11 filing and DIP Financing Motion. 440 A main factor of that concern stemmed from not being mentioned in the DIP Financing Motion. 441 Given this uncertainty and the wide variety of potential outcomes, the Guilds reserved “all rights, arguments and remedies.” 442 They hoped to resolve these issues through discussions, but “if these concerns [were] not resolved, then the Guilds [requested] such relief as this Court may order in furtherance of adequate protection for secured Guild Claims.” 443

435 Id. at 2.
436 Id.
437 Id.
438 Id.
439 Id.
440 Id. at 3.
441 Id. at 4.
442 Id. at 7.
443 Id.
**Interim Order**

I. Interim Order

The DIP Financing Motion was approved, and the Interim Order was effective immediately. The Debtors were authorized to borrow and guaranty an aggregate principal amount up to $7,500,000.

II. Budget for DIP Facility

The DIP Parties created a cash-flow budget, which projected all cash receipts and disbursements extending 18-weeks out from the Petition Date. At the discretion of the DIP Agent, Majority DIP Lenders, and the Pre-Petition Agent, the budget could be amended or supplemented by Debtors, provided they delivered a supplement every four weeks. This proposed budget was created with the intention to allow the Debtors to pursue and complete their Asset Sale and pay postpetition obligations.

The Debtors provided a weekly budget report regarding their adherence to the Approved Budget for “the preceding one-week period and the preceding four-week period.” Additionally, these report contained an explanation for any variances. Specifically, the reports addressed “the actual disbursements and receipts of the debtors for the preceding week with the disbursements and receipts contained in the Approved Budget, on a line by line basis.”

---

444 Interim Order (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Obtain Postpetition Financing Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105, 361, 362, 363(c), 363(e), 364(d)(1), and 364(e) and (B) Utilize Cash Collateral of Pre-Petition Secured Entities, (II) Granting Adequate Protection to Pre-Petition Secured Entities, (III) Scheduling a Final hearing Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rules 4001(b) and 4001(c), and (IV) Granting Related Relief 76.pdf at 17, In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al., No. 18-10601 (filed Mar. 20, 2018) [hereinafter DIP Financing Interim Order].

445 Id.

446 Id. at 10.

447 Id.

448 Id. at 11.

449 Id.

450 Id.

451 Id.
disbursements for any four-week period exceed the Approved Budget, it did not result in an event of default if it is for less than $600,000 in aggregate.452

**III. Pre-Petition Secured Parties’ Adequate Protection**

The Pre-Petition Secured Parties were entitled to repayment of their Pre-Petition Obligations.453 Until this was completed, they were to receive adequate protection on their interests.454 The Pre-Petition Secured Parties were granted five forms of Adequate Protection.455

First, they received payment of their pre-petition interest.456 Once the DIP Facility closed, Debtors applied the proceeds of the DIP Loans to pay “all accrued and unpaid pre-petition interest” under those Pre-Petition Credit Agreements.457

Second, the Debtors paid the “reasonable, documented, pre-petition and post-petition fees, costs, and expenses incurred or accrued by the Pre-Petition Secured Parties in connection with any and all aspects of the Chapter 11 Cases.”458

Third, Debtors made Monthly Adequate Protection Payments.459 On the last Friday of each month (each, a “Settlement Date”), the DIP Agent took all cash receipts, collections, income (“Collection Account”) and applied 50% towards outstanding DIP Obligations and 50% to outstanding Pre-Petition Obligations.460 That said, these payments were subject to the DIP Agent

452 *Id.*

453 *Id.*

454 *Id.*

455 *Id.* at 25–30.

456 *Id.* at 25.

457 *Id.*

458 *Id.* at 26 (This includes, without limitation, “the fees and disbursements of counsel, appraisers, financial advisors and other professionals hired by or on behalf of the Pre-Petition Agent or the Pre-Petition Lenders.”).

459 *Id.* at 27.

460 *Id.*
revoking consent and applying those funds to outstanding DIP Obligations and “disgorgement to the extent of a final and non-appealable Challenge.”

Fourth, the Pre-Petition Lenders were entitled to Adequate Protection Liens. These liens were “valid, enforceable, unavoidable, and fully perfected replacement liens and security interests in all DIP Collateral.” These liens were subordinate to DIP Liens, Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens and any Permitted Third-Party DIP Liens, but “senior to the Pre-Petition Liens,” and subject to the Carve-Out provision. Unless stated otherwise, these liens were not to be made equal to or less than any Priming Liens under Section 364(d) of the Bankruptcy Code.

Finally, the Pre-Petition Agent was granted superpriority administrative expense claims in the event the Adequate Protection Liens failed in “[protecting] against the diminution in value of Pre-Petition Collateral.” Section 503 of the Bankruptcy Code permits a request for payment of administrative expenses upon the showing of cause. “After a notice and a hearing, there were allowed administrative expenses . . . including the actual, necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate.” These claims, however, were junior to DIP Superpriority Claims.

---

461 **Id.** at 27–29 (This monthly payment will be applied against “all fees and expenses not otherwise paid, . . . payment of all accrued and unpaid post-petition interest owing, . . . and repayment of outstanding principal amounts of the Pre-Petition Loans and any other Pre-Petition Obligations.”).

462 **Id.** at 29.

463 **Id.**

464 **Id.**

465 **Id.**

466 **Id.** at 30.


468 11 U.S.C. § 503(b) [https://perma.cc/42NM-ZC5E]

IV. Restriction on Use of DIP Lenders’ Funds

There were 5 overarching restrictions on the use of the DIP Facility, which included:470

(i) “Payment of interest and principal” on any indebtedness that is subordinate to the DIP Facility;
(ii) Financing any “adversary action, suit, arbitration, proceeding, application, motion, other litigation, examination or investigation” related to the DIP Loan Documents;
(iii) Financing “any suit, arbitration, proceeding application, motion, other litigation, examination or investigation: related to the rights and remedies of the DIP Secured Parties;
(iv) “[Making] any distribution under a plan of reorganization or liquidation in any Chapter 11 Case” without the DIP Agent’s written consent;
(v) “[Making] any payment in settlement of a claim, action or proceeding” without the DIP Agent’s written consent.

V. Events of Default

There were 7 named events of default, all of which were triggered upon the Debtors failure to act in some way. Notably, most related to the Debtors plan to conduct a 363 Asset Sale and laid out a process of steps that had to be completed along the way.471 This allowed the DIP Agent to keep checks in place to reduce the risk of default on behalf of the Debtors.

VI. Termination

The use of the DIP Facility Loans and Cash Collateral were also set to terminate at the earliest of eight separate events. These were in place because upon the occurrence of any, the need

470 Id. at 49.

471 Id. at 43–44 (The specific events of default included: (i) File a 363 motion, on the Petition Date, to sell all or substantially all of their assets; (ii) Obtain Bankruptcy Court Approval for the proposed Bidding Procedures within 35 days after the 363 motion; (iii) Conduct an auction within 60 days after entry of the Bidding Procedures Order; (iv) Obtain an order authorizing the Asset Sale within 10 days after the Auction; (v) Consummate the Asset Sale within 125 days after the Petition date; (vi) In the event that Debtors elect to not proceed with an Asset Sale, they shall proceed subject to the DIP Agent’s and Pre-Petition Agent’s credit bid rights of the Pre-Petition Collateral; (vii) Subject to entry of the Final Order, commence an adversary proceeding within 10 days of written notice by the DIP Agent against a third party who has “failed to make material payment” to Debtors, continue to prosecute and use best efforts to collect such amounts, and consult with the DIP Agent and Pre-Petition Agent regarding pleadings to be filed.).
for these funds became nonexistent. Ultimately, the use of the DIP Facility Loans took place once the Debtors conducted their 363 Asset Sale.472

VII. Collection and Disbursements

Until the DIP Obligations had been satisfied, “all cash receipts, Cash Collateral and all proceeds” were subject to the DIP Liens and Adequate Protection Liens.473 Also, “to the extent” that cash receipts, Cash Collateral, and proceeds were related to Pre-Petition Collateral, they were be deposited into the Collection Account.474

VIII. DIP Superpriority

Under Section 364(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, the DIP Obligations were granted a superpriority expense claim.475 They were to have priority over “all administrative expenses, adequate protection claims, diminution claims and all other claims against the Debtors.”476 These claims were, however, subject to the “Carve-Out and any Permitted Third-Party Indebtedness.”477

IX. DIP Priming Liens

The DIP Agent was granted “valid, binding and fully perfected, security interests” on all of Debtors’ property.478 These liens were “subject only to any Permitted Third-Party DIP Liens and the payment of the Carve-Out.”479 These superior liens included those under Section 364(d)

472 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at 18 (The full scope of events of termination included: (i) the Scheduled Termination Date; (ii) an Event of Default; (iii) the Debtors termination of any commitments; (iv) the expiration of the Interim Order, provided the Final Order had not taken effect; (v) the conversion to chapter 7; (vi) dismissal of the chapter 11 case; the date of the 363 Asset Sale; and (vii) the date a plan or reorganization or liquidation became effective.).

473 Id.

474 Id. at 18–19.

475 Id. at 22.

476 Id.

477 Id.

478 Id. at 23.

479 Id.
of the Bankruptcy Code, 480 Section 364(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code, 481 and Section 364(c)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code. 482 “The DIP Liens and the Adequate Protection Liens” were not subordinate to any lien that was avoidable under Section 551 of the Bankruptcy Code or “any intercompany or affiliate liens” of the Debtors. 483 The purpose of these liens was to guarantee to the DIP Agent that their interests are protected beyond those of any other creditor.

X. Carve-Out

A carve out is a provision within a DIP facility that protects the interests of all retained professionals for a chapter 11 case. In effect, it is a concession by the DIP lender that the Debtor’s and Committee’s counsel and other professionals must be paid in order for the case to move forward, and the lender agrees that the carve out amount from the loan proceeds can be used to pay the professionals their allowed fees and expenses. Due to the superiority liens that come with a motion for DIP financing, there is an increased likelihood that these professionals may not otherwise recover for their work. 484 Increasingly required by courts, a carve-out preserves a form of payment to these professionals despite the presence of a multi-layer lien protection in favor of the DIP lender. 485 In this case, once a DIP Agent provided written notice of an Event of Default, “the DIP Liens, DIP Superpriority Claims, Adequate Protection Superpriority Claims, Adequate Protection Liens, and Pre-Petition Liens [would] be subject to” fees for the clerk of the Bankruptcy Court and to the Office of the United States Trustee and the documented, unpaid fees incurred by

480 Id. (These liens have a “first priority, senior priming” status on all DIP Collateral and are subordinate only to any liens on Pre-Petition Collateral.); see also 11 U.S.C. § 364(d) [https://perma.cc/XUB9-XHVB].

481 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at at 24 (These liens are a “junior, perfected, ‘silent second’ lien and security interest [on] . . . all DIP Collateral.”); see also 11 U.S.C. § 364(c)(3) [https://perma.cc/XUB9-XHVB].

482 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at 24 (These lines are “a continuing, enforceable, first priority, fully-perfected lien and security interest [on] . . . all DIP Collateral.”); see also 11 U.S.C. § 364(c)(2) [https://perma.cc/XUB9-XHVB].

483 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at 25.


485 Id.
retained Professionals. The payment to these Professionals could not exceed $250,000. Additionally, any money or collateral secured under the DIP contract could not be used for any claims related to a party with a secured interest.

Provided there had not been a Carve-Out Trigger, the Debtors were permitted to pay expenses under Section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code. These payments will not reduce the Carve-Out. Once there has been a Carve-Out Trigger, any amounts paid will reduce the Carve-Out dollar-for-dollar.

XI. Protection of DIP Lenders’ Rights

If there were any outstanding DIP Facility Loans, DIP Obligations, or obligations under the DIP Credit Agreement, then the Pre-Petition Secured Parties were not permitted to attempt to foreclose or recover their liens or exercise rights with the DIP Collateral. Further, the Pre-Petition Secured Parties would “be deemed to have consented to any release of DIP Collateral authorized under the DIP Loan Documents.” Also, the Pre-Petition Secured Parties could not “take any action to perfect their security interests in the DIP Collateral,” unless the DIP Agent filed to perfect their liens under the Interim Order. Finally, they could not “terminate or modify the use of Cash Collateral.”

XII. Permitted Third-Party Indebtedness

---

486 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at 32.
487 Id. at 33.
488 Id. at 34. These expenses include the “reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services . . . and reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses.” 11 U.S.C. § 330(a) [https://perma.cc/Z682-WBMT].
489 DIP Financing Interim Order, supra note 444, 76.pdf at 34.
490 Id. at 37.
491 Id.
492 Id.
493 Id.
The Debtors were permitted to incur “senior secured, superpriority debtor-in-possession indebtedness in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $10,000,000.” This indebtedness could obtain superpriority administrative claim status and could only be secured with all of “Weinstein Television LLC’s right, title, and interest in . . . all personal property and other assets” (“Permitted Third-Party DIP Collateral”).

XIII. Asset Disposition

Per the DIP Credit Agreement, and subject to both the Court’s authorization and satisfaction of Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens, Debtors paid to the DIP Agent all proceeds resulting from the sale, lease, or disposition of DIP Collateral. With that, any proceeds related to the Pre-Petition Collateral were placed in the Collection Account and subjected to Monthly Adequate Protection Payments.

XIV. 506(c) Waiver

Once the Final Order was entered, the Debtors irrevocably waived the ability to assert any claim under Section 506(c) of the Bankruptcy Code for costs related to the “preservation, protection, or enhancement of . . . the DIP Secured Parties or the Pre-Petition Secured Parties.” Upon the entry of Final Order, the Secured Lending Entities would not be “subject to the equitable doctrine of ‘marshaling’ . . . with respect to the DIP Collateral or the Pre-Petition Collateral.”

The doctrine of marshaling is applicable when “two or more creditors claim against one debtor and the first creditor can reach two properties held by the debtor where the second can only reach one.” One essential element is that a senior secured creditor has a right to all of the

494 *Id.* at 38.
495 *Id.*
496 *Id.*
497 *Id.*
498 *Id.* at 39.
499 *Id.*
They must exhaust all assets or funds in one piece of collateral before moving on to the next assets, thus allowing the junior secured creditor an opportunity to enforce its claim against those assets. DIP Lenders in this case, therefore, wanted to avoid losing their senior priority over the DIP Collateral.

**XVI. Automatic Effectiveness of Liens**

Once the DIP Financing Interim Order was entered, the DIP Liens and Adequate Protection Liens were “valid, perfected, enforceable, nonavoidable and effective by operation of law, and not subject to challenge.”

**XVII. Automatic Stay**

Once the DIP Financing Interim Order was entered, all applicable automatic stay provisions were vacated so that the DIP Secured Parties could exercise their rights against the Debtors without being barred until the end of the bankruptcy. Therefore, if the Debtors defaulted in any way, those parties could seek immediate remedies.

**XVIII. Credit Bid**

The Bankruptcy Code permits a holder of a secured claim to credit bid at a 363 Asset Sale of its collateral. In other words, when an asset is being sold that is subject to a lien, the creditor may use the amount of that claim as part of the offer of the purchase price of such property.

---


502 *Id.*

503 *Id.* at 40–41 (The permitted remedies included: (i) termination of the Debtors use of Cash Collateral; (ii) ability to declare all DIP Obligations immediately due; (iii) ability to charge the default rate of interest; (iv) ability to freeze the Debtors’ accounts; (v) ability to set off any and all amounts in the Debtors’ accounts; and (vi) ability to take any other actions or exercise any other rights.).

504 11 U.S.C. § 363(k) [https://perma.cc/LJC9-S3J8].

505 *Id.*
Here, the DIP Agent was permitted to credit bid the amount of all DIP Obligations in any 363 Asset Sale, a plan of reorganization or liquidation, or a sale by a chapter 7 trustee.\textsuperscript{506}

Subject to the Code, the Pre-Petition Agent could also credit bid any remaining Pre-Petition Obligations in any Asset Sale, provided all DIP Obligations, Third-Party Pre-Petition Liens, and any Additional Permitted DIP Liens are satisfied.\textsuperscript{507}

**Final Order**

**I. Approval and Ratification of Orders**

The Final Order was approved and became effective immediately.\textsuperscript{508} “The terms and conditions of the Interim Order . . . are hereby ratified and confirmed on a final basis.”\textsuperscript{509}

**II. Authorization to Borrow DIP Facility Loans and Use Cash Collateral**

The DIP Borrowers were authorized to borrow up to $25,000,000 under the DIP Facility.\textsuperscript{510} Additionally, the Debtors placed in a reserve “all payments received pursuant to that License and Amendment Agreement” entered by and between Anchor Bar Entertainment, LLC and Debtors on December 4, 2014 (“Anchor Bay Cash Collateral”).\textsuperscript{511}

**III. Carve-Out**

The maximum amount applicable to Carve-Out expenses was increased to $500,000 under the Final Order.\textsuperscript{512}

---

\textsuperscript{506} DIP Financing Interim Order, *supra* note 444, 76.pdf at 45.

\textsuperscript{507} *Id.*

\textsuperscript{508} Final Order (I) Authorizing the Debtors to (A) Obtain Postpetition Financing Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105, 361, 362, 363(c), 363(e), 364(c), 364(d)(1) and 364(e) and (B) Utilize Cash Collateral of Pre-Petition Secured Entities, (II) Granting Adequate Protection to Pre-Petition Secured Entities, and (III) Granting Related Relief 267.pdf at 20, *In re The Weinstein Company Holdings LLC, et al.*, No. 18-10601 (filed Apr. 19, 2018).

\textsuperscript{509} *Id.*

\textsuperscript{510} *Id.* at 21.

\textsuperscript{511} *Id.*

\textsuperscript{512} *Id.* at 40.
IV. Stalking Horse Bid

If the Stalking Horse Bid was determined to be the best bid and was supported by the Committee, then the Committee will have waived “any right to challenge a sale pursuant to such bid.”

V. Guild Liens

The DIP Lenders recognize that “the Directors Guild of America, Inc., the Screen Actors Guild – American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, and the Writers Guild of America West, Inc. assert a first lien” on certain assets of TWCH. These liens are Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens and are Permitted Priority Liens.

VI. Technicolor Liens

The DIP Lenders recognize that “Technicolor USA, Inc. and its affiliates assert a priority possessory lien and related rights under Cal. Civ. Code § 3051 and Cal. Comm. Code § 9333” on everything deposited with Technicolor as collateral for amounts owed. These liens were Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens and were Permitted Priority Liens.

VII. PFC Liens

The DIP Lenders recognize that “PFC asserts that it has Pre-Petition Third-Party Liens” as collateral for debts owed to PFC. These liens were Permitted Priority Liens.

513 Id. at 54.
514 Id. at 55.
515 Id.
516 Id.
517 Id. at 56.
518 Id.
CONVERSION TO CHAPTER 7

Under the Bankruptcy Rules, a debtor “may convert out of chapter 11 and into chapter 7 at any time, with three exceptions...[they] cannot convert if:

(i) [H]e is not a DIP (i.e., if a trustee has been appointed);
(ii) [T]he case was begun as an involuntary 11; or
(iii) [T]he case was converted to 11 other than at the request of the debtor.”

Specifically, after the Debtors sold substantially all of its assets to Lantern Entertainment, they moved for an order of conversion and sought approval of “[the] Procedures for the conversion of the Debtors’ chapter 11 cases.” The conversion procedures included provisions that detailed how professionals would seek final compensation, provided for the dissolution of the unsecured creditors committee, and listed the number of clerical and administrative steps the Debtors would take when sending information to the chapter 7 trustee.

519 BANKRUPTCY IN PRACTICE, Supra note 289 at 138; see also § 1112(a)(1)-(3).


521 Id. at 9-11. (“(a) Professional Fees. To the extent applicable, professionals retained in the chapter 11 cases (excluding professionals retained in the ordinary course of business pursuant to the Order Authorizing the Debtors to Employ and Compensate Professionals Utilized in the Ordinary Course of Business, Effective Nunc Pro Tunc to the Petition Date [Docket No. 253]) shall submit final fee applications (the “Final Fee Applications”) in accordance with the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rules, Local Rules, and orders of this Court by no later than 14 days after the Conversion Date (the “Final Fee Application Deadline”). The Court will schedule a hearing, at the Court’s convenience, on such Final Fee Applications on or before the date that is 28 days after the Final Fee Application Deadline. All approved amounts owed for professionals’ fees and expenses shall be paid (x) first, from each professional’s retainer, to the extent such retainers exist; and thereafter (y) from the Debtors’ chapter 7 estates.

(b) The Committee. On the Conversion Date, the Committee shall be immediately dissolved, and all professionals retained by the Committee shall be immediately discharged, with no further action required by the Debtors or the Committee.

(c) Books and Records. As soon as reasonably practicable, but in no event more than fourteen (14) days after the assumption of duties by the chapter 7 trustee, the Debtors shall turn over to the chapter 7 trustee the books and records of the Debtors in the Debtors’ possession and control, as required by Bankruptcy Rule 1019(4). For purposes hereof, the Debtors may provide copies (including electronic copies) of such books and records to the chapter 7 trustee, or instructions for locating and accessing such books and records, and may retain copies of such books and records to the extent necessary to complete the reports required herein.

(d) Lists and Schedules. To the extent not already filed with the Court, within 14 days of the Conversion Date, the Debtors shall file the statements and schedules required by Bankruptcy Rules 1019(1)(A) and 1007(b).

(e) Schedule of Unpaid Debts. Within 14 days of the Conversion Date, the Debtors shall file a schedule of unpaid debts incurred after commencement of the Debtors’ chapter 11 cases, including the name and address of each creditor, as required by Bankruptcy Rule 1019(5).

(f) Final Report. Within thirty (30) days after the Conversion Date, the Debtors shall file and transmit to the chapter 7 trustee a final report and account in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 1019(5)(A).

(g) Claims. Within 14 days of the Conversion Date, Epiq shall (i) forward to the Clerk of this Court an electronic version of all imaged claims; (ii) upload the creditor mailing list into CM/ECF; (iii) docket a final claims register in the Debtors’ chapter 11 cases; and (iv) box and transport all original claims to the Philadelphia Federal Records Center,
TWC also defended the case for conversion based on three rationales including (1) that there was not enough liquidity to ultimately confirm a chapter 11 plan, (2) that TWC had sold substantially all of its assets and that it no longer maintained a viable business, (3) and that chapter 7 would ultimately provide the best method for prosecuting director & officer claims for the benefit of all creditors.  

**Objections & Responses**

In response to the Debtor’s motion, High Technology Video objected to the conversion motion in principle, the Estate of Harold Jensen reserved its right to receive “rightful holdings” but declined to outright object, and MUFG Union Bank filed a Reservation of Rights “in order to highlight certain issues relating to the administration of the Debtors’ estates that will need to be addressed regardless of whether the Conversion Motion is granted.” None of the reservations, or the unsupported High Technology Video objection, prevented the case from being converted for liquidation.

---

14470 Townsend Road, Philadelphia, PA 19154 and docket a completed SF-135 Form indicating the accession and location numbers of the archived claims.

522 *Id.* at 12–13.

523 Objection to Debtors' Motion for an Order (I) Converting their Chapter 11 Cases to Cases Under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code and (II) Granting Related Relief. (related document(s)2357) [Filed by High Technology Video, Inc (LAM), In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 19, 2018) [hereinafter “High Technology Video Objection”] (This particular objection simply stated that the party “objected” without supporting documentation or a declaration.).

524 Response to Debtors' Motion for an Order (I) Converting their Chapter 11 Cases to Cases Under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code and (II) Granting Related Relief. (related document(s)2357) [Filed by Harold Jensen (LAM), In re The Weinstein Co., No. 18-10601 (Bankr. D. Del. Filed Mar. 19, 2018) [hereinafter “Reservation Rights of Estate of Harold Jensen”].

HARVEY WEINSTEIN’S FALLOUT

A Timeline of Events

After the New York Times initially broke the stories of Harvey Weinstein and his sexual misconduct, investigations began both in the United States and the United Kingdom. Days apart in November and December of 2017, civil actions were filed in the United Kingdom and New York. One of these was a class action from six women, who sought to represent “hundreds of other women” that Weinstein allegedly preyed upon. Then in February of 2018, New York state prosecutors filed a lawsuit against The Weinstein Company after a four-month investigation indicated that the company “failed to protect employees from his alleged harassment and abuse.” Despite his lawyer asserting that the allegations were “legally defective or factually not supported,” Weinstein turned himself into New York Police on May 25, 2018, and was charged with rape and sexual abuse. A grand jury indicted Weinstein, which lead to him pleading not guilty in front of the New York Supreme Court. In June of 2018, a third case was brought against Weinstein, in which he pleaded not guilty. On October 11, 2018, Weinstein had one of six sexual assault charges dropped due to a victim giving conflicting stories. On January 9, 2019, another victim had her lawsuit dismissed because “the allegation did not fall within the scope of the statute she sued under.”

---


527 Weinstein Timeline, supra note 525 [https://perma.cc/4AE3-JH5Y].


529 Weinstein Timeline, supra note 525 [https://perma.cc/4AE3-JH5Y].

530 Id.

531 Id.

532 Id.

533 Id.

534 Id.
The Settlement

On May 24, 2019, CNBC reported that Weinstein, in his personal capacity, reached a “tentative $44 million deal to settle civil lawsuits.” 535 This amount would be paid by insurance policies, $30 million of which would go to the victims with the rest going towards legal fees. 536

In March of 2020, seven women wrote a letter to New York Attorney General Letitia James in opposition to the proposed settlement. 537 Their main contention with the settlement was that it “is insulting to all of the survivors in that it represents a small fraction of what should be paid by Mr. Weinstein, his former directors and officers, and large multibillion-dollar insurance companies.” 538 Additionally, they took issue with the fact that a significant portion of the settlement will go to lawyers of the Weinstein brothers and other multi-millionaires. 539


538 Id.

539 Id.
### Schedule A – Compensation

#### First Omnibus Compensation Order\(^{540}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3/30/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$962,299.00</td>
<td>$5,722.63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Layton</td>
<td>3/19/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$1,985,197.50</td>
<td>$59,633.55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>3/19/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$6,926,274.50</td>
<td>$145,886.99</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski Stang</td>
<td>3/28/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$2,106,125.00</td>
<td>$72,934.22</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%, less the amount for reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Moelis Final Compensation\(^{541}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/19/18 – 7/13/18</td>
<td>$7,200,806.46</td>
<td>$63,562.40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


## Second Omnibus Compensation Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>7/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$623,505.50</td>
<td>$17,372.89</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Layton</td>
<td>7/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$614,672.50</td>
<td>$19,844.78</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>7/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$1,686,503.00</td>
<td>$14,410.44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski Stang</td>
<td>7/1/18 – 6/30/18</td>
<td>$874,887.75</td>
<td>$24,290.28</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>6/19/18/ - 9/30/18</td>
<td>$331,557.50</td>
<td>$3,525.30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withum</td>
<td>6/18/18 – 9/30/18</td>
<td>$323,067.00</td>
<td>$430.15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Third Omnibus Compensation Order[^543]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$162,045.50</td>
<td>$2,732.41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$450,540.50</td>
<td>$8,808.21</td>
<td>$1,125.00</td>
<td>100%, less the amount of reduction</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$605,255.00</td>
<td>$6,904.83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$589,018.75</td>
<td>$2,444.98</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$310,780.50</td>
<td>$619.88</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withum</td>
<td>10/1/18 – 12/31/18</td>
<td>$8,871.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fourth Omnibus Compensation Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski</td>
<td>1/1/19 –</td>
<td>$554,565.25</td>
<td>$29,197.86</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stang</td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski</td>
<td>4/1/19 –</td>
<td>$310,596.50</td>
<td>$8,156.48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stang</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth</td>
<td>1/1/19 –</td>
<td>$120,664.00</td>
<td>$21.54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth</td>
<td>4/1/19 –</td>
<td>$79,343.50</td>
<td>$473.41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>1/1/19 –</td>
<td>$146,277.50</td>
<td>$24.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>4/1/19 –</td>
<td>$172,765.50</td>
<td>$1,930.18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1/1/19 –</td>
<td>$315,621.00</td>
<td>$6,230.90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards</td>
<td>4/1/19 –</td>
<td>$220,940.00</td>
<td>$3,497.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>1/1/19 –</td>
<td>$193,299.50</td>
<td>$717.64</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>4/1/19 –</td>
<td>$294,114.50</td>
<td>$2,854.93</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withum</td>
<td>10/1/18 –</td>
<td>$119,181.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Fifth Omnibus Compensation Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Approved Fees</th>
<th>Approved Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>7/1/19 – 9/30/19</td>
<td>$87,217.00</td>
<td>$159.14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Layton</td>
<td>7/1/19 – 9/30/19</td>
<td>$116,930.00</td>
<td>$991.81</td>
<td>$23.91 Expenses</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%, less the amount of expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth Shaw</td>
<td>7/1/19 – 9/30/19</td>
<td>$59,779.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>7/1/19 – 9/30/19</td>
<td>$70,035.50</td>
<td>$141.61</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachulski Stang</td>
<td>7/1/19 – 9/30/19</td>
<td>$160,672.50</td>
<td>$3,325.03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>