

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

APRIL/MAY 2022

EDITOR'S NOTE: IN THE COURTS

Victoria Prussen Spears

THIRD CIRCUIT LETS THE KATZ OUT OF THE BAG: NO SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY FOR CALIFORNIA IN THE POST-CONFIRMATION VENOCO DISPUTE

Ronit J. Berkovich and Austin Crabtree

SIXTH CIRCUIT HOLDS STATE COURT TAX FORECLOSURE SUBJECT TO FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ATTACK

Michael L. Cook

MORTGAGEES HOLDING LIENS AGAINST CHAPTER 13 DEBTOR'S PRIMARY RESIDENCE COULD BE SUBJECT TO PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR NOTICE VIOLATIONS

Michelle Badolato and Deborah A. Reperowitz

DRIVING WHILE UNIMPAIRED: DELAWARE JUDGE ISSUES IMPORTANT RULING IN *HERTZ* CHAPTER 11 CASE ON TREATMENT OF UNIMPAIRED CREDITORS, ALLOWANCE OF MAKE-WHOLE PREMIUMS AND POSTPETITION INTEREST

Benjamin D. Feder

BANKRUPTCY COURT HOLDS DEBTOR-ASSIGNOR IS NOT OFF THE HOOK FOR PRE- AND POST-ASSIGNMENT DAMAGES UNDER LEASE ASSIGNED PRE-BANKRUPTCY BECAUSE LANDLORD NEVER GRANTED A RELEASE

Patrick J. Potter, Claire K. Wu and Kwame O. Akuffo

VALIDITY OF NON-CONSENSUAL THIRD-PARTY RELEASES CALLED INTO QUESTION IN PURDUE BANKRUPTCY – BUT FOR HOW LONG?

Douglas S. Mintz, Kristine Manoukian, Peter J. Amend, and Kelly (Bucky) Knight

J&J TALC LAWSUITS TRANSFERRED TO NEW JERSEY – A LOOK INTO THE TEXAS TWO-STEP MANEUVER

Douglas S. Mintz and Kelly (Bucky) Knight

THERANOS: THE LIMITS OF THE “FAKE IT TILL YOU MAKE IT” STRATEGY

Carrie H. Cohen, James M. Koukios, Christine Y. Wong, and Sophie H. Cash

THE HONG KONG APPROACH WHERE DEBTORS LODGE A PETITION FOR THEIR OWN BANKRUPTCY – HOW TO PREVENT ABUSE OF PROCESS

Glenn Haley and Carrie Yiu



LexisNexis

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 3

April–May 2022

Editor's Note: In the Courts Victoria Prussen Spears	107
Third Circuit Lets the <i>Katz</i> Out of the Bag: No Sovereign Immunity for California in the Post-Confirmation <i>Venoco</i> Dispute Ronit J. Berkovich and Austin Crabtree	110
Sixth Circuit Holds State Court Tax Foreclosure Subject to Fraudulent Transfer Attack Michael L. Cook	115
Mortgagees Holding Liens Against Chapter 13 Debtor's Primary Residence Could Be Subject to Punitive Damages for Notice Violations Michelle Badolato and Deborah A. Reperowitz	119
Driving While Unimpaired: Delaware Judge Issues Important Ruling in <i>Hertz</i> Chapter 11 Case on Treatment of Unimpaired Creditors, Allowance of Make-Whole Premiums and Postpetition Interest Benjamin D. Feder	122
Bankruptcy Court Holds Debtor-Assignor Is Not Off the Hook for Pre- and Post-Assignment Damages Under Lease Assigned Pre-Bankruptcy Because Landlord Never Granted a Release Patrick J. Potter, Claire K. Wu and Kwame O. Akuffo	128
Validity of Non-Consensual Third-Party Releases Called into Question in Purdue Bankruptcy—But for How Long? Douglas S. Mintz, Kristine Manoukian, Peter J. Amend and Kelly (Bucky) Knight	132
J&J Talc Lawsuits Transferred to New Jersey—A Look into the Texas Two-Step Maneuver Douglas S. Mintz and Kelly (Bucky) Knight	137
Theranos: The Limits of the “Fake It Till You Make It” Strategy Carrie H. Cohen, James M. Koukios, Christine Y. Wong and Sophie H. Cash	142
The Hong Kong Approach Where Debtors Lodge A Petition for Their Own Bankruptcy—How to Prevent Abuse of Process Glenn Haley and Carrie Yiu	146

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

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

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at 513.257.9021
Email: ryan.kearns@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

Example: Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SCOTT L. BAENA

Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP

ANDREW P. BROZMAN

Clifford Chance US LLP

MICHAEL L. COOK

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

MARK G. DOUGLAS

Jones Day

MARK J. FRIEDMAN

DLA Piper

STUART I. GORDON

Rivkin Radler LLP

PATRICK E. MEARS

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

The Hong Kong Approach Where Debtors Lodge A Petition for Their Own Bankruptcy—How to Prevent Abuse of Process

*By Glenn Haley and Carrie Yiu**

In this article, the authors discuss a recent decision that dismissed four debtors' petitions on the ground that they constituted an abuse of process.

If a person presents a petition for their own bankruptcy (“self-petition”), are there any safeguards to ensure that the self-petition is genuine, as opposed to a cynical device by the person to buy themselves time to pay, or to give themselves some negotiating position with their creditors?

This interesting question was considered in a recent Hong Kong judgment.

On December 6, 2021, at a hearing of four debtors’ petitions (with the neutral citation [2021] HKCFI 3732),¹ the court dismissed each of the self-petitions on the ground that they constituted an abuse of process.

On December 10, 2021, the court gave its reasons for judgment, and the judgment gives helpful guidance as to the likely judicial approach when dealing with self-petitions in the future.

BRIEF FACTS

The court considered four debtors’ petitions which shared a similar fact pattern (*Re So Tsz Man* (HCB 7033/2020), *Re Lee Wing* (HCB 7299/2020), *Re Tam Wai Yiu* (HCB 7569/2020) and *Re Qiu Wenjun* (HCB 3930/2021)):

1. Each of the debtors had presented a self-petition for their own bankruptcy on the ground that they were unable to pay their debts.
2. Prior to the hearing on December 6, 2021, numerous hearings had been scheduled before a Master. However, the debtors had failed to attend some to all of these hearings. This was despite the warning letters issued by the court informing them that failure to attend the next hearing would result in the dismissal of the petition.
3. Each of the debtors filed numerous affirmations stating that they had been discussing debt restructuring proposals with their creditors and

* Glenn Haley is a partner in the Hong Kong office of Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP. Carrie Yiu is an associate in the firm’s office in Hong Kong. The authors may be contacted at glenn.haley@bclplaw.com and carrie.yiu@bclplaw.com, respectively.

¹ https://legalref.judiciary.hk/lrs/common/ju/ju_frame.jsp?DIS=140873&currpage=T.

asked for an adjournment of the petition so as to discuss the proposals with the creditors.

4. When asked by the court, each of the debtors confirmed that they did not want a bankruptcy order to be issued against them.
5. Each of the debtors confirmed, when quizzed by the court, that their creditors had not pressed them to make any repayment after the presentation of the petition.
6. Upon the court's enquiry with each of the debtors, it became apparent that they had been told by persons who allegedly have some knowledge of bankruptcy proceedings that by presenting the self-petitions, they could achieve what in effect is a moratorium with the creditors, because the creditors would not be able to require the debtors to repay the debts pending determination of the petitions.

LAW REGARDING GROUNDS FOR PRESENTING A SELF-PETITION

Section 10 of the Bankruptcy Ordinance (Cap. 6) ("BO") provides as follows:

Grounds of debtor's petition

1. A debtor's petition may be presented to the court only on the ground that the debtor is unable to pay his debts.
2. The petition shall be accompanied by a statement of the debtor's affairs containing—
 1. such particulars of the debtor's creditors and of his debts and other liabilities and of his assets as may be prescribed; and
 2. such other information as may be prescribed.
3. A debtor's petition may be presented whether or not the aggregate amount of indebtedness is equal to or exceeds the amount provided for a creditor's petition under section 6(2)(a).

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A SELF-PETITION

The court emphasized that presenting a self-petition is a serious matter.

When filing a debtor's petition for bankruptcy, the debtor is required to complete:

1. A "Debtor's Bankruptcy Petition" on Form 3 of Bankruptcy (Forms) Rules (Cap. 6B) ("Forms Rules"), which requires the debtor to (i) state

that they “request the court that a bankruptcy order be made against [them]” and (ii) sign the petition in the presence of a witness.

2. A “Statement of Affairs (Debtor’s Petition)” on Form 28C of the Forms Rules, which must be verified by an affidavit.

These procedural requirements under the Forms Rules are designed to ensure that a debtor presents a petition to seek a bankruptcy order only if they (1) are unable to pay a debt, and (2) genuinely wish to seek a bankruptcy order.

PURPOSE OF SECTION 10 OF THE BO

The statutory purpose of Section 10 of the BO is to permit an insolvent debtor to invoke the bankruptcy jurisdiction where they are unable to pay their debts. By invoking the bankruptcy jurisdiction, however, the debtor gives up all their property in return for being freed from the burdens of their debts and, upon discharge from bankruptcy, to make a clean start.

The statutory scheme of bankruptcy is designed to avoid multiple executions and other forms of enforcement against the debtor’s assets, so as to ensure that all creditors will be dealt with fairly and equitably through the bankruptcy process, and to achieve a fair and orderly distribution of the debtor’s assets amongst their creditors.

COURT’S POWER TO DISMISS A BANKRUPTCY PETITION

Section 5(3) of the BO provides that the court has a general power to dismiss or stay a petition “if it appears to it appropriate to do so on the grounds that there has been a contravention of rules or for any other reason.”

The court in *Re So Tsz Man* indicated that the court should dismiss a self-petition as an abuse of process if it is shown that the debtor is able to pay their debts.

COURT’S JUDGMENT

In the present case, the court said it was clear that the debtors did not intend to seek genuinely a bankruptcy order from the court. Instead, they used self-petitions as “the means to suspend their obligations to make repayment of the debts and to negotiate with the creditors on the terms of repayment.”

The court emphasized that, it is not open to a debtor to make a request for a bankruptcy order in the self-petition if they do not in fact intend to seek the order when the petition comes to be heard by the court. If a debtor does not wish the court to make a bankruptcy order against him, they should not present

a self-petition in the first place. Further, it is not the function of a self-petition to allow a debtor to achieve a moratorium with their creditors. The debtor is free to negotiate with their creditors, and does not need to maintain a self-petition to carry on such negotiations.

The court regarded it was an abuse of process for a debtor to present a self-petition but then to seek to postpone the determination of the petition by not attending the scheduled hearing(s) or by asking for an adjournment for the purpose of negotiating with their creditors.

As a result, the court in *Re So Tsz Man* dismissed each of the four self-petitions for being abusive of the court's process.

COURT'S FUTURE APPROACH ON SELF-PETITIONS

The court expressed the view that it is a matter of concern that many debtors had chosen to present a self-petition, which process comes at a not insignificant cost to the debtor, including:

- A deposit to the Official Receiver pursuant to Rule 52(1)(a) of the Bankruptcy Rules (Cap. 6A) (currently at \$8,000);
- A filing fee of \$1,045 to the court; and
- Other fees which may be charged by the agents or solicitors for assisting the debtor in the preparation and filing of the petition and the statement of affairs.

To ensure that in future debtors will not be misled by others as to the proper purpose of self-petitions, and to prevent further abuse of process, the court (save in exceptional circumstances) is likely to adopt the following approach in dealing with self-petitions:

1. If a debtor does not attend the scheduled hearing before a Master, the Master will adjourn the petition to the bankruptcy judge for dismissal for want of prosecution.
2. The court will not allow an adjournment of the petition simply on the ground that the debtor needs more time to negotiate with their creditors.
3. At the hearing before the bankruptcy judge, if the debtor does not attend the hearing, the petition will be dismissed for want of prosecution and/or abuse of process.
4. If the debtor attends the hearing before the bankruptcy judge and informs the court that they do not wish to seek a bankruptcy order, the petition will be dismissed for abuse of process.

In all of the above scenarios, the costs of the Official Receiver will be borne by the debtor and be paid out of the deposit. The court reminded debtors who do not wish to seek a bankruptcy order that it will be to their advantage to withdraw the self-petition at the hearing before Master so as to minimize the costs payable to the Official Receiver.

ORO'S ANNOUNCEMENT

On December 10, 2021 (the same day as the handing down of the reasons for judgment in *Re So Tsz Man*), the Official Receiver's Office ("ORO") announced an "Important Notice for Petitioner in Bankruptcy Proceedings." The ORO reminded, among others, debtors in self-petition cases and their legal representatives of their duties to ensure their bankruptcy petitions are prosecuted efficiently and expeditiously. Their duties include but are not limited to the following:

1. Attending the petition hearing and adjourned hearings (if any) at the appointed date and time;
2. Communicating proactively with the court on matters regarding the petition;
3. Responding in a timely way to any requisitions that may be raised by the court from time to time; and
4. Proceeding with the petition efficiently and applying for adjournment only where circumstances fully justify.

The ORO further reminded potential self-petitioners and their advisers that any petitions presented that (a) are not in compliance with the relevant requirements, or (b) amount to an abuse of process (e.g., the bankruptcy proceedings being invoked in an improper manner or for an improper purpose such as using it as a means for negotiation with creditors) are liable to be dismissed by the court with costs ordered against the debtors in self-petition cases.

Re So Tsz Man, together with the ORO's announcement, serve as a timely and important reminder that the self-petition is a tool which can be employed only under specific conditions. Debtors should obtain proper legal advice before presenting a self-petition to avoid dismissal of the petition and adverse costs consequence.