

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

June 2025

Editor's Note: Courts Rule
Victoria Prussen Spears

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Holds That Gatekeeping and Injunction Provisions in Bankruptcy Plans Cannot Shield Non-Debtors From Liability
Douglas Mintz, Casey Servais and Thomas Curtin

Federal District Court Finds Consumer Wire Transfers Are Subject to the Electronic Fund Transfer Act
Eric Hail, Ted Huffman, Christina Grigorian and Asena Baran

American Tire: Rubber Hits the Road in Non-Ratable Chapter 11 Liability Management Transaction
Lynne B. Xerras and Faisal Kraziem

U.S. Small Business Administration Loans: Benefits for Lenders and Borrowers
Peter Brockmeyer and Sanjana Pai

FinCEN Issues Order Imposing New Obligations on Money Services Businesses Operating Along the U.S. Southwest Border
Deborah S. Thoren-Peden, Aaron R. Hutman, Craig J. Saperstein, Brian H. Montgomery and Daniel C. Wood

Achieving Financial Stability and Resilience: How China Could Learn from the United States and the United Kingdom in Building a Financial Safety Net – Part III
Lerong Lu and Ci Ren



LexisNexis

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 142

NUMBER 6

June 2025

Editor's Note: Courts Rule Victoria Prussen Spears	241
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Holds That Gatekeeping and Injunction Provisions in Bankruptcy Plans Cannot Shield Non-Debtors From Liability Douglas Mintz, Casey Servais and Thomas Curtin	243
Federal District Court Finds Consumer Wire Transfers Are Subject to the Electronic Fund Transfer Act Eric Hail, Ted Huffman, Christina Grigorian and Asena Baran	247
American Tire: Rubber Hits the Road in Non-Ratable Chapter 11 Liability Management Transaction Lynne B. Xerras and Faisal Kraziem	251
U.S. Small Business Administration Loans: Benefits for Lenders and Borrowers Peter Brockmeyer and Sanjana Pai	258
FinCEN Issues Order Imposing New Obligations on Money Services Businesses Operating Along the U.S. Southwest Border Deborah S. Thoren-Peden, Aaron R. Hutman, Craig J. Saperstein, Brian H. Montgomery and Daniel C. Wood	262
Achieving Financial Stability and Resilience: How China Could Learn from the United States and the United Kingdom in Building a Financial Safety Net – Part III Lerong Lu and Ci Ren	268

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

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

Matthew T. Burke at (800) 252-9257
Email: matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com

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

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

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)
ISBN: 978-0-7698-8020-4 (eBook)
ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)
ISSN: 2381-3512 (Online)

Cite this publication as:
The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

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.

The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, RELX, LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc., or any of its or their respective affiliates.

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 © 2025 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

CARLETON GOSS

Partner, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP

DOUGLAS LANDY

White & Case LLP

PAUL L. LEE

Of Counsel, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

MICHAEL D. LEWIS

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

TIMOTHY D. NAEGELE

Partner, Timothy D. Naegele & Associates

STEPHEN J. NEWMAN

Partner, Steptoe & Johnson LLP

ANDREW OLMEM

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. 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, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW, Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Holds That Gatekeeping and Injunction Provisions in Bankruptcy Plans Cannot Shield Non-Debtors From Liability

*By Douglas Mintz, Casey Servais and Thomas Curtin**

In this article, the authors review a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit that demonstrates that, at least in the Fifth Circuit, gatekeeping and injunction provisions cannot shield most non-debtors from liability.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has ruled in *In re Highland Capital Mgmt., L.P.*, that a plan's gatekeeping and injunction provisions could not extend to claims against most non-debtors or non-estate fiduciaries. The *Highland* decision demonstrates that, at least in the Fifth Circuit, gatekeeping and injunction provisions cannot shield most non-debtors from liability.

BACKGROUND

Highland Capital Management, previously a \$13 billion investment fund, filed for Chapter 11 protection in 2019. The unsecured creditors committee and the debtor's independent directors proposed a Chapter 11 plan that included three provisions intended to shield various parties from liability:

- First, the plan included an exculpation provision, which extinguished claims against the "Exculpated Parties" based on their actions in negotiating and implementing the plan, except for any acts that constitute bad faith, gross negligence, or willful misconduct. The plan defined "Exculpated Parties" to include the debtor, the unsecured creditors committee and its members, independent directors of the debtor, the litigation and claimant trusts, the debtor's chief restructuring officer, the debtor's general partner, professionals of the debtor and unsecured creditors committee, and related persons for each of the foregoing.
- Second, the plan included an injunction provision prohibiting holders of claims against or equity interests in the debtor from taking any "actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation" of the plan.
- Third, the plan included a "gatekeeper" clause, prohibiting creditors

* The authors, attorneys with Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP, may be contacted at douglas.mintz@cwt.com, casey.servais@cwt.com and thomas.curtin@cwt.com, respectively.

and equity holders from commencing or pursuing any claim arising from the Chapter 11 case against the “Protected Parties” (defined to include substantially the same entities as those included as “Exculpated Parties”) without first obtaining authorization from the bankruptcy court to pursue such claims. This “gatekeeper” provision provided that prior to commencing any such action, the bankruptcy court must first determine that the claims are colorable.

Various parties objected to the plan and challenged the exculpation, injunction, and gatekeeping provisions. The bankruptcy court confirmed the plan and overruled these objections.

In the initial appeal, the Fifth Circuit reversed confirmation “only insofar as the plan exculpates certain non-debtors in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 524(e)” and removed all non-debtor entities that were not estate fiduciaries from the scope of exculpation provisions.¹ As a result, the Fifth Circuit ordered that the plan was only to include the debtor, the debtor’s independent directors, the unsecured creditors committee and its members, and all related persons as “Exculpated Parties.” The court otherwise “affirm[ed] on all remaining grounds.”

The appellants – certain investment funds – subsequently moved for panel rehearing, requesting that the court clarify whether its holding applied to the definition of the term “Protected Parties” used in the plan’s injunction and gatekeeping provisions. The court granted rehearing, and deleted a sentence in its original opinion that stated that the “injunction and gatekeeper provisions are . . . perfectly lawful.”

Thereafter, the debtor amended the plan to strike the non-debtor entities from the “Exculpated Parties” defined term, but the debtor did not seek any amendments to the “Protected Parties” defined term. As such, the gatekeeping and injunction provisions continued to shield non-debtor entities from liability. The investment firms (who were appellants in the first appeal) again objected to the plan on the basis that the term “Protected Parties” impermissibly included non-debtor entities. The bankruptcy court again confirmed the plan over the investment firms’ objection. The bankruptcy court’s decision preceded the Supreme Court’s decision in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma*, which held that non consensual third party releases are impermissible. The investment firms appealed again.

THE FIFTH CIRCUIT’S DECISION

This time, the Fifth Circuit again reversed the bankruptcy court’s confirmation order, finding that the bankruptcy court exceeded its authority in

¹ See *In re Highland Capital Mgmt.*, 48 F.4th 419, 424 (5th Cir. 2022).

approving the plan's gatekeeping and injunction provisions. Citing the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma*, the Fifth Circuit found that the Bankruptcy Code "does not authorize a release and injunction that, as part of a plan of reorganization under Chapter 11, effectively seeks to discharge claims against a non-debtor without the consent of the affected claimants."

The Fifth Circuit also held that "bankruptcy injunctions, though not in themselves releases, similarly act to shield persons and entities from liability and therefore may not be entered to protect non-debtors not legally entitled to release." Moreover, even though Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code gives bankruptcy courts "a range of powers," the court found that those powers are not unlimited and must be consistent with the Bankruptcy Code. Under Section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code, "a discharge of a debt of the debtor" may not "affect the liability of any other entity on . . . such debt."

Even though the Fifth Circuit acknowledged that bankruptcy courts "have some power to perform gatekeeping functions," they do not have "unrestricted power to protect non-debtors from liability via a pre-filing injunction." According to the Fifth Circuit, permissible forms of gatekeeping include: (i) preventing a usurpation of the bankruptcy court's powers to distribute "trust assets to creditors equitably"; and (ii) shielding the bankruptcy trustee from personal liability for acts taken within the "scope of his official duties." But the Fifth Circuit found that this gatekeeping function should not be extended to "give bankruptcy courts gatekeeping power over claims against non-debtors."

The Fifth Circuit held that its first *Highland* decision required the "bankruptcy court to narrow the definition of 'Protected Parties' used in the Gatekeeper Clause coextensively with the definition of 'Exculpated Parties'" used in the plan's exculpation provision.

Specifically, the Fifth Circuit previously held that the plan violated Section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code "insofar as it exculpates *and enjoins* certain non-debtors." Finally, in granting rehearing, the Fifth Circuit specifically struck language in the initial *Highland* opinion suggesting the validity of the gatekeeper and injunction provisions. Thus, the "Protected Parties" could only include the debtor, independent directors, and the unsecured creditors committee and its members.

KEY TAKEAWAYS AND CONCLUSIONS

- In the aftermath of the *Purdue Pharma* decision in which the Supreme Court limited the scope of non-consensual third party releases, some speculated that plan injunction and gatekeeping provisions might provide a viable alternative to non-consensual third party releases. The *Highland* decision confirms that, at least in the Fifth Circuit, these non

release provisions cannot effectively shield most non-debtors from liability and may not function as a non-consensual third party release.

- The Fifth Circuit found that although a plan injunction is not itself a release, the injunction shields entities from liability in a similar fashion and therefore cannot extend to most non debtors.
- Bankruptcy courts in other circuits have recently confirmed plans that included gatekeeping provisions, which demonstrates that parties view these provisions as critical tools to control post-confirmation litigation. Recent examples include the Chapter 11 plans for BlockFi (in the New Jersey bankruptcy court) and Spirit Airlines (pending in the bankruptcy court for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York). Whether gatekeeping provisions will withstand scrutiny in other circuits remains to be seen.
- Parties may nevertheless seek to shield non-debtors through “opt-out” release provisions in a Chapter 11 plan. The Bankruptcy Court for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas recently approved “opt-out” provisions in the Container Store Group’s bankruptcy, which is currently on appeal.