

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JANUARY 2022

**EDITOR'S NOTE: BANKRUPTCY DEVELOPMENTS**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**UNDERSTANDING PAYMENT DISPUTES IN BANKRUPTCY BETWEEN PROJECT PARTICIPANTS DURING AND AFTER COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

James P. Chivilo, Richard A. Bixter and Gregory R. Meeder

**COURTS BEGIN INTERPRETING NEW DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR TRUSTEES BEFORE FILING PREFERENCE ACTIONS**

Gregory G. Hesse and Michael R. Horne

**SUBSTANTIVE CONSOLIDATION AND NON-CONSOLIDATION OPINIONS**

Kathryn M. Borgeson and Peter M. Dodson

**SECOND CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS RULES NON-QUALIFIED PRIVATE STUDENT LOANS ARE DISCHARGEABLE**

Benjamin Mintz and Brendan M. Gibbons

**"TEXAS TWO STEP" CREATES UNIQUE RESTRUCTURING OPPORTUNITY—BUT NOT WITHOUT CHALLENGES**

Jordan Chavez, Alex Kirincic and Cameron Scales

**ARIZONA SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERS HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION AND JUDGMENT LIEN RULES**

Gabriel M. Hartsell, W. Scott Jenkins, Jr., and Madison Stark

**SOVEREIGN DEBT RESTRUCTURINGS IN LATIN AMERICA: A NEW CHAPTER**

Ian Clark, Thomas MacWright, Brian D. Pfeiffer, Dimitrios Lyratzakis and Amanda Parra Criste

**THE NEW CROSS-BORDER ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN HONG KONG AND MAINLAND CHINA ON INSOLVENCY AND RESTRUCTURING MATTERS—A COMPARISON WITH CHAPTER 15 OF THE U.S. BANKRUPTCY CODE**

Naomi Moore, Abid Qureshi, Liz Osborne, Daniel Cohen, Jeremy Haywood and Jingli Jiang



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 1

January 2022

---

<b>Editor's Note: Bankruptcy Developments</b> Steven A. Meyerowitz	1
<b>Understanding Payment Disputes in Bankruptcy Between Project Participants During and After Completion of Construction Projects</b> James P. Chivilo, Richard A. Bixter and Gregory R. Meeder	4
<b>Courts Begin Interpreting New Due Diligence Requirements for Trustees Before Filing Preference Actions</b> Gregory G. Hesse and Michael R. Horne	10
<b>Substantive Consolidation and Non-Consolidation Opinions</b> Kathryn M. Borgeson and Peter M. Dodson	15
<b>Second Circuit Court of Appeals Rules Non-Qualified Private Student Loans Are Dischargeable</b> Benjamin Mintz and Brendan M. Gibbons	18
<b>"Texas Two Step" Creates Unique Restructuring Opportunity—But Not Without Challenges</b> Jordan Chavez, Alex Kirincic and Cameron Scales	21
<b>Arizona Significantly Alters Homestead Exemption and Judgment Lien Rules</b> Gabriel M. Hartsell, W. Scott Jenkins, Jr., and Madison Stark	24
<b>Sovereign Debt Restructurings in Latin America: A New Chapter</b> Ian Clark, Thomas MacWright, Brian D. Pfeiffer, Dimitrios Lyratzakis and Amanda Parra Criste	27
<b>The New Cross-Border Arrangement Between Hong Kong and Mainland China on Insolvency and Restructuring Matters—A Comparison with Chapter 15 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code</b> Naomi Moore, Abid Qureshi, Liz Osborne, Daniel Cohen, Jeremy Haywood and Jingli Jiang	39

## 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](http://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](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

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

# Substantive Consolidation and Non-Consolidation Opinions

*By Kathryn M. Borgeson and Peter M. Dodson\**

*In this article, the authors review the elements that should be included in a non-consolidation opinion delivered to the lender in a structured finance transaction by counsel for the special purpose entity.*

Substantive consolidation is an equitable remedy pursuant to which a bankruptcy court disregards the separate legal existence of a debtor, and pools the assets and liabilities of the debtor with one or more of its affiliates, in order to make distributions to creditors under a plan of reorganization or liquidation.

The Bankruptcy Code does not contain specific authorization for substantive consolidation. Instead, a bankruptcy court's authority to substantively consolidate affiliated entities is derived from its general equitable powers.

When affiliated entities are substantively consolidated, intercompany claims among those entities are eliminated, the assets of the consolidated entities are pooled, and the claims of creditors against each entity are treated as against the common pool of assets. Substantive consolidation typically benefits one entity's creditors at the expense of another entity's creditors because each of the entities being consolidated has a different debt-to-asset ratio.

Lenders in structured finance transactions often require their borrowers to be special purpose entities ("SPEs") to isolate the assets that are being financed, and the cash flow from those assets, from outside factors, such as the performance of other assets or the financial condition of the SPE's affiliates. Substantive consolidation of an SPE with one or more of its affiliates defeats the isolation of the SPE's assets, pulling them into a common distribution pool.

## HOW IT WORKS

To provide comfort as to the lender's interest in the assets being financed, and the cash flow from those assets, the lender in a structured finance transaction often requires a non-consolidation opinion to be delivered by the SPE's counsel at closing.

---

\* Kathryn M. Borgeson, special counsel in the Washington, D.C., office of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP, concentrates her practice in the areas of bankruptcy and structured finance. Peter M. Dodson, senior counsel in the firm's office in Washington, D.C., focuses his practice on the representation of lenders in connection with bankruptcy-remote commercial mortgage loan originations, commercial mortgage-backed securitizations and asset-backed securitizations. The authors may be contacted at [kathryn.borgeson@cwt.com](mailto:kathryn.borgeson@cwt.com) and [peter.dodson@cwt.com](mailto:peter.dodson@cwt.com), respectively.

A non-consolidation opinion states that if one or more parent entities of the SPE files for bankruptcy, the bankruptcy court would respect the separate legal existence of the SPE and would not order the substantive consolidation of the assets and liabilities of the SPE with those of one or more of its parent entities, guarantors or affiliated managers (such as an affiliated property manager).

The opinion confirms that the SPE structure required by the lender will be respected in bankruptcy, and that the SPE's assets will remain isolated and will not be pulled into a common distribution pool with those of the SPE's affiliates.

Because the Bankruptcy Code does not contain prescribed standards for substantive consolidation, judicially developed standards control. Bankruptcy courts have developed multiple, complicated and occasionally conflicting tests for determining whether an SPE should be substantively consolidated with one or more of its parent entities. However, four important categories of factors have emerged:

- (1) *Record keeping*: the SPE should have separately identifiable assets and liabilities, and separate accounting records and financial statements.
- (2) *Operational issues*: the SPE should be adequately capitalized and economically independent from its equityholders.
- (3) *Intercompany transactions*: the SPE's transactions with affiliates should be on arm's length and commercially reasonable terms, and guarantees of the SPE's obligations by affiliates and other credit support by affiliates should be limited.
- (4) *Benefits and harms*: whether the benefits of substantive consolidation outweigh the prejudice to creditors that results from substantive consolidation.

Essentially, courts are looking to see whether the SPE's assets and liabilities can be separated from those of its affiliates, and whether the SPE can conduct its business as a standalone entity.

Courts also look to whether substantive consolidation would cause injustice to creditors who relied on the separate credit and existence of the SPE.

Substantive consolidation may result where an SPE's assets and liabilities are "hopelessly entangled" with those of its affiliates or where an SPE has to rely on its affiliates to conduct its business.

## PRACTICE TIPS

The affiliates of the SPE that are included in the non-consolidation opinion are referred to as the non-consolidation opinion "pairings."

- The rule of thumb, and the requirement in rated deals, is to pair the SPE against any equity owner (or group of affiliated equity owners) that owns 49 percent or more of the equity interests in the SPE, plus any guarantor and any affiliated manager (collectively, the “Related Entities”).
- The non-consolidation opinion will have the SPE on one “side” of the opinion, and the Related Entities on the other. Other deal-required SPEs, such as operating lessees or general partners of a limited partnership SPE, should be included on the SPE side of the non-consolidation opinion, paired against the Related Entities. No non-consolidation opinion is necessary between deal-required SPEs.
- In real estate transactions with both a mortgage loan and a mezzanine loan, the mezzanine borrower is not a deal-required SPE for purposes of the mortgage loan because it has separate debt that needs to be isolated from the debt of the mortgage borrower. Instead, the mezzanine borrower, as an equity owner of the mortgage borrower, should be included as a Related Entity in the mortgage non-consolidation opinion.