## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

ARMSTRONG WORLD INDUSTRIES, INC. ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY SETTLEMENT TRUST *et al.* 

Miscellaneous Proceeding

Plaintiffs,

No. 22-00303 (JCW)

v.

(Transferred from District of Delaware)

ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al.

Defendants.

In re

Chapter 11

ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al., 1

Case No. 20-30608

Debtors.

## **DECLARATION OF MORGAN R. HIRST**

- I, Morgan R. Hirst, hereby declare under penalty of perjury:
- 1. I am a partner of the law firm of Jones Day; my office is located at 110 North Wacker Drive, Suite 4800, Chicago, Illinois 60606. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Illinois. There are no disciplinary proceedings pending against me.
- 2. I submit this declaration in connection with *Debtors' Opposition to Delaware Processing Facility's Motion to Strike, or in the Alternative, Continue the Hearing on Debtors' Motion for Reconsideration*, filed contemporaneously herewith. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein.

<sup>1</sup> The Debtors are the following entities (the last four digits of their respective taxpayer identification numbers follow in parentheses): Aldrich Pump LLC (2290) and Murray Boiler LLC (0679). The Debtors' address is 800-E Beaty Street, Davidson, North Carolina 28036.



{00374923 v 2 }

Case 22-00303 Doc 93 Filed 03/27/23 Entered 03/27/23 22:10:03 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 2

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the

transcript of the February 9, 2023 hearing in In re DBMP LLC, No. 20-30080 (JCW) (Bankr.

W.D.N.C.).

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the

transcript of the February 14, 2023 hearing in <u>In re Aldrich Pump LLC</u>, et al., No. 20-30608 (JCW)

(Bankr. W.D.N.C.).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true

and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated: March 27, 2023

Chicago, IL

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Morgan R. Hirst

Morgan R. Hirst

## **EXHIBIT**

A

	A Page 2	of 9		- I
				1
1			KRUPTCY COURT NORTH CAROLINA	
2			IVISION	
3	IN RE:	:	Case No. 20-30080-JCW	
4	DBMP LLC,	:	Chapter 11	
5	Debtor,	:	Charlotte, North Carolina Thursday, February 9, 2023	
6		:	9:30 a.m.	
7		: : :		:
8	OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMANTS, and SANDER L.	:	AP 22-3045 (JCW)	
9	ESSERMAN, etc.,	•		
10	Plaintiffs,			
11	V.			
12	CERTAINTEED LLC (f/k/a CERTAINTEED CORPORATION)	:		
13	(a/k/a "OLD CERTAINTEED"),	:		
14	Defendant,	:		
15	:::::::::::::	: : :	: : : : : : : : : : : : :	:
16	DBMP LLC,	:	AP 20-3004 (JCW)	
17	Plaintiff,	:		
18	v.	:		
19	THOSE PARTIES LISTED ON APPENDIX A TO COMPLAINT and	:		
20	JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-1000,	:		
21	Defendants,	:		
22		: : :	: : : : : : : : : : : :	:
23				
24				
25				

A Page 3 of 9		
		2
1	THE ARMSTRONG WORLD INDUSTRIES, INC. ASBESTOS	: Case No. 22-00302 (JCW)
2	PERSONAL INJURY SETTLEMENT TRUST, et al.,	: (Transferred from the District of Delaware)
3	77 1 1 1 5 5	:
4	Plaintiffs,	:
_	v.	
5	DBMP LLC,	:
6	·	:
7	Defendant.	:
8		
9		OF PROCEEDINGS ABLE J. CRAIG WHITLEY,
10		BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For Debtor/Defendant, DBMP LLC:	Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson, P.A. BY: GARLAND CASSADA, ESQ.
13	BENT EDG.	M. BENNETT WRIGHT, ESQ.  101 N. Tryon Street, Suite 1900
14		Charlotte, NC 28246
15		Jones Day BY: GREGORY M. GORDON, ESQ.
16		2727 North Harwood St., Suite 500 Dallas, Texas 75201
17		ballab, loxab /3201
18	Audio Operator:	COURT PERSONNEL
19	Haaro operator.	
20	Transcript prepared by:	JANICE RUSSELL TRANSCRIPTS 1418 Red Fox Circle
21		Severance, CO 80550 (757) 422-9089
22		trussell31@tdsmail.com
23		
24	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.	
25		

A Page 4 of 9		
		3
1	APPEARANCES (continued):	
2	For Debtor/Defendant, DBMP LLC:	Jones Day BY: JEFFREY B. ELLMAN, ESQ.
3	BBM EBC.	1221 Peachtree Street, N.E., #400 Atlanta, GA 30361
4		Jones Day
5		BY: JAMES M. JONES, ESQ. 250 Vesey Street
6		New York, NY 10281
7	For Plaintiff, ACC:	Robinson & Cole LLP BY: DAVIS LEE WRIGHT, ESQ.
8		1201 N. Market Street, Suite 1406 Wilmington, DE 19801
9		Winston & Strawn LLP
10		BY: DAVID NEIER, ESQ. CRISTINA CALVAR, ESQ.
11		200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166-4193
12		Caplin & Drysdale
13		BY: JAMES P. WEHNER, ESQ. One Thomas Circle, N.W.,
14		Washington, DC 20005
15		Hamilton Stephens BY: ROBERT A. COX, JR., ESQ.
16		525 North Tryon St., Suite 1400 Charlotte, NC 28202
17		NATHANIEL ROSE, ESQ.
18	For Plaintiff, Future	Young Conaway
19	Claimants' Representative, Sander L. Esserman:	BY: SEAN GREECHER, ESQ. SHARON ZIEG, ESQ.
20		1000 North King Street Wilmington, DE 19801
21		Alexander Ricks PLLC
22		BY: FELTON E. PARRISH, ESQ. 1420 E. 7th Street, Suite 100
23		Charlotte, NC 28204
24		
25		

	A Page 5 c	of 9 4	ĺ
1	APPEARANCES (continued):		
2	For Defendants, CertainTeed		
3	LLC, et al.:	BY: HOWARD S. STEEL, ESQ. STACY DASARO, ESQ.	
4		620 Eighth Avenue New York, NY 10018	
5		Rayburn Cooper & Durham, P.A. BY: JOHN R. MILLER, JR., ESQ.	
6		227 West Trade Street, Suite 1200 Charlotte, NC 28202	
7	For Certain Matching	Waldrep Wall	
8	Claimants:	BY: DIANA SANTOS JOHNSON, ESQ. 370 Knollwood Street, Suite 600	
9		Winston-Salem, NC 27103	
10	APPEARANCES (via telephone):		
11	For Certain Matching	Hogan McDaniel	
12	Claimants:	BY: DANIEL K. HOGAN, ESQ.  1311 Delaware Avenue	
13		Wilmington, DE 19806	
14 15	For Plaintiff, ACC:	Winston & Strawn LLP BY: CARRIE HARDMAN, ESQ. 200 Park Avenue	
16		New York, NY 10166-4193	
17		SANDER L. ESSERMAN	
18		Future Claimants' Representative 2323 Bryan Street, Suite 2200	
19		Dallas, TX 75201-2689	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

regard to these provisions and discussion and I would decline to find that I misapprehended what you were arguing.

Now there may be an argument in the <u>Aldrich</u> case that I should have stayed consistent with this ruling and no order's been entered there, is my understanding, and I'm not encouraging a motion for rehearing on that, but, if it comes, it comes. If anything, we had been careful in this case, DBMP, to try to address the privacy concerns and what I did was intentional there. Some time passed and it may be argued that I should have done the same thing.

You will note that in <u>Aldrich</u> I was doing two things. I don't want to talk too much about the <u>Aldrich</u> decision because those folks aren't here, but the bottom line was I had two concerns. One was, as I recall it, this was the first time I had actually been presented with demonstratives that showed me exactly what kind of information can be in the narratives. That made a little bit of an impression, but -- and this is where being married for 36 years will help you out -- I'm not one to believe that I've never made an error, either, and I may have in <u>Aldrich</u> because I don't recall, did not then recall all of the, the Footnote 2 and the efforts that we had made to scrub data. I was thinking, primarily, about my secondary concern, which was the need for sampling in these cases, generally, and it might not have been the appropriate thing to do then. I'm not going to decide that today.

But the bottom line is the costs in these cases are spiraling ever higher. We are getting into more and more of a morass of litigation that's going to require more and more privilege reviews, estimation, claims file requests, and, and the like and my concern was, overall, that we need to start pulling these cases towards getting to a resolution, not going the other way around, and I view sampling as a way that we can avoid some of the costs and expense, delay, etc., that are occasioned by these cases.

So for better or worse, those two things were on my mind at the time and if there is an error that has been made, in my opinion it would be in the <u>Aldrich</u> case, not in this one because this one got very careful consideration and effectively, we dealt with that.

So as to standing, I don't see a particular burden here. I agree with Mr. Cassada that while there might be an interest in, in the Matching Claimants as to the information that is being provided, the law I'm not sure is where most of us would feel emotionally. We would say yes, that is your information, but I'm not sure that, legally, that information isn't owned by the Trusts instead of the claimants. But you've got at least some sort of interest there in the data itself and we tried to accommodate that and it was carefully accommodated and I'm satisfied that the accommodations in this case were sufficient to protect the information.

And that kind of feeds into the third part of this as 1 to whether or not there is a risk of inadvertent disclosure and 2 whether this is moot and I believe at this juncture it really 3 The information's been provided, scrubbed, as I, as been 4 represented in court. There is no PII in the documentation and 5 I'm going to decline the motion to alter or amend. 6 7 And ask the prevailing party, the debtors, to draw an order consistent with those remarks and the arguments made in 8 their briefing, okay? 9 Anything else? 10 11 (No response) 12 THE COURT: Anyone -- everyone good for the day? 13 (No response) Well, I'm pleased that you've been able to 14 THE COURT: 15 work some on, on the first three matters. I hope you, those 16 are productive. If not, we'll, we'll talk about them next 17 month. And hope everyone travels safely home and that you 18 enjoy your weekend. As always, you always provide me a lot to 19 think about and we'll look forward to that in the future. 20 Court's in recess. 21 MR. GORDON: Thank you, your Honor. 22 Thank you, your Honor. 23 MR. ELLMAN: (Proceedings concluded at 12:00 p.m.) 24 25

CERTIFICATE I, court-approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. /s/ *Janice Russell* February 13, 2023 Janice Russell, Transcriber Date 

## **EXHIBIT B**

	B Page 4 o	
		3
1	APPEARANCES (continued):	
2		
3	For ACC:	Caplin & Drysdale BY: JAMES P. WEHNER, ESQ. One Thomas Circle, NW, Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005
_		
5 6		Robinson & Cole LLP BY: NATALIE RAMSEY, ESQ. DAVIS LEE WRIGHT, ESQ.
7		1201 N. Market Street, Suite 1406 Wilmington, DE 19801
8		Robinson & Cole LLP BY: KATHERINE M. FIX, ESQ.
9		1650 Market Street, Suite 3600 Philadelphia, PA 19103
10		Hamilton Stephens
11		BY: ROBERT A. COX, JR., ESQ. 525 North Tryon St., Suite 1400
12		Charlotte, NC 28202
13		JONAH RECORDSCOSKY, ESQ.
14	For the FCR:	Orrick Herrington BY: JONATHAN P. GUY, ESQ.
15		1152 15th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20005-1706
16		Grier, Wright & Martinez, PA
17		BY: A. COTTEN WRIGHT, ESQ. 521 E. Morehead St, Suite 440
18		Charlotte, NC 28202
19	For Certain Insurers:	Duane Morris LLP BY: RUSSELL W. ROTEN, ESQ.
20		865 S. Figueroa St., Suite 3100 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5440
21	For Trane Technologies	McCarter & English, LLP
22	Company LLC and Trane U.S. Inc.:	BY: GREGORY J. MASCITTI, ESQ. 825 Eighth Avenue, 31st Floor
23		New York, NY 10019
24		
25		

	B Page 5 o	
		4
1	APPEARANCES (continued):	
2	For DCPF:	Alexander Ricks PLLC BY: FELTON PARRISH, ESQ.
3		1420 E. 7th Street, Suite 100 Charlotte, NC 28204
4		
5	APPEARANCES (via telephone):	
6	_	
7	For DCPF:	Young Conaway BY: KEVIN A. GUERKE, ESQ. 1000 North King Street
8		Wilmington, Delaware 19801
9		Ballard Spahr LLP BY: TYLER B. BURNS, ESQ.
10		919 North Market St., 11th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801-3034
11	For Trane Technologies	McGuireWoods, LLP
12	Company LLC and Trane U.S. Inc.:	BY: K. ELIZABETH SIEG, ESQ. 800 East Canal Street
13		Richmond, VA 23219-3916
14	For Travelers Insurance Companies, et al.:	Steptoe & Johnson LLP BY: JOSHUA R. TAYLOR, ESQ.
15		1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036
16	For Matching Claimants:	Hogan McDaniel
17	ror maconing cranmanes.	BY: DANIEL K. HOGAN, ESQ. 1311 Delaware Avenue
18		Wilmington, DE 19806
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Is there no one else at your firm who could handle the, the argument or Mr. Parrish, either one?

MR. GUERKE: I don't think so, your Honor, but I'd be, be happy to look into it.

THE COURT: Okay.

Well, the, the problems we run into, folks, in these cases are that there's so many of you and so many attorneys working on the files that if we start picking out and changing hearing dates based on one person, well, there'll be no end of it. I'll just refer you since I mentioned the <a href="Kaiser">Kaiser</a> case of all the efforts that were made by the parties to schedule a hearing with the Fourth Circuit and how many conflicts were, were noted there. I just don't think on a retail level doing these cases month to month that I can do anything, but say we've got local counsel for a reason and it's not just to, to earn a pro hac vice fee for the, for the District Court's coffers. It's basically so that if there is a need to stand in.

So I would suggest that you -- you've got plenty of time to prepare. If there's going to be a rehearing motion -- and that's sort of what I think it is since I announced a ruling, but nothing written has been entered. So I, I would view it as a rehearing motion -- let's go ahead and do that on the 30th and just send who you can, all right? Okay.

MR. GUERKE: Understood. Thank you, your Honor.