Entered 05/12/23 18:21:22 Case 23-00300 Doc 56 Filed 05/12/23 Desc Main Docket #0056 Date Filed: 5/12/2023 Document raye I UI ZI

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al.

Defendants.

AC&S ASBESTOS SETTLEMENT TRUST, COMBUSTION ENGINEERING 524(G) ASBESTOS PI TRUST, GI HOLDINGS INC. ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY SETTLEMENT TRUST. GST SETTLEMENT FACILITY, KAISER ALUMINUM & CHEMICAL CORPORATION ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY TRUST, QUIGLEY COMPANY, INC. ASBESTOS PI TRUST T H AGRICULTURE & NUTRITION, L.L.C. ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY TRUST, and YARWAY ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY TRUST,

Petitioners,

v.

ALDRICH PUMP LLC, MURRAY BOILER LLC.

Respondents.

In re

ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al., 1

Debtors.

Miscellaneous Proceeding

No. 22-00303 (JCW)

(Transferred from District of Delaware)

Miscellaneous Pleading

No. 23-00300 (JCW)

(Transferred from District of New Jersey)

Chapter 11

Case No. 20-30608

¹ 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.



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 Objectors' Ex*Parte Motion to Amend Scheduling Order, filed contemporaneously herewith. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein.
- 3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the transcript of the March 30, 2023 hearing in In re Aldrich Pump LLC, No. 20-30608 (JCW) (Bankr. W.D.N.C.), Armstrong World Industries, Inc. Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust v. Aldrich Pump LLC, Misc. No. 22-00303 (JCW) (Bankr W.D.N.C.), and AC&S Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Aldrich Pump LLC, Misc. No. 23-00300 (JCW) (Bankr. W.D.N.C.).

Case 23-00300 Doc 56 Filed 05/12/23 Entered 05/12/23 18:21:22 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 21

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: May 12, 2023

Chicago, IL

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Morgan R. Hirst

Morgan R. Hirst

EXHIBIT A

	Document Page	5 of 21
		1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA	
2	CHARLOT	TE DIVISION
3	IN RE:	: Case No. 20-30608 (JCW) (Jointly Administered)
4	ALDRICH PUMP LLC, ET AL.,	: Chapter 11
5	Debtors,	: Charlotte, North Carolina
6		: Thursday, March 30, 2023 9:30 a.m.
7		: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :
8	OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF	: AP 22-03028 (JCW)
9	-,	:
10	estates of Aldrich Pump LLC and Murray Boiler LLC,	:
11	Plaintiff,	:
12	v.	:
13 14	INGERSOLL-RAND GLOBAL HOLDING COMPANY LIMITED,	:
15	et al.,	:
16	Defendants,	
17	OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF	: AP 22-03029 (JCW)
18	ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMANTS, on behalf of the	:
19	estates of Aldrich Pump LLC and Murray Boiler LLC,	:
20	Plaintiff,	:
21	v.	:
22	TRANE TECHNOLOGIES PLC, et al.,	:
23	Defendants,	:
24		:
25		

	Document Page	6 of 21	_ 1
			2
1			
2	ARMSTRONG WORLD INDUSTRIES, INC. ASBESTOS PERSONAL INJURY	No. 22-00303 (JCW)	
3	SETTLEMENT TRUST, et al.,	of Delaware)	
4	Plaintiffs,	:	
5	v.	:	
6	ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al.,	:	
7	<pre>Defendants, : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :</pre>	:	:
8	AC&S ASBESTOS SETTLEMENT :	: Miscellaneous Pleading	
9	TRUST, et al.,	No. 23-00300 (JCW) : (Transferred from District	
10	Petitioners,	New Jersey)	
11	v.	:	
12	ALDRICH PUMP LLC, et al.,	:	
13	Respondents,	:	
14	VERUS CLAIM SERVICES, LLC,	:	
15	Interested Party,		
16	NON-PARTY CERTAIN MATCHING CLAIMANTS,	•	
17	Interested Party.	:	
18			:
19		OF PROCEEDINGS BLE J. CRAIG WHITLEY,	
20		BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
21	APPEARANCES:		
22	For Debtors/Defendants, Aldrich Pump LLC and Murray	Rayburn Cooper & Durham, P.A. BY: JOHN R. MILLER, JR., ESQ.	
23	Boiler LLC:	MATTHEW TOMSIC, ESQ. C. RICHARD RAYBURN, JR., ESQ	,
24		227 West Trade St., Suite 1200 Charlotte, NC 28202	٠ د
25		CHALLOCCE, NC 20202	

	Document	Page 8 of 21
1	APPEARANCES (continued):	
2	, ,	
3	For the ACC:	Caplin & Drysdale BY: SERAFINA CONCANNON, ESQ.
4		One Thomas Circle, NW, Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005
5		Robinson & Cole LLP BY: NATALIE RAMSEY, ESQ.
6		DAVIS LEE WRIGHT, ESQ. 1201 N. Market Street, Suite 1406
7		Wilmington, DE 19801
8		Robinson & Cole LLP BY: ANDREW A. DePEAU, ESQ.
9		280 Trumbull Street Hartford, CT 06103
10		Winston & Strawn LLP
11		BY: DAVID NEIER, ESQ. CRISTINA I. CALVAR, ESQ.
12		200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166-4193
13		
14		Hamilton Stephens BY: ROBERT A. COX, JR., ESQ. 525 North Tryon St., Suite 1400
15		Charlotte, NC 28202
16	For the FCR:	Orrick Herrington BY: JONATHAN P. GUY, ESQ.
17		DANNY BAREFOOT, ESQ. 1152 15th Street, NW
18		Washington, D.C. 20005-1706
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 Individual Fiduciary	Brooks Pierce
22	Duty Defendants:	BY: JIM W. PHILLIPS, JR., ESQ. JEFFREY E. OLEYNIK, ESQ.
23		P. O. Box 26000 Greensboro, NC 27420
24		
25		

	Document Page	e 11 of 21	7
1	APPEARANCES (via telephone co	ontinued):	
2	For Travelers Insurance Companies, et al.:	Steptoe & Johnson LLP BY: JOSHUA R. TAYLOR, ESQ.	
3	companies, ce al	1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	
4	For Verus Claims Services,		
5	LLC:	BY: ANDREW ANSELMI, ESQ. West Tower, Fifth Floor	
6		56 Headquarters Plaza Morristown, NJ 07960	
7			
8 9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

```
1
             THE COURT: Let me know. I'm going to ask the clerk
 2
    to, to sit in the courtroom.
 3
             THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Uh-huh (indicating an
 4
    affirmative response).
 5
             THE COURT: Or can they just buzz you at a number or
 6
    something so you don't have to sit here? Okay.
 7
             All right. Well, we'll take a recess until you're
    ready to go.
 8
 9
                         Thank you, your Honor.
             MR. EVERT:
         (Recess from 2:46 p.m., until 3:41 p.m.)
10
11
                              AFTER RECESS
         (Call to Order of the Court)
12
             THE COURT: Have a seat.
13
             All right. What was arrived at during the break?
14
15
             Mr. Hirst.
             MR. HIRST: Your Honor, Morgan Hirst for the debtors.
16
17
             Mr. Evert got to do all the fun argument. I got to
18
    announce an agreed schedule. So --
             THE COURT: Okay. Well, you're one up.
19
20
             MR. HIRST: -- exciting, exciting for me.
21
             So, your Honor, we did, I think, reach an agreement.
22
    We have one tiny disagreement, which we'll raise at the end.
23
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             MR. HIRST: It is a, maybe a lengthier schedule than
24
25
    your Honor originally may have suggested.
```

```
THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
 1
 2
    response).
             MR. HIRST: The other side would like to retain an
 3
    expert to rebut, or attempt to rebut Dr. Mullin. We have no
 4
 5
    issue with that.
             So June 6 is what we decided on for a hearing date --
 6
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             MR. HIRST: -- if that works for the Court and we --
 8
             THE COURT:
                         It does.
 9
             MR. HIRST: -- -- I think, understand that it does.
10
11
    And then there's some interim dates in the middle.
             First of all, here's what we understand and I think
12
13
    the other side understands what this hearing is. We want to
    make sure your Honor is -- is --
14
15
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. HIRST: -- agreeing with this. The, the issue at
16
17
    the hearing is whether or not there's going to be compliance
18
    with a subpoena in full; in other words, a response concerning
    all the claimants or all the Matching Claimants, or whether
19
    it's going to be a sampled compliance with a subpoena.
20
21
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                         That's what we understand the hearing to
22
             MR. HIRST:
    be about.
23
             With that in mind, here's kind of some interim dates
24
    that we've agreed to. This is more for your Honor's
25
```

- Page 14 of 21 information, but we'll --1 2 THE COURT: Please. MR. HIRST: -- make it for the record. 3 The other side's going to retain an expert. 4 going to submit some expert report or a declaration or some 5 form of expert submission by April 25th. They will then have 6 7 the opportunity to depose Dr. Mullin up until May 5th. THE COURT: Okay. 8 They will then submit We -- I'm sorry. 9 MR. HIRST: their brief. Verus will submit a brief in opposition to our 10 11 motion for rehearing. DCPF can supplement their opposition to the motion for rehearing. Those briefs from the objectors to 12 13 the motion for rehearing will be done by May 12th. THE COURT: Right. 14 15 MR. HIRST: We will have the right to depose the expert they're going to put up and Mr. Eveland, who is the 16 17 Verus President, I believe, who submitted an affidavit, and 18 then, potentially, Mr. Winner, who's the DCPF President, though that's our area of disagreement, but those depositions have to 19 take place by May 19th. And then our reply brief is due May 20 26th. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay.
- And there'll be no -- yeah -- there'll be 23 MR. HIRST: no further briefing after May 26th. One issue of minor 24 disagreement for your Honor, I think, can decide today is 25

```
Mr. Winner.
 1
             So Mr. Winner is DCPF's President.
 2
             Is that right, Kevin?
 3
                          I believe he's COO.
 4
             MR. GUERKE:
             MR. WINNER: Or COO. He submitted a declaration in,
 5
 6
    in support of their motion to quash --
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Right.
             MR. HIRST: -- last summer.
 8
             THE COURT:
                         Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
 9
10
    response).
11
             MR. HIRST: They have -- DCPF -- and Mr. Guerke'll,
    Mr. Guerke'll tell me if I got this wrong -- they've indicated
12
13
    they will at least rely on his old declaration. They may
    submit a supplemental declaration. We would like to take his
14
15
    deposition, regardless. DCPF has indicated they would only
    agree to a deposition of Mr. Winner in the event they provide a
16
    supplemental declaration. And so our view is if they're going
17
18
    to rely on his declaration, we should get to depose him whether
    it's a new declaration or an old declaration. That, I think,
19
    is the only issue in dispute.
20
21
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             MR. GUERKE: That is in dispute, your Honor.
22
    Kevin Guerke on behalf of DCPF.
23
24
             We object to a deposition of Richard Winner at this
```

The, the declaration was filed in July. The debtors

25

point.

```
chose not to depose him and the motion to -- so the first we
 1
    heard about the deposition, that they want to take his
 2
    deposition after all these months was just now out in the
 3
    hallway, but struck a, a, a reasonable balance that if we're
 4
    going to supplement with new information, they'd have a chance
 5
    to depose Mr. Winner on the new information, but don't get a
 6
 7
    chance to go back and, and start all over again.
             DCPF is not a party to this case. You've heard us
 8
    arque burden and expense probably more than you, you want to
 9
    hear. We shouldn't have that burden magnified by additional
10
11
    discovery directed at us. I know we're going down on this path
12
    on sampling --
             THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative
13
    response).
14
15
             MR. GUERKE: -- and additional expert discovery, but,
    you know, your Honor, we had a sampling ruling. We thought it
16
                The debtors proposed a sampling that worked for the
17
    was great.
18
    debtors. The parties talked about it and reached agreement on
    a sampling protocol, at least a 99 percent agreement, and, and
19
    this all could be avoided with the 10 percent sampling, your
20
    Honor and -- but if we have to go down this path, it's going to
21
    be a, a longer, more drawn-out, burdensome, expensive process.
22
             Thank you.
23
             THE COURT: And what is it you want to ask him about,
24
```

generally?

```
If they're going to rely on him -- they
 1
             MR. HIRST:
    have his affidavit -- if they're going to rely on that
 2
    affidavit on June 6th, we'd like a chance to ask him questions
 3
    about his affidavit and the factual underpinnings behind it.
 4
    If they're not going to rely on his affidavit on June 6th at
 5
    the hearing or in their papers, we don't have any reason to
 6
 7
    bother.
             THE COURT:
                         So why now and not before?
 8
             MR. HIRST:
                         Why now? 'Cause they're going to rely on
 9
10
    him in a hearing in --
11
             THE COURT: Okay.
             MR. HIRST: -- two months where they're now going to
12
    have an expert who, presumably, is going to rely, in part, on
13
    some of Mr. Winner's factual underpinnings to his testimony.
14
15
    So that's, that's why.
             THE COURT:
                         Well, I got to tell you. What I was
16
17
    envisioning more was talking about the need for sam, for full-
18
    blown production versus sampling, not as much on, on burden to
    that. But if we're going to argue about burden, then, you
19
    know, if we're going to use him, that's fine. We probably need
20
    to, to depose him.
21
             But from my vantage point, the questions I have,
22
    primarily, in my mind that made me want to have a further
23
    hearing is, given that we got down the road so far about
24
    sampling, why is that not sufficient? I mean, the bottom line
25
```

```
is what are the likelihood that, that, if we do full
 1
    production, that there's a risk, now that I can remember that
 2
    we were doing these hand scrubbing. But if we're going to
 3
    fight about the, you know, how much other cost there is to the,
 4
    the Facility, then yeah, I think I'd be inclined to, to allow
 5
    it.
 6
 7
             The question is how, how broadly are y'all planning to
 8
    arque.
 9
             MR. HIRST:
                         That's actually to my colleagues. 'Cause
    we're happy to take the issue of burden off of the table,
10
11
    essentially. If they're going to simply argue -- if the entire
    hearing's going to be about -- I mean, their basis for a
12
13
    sampling -- their, their motion requesting sampling was 'cause
    it was burdensome.
14
15
             MS. MOSKOW-SCHNOLL: That is not the only reason.
             THE COURT: No, no, no. It was also about
16
17
    confidentiality.
18
             MR. HIRST: Confidentiality as well. No, those were
    the, the two underpinnings.
19
20
             THE COURT:
                         Right.
                         If we're going to continue to --
21
             MR. HIRST:
                         So are we arguing both, or one?
22
             THE COURT:
                                                           That's.
    that's all I really think. 'Cause if we're arguing both, I
23
```

think I'm setting a rehearing and if I'm reconsidering all of

that, then fine. But the bottom line is the -- in that event,

24

- 191 I think we need to have full fact presentation there, 1 declaration, and if we're going to get anything else from him, 2 an amended declaration or whatnot, the chance to review. 3 we're just going to talk about what the debtors needs are and 4 why they aren't satisfied, then I would say no. 5 MR. GUERKE: Your Honor, the, the same group of 6 people have already taken Mr. Winner's deposition --7 THE COURT: Uh-huh (indicating an affirmative 8 response). 9 He already went through 10 MR. GUERKE: -- in DBMP. 11 that, that burden in time and effort. The declaration that we filed in this case is similar to declarations that were filed 12 13 in past cases -- and I don't want to mix the cases up -- but --
 - THE COURT: Yeah. We've done too much of that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MR. GUERKE: -- it's -- it's un -- it's unfair to DCPF as a nonparty to keep being dragged, dragged into more and more discovery and, and we, we object, your Honor. Unless we, unless we assert additional facts in a supplemental declaration, we ask that the Court not allow a deposition of, of Mr. Winner. His, his declaration has been out there and we've argued it for months and months.
- If we're going to rehear burden, then I'm THE COURT: going to, to allow them to do the deposition, okay? All right.
- I, I appreciate where he's come, where the Facility's coming from and this being nonparties, but they're very

interested nonparties and, and effectively, I think the 1 information is very key to what we're doing here. 2 So I, I want a decent record that can go up, if it 3 needs to be, and I believe we need him for that purpose, so. 4 5 All right. What else? 6 MR. GUERKE: Please. 7 MS. MOSKOW-SCHNOLL: Your Honor, I just wanted to put on the record that we, we believe you did enter an order and 8 9 that this is procedurally improper. THE COURT: Understood. 10 11 MS. MOSKOW-SCHNOLL: I just want to make sure that was on the record. 12 THE COURT: Overruled. 13 MS. MOSKOW-SCHNOLL: Thank you. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Guy? 16 17 MR. GUY: Your Honor, we weren't asked about these 18 dates, but we will totally work with them, of course. On the sampling motion, I want to be practical about 19 I know I want to move forward, but I think, realistically, 20 we're not going to get progress until this is resolved. 21 So maybe we can continue it until after this hearing. 22 I hate to say that because my predictions have proven to be 23

true again, but that seems like the sensible thing to do. But

I defer to the Court entirely on that.

24

	Boodinion Ago 21 of 21
1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	I, court approved transcriber, certify that the
3	foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic
4	sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
5	matter.
6	/s/ Janice Russell April 4, 2023
7	Janice Russell, Transcriber Date
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	