Case	2:23-bk-12359-SK Doc 935 Filed 02/16/2 Main Document F	אר באנביבל 12/16/21 ביל 12/25 און ביל 12/26/2024 ביל 19 ב
1	GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP KEVIN J. WALSH (admitted pro hac vice)  COLLEEN A. MURPHY (admitted pro hac vice) CHRISTOPHER MARKS (admitted pro hac vice) One International Place, Suite 2000 Boston, Massachusetts 02110 Telephone: (617) 310-6000 Email: Kevin.Walsh@gtlaw.com	
2		
3		
4		
5	Colleen.Murphy@gtlaw.com Chris.Marks@gtlaw.com	
6	Counsel to U.S. Bank Trust Company,	
7	National Association, as Master Trustee	
8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES DIVISION	
9	In re:	Lead Case No.: 2:23-bk-12359-SK
10	BEVERLY COMMUNITY HOSPITAL	Jointly administered with:
11	ASSOCIATION, dba BEVERLY HOSPITAL (A NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT	Case No.: 2:23-bk-12360-SK
12	CORPORATION), et al, <sup>1</sup>	Case No.: 2:23-bk-12361-SK
13	Debtors,	Hon. Sandra R. Klein
14		Chapter 11 Case
15	☐ Affects Beverly Community	U.S. BANK TRUST COMPANY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AS MASTER
16	Hospital Association	TRUSTEE'S OBJECTION TO APPLICATION FOR ORDER SETTING
17	☐ Montebello Community Health Services, Inc.	HEARING ON SHORTENED NOTICE
18	☐ Beverly Hospital Foundation	Date: TBD
19	, ,	Time: TBD  Judge: Sandra R. Klein
20		Place: Zoom.Gov
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28	The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Beverly Community Hospital Association d/b/a Beverly Hospital (6005), Montebello Community Health Services, Inc. (3550), and Beverly Hospital Foundation (9685). The mailing address for the Debtors is 309 W. Beverly Blvd., Montebello, California 90640.	
28		

# Case 2:23-bk-12359-SK Doc 935 Filed 02/16/24 Entered 02/16/24 12:35:41 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 9

Secured creditor U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as master trustee (the "Master Trustee") hereby objects to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' (the "Committee") Application for Order Setting Hearing on Shortened Notice [Docket No. 929] (the "Application"). Through the Application the Committee requests that the Court hear its Motion to Expand the Scope of the Mediation [Docket No. 928] (the "Motion") on shortened notice to allow the Committee to join the Chapter 11 Trustee, Howard M. Ehrenberg (the "Chapter 11 Trustee") into a mediation in the currently pending adversary proceeding brought by the Committee against the Master Trustee (the "Adversary Proceeding"), which is scheduled to begin on March 8, 2024 in Los Angeles (the "Mediation"), and expand the scope of the Mediation to include issues that the Committee readily admits are not yet before this Court.

The Court should deny the Application because there is no good cause to shorten the time in which the Master Trustee must respond to what can most generously be described as the Committee's latest filing borne of desperation. The Committee has had four (4) months since the October 18, 2023 status conference during which the Court ordered the parties in the Adversary Proceeding to mediation to bring the Motion and ask the Court to expand the scope of the Mediation. The Committee even tried at that October 18<sup>th</sup> hearing to expand the scope of the Mediation to no avail.

More than a month has passed since the Chapter 11 Trustee filed his status report on January 10, 2024 [Docket No. 915], disclosing his settlement discussions with the Master Trustee concerning the funding of this case going forward. And over three (3) weeks have elapsed since the last status conference in this case, during which the Committee expressed its intent to attempt to expand the scope of the Mediation.

Either the Committee sat on its hands and did not seek the relief it now requests through the Motion until the last minute (which is nobody's fault but its own), or, more likely, the Committee

e (which is nobody's fault but its own), or, more likely, the Committee

waited until the eleventh hour (right before a holiday weekend) to file its Motion and seek an expediated hearing in a transparent attempt to catch the Master Trustee off-guard and limit its time to respond to the Motion. The alleged timing crunch is a self-created emergency reminiscent of when the Committee filed its Amended Complaint in the Adversary Proceeding mere days before the sale hearing in an attempt to frustrate the Master Trustee's consent rights with respect to the sale of its collateral under 11 U.S.C. § 363(f). The Court saw through the Committee's gamesmanship then, and did not countenance their tactics. The Application and Motion are simply more of the same hustle and should be similarly denied.

The Motion does not need to be heard on an expediated basis for several reasons, not the least of which is the fact that there is no mediation pending in the main bankruptcy case to which to join the Committee's fanciful surcharge arguments. Rather, the Committee and the Master Trustee are mediating the Adversary Proceeding. The Committee and Master Trustee are the only parties in the Adversary Proceeding. There is no logic to the Committee's request that the Court add another party, the Chapter 11 Trustee, and add issues that are wholly unrelated to the Adversary Proceeding, to the Mediation that is already scheduled and fully briefed. Indeed, it took the parties weeks to simply schedule the Mediation because the Committee demanded that *both* of its law firms attend the Mediation.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, days after the January 24, 2024 status conference, during which counsel for the Committee proclaimed that he had "peeled back the onion" on the legal standard for a surcharge in the Ninth Circuit (which is curious phraseology in light of the fact that the surcharge standard in this jurisdiction is well settled), and concluded that the Master Trustee is liable for \$12 million to \$26

One can only speculate that the impetus of those delay tactics was to allow the Committee the time to file the Motion, in which it seeks to force the Master Trustee to discuss the payment of the Committee's professional fees, the Committee's seemingly sole focus in this case. In addition, the fact that the Committee finds it necessary to have two law firms attend the Mediation when only one firm is tasked with handling the Adversary Proceeding speaks volumes as to why the fees of the estate professionals are so outrageously high in this case.

million<sup>3</sup> under Section 506(c) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Master Trustee requested, through the Chapter 11 Trustee, that the Committee provide its legal support for that statement. According to the Chapter 11 Trustee, counsel for the Committee refused to do so and the Committee's counsel did not take that opportunity to reach out to the Master Trustee's counsel to discuss the surcharge issue. It smacks of desperation that the Committee would refuse to engage with the Master Trustee to discuss its arguments but now wants to force the Master Trustee to mediate those same arguments (thereby wasting not only the Master Trustee's time but that of Judge Barash who has already been more than generous with his time).

What's more, there is nothing to mediate at this time with respect to a surcharge of the Master Trustee's collateral. The Chapter 11 Trustee, who is the only party that can seek a surcharge, has not filed any such motion. Nor have the Chapter 11 Trustee and the Master Trustee reached a settlement with respect to the parameters of a surcharge. The Committee has no standing to seek a surcharge<sup>4</sup> and it is inappropriate for the Committee to insert itself into those negations under the guise of the Mediation in the Adversary Proceeding. Indeed, even *if* the Master Trustee and the Chapter 11 Trustee reach a settlement with respect to a surcharge, the Committee's dispute would ultimately be with the Chapter 11 Trustee, not the Master Trustee, and be governed by the settlement standard of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019. What role the Master Trustee would have in any such mediation is a mystery.

The fact that the Committee claims to believe that the Master Trustee could possibly be surcharged for \$26 million in connection with the sale of its collateral for \$23.2 million is telling of the legitimacy of their legal theories and candor with the Court. Of course, the Committee cited to no legal authority for the proposition that a secured creditor would owe money, over and above the value of its collateral, under Section 506(c). Counsel should peel another onion or two and review the applicable case law regarding the scope of a surcharge under Section 506(c) in the Ninth Circuit before filing briefs and addressing the Court.

See e.g., Debbie Reynolds Hotel & Casino, Inc. v. Calstar Corp. (In re Debbie Reynolds Hotel & Casino, Inc.), 255 F.3d 1061, 1068-69 (9th Cir. 2001) ("Under Hartford Underwriters, [a creditor] has no standing to seek a surcharge from [a secured creditor]. Consequently, the immunizing language of the settlement agreement did not alter the legal rights of [creditor] and was properly approved by the bankruptcy court.")

# Case 2:23-bk-12359-SK Doc 935 Filed 02/16/24 Entered 02/16/24 12:35:41 Desc Main Document Page 5 of 9

At bottom, the Committee created the timing issue that it now complains of, either intentionally as part of its "trial by ambush" strategy in this case, or through inattention by waiting until the last minute to file its Motion. In either case, there is no good cause to expediate the consideration of the Motion that has no connection to the Mediation scheduled for March 8th, and the Court should deny the Application and set the Motion on a normal notice and briefing schedule.

# **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS TO SEEK SANCTIONS**

The Master Trustee hereby reserves its rights to seek sanctions against the Committee for its filing of the Application based on a self-created emergency. The Master Trustee further reserves its rights to similarly seek sanctions against the Committee for its costs and fees associated with responding to the Motion, which largely ignores well-settled case law in this jurisdiction, is riddled with false and/or inaccurate statements of fact and law and through which the Committee is inappropriately attempting to litigate surcharge issues that it has no standing to bring under black letter law.

WHEREFORE, the Master Trustee respectfully request that the Court deny the Application and set the Motion for a normal notice and hearing schedule.

Respectfully Submitted

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By /s/ Kevin J. Walsh

Kevin J. Walsh (admitted *pro hac vice*) Colleen A. Murphy (admitted *pro hac vice*) Christopher Marks (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Counsel to the U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as Master Trustee

#### PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is: One International Place, Boston, MA 02110 A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled (specify): U.S. Bank Trust Company, National Association, as Master Trustee's Objection to Application for Order for Order Setting Hearing on Shortened Notice. will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below: 1. TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF): Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On (date) , I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below: Service information continued on attached page 2. SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL: On (date) 02/16/2024 , I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed. Service information continued on attached page 3. SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY, OVERNIGHT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL (state method for each person or entity served): Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on (date) the following persons and/or entities by personal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in writing to such service method), by facsimile transmission and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that personal delivery on, or overnight mail to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed. Service information continued on attached page I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. 02/16/2024 Kevin J. Walsh /s/ Kevin J. Walsh Date Printed Name Signature

This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

#### **SERVICE LIST**

- Megan M Adeyemo madeyemo@grsm.com, asoto@grsm.com
- David E Ahdoot <u>dahdoot@bushgottlieb.com</u>, kprestegard@bushgottlieb.com
- Joseph M Ammar ammar@millercanfield.com
- Scott E Blakeley seb@blakeleyllp.com, ecf@blakeleyllp.com
- Joseph P Buchman jbuchman@bwslaw.com, gmitchell@bwslaw.com
- Adrian Butler abutler@bushgottlieb.com
- Augustus Curtis augustus.t.curtis@usdoj.gov
- **Howard M Ehrenberg (TR)** ehrenbergtrustee@gmlaw.com, ca25@ecfcbis.com;C123@ecfcbis.com;howard.ehrenberg@ecf.courtdrive.com;Ka ren.Files@gmlaw.com
- David K Eldan David.Eldan@doj.ca.gov
- Amanda N Ferns aferns@fernslaw.com, mmakalintal@fernslaw.com
- **Alan W Forsley** alan.forsley@flpllp.com, awf@fkllawfirm.com,awf@fl-lawyers.net,addy@flpllp.com
- John-Patrick M Fritz jpf@lnbyg.com, JPF.LNBYB@ecf.inforuptcy.com
- Evelina Gentry evelina.gentry@akerman.com, rob.diwa@akerman.com
- Evan Gershbein ECFpleadings@kccllc.com
- Faisal Gill fgill@glawoffice.com
- Steven T Gubner sgubner@bg.law, ecf@bg.law
- Melissa Hamill melissa.hamill@doj.ca.gov
- Hallie Dale Hannah hallie@hannahlaw.com
- **Brian T Harvey** bharvey@buchalter.com, docket@buchalter.com;dbodkin@buchalter.com
- Stella A Havkin stella@havkinandshrago.com, shavkinesq@gmail.com
- Robert M Hirsh robert.hirsh@nortonrosefulbright.com
- Mark S Horoupian mark.horoupian@gmlaw.com, mhoroupian@ecf.courtdrive.com;cheryl.caldwell@gmlaw.com;karen.files@gmla w.com
- Darryl Jay Horowitt dhorowitt@ch-law.com, bkasst@ch-law.com
- **David I Horowitz** david.horowitz@kirkland.com, keith.catuara@kirkland.com;terry.ellis@kirkland.com;elsa.banuelos@kirkland.com;ivon.granados@kirkland.com
- **Sonja Hourany** sonja.hourany@quinngroup.net, kadele@wgllp.com;lbracken@wgllp.com;shourany@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Eric P Israel eisrael@danninggill.com, danninggill@gmail.com;eisrael@ecf.inforuptcy.com
- Quinn Scott Kaye kaye@millercanfield.com

- **Nicholas A Koffroth** nkoffroth@foxrothschild.com, khoang@foxrothschild.com
- David S Kupetz David.Kupetz@lockelord.com, mylene.ruiz@lockelord.com
- Alexandria Lattner alattner@sheppardmullin.com, ehwalters@sheppardmullin.com
- **Daniel A Lev** daniel.lev@gmlaw.com, cheryl.caldwell@gmlaw.com;dlev@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Marc A Levinson MALevinson@orrick.com, borozco@orrick.com,casestream@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Ron Maroko ron.maroko@usdoj.gov
- David M Medby dmedby@lawgarcia.com, jmobley@lawgarcia.com
- Joshua M Mester jmester@jonesday.com
- Elissa Miller elissa.miller@gmlaw.com, emillersk@ecf.courtdrive.com;cheryl.caldwell@gmlaw.com
- Kenneth Misken Kenneth.M.Misken@usdoj.gov
- Kelly L Morrison kelly.l.morrison@usdoj.gov
- Tania M Moyron tania.moyron@dentons.com, rebecca.wicks@dentons.com;kathryn.howard@dentons.com;derry.kalve@dentons.com;glenda.spratt@dentons.com;DOCKET.GENERAL.LIT.LOS@dentons.com
- Alan I Nahmias anahmias@mbn.law, jdale@mbn.law
- Jennifer L Nassiri JNassiri@sheppardmullin.com
- Neli Nima Palma neli.palma@doj.ca.gov
- Valerie Bantner Peo vbantnerpeo@buchalter.com
- **Thomas Phinney** tphinney@ffwplaw.com, akieser@ffwplaw.com;docket@ffwplaw.com
- **Thomas J Polis** tom@polis-law.com, paralegal@polis-law.com;r59042@notify.bestcase.com
- Christopher E Prince cprince@lesnickprince.com, jmack@lesnickprince.com;cprince@ecf.courtdrive.com;jnavarro@lesnickprince.c om
- **Dean G Rallis** drallis@hahnlawyers.com, jevans@hahnlawyers.com;drallis@ecf.courtdrive.com;jevans@ecf.courtdrive.com
- William M Rathbone wrathbone@grsm.com, sdurazo@grsm.com
- Michael B Reynolds mreynolds@swlaw.com, kcollins@swlaw.com
- Russell W Reynolds rreynolds@ch-law.com, bkasst@ch-law.com
- Jason E Rios jrios@ffwplaw.com, docket@ffwplaw.com
- Mary H Rose mrose@buchalter.com, marias@buchalter.com;docket@buchalter.com
- Kenneth N Russak krussak@knrlaw.com, krussak@russaklaw.com
- Nathan A Schultz nschultzesq@gmail.com
- Olivia Scott olivia.scott3@bclplaw.com

- Zev Shechtman zs@DanningGill.com, danninggill@gmail.com;zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com
- **Howard Steinberg** steinbergh@gtlaw.com, pearsallt@gtlaw.com;NEF-BK@gtlaw.com;howard-steinberg-6096@ecf.pacerpro.com
- Andrew Still astill@swlaw.com, kcollins@swlaw.com
- Tamar Terzian tterzian@hansonbridgett.com, ssingh@hansonbridgett.com
- Jacob Unger junger@jacobungerlaw.com
- United States Trustee (LA) ustpregion16.la.ecf@usdoj.gov
- Mark J Valencia mvalencia@vclitigation.com
- Emilio Eugene Varanini emilio.varanini@doj.ca.gov
- **Kevin Walsh** kevin.walsh@gtlaw.com, kevin-walsh-3952@ecf.pacerpro.com
- Kenneth K Wang Kenneth.Wang@doj.ca.gov, Anthony.Conklin@doj.ca.gov
- **Sharon Z. Weiss** sharon.weiss@bclplaw.com, raul.morales@bclplaw.com,REC\_KM\_ECF\_SMO@bclplaw.com
- Roye Zur rzur@elkinskalt.com, cavila@elkinskalt.com;lwageman@elkinskalt.com;1648609420@filings.docketbir d.com