Docket #0463 Date Filed: 5/23/2025

UNITED STATES
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

**APPEAL TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

**Case Number:** 19-50194 **BK** (●) **AP** ( )

If AP, related BK case number: 18-12378

**Title of Order Appealed:** Final Judgment

**Docket #:** 457 **Date Entered:** 5/8/2025

Item Transmitted:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☑ | **Notice of Appeal** | **Docket #:** 462 | **Date Filed:** | 5/22/2025 |
| ☐ | **Amended Notice of Appeal** | **Docket #:** | **Date Filed:** | |
| ☐ | **Cross Appeal** | **Docket #:** | **Date Filed:** | |
| ☐ | **Motion for Leave to Appeal** | **Docket #:** | **Date Filed:** | |
| ☐ | **Request for Certification of Direct Appeal** | **Docket #:** | **Date Filed:** | |

**Appellant/Cross Appellant:**

Welded Construction, L.P.

**Appellee/Cross Appellee**

Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC

**Counsel for Appellant/Cross Appellant:**

Sean M. Beach
Kevin A. Guerke
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(additional attorneys listed on appeal)

**Counsel for Appellee/Cross Appellee:**

Lucian B. Murley
1201 North Market Street, Suite 2300
Wilmington, DE 19801
(additional attorneys listed on appeal)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Filing fee paid?** | **Yes** ( ) | **No** (●) |
| **IFP application filed by applicant?** | **Yes** ( ) | **No** (●) |
| **Have additional appeals of the same order been filed?** | **Yes** ( ) | **No** (●) |
| ***If Yes, has District Court assigned a Civil Action Number?** | **Yes** ( ) | **No** (●) |

**Civil Action Number:**

*(continued on next page)*

1812378250523000000000001

**Notes:** **NOTICE OF APPEAL FEE DUE SENT TO APPELLANT**

***I hereby certify that all designated items are available electronically through CM/ECF.***

**Date:** 5/23/2025 **by:** /s/ Kimberly Ross
**Deputy Clerk**

Bankruptcy Court Appeal (BAP) Number: 25-25

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | |
|---|---|
| In re:<br><br>WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P., *et al.*,[1]<br><br>Debtors. | Chapter 11<br><br>Case No. 18-12378 (LSS)<br><br>(Jointly Administered) |
| WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P.,<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>v.<br><br>THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC., WILLIAMS PARTNERS OPERATING LLC, and TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY, LLC,<br><br>Defendants. | Adv. Pro. No. 19-50194 (LSS) |

## NOTICE OF APPEAL

Plaintiff Welded Construction, L.P. submits this Notice of Appeal and Statement of Election in conformity with Official Bankruptcy Form 417A.

**Part 1: Identify the appellant(s)**

1. Name(s) of appellant(s):

   Welded Construction, L.P.

2. Position of appellant(s) in the adversary proceeding or bankruptcy case that is the subject of this appeal:

   Appellant is the plaintiff and counter-claim defendant in the adversary proceeding.

[1] The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Welded Construction, L.P. (5008) and Welded Construction Michigan, LLC (9830). The mailing address for each of the Debtors is P.O. Box 470, Perrysburg, OH 43552-0470.

**Part 2: Identify the subject of this appeal**

1. Describe the judgment, order, or decree appealed from:

Under 28 U.S.C. § 158 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8002 and 8003, Welded Construction, L.P. hereby gives notice of appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware's Final Judgment [Adv. D.I. 457] (attached as Exhibit A). The appeal of the Final Judgment relates only to the determination of post-judgment interest and penalties. The letter ruling stating the reasons for the Final Judgment regarding post-judgment interest and penalties [Adv. D.I. 455] is attached as Exhibit B.

2. State the date on which the judgment, order, or decree was entered:

The Final Judgment regarding post-judgment interest and penalties was issued on May 8, 2025.

**Part 3: Identify the other parties to the appeal**

List the names of all parties to the judgment, order, or decree appealed from and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of their attorneys:

1. **Appellant Welded Construction, L.P.**

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP
Sean M. Beach
Kevin A. Guerke
Michael S. Neiburg
Travis G. Buchanan
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Telephone: (302) 571-6600
Facsimile: (302) 571-1256
Email: sbeach@ycst.com
kguerke@ycst.com
mneiburg@ycst.com
tbuchanan@ycst.com

**2. Appellee Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC**

SAUL EWING LLP
Lucian B. Murley
1201 N. Market Street, Suite 2300
Wilmington, DE 19899
Telephone: (302) 421-6898
luke.murley@saul.com

WATT TIEDER HOFFAR & FITZGERALD, LLP
Shelly L. Ewald
Jennifer L. Kneeland
Jonathan Burwood
Jordan A. Hutcheson
1765 Greensboro Station Place, Suite 1000
McLean, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 749-1000
Fax: (703) 893-8029
sewald@watttieder.com
jkneeland@watttieder.com
jburwood@watttieder.com
jhutcheson@watttieder.com

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP
Andrew Ditchfield
Marc J. Tobak
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: 212-450-4000
andrew.ditchfield@davispolk.com
marc.tobak@davispolk.com

**Part 4: Optional election to have appeal heard by District Court**

Not applicable.

**Part 5: Sign below**

Dated: May 22, 2025
Wilmington, Delaware

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

*/s/ Travis G. Buchanan*

Sean M. Beach (No. 4070)
Kevin A. Guerke (No. 4096)
Michael S. Neiburg (No. 5275)
Travis G. Buchanan (No. 5595)
Rodney Square
1000 North King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Telephone: (302) 571-6600
Facsimile: (302) 571-1256
Emails: sbeach@ycst.com
kguerke@ycst.com
mneiburg@ycst.com
tbuchanan@ycst.com

*Counsel for Welded Construction, L.P.*

**EXHIBIT A**

**Final Judgment regarding post-judgment interest and penalties**

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | |
|---|---|
| In re: | Chapter 11 |
| WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P., *et al.*,[1] | Case No. 18-12378 (LSS) |
| Debtors. | (Jointly Administered) |
| WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P., Plaintiff, vs. THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC., WILLIAMS PARTNERS OPERATING LLC, and TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY, LLC, Defendants. | Adv. Pro. No. 19-50194 (LSS) |

**FINAL JUDGMENT**

**WHEREAS**, the above-captioned adversary proceeding (the "Adversary Proceeding") came on for a bench trial before this Court with respect to the claims and counterclaims between Welded Construction, L.P. ("Welded") and Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC ("Transco");

[1] The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Welded Construction, L.P. (5008) and Welded Construction Michigan, LLC (9830). The mailing address for each of the Debtors is P.O. Box 470, Perrysburg, OH 43552-0470.

**WHEREAS**, the Court rendered its Opinion [Adv. Docket No. 442] (the "Opinion") on February 4, 2025, which constitutes the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Rule 7052 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure; and

**WHEREAS**, the Court rendered a supplemental letter ruling regarding post-judgment interest and penalties [Adv. Docket No. 455] (the "Letter Ruling") on April 21, 2025;

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED**, as stated in the Opinion and Letter Ruling, that:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of Welded and against Transco in the principal amount of $44,632,308 plus (i) pre-judgment interest and penalties, which total $57,447,123.01 as of April 30, 2025, and shall continue to accrue as set forth in the following paragraph, and (ii) attorneys' fees and expenses (collectively, the "Judgment").

2. Subject to the quantification of attorneys' fees and expenses as set forth in Paragraph 4, the Judgment in Welded's favor is $102,079,431.01 as of April 30, 2025, with pre-judgment interest and penalties continuing to accrue, pursuant to 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 501 *et seq.*, at (i) the rate of 1% simple interest on the principal amount of $39,582,308 per month (prorated for any fraction of a month); and (ii) 1% penalty on the principal amount of $39,582,308 per month (prorated for any fraction of a month) from April 13, 2019, until the entry of this Judgment.

3. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, Welded is awarded post-judgment interest on the Judgment until the date that the Judgment is paid in full by, or on behalf of, Transco. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, post-judgment interest on Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses will accrue from the date that those attorneys' fees and expenses are quantified in a separate judgment order

as set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Judgment. Post-judgment interest on the remainder of the Judgment will accrue from the date of the entry of this Judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961.

4. Pursuant to 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 512(b), as the substantially prevailing party, Welded is awarded its attorneys' fees and expenses in this Adversary Proceeding. Welded shall make a submission regarding its attorneys' fees and expenses no later than forty-five (45) days from the date of entry of this Judgment. Transco shall have fourteen (14) days from the date Welded's submission is filed with the Court to file a response. Welded shall have seven (7) days from the date Transco's response is filed with the Court to file a reply. The Court shall enter a separate judgment order quantifying Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses.

5. All of Transco's claims and counterclaims against Welded, including Transco's (i) *Motion for Order Directing Welded Construction, L.P. to Comply with the Court's Orders Approving Commitment Letters* [Case No. 18-12378-LSS, Docket No. 836], and (ii) *Request for Adequate Protection* [Case No. 18-12378-LSS, Docket No. 837], regarding Transco's Request for Payment of Administrative Expense (assigned claim number 775) filed on April 26, 2019, as well as Transco's proofs of claim numbers 632 and 636, are hereby fully resolved and satisfied for the reasons set forth in the Opinion.

6. The Court enters this Judgment in favor of Welded and against Transco in this Adversary Proceeding for the reasons set forth in the Opinion. The Clerk of the Court is hereby directed to enter judgment on a final basis as set forth in this Judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) because there is no just reason for delay of entry of final judgment against Transco in this matter. All of Welded's existing claims against Transco and all of Transco's claims against Welded have been finally adjudicated by the Opinion, with the exception of quantification of the award of Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses, which will be

addressed by the Court as set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Judgment. The delay of entry of final judgment until the adjudication of Welded's complaint against The Williams Companies, Inc. and William Partners Operating LLC by a jury trial would prejudice the creditors of the Debtors' estate.

**Dated: May 8th, 2025**
**Wilmington, Delaware**

**LAURIE SELBER SILVERSTEIN**
**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE**

# Notice Recipients

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| District/Off: 0311−1 | User: admin | Date Created: 5/8/2025 |
| Case: 19−50194−LSS | Form ID: pdfjo | Total: 31 |

**Recipients of Notice of Electronic Filing:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| trans | Reliable Companies | gmatthews@reliable−co.com |
| aty | Albert Kass | ECFpleadings@kccllc.com |
| aty | Allison S Mielke | amielke@ycst.com |
| aty | Erin Edwards | bankfilings@ycst.com |
| aty | F. Troupe Mickler, IV | tmickler@ashbygeddes.com |
| aty | Gary D. Bressler | gbressler@mdmc−law.com |
| aty | Jaclyn C Marasco | jaclyn.marasco@faegredrinker.com |
| aty | Jennifer Larkin Kneeland | jkneeland@watttieder.com |
| aty | Jennifer Larkin Kneeland | jkneeland@watttieder.com |
| aty | Josef W. Mintz | mintz@blankrome.com |
| aty | Kathleen M. Miller | kmiller@skjlaw.com |
| aty | Kevin A Guerke | kguerke@ycst.com |
| aty | Lucian Borders Murley | luke.murley@saul.com |
| aty | Michael S. Neiburg | mneiburg@ycst.com |
| aty | Sean Matthew Beach | sbeach@ycst.com |
| aty | Steven William Soule' | ssoule@hallestill.com |
| aty | Travis G. Buchanan | bankfilings@ycst.com |

TOTAL: 17

**Recipients submitted to the BNC (Bankruptcy Noticing Center):**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| pla | Welded Construction, L.P. | P.O. Box 470 Perrysburg, OH 43551 |
| clagent | Kurtzman Carson Consultants, LLC dba Verita Global | 222 N. Pacific Coast Highway Suite 300 El Segundo, CA 90245 |
| aty | Andrew Ditchfield | Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 |
| aty | John Perry | Perry Dampf Dispute Solutions 721 Government Street Suite 102 Baton Rouge, LA 70802 |
| aty | John F. Heil, III | Hall Estill 320 South Boston Avenue Suite 200 Tulsa, OK 74103−3706 |
| aty | John F. Heil, III | Hall Estill 320 South Boston Avenue Suite 200 Tulsa, OK 74103−3706 |
| aty | Jonathan C. Burwood | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22101 |
| aty | Jonathan C. Burwood | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| aty | Jordan A. Hutcheson | Watt, Tieder, Hoffar & Fitzgerald, L.L.P 1765 Greensboro Station Place Suite 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| aty | Marc J. Tobak | Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 |
| aty | Shelly L. Ewald | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22101 |
| aty | Shelly L. Ewald | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| ust | U.S. Trustee | Office of the United States Trustee J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building 844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox 35 Wilmington, DE 19801 |
| ust | U.S. Trustee | Office of United States Trustee J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building 844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox 35 Wilmington, DE 19899−0035 |

TOTAL: 14

**EXHIBIT B**

**Letter Ruling**

# UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
## DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Laurie Selber Silverstein
Judge

824 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 252-2900

April 21, 2025

**VIA CM/ECF**

Michael S. Neiburg, Esq.
Sean M. Beach, Esq.
Travis G. Buchanan, Esq.
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor
Rodney Square, 1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Lucian B. Murley, Esq.
Saul Ewing LLP
1201 N. Market Street, Suite 2300
Wilmington, DE 19801

Shelly L. Ewald, Esq.
Jonathan C. Burwood, Esq.
Watt, Tieder, Hoffar & Fitzgerald, L.L.P.
1765 Greensboro Station, Place Suite 1000
McLean, VA 22102

In re: Welded Construction, L.P. – Adversary Proceeding No. 19-50194

Dear Counsel:

As the parties know, on February 4, 2025, I issued my Opinion[1] in the referenced adversary proceeding. I instructed the parties to settle a judgment order reflecting my rulings.

In simultaneous speaking letters filed March 3, 2025, Transco and Welded submitted competing forms of order. The only point of contention is whether the CASPA interest rate and penalty continue to accrue until the judgment is satisfied in full (Welded's position) or whether once judgment is entered, the penalty ceases to accrue and the federal post-judgment interest rate applies (Transco's position).[2]

Welded primarily relies on the Opinion, observes that it does not identify a cutoff date for the accrual of CASPA interest and penalties and argues that this is consistent with the statute,

---

[1] *Welded Constr., L.P. v. The Williams Cos. (In re Welded Constr., L.P.)* Adv. Pro. No. 19-50194, 2025 WL 433018 (Bankr. D. Del. Feb. 4, 2025) (slip op.), ECF No. 442.

[2] Letter to Hon. Laurie S. Silverstein re: Proposed J. Order, ECF No. 448; Letter Br. in Supp. of Proposed J. Order, ECF No. 449.

which is remedial in nature. Welded cites to *Zimmerman*,[3] a Pennsylvania state court decision, which rules that CASPA interest and penalties continue to accrue until the judgment is paid. Welded then concludes that the Opinion reflects *Zimmerman*'s reasoning because I ruled that with respect to the Final Payment, "interest should begin to run from the date of judgment."[4] Finally, Welded argues that applying the lower federal rate would benefit the owner rather than the contractor, thereby undermining CASPA's purpose.

Transco asks me to conclude that CASPA penalties and interest cease upon entry of the judgment and thereafter the federal post-judgment interest rate applies. Transco primarily makes an *Erie* argument, i.e., that bankruptcy courts presiding over adversary proceedings apply state law for substantive issues and federal law for procedural issues. It contends that an award of post-judgment interest is procedural, therefore, the federal post-judgment interest rate, 28 U.S.C. § 1961, applies. Transco also argues that penalties imposed by state statutes terminate at the entry of judgment and are supplanted by the federal post-judgment rate.

**Discussion**

I'll start with two observations. First, when drafting the Opinion, I did not specifically consider when the penalties end or the appropriate rate of post-judgment interest. In the context of this dispute, however, I will not find that either party waived the argument;[5] it was simply not addressed and it was not clear that there would be a dispute. Second, I did not rule on whether this adversary proceeding was based on bankruptcy jurisdiction or diversity jurisdiction because I did not need to.[6] This distinction remains unbriefed by both parties.

CASPA "introduced disincentives" into the "financial relationships of participants in the construction industry."[7] Those disincentives include interest at 1% per month, a penalty at 1% per month and attorney's fees for the substantially prevailing party. These three disincentives are separate and cumulative (if appropriate), not alternatives.[8] In the Opinion, I ruled that all three were appropriate as set forth therein.

---

[3] *Zimmerman v. Harrisburg Fudd I, L.P.*, 984 A.2d 497, 505 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2009).

[4] Letter Br. 2, ECF No. 449 (quoting *In re Welded*, 2025 WL 433018, at *77, ECF No. 442).

[5] *See* Letter Br. 2, ECF No. 449.

[6] *In re Welded*, 2025 WL 433018, at *71, ECF No. 442.

[7] *Zimmerman*, 984 A.2d at 505.

[8] *See* 73 PA. Cons. Stat. § 505(d) (2025) (providing for interest on balances due and owing); *Id.* § 512(a) (providing for a penalty in the event litigation is commenced); *Id.* § 512(b) (providing a reasonable attorney fee to the substantially prevailing party).

*A. State Court outcomes*

Both parties acknowledge that the *Zimmerman* court imposed CASPA penalties and interest following judgment.[9] But, Transco argues that *Zimmerman* is not applicable in federal court, and, in any event, the court misreads CASPA's penalty provision. Transco argues that § 512(a)(1) permits the court to award a penalty equal to 1% per month of amounts wrongfully withheld, but says nothing about the continued accrual of the penalty post-award. Welded relies on *Zimmerman*'s ruling and CASPA's remedial purposes which are accorded a "liberal construction to effect [its] objects and to promote justice." The parties did not cite any Pennsylvania Supreme Court authority.

While I hesitate to disagree with a decision issued by a Pennsylvania state court on a Pennsylvania state statute, the portion of the decision discussing the CASPA penalty contains *de minimis* analysis and, as such, is accorded less deference.[10] Section 512 establishes a penalty of 1% per month on the amount wrongfully withheld as additional "damages" that a court shall "award." This does not suggest that it persists after the award is granted. As for post-judgment interest, the *Zimmerman* court held that § 505 "clearly mandates" CASPA interest from default until payment in full and is an exception to Pennsylvania's post-judgment interest statute.[11] Section 505 does not limit the payment of interest as part of the court's award and so I accept the *Zimmerman* ruling on this point. Further, the *Zimmerman* court reasons considering analogous caselaw that § 505 is an exception to Pennsylvania's post-judgment interest rate statute.

Accordingly, if Welded had sued in a Pennsylvania state court and received a state court judgment, the CASPA interest rate would be applicable post-judgment. And, while I disagree,

---

[9] *Zimmerman* involved an arbitration proceeding resulting in a "stipulated award" which was then entered as a judgment, thus the decision at times uses the term "award" rather than "judgment."

[10] *C.J. Hughes Constr. Co., Inc. v. EQM Gathering OPCO, LLC*, No. 22-3391, 2024 WL 1652341, at *7 (Apr. 17, 2024) (Ambro, J., dissenting in part):

> But the case for deference weakens considerably when, as here, the state courts provide *de minimis* analysis. After all, our goal is to predict how state supreme courts would rule, and the substantial respect we rightly extend them means that we should not assume they will follow decisions that are minimally explained or facially erroneous. We have disregarded state intermediate appellate court decisions on that basis in the past. *Makowka*, 754 F.3d at 148-49 (disagreeing with controlling state intermediate appellate case because "it is internally inconsistent, it conflicts with the text and structure of [the statute], and it contravenes a fundamental precept of Pennsylvania law."); *Roma v. United States*, 344 F.3d 352, 359-62 (3d Cir. 2003). We should not hesitate to do so when, as here, data – like Pennsylvania precedent and law on statutory interpretation – supports a different view. I thus respectfully dissent.

[11] *Zimmerman*, 984 A.2d at 502 n.8; *see also* 42 PA. Cons. Stat. § 8101 (2025) ("Except as otherwise provided by another statute, a judgment for a specific sum of money shall bear interest at the law rate . . . .").

Welded would also have an argument that CASPA penalties continue to accrue until the judgment is paid in full.

*B. Federal Court outcomes*

Welded chose to bring its lawsuit in the bankruptcy court, thus obtaining a judgment in federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a) provides, with exceptions not relevant here, that "[i]nterest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court . . . ."[12] It is undisputed that bankruptcy courts are units of district courts.[13] In isolation, then, this suggests that § 1961 applies.[14] Indeed, the Third Circuit applied § 1961 to a judgment in its ruling on the Internal Revenue Service's right to post-judgment interest on its bankruptcy claims on this very reasoning.[15] Notwithstanding, the Third Circuit has also recognized that § 1961 "provides a

---

[12] (a) Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court. Execution therefor may be levied by the marshal, in any case where, by the law of the State in which such court is held, execution may be levied for interest on judgments recovered in the courts of the State. Such interest shall be calculated from the date of the entry of the judgment, at a rate equal to the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week preceding the date of the judgment. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall distribute notice of that rate and any changes in it to all Federal judges.

(b) Interest shall be computed daily to the date of payment except as provided in section 2516(b) of this title and section 1304(b) of title 31, and shall be compounded annually.

(c)(1) This section shall not apply in any judgment of any court with respect to any internal revenue tax case. Interest shall be allowed in such cases at the underpayment or overpayment rate (whichever is appropriate) established under section 6621 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, interest shall be allowed on all final judgments against the United Stats in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, at the rate provided in subsection (a) and as provided in subsection (b).

(3) Interest shall be allowed, computed, and paid on judgments of the United States Court of Federal Claims only as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or in any other provision of law.

(4) This section shall not be construed to affect the interest of any judgment of any court not specified in this section.

[13] *Resyn Corp. v. United States (In re Resyn Corp.)*, 945 F.2d 1279, 1284 (3d Cir. 1991).

[14] "Section 1961, therefore, applies to bankruptcy court judgments." *Id. See also FTI Consulting, Inc. v. Sweeney (In re Centaur, LLC)*, No. 10-10799, 2019 WL 2122952, at *5 (Bankr. D. Del. May 13, 2019) ("Courts have held that section 1961 applies to bankruptcy court judgments."); *Carmichael v. Balke (In re Imperial Petroleum Recovery Corp.)*, 84 F.4th 264, 272 (5th Cir. 2023).

[15] *Resyn*, 945 F.2d at 1284. The *Resyn* court does not address the intersection of § 1961 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(b), which permits interest only on secured claims in the context of claims allowance (*i.e.*, if Transco

default rule [which] may be modified by private agreement."[16] Examining the doctrine of merger, the court determined that parties to a contract may stipulate to a rate of interest post-judgment which will override § 1961 if their intent is clearly and unequivocally manifested in a contract.[17]

*C. Application*

Welded does not rely on any provision of the Agreement to argue it is entitled to post-judgment interest at the CASPA rate. Nor does Welded cite any law for the proposition that a state statute can provide an exception to § 1961.

While I recognize and appreciate CASPA's remedial nature, in the face of the language of § 512, the decision to file in federal court and for the above reasons, I conclude that: (i) CASPA penalties do not continue to accrue post-judgment and (ii) the post-judgment interest rate is determined by § 1961.[18]

**Conclusion**

The parties shall confer and update the proposed form of order to reflect the current amounts accrued, make conforming changes and resubmit for entry.

Very truly yours,



Laurie Selber Silverstein

LSS/cmb

---

had received a net judgment, no post-judgment interest would accrue because Transco asserts an unsecured claim.).

[16] *Sovereign Bank v. Remi Cap., Inc.*, 49 F.4th 360, 365 (3d Cir. 2022).

[17] *Id.* at 368.

[18] I make no conclusion as to the applicable interest rate if the judgment is entered in a state court for execution. *See Chen v. Asian Terrace Rest., Inc.*, 602 F.Supp.3d 348, 352 n.1 (E.D.N.Y. 2022).

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In re: | ) | Chapter 11 |
| WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P., *et al.*,[1] | ) | Case No. 18-12378 (LSS) |
| Debtors. | ) | (Jointly Administered) |
| WELDED CONSTRUCTION, L.P., | ) | |
| Plaintiff, | ) | |
| vs. | ) | Adv. Pro. No. 19-50194 (LSS) |
| THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC., WILLIAMS PARTNERS OPERATING LLC, and TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY, LLC, | ) | |
| Defendants. | ) | |

**FINAL JUDGMENT**

**WHEREAS**, the above-captioned adversary proceeding (the "Adversary Proceeding") came on for a bench trial before this Court with respect to the claims and counterclaims between Welded Construction, L.P. ("Welded") and Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC ("Transco");

[1] The Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are: Welded Construction, L.P. (5008) and Welded Construction Michigan, LLC (9830). The mailing address for each of the Debtors is P.O. Box 470, Perrysburg, OH 43552-0470.

**WHEREAS**, the Court rendered its Opinion [Adv. Docket No. 442] (the "Opinion") on February 4, 2025, which constitutes the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Rule 7052 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure; and

**WHEREAS**, the Court rendered a supplemental letter ruling regarding post-judgment interest and penalties [Adv. Docket No. 455] (the "Letter Ruling") on April 21, 2025;

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED**, as stated in the Opinion and Letter Ruling, that:

1. Judgment is entered in favor of Welded and against Transco in the principal amount of $44,632,308 plus (i) pre-judgment interest and penalties, which total $57,447,123.01 as of April 30, 2025, and shall continue to accrue as set forth in the following paragraph, and (ii) attorneys' fees and expenses (collectively, the "Judgment").

2. Subject to the quantification of attorneys' fees and expenses as set forth in Paragraph 4, the Judgment in Welded's favor is $102,079,431.01 as of April 30, 2025, with pre-judgment interest and penalties continuing to accrue, pursuant to 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 501 *et seq.*, at (i) the rate of 1% simple interest on the principal amount of $39,582,308 per month (prorated for any fraction of a month); and (ii) 1% penalty on the principal amount of $39,582,308 per month (prorated for any fraction of a month) from April 13, 2019, until the entry of this Judgment.

3. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, Welded is awarded post-judgment interest on the Judgment until the date that the Judgment is paid in full by, or on behalf of, Transco. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961, post-judgment interest on Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses will accrue from the date that those attorneys' fees and expenses are quantified in a separate judgment order

as set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Judgment. Post-judgment interest on the remainder of the Judgment will accrue from the date of the entry of this Judgment, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961.

4. Pursuant to 73 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 512(b), as the substantially prevailing party, Welded is awarded its attorneys' fees and expenses in this Adversary Proceeding. Welded shall make a submission regarding its attorneys' fees and expenses no later than forty-five (45) days from the date of entry of this Judgment. Transco shall have fourteen (14) days from the date Welded's submission is filed with the Court to file a response. Welded shall have seven (7) days from the date Transco's response is filed with the Court to file a reply. The Court shall enter a separate judgment order quantifying Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses.

5. All of Transco's claims and counterclaims against Welded, including Transco's (i) *Motion for Order Directing Welded Construction, L.P. to Comply with the Court's Orders Approving Commitment Letters* [Case No. 18-12378-LSS, Docket No. 836], and (ii) *Request for Adequate Protection* [Case No. 18-12378-LSS, Docket No. 837], regarding Transco's Request for Payment of Administrative Expense (assigned claim number 775) filed on April 26, 2019, as well as Transco's proofs of claim numbers 632 and 636, are hereby fully resolved and satisfied for the reasons set forth in the Opinion.

6. The Court enters this Judgment in favor of Welded and against Transco in this Adversary Proceeding for the reasons set forth in the Opinion. The Clerk of the Court is hereby directed to enter judgment on a final basis as set forth in this Judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) because there is no just reason for delay of entry of final judgment against Transco in this matter. All of Welded's existing claims against Transco and all of Transco's claims against Welded have been finally adjudicated by the Opinion, with the exception of quantification of the award of Welded's attorneys' fees and expenses, which will be

addressed by the Court as set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Judgment. The delay of entry of final judgment until the adjudication of Welded's complaint against The Williams Companies, Inc. and William Partners Operating LLC by a jury trial would prejudice the creditors of the Debtors' estate.

**Dated: May 8th, 2025**
**Wilmington, Delaware**

**LAURIE SELBER SILVERSTEIN**
**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE**

# Notice Recipients

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| District/Off: 0311−1 | User: admin | Date Created: 5/8/2025 |
| Case: 19−50194−LSS | Form ID: pdfjo | Total: 31 |

**Recipients of Notice of Electronic Filing:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| trans | Reliable Companies | gmatthews@reliable−co.com |
| aty | Albert Kass | ECFpleadings@kccllc.com |
| aty | Allison S Mielke | amielke@ycst.com |
| aty | Erin Edwards | bankfilings@ycst.com |
| aty | F. Troupe Mickler, IV | tmickler@ashbygeddes.com |
| aty | Gary D. Bressler | gbressler@mdmc−law.com |
| aty | Jaclyn C Marasco | jaclyn.marasco@faegredrinker.com |
| aty | Jennifer Larkin Kneeland | jkneeland@watttieder.com |
| aty | Jennifer Larkin Kneeland | jkneeland@watttieder.com |
| aty | Josef W. Mintz | mintz@blankrome.com |
| aty | Kathleen M. Miller | kmiller@skjlaw.com |
| aty | Kevin A Guerke | kguerke@ycst.com |
| aty | Lucian Borders Murley | luke.murley@saul.com |
| aty | Michael S. Neiburg | mneiburg@ycst.com |
| aty | Sean Matthew Beach | sbeach@ycst.com |
| aty | Steven William Soule' | ssoule@hallestill.com |
| aty | Travis G. Buchanan | bankfilings@ycst.com |

TOTAL: 17

**Recipients submitted to the BNC (Bankruptcy Noticing Center):**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| pla | Welded Construction, L.P. | P.O. Box 470 Perrysburg, OH 43551 |
| clagent | Kurtzman Carson Consultants, LLC dba Verita Global | 222 N. Pacific Coast Highway Suite 300 El Segundo, CA 90245 |
| aty | Andrew Ditchfield | Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 |
| aty | John Perry | Perry Dampf Dispute Solutions 721 Government Street Suite 102 Baton Rouge, LA 70802 |
| aty | John F. Heil, III | Hall Estill 320 South Boston Avenue Suite 200 Tulsa, OK 74103−3706 |
| aty | John F. Heil, III | Hall Estill 320 South Boston Avenue Suite 200 Tulsa, OK 74103−3706 |
| aty | Jonathan C. Burwood | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22101 |
| aty | Jonathan C. Burwood | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| aty | Jordan A. Hutcheson | Watt, Tieder, Hoffar & Fitzgerald, L.L.P 1765 Greensboro Station Place Suite 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| aty | Marc J. Tobak | Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP 450 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10017 |
| aty | Shelly L. Ewald | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22101 |
| aty | Shelly L. Ewald | Watt Tieder Hoffar & Fitzgerald LLP 1765 Greensboro Station PL Ste. 1000 McLean, VA 22102 |
| ust | U.S. Trustee | Office of the United States Trustee J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building 844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox 35 Wilmington, DE 19801 |
| ust | U.S. Trustee | Office of United States Trustee J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building 844 King Street, Suite 2207 Lockbox 35 Wilmington, DE 19899−0035 |

TOTAL: 14

# UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
## DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Laurie Selber Silverstein
Judge

824 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 252-2900

April 21, 2025

**VIA CM/ECF**

Michael S. Neiburg, Esq.
Sean M. Beach, Esq.
Travis G. Buchanan, Esq.
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor
Rodney Square, 1000 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Lucian B. Murley, Esq.
Saul Ewing LLP
1201 N. Market Street, Suite 2300
Wilmington, DE 19801

Shelly L. Ewald, Esq.
Jonathan C. Burwood, Esq.
Watt, Tieder, Hoffar & Fitzgerald, L.L.P.
1765 Greensboro Station, Place Suite 1000
McLean, VA 22102

In re: Welded Construction, L.P. – Adversary Proceeding No. 19-50194

Dear Counsel:

As the parties know, on February 4, 2025, I issued my Opinion[1] in the referenced adversary proceeding. I instructed the parties to settle a judgment order reflecting my rulings.

In simultaneous speaking letters filed March 3, 2025, Transco and Welded submitted competing forms of order. The only point of contention is whether the CASPA interest rate and penalty continue to accrue until the judgment is satisfied in full (Welded's position) or whether once judgment is entered, the penalty ceases to accrue and the federal post-judgment interest rate applies (Transco's position).[2]

Welded primarily relies on the Opinion, observes that it does not identify a cutoff date for the accrual of CASPA interest and penalties and argues that this is consistent with the statute,

---

[1] *Welded Constr., L.P. v. The Williams Cos. (In re Welded Constr., L.P.)* Adv. Pro. No. 19-50194, 2025 WL 433018 (Bankr. D. Del. Feb. 4, 2025) (slip op.), ECF No. 442.

[2] Letter to Hon. Laurie S. Silverstein re: Proposed J. Order, ECF No. 448; Letter Br. in Supp. of Proposed J. Order, ECF No. 449.

which is remedial in nature. Welded cites to *Zimmerman*,[3] a Pennsylvania state court decision, which rules that CASPA interest and penalties continue to accrue until the judgment is paid. Welded then concludes that the Opinion reflects *Zimmerman*'s reasoning because I ruled that with respect to the Final Payment, "interest should begin to run from the date of judgment."[4] Finally, Welded argues that applying the lower federal rate would benefit the owner rather than the contractor, thereby undermining CASPA's purpose.

Transco asks me to conclude that CASPA penalties and interest cease upon entry of the judgment and thereafter the federal post-judgment interest rate applies. Transco primarily makes an *Erie* argument, i.e., that bankruptcy courts presiding over adversary proceedings apply state law for substantive issues and federal law for procedural issues. It contends that an award of post-judgment interest is procedural, therefore, the federal post-judgment interest rate, 28 U.S.C. § 1961, applies. Transco also argues that penalties imposed by state statutes terminate at the entry of judgment and are supplanted by the federal post-judgment rate.

**Discussion**

I'll start with two observations. First, when drafting the Opinion, I did not specifically consider when the penalties end or the appropriate rate of post-judgment interest. In the context of this dispute, however, I will not find that either party waived the argument;[5] it was simply not addressed and it was not clear that there would be a dispute. Second, I did not rule on whether this adversary proceeding was based on bankruptcy jurisdiction or diversity jurisdiction because I did not need to.[6] This distinction remains unbriefed by both parties.

CASPA "introduced disincentives" into the "financial relationships of participants in the construction industry."[7] Those disincentives include interest at 1% per month, a penalty at 1% per month and attorney's fees for the substantially prevailing party. These three disincentives are separate and cumulative (if appropriate), not alternatives.[8] In the Opinion, I ruled that all three were appropriate as set forth therein.

---

[3] *Zimmerman v. Harrisburg Fudd I, L.P.*, 984 A.2d 497, 505 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2009).

[4] Letter Br. 2, ECF No. 449 (quoting *In re Welded*, 2025 WL 433018, at *77, ECF No. 442).

[5] *See* Letter Br. 2, ECF No. 449.

[6] *In re Welded*, 2025 WL 433018, at *71, ECF No. 442.

[7] *Zimmerman*, 984 A.2d at 505.

[8] *See* 73 PA. Cons. Stat. § 505(d) (2025) (providing for interest on balances due and owing); *Id.* § 512(a) (providing for a penalty in the event litigation is commenced); *Id.* § 512(b) (providing a reasonable attorney fee to the substantially prevailing party).

*A. State Court outcomes*

Both parties acknowledge that the *Zimmerman* court imposed CASPA penalties and interest following judgment.[9] But, Transco argues that *Zimmerman* is not applicable in federal court, and, in any event, the court misreads CASPA's penalty provision. Transco argues that § 512(a)(1) permits the court to award a penalty equal to 1% per month of amounts wrongfully withheld, but says nothing about the continued accrual of the penalty post-award. Welded relies on *Zimmerman*'s ruling and CASPA's remedial purposes which are accorded a "liberal construction to effect [its] objects and to promote justice." The parties did not cite any Pennsylvania Supreme Court authority.

While I hesitate to disagree with a decision issued by a Pennsylvania state court on a Pennsylvania state statute, the portion of the decision discussing the CASPA penalty contains *de minimis* analysis and, as such, is accorded less deference.[10] Section 512 establishes a penalty of 1% per month on the amount wrongfully withheld as additional "damages" that a court shall "award." This does not suggest that it persists after the award is granted. As for post-judgment interest, the *Zimmerman* court held that § 505 "clearly mandates" CASPA interest from default until payment in full and is an exception to Pennsylvania's post-judgment interest statute.[11] Section 505 does not limit the payment of interest as part of the court's award and so I accept the *Zimmerman* ruling on this point. Further, the *Zimmerman* court reasons considering analogous caselaw that § 505 is an exception to Pennsylvania's post-judgment interest rate statute.

Accordingly, if Welded had sued in a Pennsylvania state court and received a state court judgment, the CASPA interest rate would be applicable post-judgment. And, while I disagree,

---

[9] *Zimmerman* involved an arbitration proceeding resulting in a "stipulated award" which was then entered as a judgment, thus the decision at times uses the term "award" rather than "judgment."

[10] *C.J. Hughes Constr. Co., Inc. v. EQM Gathering OPCO, LLC*, No. 22-3391, 2024 WL 1652341, at *7 (Apr. 17, 2024) (Ambro, J., dissenting in part):

> But the case for deference weakens considerably when, as here, the state courts provide *de minimis* analysis. After all, our goal is to predict how state supreme courts would rule, and the substantial respect we rightly extend them means that we should not assume they will follow decisions that are minimally explained or facially erroneous. We have disregarded state intermediate appellate court decisions on that basis in the past. *Makowka*, 754 F.3d at 148-49 (disagreeing with controlling state intermediate appellate case because "it is internally inconsistent, it conflicts with the text and structure of [the statute], and it contravenes a fundamental precept of Pennsylvania law."); *Roma v. United States*, 344 F.3d 352, 359-62 (3d Cir. 2003). We should not hesitate to do so when, as here, data – like Pennsylvania precedent and law on statutory interpretation – supports a different view. I thus respectfully dissent.

[11] *Zimmerman*, 984 A.2d at 502 n.8; *see also* 42 PA. Cons. Stat. § 8101 (2025) ("Except as otherwise provided by another statute, a judgment for a specific sum of money shall bear interest at the law rate . . . .").

Welded would also have an argument that CASPA penalties continue to accrue until the judgment is paid in full.

*B. Federal Court outcomes*

Welded chose to bring its lawsuit in the bankruptcy court, thus obtaining a judgment in federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a) provides, with exceptions not relevant here, that "[i]nterest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court . . . ."[12] It is undisputed that bankruptcy courts are units of district courts.[13] In isolation, then, this suggests that § 1961 applies.[14] Indeed, the Third Circuit applied § 1961 to a judgment in its ruling on the Internal Revenue Service's right to post-judgment interest on its bankruptcy claims on this very reasoning.[15] Notwithstanding, the Third Circuit has also recognized that § 1961 "provides a

---

[12] (a) Interest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court. Execution therefor may be levied by the marshal, in any case where, by the law of the State in which such court is held, execution may be levied for interest on judgments recovered in the courts of the State. Such interest shall be calculated from the date of the entry of the judgment, at a rate equal to the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week preceding the date of the judgment. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall distribute notice of that rate and any changes in it to all Federal judges.

(b) Interest shall be computed daily to the date of payment except as provided in section 2516(b) of this title and section 1304(b) of title 31, and shall be compounded annually.

(c)(1) This section shall not apply in any judgment of any court with respect to any internal revenue tax case. Interest shall be allowed in such cases at the underpayment or overpayment rate (whichever is appropriate) established under section 6621 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, interest shall be allowed on all final judgments against the United Stats in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, at the rate provided in subsection (a) and as provided in subsection (b).

(3) Interest shall be allowed, computed, and paid on judgments of the United States Court of Federal Claims only as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or in any other provision of law.

(4) This section shall not be construed to affect the interest of any judgment of any court not specified in this section.

[13] *Resyn Corp. v. United States (In re Resyn Corp.)*, 945 F.2d 1279, 1284 (3d Cir. 1991).

[14] "Section 1961, therefore, applies to bankruptcy court judgments." *Id. See also FTI Consulting, Inc. v. Sweeney (In re Centaur, LLC)*, No. 10-10799, 2019 WL 2122952, at *5 (Bankr. D. Del. May 13, 2019) ("Courts have held that section 1961 applies to bankruptcy court judgments."); *Carmichael v. Balke (In re Imperial Petroleum Recovery Corp.)*, 84 F.4th 264, 272 (5th Cir. 2023).

[15] *Resyn*, 945 F.2d at 1284. The *Resyn* court does not address the intersection of § 1961 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(b), which permits interest only on secured claims in the context of claims allowance (*i.e.*, if Transco

default rule [which] may be modified by private agreement."[16] Examining the doctrine of merger, the court determined that parties to a contract may stipulate to a rate of interest post-judgment which will override § 1961 if their intent is clearly and unequivocally manifested in a contract.[17]

*C. Application*

Welded does not rely on any provision of the Agreement to argue it is entitled to post-judgment interest at the CASPA rate. Nor does Welded cite any law for the proposition that a state statute can provide an exception to § 1961.

While I recognize and appreciate CASPA's remedial nature, in the face of the language of § 512, the decision to file in federal court and for the above reasons, I conclude that: (i) CASPA penalties do not continue to accrue post-judgment and (ii) the post-judgment interest rate is determined by § 1961.[18]

**Conclusion**

The parties shall confer and update the proposed form of order to reflect the current amounts accrued, make conforming changes and resubmit for entry.

Very truly yours,



Laurie Selber Silverstein

LSS/cmb

---

had received a net judgment, no post-judgment interest would accrue because Transco asserts an unsecured claim.).

[16] *Sovereign Bank v. Remi Cap., Inc.*, 49 F.4th 360, 365 (3d Cir. 2022).

[17] *Id.* at 368.

[18] I make no conclusion as to the applicable interest rate if the judgment is entered in a state court for execution. *See Chen v. Asian Terrace Rest., Inc.*, 602 F.Supp.3d 348, 352 n.1 (E.D.N.Y. 2022).