

CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	xv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Early Dismissal for Bad Faith	5
I. Genesis of the Bad Faith Doctrine: Threshold and Dispositive Issue	6
II. The Subjective Bad Faith Test: “Valid Bankruptcy Purposes”	8
A. Do the 1994 SARE Amendments Modify or Alter the Application of the <i>Phoenix-Piccadilly</i> Standards?	10
III. The Requirement for Both Objective and Subjective Bad Faith	15
A. Challenges to the Dual Standard in <i>Carolyn</i>	19
IV. Recent Examples of Motions Seeking Early Dismissal for Alleged Bad Faith	22
A. <i>Rittenhouse</i> : Dismissal Granted in Condominium Construction Context	23
B. <i>In re General Growth Properties</i> : Denial of Motion to Dismiss Where Debtor Is Solvent and Court Considers Interests of the Corporate Family.....	26
C. Motions to Dismiss Based on the Objective Futility Arising from the Lack of an Impaired Assenting Class	28
D. Defenses to the Lack of an Impaired Class.....	31
V. Challenges to the Good Faith Doctrine	32
VI. Statutory Grounds for Motion to Dismiss: 11 U.S.C. § 1112	35
A. Relationship to the Good Faith Doctrine	38
Chapter 2: Cash Collateral	41
I. Introduction	41
A. Statutory Framework	43
II. How Is a Mortgage Lender’s Interest in Rental Income Perfected? Common Law and Statutory Standards	44
A. The Relationship between State Law on Perfection and Federal Bankruptcy Law; the Rule in <i>Butner</i>	44

B. Common Law Rules on Rent Perfection: Need for “Additional Acts”	46
C. State Statutory Provisions that Provide for Perfection on Recordation: End of the Common Law Era of Perfection?	50
D. Summary	52
III. The 1994 Amendments to § 552(b)	53
A. The 1994 Amendments	53
B. Section 552(b)(2) Still Requires Compliance with State Law Recordation	56
C. Affirmative Acts Still Required in Minority of Jurisdictions	58
IV. The Theory of the “Absolute Assignment” of Rental Income	60
A. Absolute Assignments Disfavored	60
B. Have Absolute Assignments Been Pre-empted and Prohibited by Code § 541(a)(6)?	63
C. Absolute Assignments Permitted	65
Chapter 3: Adequate Protection for Use of Collateral	69
I. Basic Concept of Adequate Protection	69
A. Introduction	69
B. Is Adequate Protection Measured from the Date of the Petition, or the Date When a Lender First Seeks Adequate Protection or Relief from the Stay?	72
C. Can Adequate Protection Be Provided by Applying the Rental Income to the Maintenance of the Real Property?	74
D. Should Adequate Protection Payments Be Credited against the Lender’s Allowed Secured Claim?	74
Chapter 4: The Single Asset Real Estate Case: Statutory Standards	85
I. Introduction	85
II. Statutory Basics	86
III. Key Issues Pertaining to Definition of a Single Asset Case and the Accelerated Plan Schedule	88
IV. What Are the Key Characteristics of a Single Asset Case?	88
A. Examples of Particular Assets	90
V. What Does It Mean to Be “Operating the Real Property?”	91

A. <i>In re Kara Homes Inc.</i>	92
B. <i>Scotia Development</i>	94
C. Not Just “Mowing the Grass”	96
VI. The Obligation of a Single Asset Debtor to Make Monthly Payments.....	97
A. How Is the Amount of the Monthly Payments Determined?.....	97
B. When Must the Debtor Start Making Payments under § 362(d)(3)?	98
C. What Is the Source of the Payment, and Must the Debtor Provide Adequate Protection in Using Rental Income?	98
VII. When Can a Lender File a Motion Seeking Relief from the Stay?	99
VIII. Is Relief from the Stay Mandatory if the Debtor Fails to Comply with the Monthly Payments or Filing of a Plan?	100
Chapter 5: The Real Estate Plan of Reorganization.....	103
I. Introduction.....	103
II. General Confirmation Standards: § 1129(a).....	104
A. Proposed in Good Faith: § 1129(a)(3)	105
B. Burden of Proof—Preponderance of Evidence: Majority Rule	106
C. Standing to Object to a Plan of Reorganization.....	109
III. Impairment and Artificial Impairment: § 1124	115
A. In General.....	115
B. What Constitutes “Impairment,” and When Is the Impairment “Artificial” and Hence Legally Inadequate to Support Confirmation?	117
C. One Impaired Class Where Affiliated Debtors Are Administratively Consolidated ...	120
D. Is Payment in Cash, in Full, without Interest, Impairment?	121
E. Reinstatement under § 1124(2)	123
F. Classification of Claims	126
G. Separate Classification of the Mortgage Lender’s Deficiency Claim	127
IV. Restructuring the Mortgage Debt: Cramdown of the Secured Claim	131
A. Introduction.....	131
B. Lien Retention and Deferred Cash Payments	132

C. Sale Plans	156
D. Indubitable Equivalent Plans	158
E. The § 1111(b) Election	160
V. Restructuring the Mortgage Debt: Cramdown of the Unsecured Claim	163
A. Strategic Importance	163
B. Basic Operation of the Cramdown of Unsecured Claims: Absolute Priority Rule	165
C. Interest Rate Considerations; Payment in Full of the Unsecured Claim	165
D. The New Value Corollary: Payment of Less than the Full Unsecured Deficiency Claim	167
E. <i>Bonner Mall</i> : The Ninth Circuit Endorses New Value and Outlines the Elements of a “New Value” Plan	170
F. <i>Bank of America National Trust and Sav Ass’n v. 203 North LaSalle Street Partnership</i> : The Requirement for a Market Test of Value	170
G. New Value Plans Since the Decision in <i>203 N. LaSalle</i> : Avoiding Even the “Market Test” Requirement?	174
Conclusion	179