

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt® PUBLICATION

MARCH 2017

**EDITOR'S NOTE: LETTERS OF CREDIT**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF A BUYER'S OBLIGATION TO OPEN  
A LETTER OF CREDIT IN CISG CONTRACTS—PART I**

Edgardo Muñoz

**MARKET ABUSE REGULATION: IMPACT ON U.S. PUBLIC  
COMPANIES—PART III**

Raj S. Panasar, Leslie N. Silverman, Sandra L. Flow,  
Aseet Vasudev Dalvi, and Jackson Martin

**A GIANT LEAP OF FAITH: UNDERSTANDING AND RATIONALIZING  
CHINA'S DEPOSIT INSURANCE SYSTEM—PART III**

Fei Li

**THIRD CIRCUIT FINDS NOTEHOLDERS HAVE RIGHT TO PAYMENT OF  
MAKE-WHOLE PREMIUM AFTER BANKRUPTCY ACCELERATION**

Joseph A. Hall, Marshall S. Huebner, Michael Kaplan, and  
Eli J. Vonnegut

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

VOLUME 134

NUMBER 3

March 2017

---

**Editor's Note: Letters of Credit**

Victoria Prussen Spears

127

**Remedies for Breach of a Buyer's Obligation to Open a Letter of Credit in CISG Contracts—Part I**

Edgardo Muñoz

130

**Market Abuse Regulation: Impact on U.S. Public Companies—Part III**

Raj S. Panasar, Leslie N. Silverman, Sandra L. Flow, Aseet Vasudev Dalvi, and Jackson Martin

138

**A Giant Leap of Faith: Understanding and Rationalizing China's Deposit Insurance System—Part III**

Fei Li

161

**Third Circuit Finds Noteholders Have Right to Payment of Make-Whole Premium after Bankruptcy Acceleration**

Joseph A. Hall, Marshall S. Huebner, Michael Kaplan, and Eli J. Vonnegut

184

## **QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Matthew T. Burke at ..... (800) 252-9257

Email: ..... [matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com](mailto:matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com)

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

---

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-8020-4 (eBook)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

ISSN: 2381-3512 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

---

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Sheshunoff is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

*An A.S. Pratt® Publication*

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**Steven A. Meyerowitz**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**Victoria Prussen Spears**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

Barkley Clark  
*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street  
LLP*

John F. Dolan  
*Professor of Law  
Wayne State Univ. Law School*

David F. Freeman, Jr.  
*Partner, Arnold & Porter LLP*

Satish M. Kini  
*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton  
LLP*

Douglas Landy  
*Partner, Milbank, Tweed,  
Hadley & McCloy LLP*

Paul L. Lee  
*Of Counsel, Debevoise &  
Plimpton LLP*

Jonathan R. Macey  
*Professor of Law  
Yale Law School*

Stephen J. Newman  
*Partner, Stroock & Stroock &  
Lavan LLP*

Bimal Patel  
*Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP*

David Richardson  
*Partner, Dorsey & Whitney*

Heath P. Tarbert  
*Partner, Allen & Overy LLP*

Stephen B. Weissman  
*Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP*

Elizabeth C. Yen  
*Partner, Hudson Cook, LLP*

Regional Banking Outlook  
James F. Bauerle  
*Keevican Weiss Bauerle & Hirsch  
LLC*

Intellectual Property  
Stephen T. Schreiner  
*Partner, Goodwin Procter LLP*

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2017 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258 (phone). Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the

authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

# Third Circuit Finds Noteholders Have Right to Payment of Make-Whole Premium after Bankruptcy Acceleration

*Joseph A. Hall, Marshall S. Huebner, Michael Kaplan, and Eli J. Vonnegut\**

*The authors of this article discuss a recent U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit ruling that noteholders were entitled to payment of an optional redemption premium at the make-whole price as a result of the repayment of their notes in a bankruptcy proceeding.*

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, based in Philadelphia, held that noteholders were entitled to payment of an optional redemption premium at the make-whole price as a result of the repayment of their notes in a bankruptcy proceeding.<sup>1</sup> When a make-whole is triggered in connection with a redemption, in addition to paying principal and accrued and unpaid interest, the issuer is required to pay an additional amount based on the discounted value of the stream of future interest payments, thereby making noteholders whole for the loss of the future income stream bargained for when the notes were purchased. A number of other courts had previously held that make-wholes were only payable in connection with an optional redemption and that a repayment following an acceleration in bankruptcy would not be optional and therefore not lead to the payment of a redemption premium absent explicit language to that effect. Together with the recent *Cash America* decision by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York,<sup>2</sup> which required payment of a make-whole premium as damages after a default by the issuer, this case introduces significant uncertainty into what issuers must pay upon default or acceleration in bankruptcy, and should encourage issuers and underwriters to address the uncertainty through explicit indenture language.

## BACKGROUND

Between 2010 and 2012, Energy Future Intermediate Holding Company

---

\* Joseph A. Hall (joseph.hall@davispolk.com), a partner at Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, is a member of the firm's Corporate Department and head of the firm's corporate governance practice. Marshall S. Huebner (marshall.huebner@davispolk.com) is a partner at the firm and co-head of its Insolvency and Restructuring Group. Michael Kaplan (michael.kaplan@davispolk.com) is a partner at the firm and co-head of the global Capital Markets Group. Eli J. Vonnegut (eli.vonnegut@davispolk.com) is a partner in the firm's Insolvency and Restructuring Group.

<sup>1</sup> *In Re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, No. 16-1351 (3d. Cir. Nov. 17, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> S.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2016.

LLC (“EFIH”) and a subsidiary issued first lien secured notes due 2020 and two series of second lien secured notes due 2021 and 2022. The indentures contained customary optional redemption provisions and customary provisions for automatic acceleration of the maturity of the notes upon a bankruptcy filing. The optional redemption provisions provided for the payment of a make-whole premium for any redemption of the first lien notes before December 2015, and for the second lien notes, before May 2016 and March 2017. After commencing Chapter 11 proceedings (in part in an effort to refinance its debt without paying the makewholes), EFIH sought to repay the first lien notes with the proceeds of debtor-in-possession financing at a lower interest rate, and also later refinanced a portion of its second lien notes. The trustees for both the first lien and second lien notes opposed the refinancing and sought payment of the make-wholes, as well as permission from the bankruptcy court to rescind the automatic acceleration of the notes upon the bankruptcy filing. The Bankruptcy Court approved both financings and denied the requests for permission to rescind the automatic acceleration, but also held that the financings would not prejudice the noteholders’ rights in their separate adversary proceedings seeking payment of the make-wholes. Following the financings, the bankruptcy court held in both separate adversary proceedings that no make-whole premium was owed. The U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware subsequently upheld both decisions. The trustees appealed to the Third Circuit, which reversed.

### **THE THIRD CIRCUIT’S ANALYSIS**

The Third Circuit first considered three questions related to the optional redemption language in the indentures:

- (1) Was there a redemption?;
- (2) Was it optional?; and
- (3) If yes to both, did it occur while the make-whole premium was payable?

The court answered all three queries in the affirmative. The Third Circuit then examined the acceleration provisions of the indentures and considered case law interpreting the interplay of acceleration provisions with optional redemption provisions. It concluded based on its review of legal precedent and the indentures that EFIH was wrong to assert that an automatic acceleration provision controls over an optional redemption provision with respect to a noteholder’s right to payment of a make-whole premium upon a repayment post-acceleration. According to the Third Circuit, an optional redemption could occur post-acceleration, because the terms of the EFIH indentures did not expressly limit optional redemptions to those occurring pre-acceleration.

### **Optional Redemption Is Not Limited to Pre-Maturity Payment**

First considering the meaning of “redemption,” which was not defined in the indentures, the appellate panel concluded that redemptions occurred even though EFIH refinanced the notes after the automatic bankruptcy acceleration. This reversed the conclusion of the lower courts that no redemptions had occurred, because acceleration brought forward the maturity date and a “redemption” by definition was a repayment *prior* to maturity. The Third Circuit instead found that New York and federal courts deemed redemption to include both pre- and post-maturity repayments of debt.

The Third Circuit then analyzed the circumstances under which the notes were repaid by EFIH, to determine whether these actions were “optional.” The appellate panel concluded that despite the automatic nature of acceleration under the indentures, EFIH’s note repayments were voluntary, particularly because the noteholders had sought to rescind the acceleration and did not want to be repaid. The opinion noted in support of its finding that EFIH filed its Chapter 11 petition of its own volition. For the third and final part of the optional redemption analysis, the Third Circuit observed that the refinancings occurred during the time that the make-whole premiums were payable under the indentures.

### **Automatic Acceleration Does Not Cut Off Optional Redemption**

The Third Circuit disagreed with the lower courts that the operation of the automatic acceleration provisions under the indentures mooted applicability of the optional redemption provisions. In its ruling, the Third Circuit declined to follow the 2014 *Momentive* decision by the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York<sup>3</sup> and other similar cases that treated make-wholes as applicable only to a *prepayment*, and thus required a clear and express statement for a make-whole premium to be required in connection with a repayment after an automatic acceleration.

In a reversal of the drafting guidance arising out of *Momentive*, the Third Circuit placed the onus on the issuer to make it clear in the indenture that an optional redemption provision was *not* applicable following acceleration. “[I]f EFIH wanted its duty to pay the make-whole on optional redemption to terminate on acceleration of its debt, it needed to make clear” in the indenture that acceleration cuts off the optional redemption provision.

### **CASH AMERICA**

*In Re Energy Future Holdings Corp.* is the second recent decision that has

---

<sup>3</sup> *In Re MPM Silicones, LLC*, (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 2014), *aff’d* 531 B.R. 321 (S.D.N.Y. May 4, 2015).



required payment of a makewhole premium in the context of a default. In *Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB v. Cash America International, Inc.*, decided in September 2016, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York held that noteholders were entitled to payment of the make-whole premium as a remedy for a breach under the indenture. The trustee alleged that a spin-off by Cash America of 80 percent of the shares of a wholly-owned subsidiary breached a covenant in the indenture and sought to enforce a prepayment of the notes (with payment of the make-whole premium) under the indenture, rather than accelerate the maturity date and allowing repayment of the notes at par value, and ultimately prevailed. *Cash America* is significant because the court found that noteholders could seek specific performance of the make-whole premium as a remedy for a “voluntary” non-bankruptcy default even though no choice to redeem the notes was made by the issuer.

### TAKEAWAYS

The Third Circuit’s interpretation of New York law is not controlling in other circuits, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, based in New York City, is currently considering similar questions in an appeal of the *Momentive* make-whole decision. The Third Circuit’s decision gives credence to an interpretation of optional redemption under New York law-governed indentures that is welcome to the distressed investor community, but likely does not reflect the commercial understanding in the new issue market. In that regard, we note that since the decision in the *Momentive* case calling for specific language reflecting intent to enforce a make-whole payment post-bankruptcy, we are aware of only a small number of public company indentures for new bond offerings that specifically require a make-whole payment in these circumstances.

Following the *Cash America* decision and the Third Circuit’s decision in *In Re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, we would expect to see healthy issuers seeking to include language in their indentures that forecloses any obligation to pay a make-whole premium following a default or an acceleration in bankruptcy. (We have in fact already seen issuers successfully include such language in their indentures.) In the provision of financing to distressed borrowers, however, we have seen, and expect to continue to see, lenders seek to explicitly provide that the make-whole premium will be due following an acceleration due to bankruptcy or other default during the make-whole period.