

§ 510(a)
§ 365(e)(1)
Chapter 11 Plan Confirmation
Subordination Provision
Indenture Agreement

In re Southern Pacific Funding Corp., Case. No. 398-37613; Civ.
No. CV-99-1613-MA

12/7/99

Marsh, aff'g ELP

unpublished

The district court affirmed the bankruptcy court's enforcement of a subordination provision in an indenture agreement as part of debtor's Chapter 11 plan confirmation.

The district court held that the subordination provision did not violate § 365(e)(1) because it did not alter the rights or obligations of the debtor. The court held that enforcement of the provision was consistent with § 510(a) and noted that other courts have affirmed application of similar subordination provisions.

P99-13(3)

FILED

DEC 7 1 18 PM '99

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON

BY _____



CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON

DEC - 7 1999

LODGED _____ RECD _____
PAID _____ DOCKETED WV

2-8-99

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CV-99-1613-MA

In Re,)
SOUTHERN PACIFIC FUNDING,)
CORPORATION,)
Debtor in Possession,)

Case No. 398-37613-elpl1
ORDER

MARSH, Judge.

Spieker Properties, L.P. appeals from an order of the bankruptcy court confirming a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization for the Debtor, Southern Pacific Funding Corporation (SPF). Spieker claims that the bankruptcy court erred in confirming a plan that enforces a subordination provision in an indenture contract. Section 12.3 of the indenture provision at issue provides that in the event of bankruptcy or any other dissolution or insolvency by SPF, following SPF's distribution of assets to senior indebtedness, subordinated notes and unsecured creditors, distributions to holders of subordinated notes must then be turned over to qualified senior indebtedness until the senior indebtedness is paid in full. The confirmed chapter 11

1889

176

1 bankruptcy plan enforces this provision and thus, following the
2 allocation and distribution of assets pursuant to the bankruptcy
3 plan, the subordinated note holders will turn over their proceeds
4 to the senior indebtedness.

5 My review of the bankruptcy court's decision is de novo
6 for conclusions of law and for clear error relative to factual
7 findings. In Re Southern California Plastics, Inc., 165 F.3d
8 1243 (9th Cir. 1999). Because the issue framed on this appeal is
9 a question of law, my review has been de novo.

10 Section 365(e)(1) of Title 11 requires that any provision
11 contained within an executory contract that seeks to terminate or
12 modify any right or obligation of the debtor based upon the
13 insolvency or financial condition of the debtor, is invalid.
14 Spieker claims that the plain language of the statute prohibits
15 enforcement of SPF's subordination agreement relative to the
16 allocation of assets between senior and subordinated
17 indebtedness.

18 While I agree with Spieker that the language of the
19 statute is clear, such that I need not engage in an analysis of
20 legislative history as proffered by the appellee and amicus
21 American Bankers Association, I also find that the indenture
22 subordination agreement at issue in this appeal does not run
23 afoul of the clear language of the statute because section 12.3
24 of the indenture does nothing to alter the rights or obligations
25 of the debtor. The debtor's duties upon a non-bankruptcy
26 dissolution are the same as they are under the bankruptcy
27 confirmation; the debtor's assets are allocated in the same
28 manner. It is only after this allocation and distribution that,

1 by virtue of a contract, subordinated note holders must turn over
2 their share of the debtor's assets to the qualified senior
3 indebtedness. Judge Perris' enforcement of this indenture
4 provision is fully consistent with 11 U.S.C. §510(a) and other
5 bankruptcy courts have affirmed application of similar
6 subordination agreements. See e.g. In Re Credit Industrial, 366
7 F.2d 402, 408-09 (2d Cir. 1966); In Re Hinderliter, 228 B.R. 848,
8 849 (Bank. E.D. Texas 1999).¹

9 Based upon the foregoing, I find that Judge Perris
10 properly confirmed application of the subordination agreement
11 included within the November 1, 1996 indenture agreement between
12 SPF and HSBC Bank USA. Accordingly, Judge Perris' decision is
13 AFFIRMED and this appeal is DISMISSED.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED this 7 day of December, 1999.

16
17 Malcolm F Marsh

18 Malcolm F. Marsh
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23

24 ¹ Appellant also relies upon In Re Texaco, 73 B.R. 960
25 (Bank. S.D. N.Y. 1987) in support of its claim. I find this case
26 factually and legally distinguishable since the indenture
27 provision sought to be enforced in Texaco involved an
28 acceleration clause and a claim of default based solely upon the
debtor's bankruptcy filing. Unlike the facts here, the indenture
trustee and noteholders in Texaco were attempting to use a
contractual clause to alter or modify the debtor's obligations
based solely upon the bankruptcy filing.