

11 U.S.C. § 544(a)
ORS 79.1050(1)(d)
Security Interest
Perfection

Hostmann v. Capital Consultants, Inc. et al., Adv. No. 97-3138
In re WS, Inc., Case No. 394-36434-dds7

11/18/97

DDS

Unpublished

Chapter 7 trustee brought adversary proceeding pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 544(a) to avoid any security interest held by Capital Consultants, Inc. ("CCI") and/or Cascade General, Inc. ("CGI") in certain claims which Debtor had against third parties for services Debtor provided the third parties during the course of its ship repair operations. The facts of the case were complicated and involved two major restructurings of obligations which Debtor owed to CCI.

The court held that CCI was continuously perfected in the "Government Contract Claims." Debtor transferred the Government Contract Claims to a related entity as part of one restructuring. That transfer of assets was later declared by the parties to be void "ab initio." However the related entity had relieved the debtor of its payment obligation. The trustee asserted that because Debtor was relieved of its payment obligation to CCI there was no debt to support the security interest in Debtor's assets which was reflected in CCI's security agreement.

ORS 79.1050(1)(d) defines "debtor" to include the owner of collateral who does not owe payment or other performance of the obligation secured. Debtor continued to be a "debtor" so long as its assets were pledged as collateral for the CCI obligation, no matter who owed the money to CCI.

Additionally, the court held that CCI had a perfected security interest in the "ARCO Alaska Claim" directly from Debtor or through Debtor's related entity. First, the security interest in the ARCO Alaska Claim was granted through a collateral assignment where CCI's financing statement recited that CCI had an interest in all of Debtor's accounts and contract rights. Second, although the Debtor assigned the ARCO Alaska Claim to its related entity which did not perfect its interest in the ARCO Alaska Claim, CCI's security interest in the related entity's accounts attached to the ARCO Alaska Claim at the time of the assignment from the Debtor.

NOV 18 1997

LODGED _____ RECD _____
PAID _____ DOCKETED WJ

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

In Re:)	Bankruptcy Case No.
)	394-36434-dds7
WS, INC., dba West State, Inc.,)	
)	
Debtor.)	
_____)	
EDWARD C. HOSTMANN, Trustee of)	
the Bankruptcy Estate of)	
WS, Inc.,)	Adv. Proc. No. 397-3138-dds
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
CAPITAL CONSULTANTS, INC., an)	
Oregon corporation; and CASCADE)	FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS
GENERAL, INC., an Oregon)	OF LAW RELATING TO CROSS-MOTIONS
corporation,)	FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Prior to the petition date WS, Inc. ("WSI"), the debtor, operated a ship repair yard. The chapter 7 trustee ("Trustee") filed this adversary proceeding seeking to avoid, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 544(a), any security interest held by Capital Consultants, Inc. ("CCI") and/or Cascade General, Inc. ("Cascade")

25

1 in certain claims which WSI had against third parties, which claims
2 arose from services WSI provided those third parties during the
3 course of its operations. The parties (the Trustee as plaintiff,
4 CCI and Cascade as co-defendants) filed cross motions for summary
5 judgment. At oral argument on the cross motions the parties agreed
6 that the matter could be treated as a trial on stipulated facts.

7 Three classes of claims are involved in this litigation. The
8 first class, referred to as the "Government Contract Claims,"
9 includes claims which WSI asserts with respect to repair work on the
10 following vessels: Cape Blanco, Cape Fear, Cape Breton, Northern
11 Light, Polar Star, Triumph, and Utrillo. The second class consists
12 of WSI's claim with respect to repair work on the ARCO Alaska ("ARCO
13 Alaska Claim"). The third class consists of WSI's claim with
14 respect to repair work on the Tacoma ("Tacoma Claim"). By
15 stipulation of the parties, the Trustee has substantially liquidated
16 the claims and is holding the proceeds pending determination of the
17 issues in this adversary proceeding.

18 The Trustee contends that there is no security agreement
19 between CCI and WSI to give CCI an interest in the Government
20 Contract Claims, the ARCO Alaska Claim, or the Tacoma Claim. The
21 Trustee also contends that WSI owes no debt to CCI to support any
22 alleged security interest.

23 I find that CCI has a perfected security interest in the
24 Government Contract Claims and in the ARCO Alaska Claim. At oral
25 argument, CCI conceded that it was unperfected as to the Tacoma
26

1 Claim. Accordingly, I find that CCI is entitled to judgment with
2 respect to the Government Contract Claims and the ARCO Alaska Claim,
3 and that the Trustee is entitled to judgment with respect to the
4 proceeds of the Tacoma Claim. My reasons follow.

5 I. BACKGROUND.

6 The facts of this case are complicated and involve two major
7 restructurings of obligations which WSI owed to CCI. The first
8 restructuring took place in November of 1993 and is referred to by
9 the parties as the Marine Finance Corporation transaction ("the MFC
10 Transaction"). The second restructuring took place in October of
11 1994 and is referred to by the parties as the Ponderosa Transaction.

12 As part of the pleadings submitted as the record relating to
13 the cross motions for summary judgment the parties stipulated to
14 certain facts, which are incorporated herein as necessary.

15 Beginning in about 1990, CCI began providing loans to WSI.
16 According to the Trustee, three of those loans are relevant to this
17 proceeding: the "Real Estate Loan," the "Uninsured Line of Credit"
18 and the "Port of Portland Loan." The Real Estate Loan and the
19 Uninsured Line of Credit are primarily relevant to the MFC
20 Transaction. The Port of Portland Loan is primarily relevant to the
21 Ponderosa Transaction.

22 A. The MFC Transaction (November 1993).

23 Marine Finance Corporation ("MFC"), an affiliate of WSI, was
24 incorporated in connection with the restructuring of certain loans
25 which WSI owed to CCI. The stipulated facts and a review of the
26

1 exhibits reflect the following chronology which relates to the MFC
2 Transaction.

3 1. The Real Estate Loan. On February 16, 1990, CCI loaned
4 WSI \$500,000, which is referred to as the Real Estate Loan. To
5 secure repayment of the Real Estate Loan WSI, also on February 16,
6 1990, executed a security agreement which granted CCI a security
7 interest in, among other things:

8 "All of Debtor's receivables, accounts, contract rights,
9 instruments, documents, chattel paper or general intangibles
10 for any obligation or indebtedness of any kind owed to
11 Debtor; and all rights of debtor to receive any payments of
12 money or other value for such obligations or indebtedness,
13 whether now existing or hereafter arising and whether in
14 exchange for goods, services, or otherwise arising in favor
15 of Debtor."

16 On February 26, 1990, CCI recorded a financing statement perfecting
17 CCI's interest. On June 10, 1991, CCI loaned WSI additional funds
18 under the terms of the Real Estate Loan. As of November 19, 1993,
19 the balance of the Real Estate Loan was \$986,993.71.

20 2. The Uninsured Line of Credit. On October 15, 1991, CCI
21 and WSI entered into a loan agreement pursuant to which CCI agreed
22 to make a loan to WSI in the form of a line of credit ("Uninsured
23 Line of Credit"). To secure repayment of the Uninsured Line of
24 Credit, WSI executed a Security Agreement and Assignment of Accounts
25 Receivable in favor of CCI. On November 19, 1993, the balance on
26 the Uninsured Line of Credit was \$3,435,000.

The parties stipulate that CCI had a valid perfected security
interest in the Government Contract Claims on November 18, 1993.
This security interest was reflected in the security agreements for

1 the Real Estate Loan and the Uninsured Line of Credit, in the UCC
2 financing statement filed in connection with the Real Estate Loan,
3 and in a "Polar Star Financing Statement." On November 18, 1993,
4 WSI granted CCI a further security interest in the Government
5 Contract Claims and their proceeds by executing seven documents,
6 each entitled "Collateral Assignment of Contract Rights, Accounts
7 Receivable and Proceeds of Claim" relating to each of the Government
8 Contract Claims.

9 3. The MFC Restructuring. In the fall of 1993, WSI was
10 obligated to CCI for the Real Estate Loan and the Uninsured Line of
11 Credit. Additionally, one of WSI's affiliates owed to CCI an
12 obligation known as the "HC Loan." On or about November 19, 1993,
13 WSI, affiliates of WSI, and MFC entered into an asset purchase
14 agreement. Under the agreement WSI transferred to MFC all of its
15 rights and interest in the Government Contract Claims. On the same
16 date, CCI, MFC and WSI entered into an agreement, the "Consent,
17 Assumption, Modification and Consolidation Agreement" (hereinafter
18 "Consolidation Agreement"), pursuant to which MFC assumed and agreed
19 to pay and perform all of WSI's financial obligations and covenants
20 under the Real Estate Loan and the Uninsured Line of Credit. Under
21 the Consolidation Agreement, the loans assumed by MFC were
22 consolidated into a single indebtedness totaling \$8,564,892. This
23 amount included an additional advance from CCI to MFC in the amount
24 of \$1,835,526.10. The consolidated indebtedness is evidenced by two
25 notes executed by MFC on November 19, 1993. Each note states that

1 the consolidation is intended to supersede the instruments
2 evidencing the prior indebtedness referred to in the Consolidation
3 Agreement.

4 Also on November 19, 1993, MFC executed a security agreement
5 which granted CCI a security interest in all of MFC's assets in
6 order to secure the consolidated indebtedness. WSI and MFC jointly
7 executed (1) an amendment to the Real Estate Loan financing
8 statement, designating MFC as an additional party (Exhibit 1, page
9 69), and (2) a new financing statement in favor of CCI which
10 described all of the Government Contract Claims, except for the
11 Polar Star claim (Exhibit 1, page 85). These financing statements
12 were recorded on December 1, 1993. Additionally, WSI and MFC
13 jointly executed an amendment to the Polar Star financing statement,
14 which was recorded on December 10, 1993 (Exhibit 1, page 80).

15 Thereafter, on August 26, 1994, CCI made an additional
16 advance to MFC in the amount of \$975,000, increasing the principal
17 amount of the consolidated indebtedness to \$9,909,892.

18 B. Other Transactions Relating to the Government Contract
19 Claims.

20 As previously stated, on November 18, 1993, WSI executed a
21 "Collateral Assignment of Contract Rights, Accounts Receivable and
22 Proceeds of Claim" relating to each of the Government Contract
23 Claims. Although the Government Contract Claims were transferred to
24 MFC in conjunction with the MFC Transaction, on October 26, 1994,
25 WSI and MFC executed a Rescission Agreement, which was consented to
26 by CCI, whereby the transfer of the Government Contract Claims was

1 rescinded "ab initio." At oral argument the parties speculated that
2 the Rescission Agreement was executed in an effort to protect the
3 Government Contract Claims from a defense by the government under
4 the Assignment of Claims Act (41 U.S.C. §15).

5 C. The Ponderosa Transaction (October 1994)

6 In addition to the Real Estate Loan and the Uninsured Line of
7 Credit, at the time of the MFC Transaction WSI also owed CCI an
8 obligation known as the Port of Portland Loan. The Port of Portland
9 Loan and the Denali Loan were further obligations of WSI which were
10 included in the Ponderosa Transaction.

11 1. The Port of Portland Loan. On June 28, 1991, CCI loaned
12 WSI \$1,950,000, evidenced by a promissory note. By April of 1992,
13 all but \$137,500 of this amount had been repaid. A replacement
14 promissory note was executed by WSI on April 3, 1992, reflecting the
15 reduced obligation. The Port of Portland Loan was not included in
16 the MFC restructuring and continued to be an obligation of WSI after
17 November 19, 1993.

18 2. The Denali Loan. Subsequent to the MFC restructuring,
19 CCI loaned WSI \$500,000, which was evidenced by a promissory note
20 dated February 18, 1994. As security for the repayment of the
21 Denali loan, WSI executed an Assignment of Contract Rights and
22 Accounts Receivable, which granted CCI a security interest in WSI's
23 rights to receive payments under a specific contract for repair and
24 maintenance work performed by WSI on the SS Denali. When WSI could
25 not pay the Denali loan by the original maturity date, CCI agreed to
26

1 extend the maturity date on the condition that CCI also be granted a
2 security interest in WSI's rights to receive payments under its
3 contract with ARCO Marine. On March 25, 1994, WSI and CCI entered a
4 loan modification agreement which amended the Assignment to include
5 the ARCO Marine contract rights.

6 WSI's financial condition continued to deteriorate in the
7 fall of 1994.

8 3. The Ponderosa Transaction.

9 On October 27, 1994, Cascade, MFC, WSI (and its affiliates),
10 and CCI entered into the Cascade Consolidation Agreement. Under the
11 Cascade Consolidation Agreement, Cascade unconditionally assumed and
12 agreed to pay and perform all of WSI's financial obligations and
13 covenants owed to CCI pursuant to the Denali loan and the Port of
14 Portland loan. The parties stipulated that as of October 27, 1994,
15 the balance on the Denali loan was \$500,000 and the balance on the
16 Port of Portland loan was \$115,942. Cascade also unconditionally
17 assumed and agreed to pay \$6,244,432.62 of the MFC consolidated
18 indebtedness. These obligations were evidenced by a note Cascade
19 executed in favor of CCI dated October 27, 1994. The Cascade
20 Consolidation Agreement provided that the note would supersede and
21 replace the promissory notes previously evidencing the consolidated

22 \ \ \ \

23 \ \ \ \

24

25

26

1 indebtedness¹ and the notes evidencing the Denali loan and the Port
2 of Portland loan.

3 Also on October 27, 1994, MFC and WSI conveyed to Cascade all
4 right, title and interest in certain personal property, equipment,
5 and inventory. The collateral did not include the Government
6 Contract Claims, the Tacoma Claim, or the ARCO Alaska Claim.

7 On October 27, 1994, Cascade, CCI and WSI executed a security
8 agreement which contained a statement that WSI acknowledged that
9 notwithstanding the execution of this security agreement, the
10 collateral assignments of contract rights, accounts receivable and
11 proceeds of sales granted by WSI to CCI on or about November 15,
12 1993 continued to be valid and binding security for obligations
13 assumed by Cascade.

14 The financing statement executed by Cascade in favor of CCI
15 was filed October 29, 1994.

16 D. The Bankruptcy.

17 An involuntary chapter 7 petition was filed against WSI on
18 October 27, 1994 and an order for relief was entered on November 3,
19 1994.

20 The trustee seeks to avoid the security interests which CCI
21 and Cascade claim in contract proceeds on the bases that (1) on the
22 petition date WSI was not indebted to either CCI or Cascade and (2)

23
24 ¹\$3,645,000 of the principal balance of the MFC consolidated
25 indebtedness was not assumed by Cascade but instead became a
26 joint obligation of MFC and Astoria Metal Corporation under
separate loan documents in favor of CCI as of October 27, 1994.

1 on the petition date no security agreement was in effect which
2 granted either CCI or Cascade a security interest in the contract
3 proceeds.

4 II. DISCUSSION.

5 CCI had a valid perfected security interest in the proceeds
6 of the Government Contract Claims as a result of the Collateral
7 Assignments, notwithstanding the MFC Transaction, the subsequent
8 Rescission Agreement, and the Ponderosa Transaction. As noted
9 previously, the parties have stipulate that as of November 18, 1993,
10 CCI had a valid perfected security interest in the Government
11 Contract Claims.

12 A. CCI's Security Interest Continued Through October 26,
13 1994.

14 The Trustee asserts that because WSI was relieved of its
15 payment obligations to CCI by virtue of the MFC Transaction on
16 November 19, 1993, there is no debt to support the security interest
17 in the CCI's security agreement. I agree with the Trustee that both
18 Uninsured Line of Credit Security Agreement (executed in conjunction
19 with the Uninsured Line of Credit) and the WSI Security Agreement
20 (executed in conjunction with the Real Estate Loan) were "replaced
21 and superseded" by the Consolidated Security Agreement executed by
22 MFC as a part of the MFC Transaction. Exhibit 7, paragraphs
23 3.2.2(b) and 3.2.3(a). However, the Collateral Assignments were
24 expressly ratified and reaffirmed by WSI (Exhibit 7, paragraph 1.3),

25 \ \ \ \

1 and modified to secure repayment of the consolidated indebtedness
2 owed by MFC (Exhibit 7, 3.2.2(3)).

3 Additionally, I find unpersuasive the Trustee's argument that
4 because WSI no longer owed a debt to CCI any security agreement or
5 security interest was invalid. While WSI may no longer have had a
6 personal obligation to CCI as a result of the MFC Transaction, that
7 does not mean that no debt existed. On the contrary, a substantial
8 debt existed, which MFC assumed as part of the MFC Transaction.

9 O.R.S. 79.1050(1)(d) defines "debtor" to include the owner of
10 collateral who does not owe payment or other performance of the
11 obligation secured. Thus WSI continued to be a debtor so long as
12 its assets were pledged as collateral for the CCI obligation, no
13 matter who owed the money to CCI.

14 So long as WSI signed a security agreement which contained a
15 description of the collateral (here, the Collateral Assignments),
16 CCI gave value (first the Uninsured Line of Credit, then the
17 consolidated indebtedness), and WSI had rights in the collateral,
18 the security interest attached. O.R.S. 79.2030. WSI had rights in
19 the Government Contract Claims prior to November 19, 1993. CCI
20 perfected its security interest in the Government Contract Claims by
21 filing a UCC-1 financing statement on December 1, 1993. See Exhibit
22 10-A. There has been no lapse in the UCC-1 financing statement.

23 Although the Government Contract Claims were initially
24 transferred to MFC as a part of the MFC Transaction, as a result of
25 the Rescission Agreement that transfer was void "ab initio."
26

1 Accordingly, WSI never lost its rights in the Government Contract
2 Claims and CCI was continuously perfected in the Government Contract
3 Claims.

4 B. CCI's Security Interest in the Government Contract Claims
5 Continued, Notwithstanding the Ponderosa Transaction.

6 CCI's security interest in the Government Contract Claims
7 granted through the Collateral Assignments were expressly continued
8 in the Ponderosa Transaction to secure repayment of the obligation
9 now owed by Cascade. See Exhibit 15, Recitals E and G, and
10 paragraph 3.2.2(b).

11 C. CCI Has a Valid Perfected Security Interest in the ARCO
12 Alaska Claim.

13 CCI claims a valid perfected security interest in the ARCO
14 Alaska Claim both directly from WSI as well as from MFC as a result
15 of the MFC Transaction.

16 CCI's claim of a security interest in the ARCO Alaska Claim
17 arises out of the Denali Loan. WSI executed a security agreement,
18 in the form of a collateral assignment, granting CCI a security
19 interest in WSI's contract rights relating to the SS Denali. See
20 Exhibit 12. This security agreement was later modified to include
21 the grant of a security interest in WSI's contract rights relating
22 to the ARCO Alaska Claim.

23 CCI has a financing statement on file which was signed by WSI
24 before the collateral assignment of the ARCO Alaska Claim and which
25 was signed by WSI during numerous subsequent amendments. (Exhibit
26

1 4). This financing statement, which recites that CCI has an
2 interest in all of WSI's accounts and contract rights, is sufficient
3 to perfect CCI's security interest in the ARCO Alaska Claim which
4 was granted through the collateral assignment.

5 Despite the Trustee's contention to the contrary, WSI
6 assigned the ARCO Alaska Claim to MFC on or about October 26, 1994.
7 See Affidavit of Charles P. Starkey ("Starkey Affidavit"), Exhibits
8 C and D.

9 The record does not reflect that MFC perfected its interest
10 in the ARCO Alaska claim. The defendants assert that the
11 prepetition transfer of the ARCO Alaska claim to MFC was excluded
12 from the application of Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code
13 because "the transfer of the ARCO Alaska account was a discrete
14 transaction involving a single account and was given in whole
15 satisfaction of a preexisting indebtedness." (Emphasis added). The
16 record reflects otherwise. Exhibit C, page 2 to the Starkey
17 Affidavit recites that WSI's Board of Directors made the assignment
18 to MFC "so that [MFC] shall give a loan to [WSI] based on that
19 receivable." Exhibit D, page 2 to the Starkey Affidavit recites
20 that MFC's Board of Directors agreed to make a loan to WSI based on
21 receipt of the assignment: "[MFC] shall lend to [WSI] at least
22 \$975,000 in consideration of the assignment of the ARCO claim to
23 [MFC]." I find no basis under O.R.S. 79.1040 to exclude from the
24 application of Article 9 the transfer of the ARCO Alaska claim from
25 WSI to MFC.

1 However, notwithstanding MFC's lack of perfection of a
2 security interest in the ARCO Alaska Claim, I find that CCI's
3 security interest in MFC's accounts, granted in the Security
4 Agreement executed by MFC in favor of CCI on November 19, 1993
5 (Exhibit 9) and perfected by the amended financing statement
6 executed in conjunction with the MFC Transaction (Exhibit 1, page
7 69) attached at the time of the assignment from WSI to MFC.

8 Thus, CCI has a valid security interest in the ARCO Alaska
9 Claim either directly from WSI or through MFC.

10 III. CONCLUSION.

11 At the time the order for relief was entered in this case,
12 CCI held a valid perfected security interest in the Government
13 Contract Claims and in the ARCO Alaska Claim. As previously
14 conceded by CCI, at the time the order for relief was entered in
15 this case, CCI was unperfected with respect to the Tacoma Claim.

16 The foregoing constitute my findings of fact and conclusions
17 of law. I will enter a separate order consistent with the
18 foregoing.

19
20 
21 DONAL D. SULLIVAN
Bankruptcy Judge

22 cc: Fred M. Granum, Esq.
23 Trish M. Brown, Esq.
24 Linda Johannsen, Esq.
25
26