

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

LEE H. ROSENTHAL
CHAIR

PETER G. McCABE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CARL E. STEWART
APPELLATE RULES

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
BANKRUPTCY RULES

MARK R. KRAVITZ
CIVIL RULES

RICHARD C. TALLMAN
CRIMINAL RULES

ROBERT L. HINKLE
EVIDENCE RULES

February 22, 2008

Michael S. Khoury, Chair
Business Law Section, State Bar of Michigan
Michael Franck Building
306 Townsend Street
Lansing, MI 48933-2083

Re: *Your Comment on Proposed Amendment to Bankruptcy Rule 8002 (Docket
Number 07-BR-030)*

Dear Mr. Khoury:

Thank you for your letter dated February 14, 2008, submitted on behalf of the Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan, commenting on the proposed amendment to Rule 8002. A copy of your correspondence has been sent to the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules for its consideration. The committee will consider all comments on the proposed amendments at its spring 2008 meeting, and actions on the proposed amendments will thereafter be posted on the Judiciary's web site: www.uscourts.gov/rules. You may also contact the Rules Committee Support Office at 202-502-1820 any time for a status report.

We very much welcome your comment and appreciate your interest in the rulemaking process.

Sincerely,



Peter G. McCabe
Secretary

BUSINESS LAW SECTION

**COUNCIL
OFFICERS & MEMBERS**

CHAIR
MICHAEL J. KHOURY
3777 FRANKLIN RD., STE. 200
NORTHVILLE, MI 48861

VIC-CHAIR
DIANE L. AKERS
198 ST. ANTHONY ST. PL. 6
FORD FORD
DETROIT 48226

MEMBERS
TANIA E. (DEE DEE) FULLER
70 WEST RANDALL ST. 5TH F
CANTONVILLE 48104

MEMBERS
ROBERT L. WILSON
STEPHEN R. WEST
4100 ROCKWELL BLVD. SUITE 1
BLOOMHURST 48304-3450

COUNCIL
JOHN B. CALTON
DETROIT
MATTHEW A. GASE
DETROIT
DAVID C. EBERHARD
5100 BURGESS BLVD
MICHAEL R. MANNING
DETROIT
EDWIN J. LUKAS
DETROIT
CHRISTOPHER C. MAESO
11000 HIGHLAND HILLS
PATRICK E. MEARS
GRAND RAPIDS
PAUL R. RENTENRACH
DETROIT
CYNTHIA L. UMPHREY
TROY

JEFFREY J. VANVINKLE
GRAND RAPIDS
STEPHEN C. WATKINS
GRAND RAPIDS
WALTER H. WALKER
JOHN R. WASSER
COMMERCIAL LITIGATION
DIANE L. AKERS
MICHIGAN JUDICIAL
ASSOCIATION
LAWSON
JUSTIN C. KLIMKO
CYRIL MOSCOW

JEFFREY S. AMMON
JUDY B. CALTON
JUDITH GREENSTONE MILLER

INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTIONS
JAMES H. BRAY
MICHIGAN BANKERS
MATTHEW A. GASE
NORTHWESTERN BANK
JANE FORBES
AGNETTE HAGERBY
MICHIGAN BANKERS
JEROME L. SCHWARTZ
MICHIGAN BANKERS
PATRICK E. MEARS
MICHIGAN BANKERS
DANIEL H. MINER
MICHIGAN BANKERS
ERIC I. LAKE

MEMBERS
JEFFREY S. AMMON
ERIC I. LAKE
CHRISTOPHER C. MAESO
DANIEL H. MINER
MARK W. PETERS
GREGORY E. SCHEIDT
SMALL BUSINESS COUNCIL
CYNTHIA L. UMPHREY

PUBLICATIONS
ROBERT L. WILSON
MICHIGAN BANKERS
TIMOTHY R. DANSHCHENCO
H. ROGER SMITH
MICHIGAN BANKERS
MICHAEL S. KHOURY

February 14, 2008

Honorable Laura Taylor Swain
United States District Court for
the Southern District of New York
Chair, Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy
Rules for the Judicial Conference

Professor Jeffrey Morris
University of Dayton Law School
Reporter, Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy
Rules for the Judicial Conference

VIA EMAIL
Rules_Comments@ao.uscourts.gov

VIA EMAIL
Rules_Comments@ao.uscourts.gov

Re: Response to Request for Comments on Proposed
Change to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure
8002 Governing Time to File Notice of Appeal from
Adverse Determinations of a Bankruptcy Court

Dear Judge Swain and Professor Morris:

We are submitting these comments in response to the Request for Comments on the Time to File a Notice of Appeal in a Bankruptcy Case ("Request for Comments") that was issued by the Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules of the Judicial Conference ("Advisory Committee") in November 2007.

The undersigned, respectively, are (i) the Chair of the Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan ("Section"), and (ii) the Co-Chairs of the Debtor/Creditors' Rights Committee of the Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan ("Committee"). The Section and the Committee each reviewed the Request for Comments and unanimously agreed that Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 8002 ("Rule 8002") that sets forth, among other things, the 10-day time period for a party filing a notice of appeal from an adverse ruling of a bankruptcy court should not be changed. In addition, the Board of Commissioners of the State Bar of Michigan at its recent meeting held on January 18, 2008 also approved the position taken by the Committee and the Section.

PAST COUNCIL CHAIRS

JEFFREY S. AMMON
G. ANN BAKER
HARVEY W. BERMAN
BRUCE D. BERGHAUSER
IRVING I. BOGREN
GONKAD A. BRAUSHAW
JAMES C. BRUND

JAMES H. CAMBRIDGE
THOMAS CARNEY
TIMOTHY R. DANSHCHENCO
ALEX J. GRONKLER
LEE D. DURHAM, JR.
DAVID FOLTEN
RICHARD B. FOSTER, JR.

CONNIE GALE
PAUL K. GASTON
VERNE C. HAMPTON II
MARK R. HIGH
JUSTIN G. KLIMKO
GORDON W. LANPHERE
ERIC I. LAKE

TRACY I. LARSEN
HUGH H. MAKENS
CHARLES E. MCCALLUM
DANIEL H. MINER
ALEXANDRA A. MEZIOLEK
CYRIL MOSCOW
MARTIN C. OETTING

RONALD R. PENTECOST
DONALD F. RYMAN
ROBERT E. W. SCHNOOR
LAWRENCE S. SCHULTZ
LAWRENCE K. SNIDER
JOHN A. TRENTACOSTA

Honorable Laura Taylor Swain
Professor Jeffrey Morris
February 14, 2008
Page 2

At its recent mid-year meeting held on February 11, 2008, a resolution was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association ("ABA") upon recommendation of the Ohio State Bar Association, the State Bar of Michigan, the ABA Sections of Business Law, Litigation, and Real Property, Trust and Estate Law, and the ABA General Practice, Solo and Small Firm Division. A copy of the ABA's resolution and a detailed background report that explains the issue and the various legal and policy reasons for their opposition to this proposed change to Rule 8002 (collectively, "ABA Comments") is attached as Appendix A. The Section and the Committee also oppose the proposed change to Rule 8002 and adopt and incorporate by reference in their entirety the ABA Comments to support their opposition to this proposed rule change.

We appreciate your consideration of the views of the Section and the Committee on this important bankruptcy matter. If the opportunity is available, we would welcome the chance to appear before the Advisory Committee to testify with respect to our opposition to the proposed rule change. We would also be happy to respond to any additional questions or concerns that the Advisory Committee may have with respect to this subject. If you would like more information regarding our position on this issue, you may contact any of the undersigned.

Thank you for your consideration of our views on this matter. We are most appreciative.


Very truly yours;



Michael S. Khoury
Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C.
Southfield, Michigan
Chair, Business Law Section
of the State Bar of Michigan



Judith Greenstone Miller
Jaffe, Raitt, Heuer & Weiss, P.C.
Southfield, Michigan
Co-Chair, Debtor/Creditors' Rights Committee of the
Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan



Judy B. Calton
Honigman Miller Schwartz & Cohn LLP
Detroit, Michigan
Co-Chair, Debtor/Creditors' Rights Committee of the
Business Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan

cc: Members of the Business Council (Via Email)
Members of the Debtor/Creditors' Rights Committee (Via Email)
1495803 03

APPENDIX A

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE
HOUSE OF DELEGATES
OF THE
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
FEBRUARY 11, 2008***

RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association supports the retention of the 10-day time limit in Rule 8002 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for filing a notice of appeal from a judgment, order or decree in a bankruptcy case and opposes any proposed amendments to Rule 8002 that would lengthen the time for filing a notice of appeal.

*Note: The "Resolution," but not the attached background "Report," constitutes official ABA policy.

REPORT

Introduction

Subdivision (a) of Rule 8002 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ["Rule 8002"] specifies a 10-day period for filing a notice of appeal from a judgment, order or decree in a bankruptcy case.¹ The Advisory Committee on Bankruptcy Rules ("Bankruptcy Rules Committee") of the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States has published a Request for Comment on a proposal to amend Rule 8002 to change the time for filing a notice of appeal from 10 days to 14 days. Comments must be submitted by February 15, 2008. The Request for Comment explains that this change is intended to make the bankruptcy appeal period consistent with a more general time computation principle setting deadlines as multiples of seven days. The Request for Comment also seeks comment on a proposal to amend Rule 8002 to lengthen the appeal period even further -- to 30 days -- in order to promote consistency between bankruptcy practice and the general civil appellate deadline in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(i).

The Bankruptcy Rules Task Force of the Ad Hoc Committee on Bankruptcy Court Structure and the Insolvency Process of the Business Law Section ("Bankruptcy Rules Task Force"), which is comprised of representatives of the co-sponsoring Sections, has reviewed the issues raised by the Request for Comment. This Report is the work of the Bankruptcy Rules Task Force.

Discussion

As the Request for Comment recognizes, the 10-day appeal period has been the governing rule since enactment of the Bankruptcy Act of 1898 -- more than 100 years ago. *See, e.g., Williams Bros. v. Savage*, 120 F. 497 (4th Cir. 1903) (enforcing 10-day appeal period in Bankr. Act 1898 § 25).

The reason for the 10-day time period is succinctly set forth in the Advisory Committee Note to Rule 8002: "The shortened time is specified in order to obtain prompt appellate review, often important to the administration of a case under the [Bankruptcy] Code." The Advisory Committee Note thus recognizes that in bankruptcy practice -- particularly chapter 11 practice -- unlike general civil practice, the courts not only adjudicate commercial disputes, but also have a significant role in supervising the conduct of on-going commercial entities that need to fund operations, settle disputes, sell assets, and the like.

Lenders, asset purchasers, entities funding settlements, contract assignees, and other parties in interest often require final and non-appealable bankruptcy court orders before they will fund or close significant transactions -- including exit financing for debtors emerging from chapter 11, other financing transactions, settlements during a case, and other major payments and asset transfers. Not infrequently, debtors are strapped for cash and time is of the essence.

The 10-day rule has worked well for over a century. The Sponsors are aware of no empirical data or study showing that it is "a potential trap for new or infrequent bankruptcy practitioners" -- a

¹ Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays and holidays are not excluded from the computation of the 10-day period. Pursuant to B.R. 9006, such intermediate days are excluded only when the period of time prescribed or allowed is less than 8 days.

concern raised in the Request for Comment. To the contrary, with the advent of electronic dockets, parties who have an interest in a particular order have the ability to be apprised of entry of the order on the day it is entered. The 10-day bankruptcy appeal rule is well known and practitioners in bankruptcy court, including commercial litigators, take the time to read the applicable Bankruptcy Rules, including the rules as to how to take an appeal, and avail themselves of the PACER system.

Given the long-standing 10-day rule -- which has worked well -- the addition of four days would only serve to create possible confusion and potential prejudice for cash-strapped debtors. *A fortiori*, a change to thirty days would be even more prejudicial.

The Bankruptcy Rules Committee notes that an argument made in favor of amending Rule 8002 is that "many practitioners" rely on principles of "equitable mootness" and the statutory mootness protections of §§ 363(m) [asset sales] and 364(e) [post-petition credit] "rather than the expiration of the deadline for commencing appeals, to ensure the finality of orders approving transactions." In the Sponsors' experience, however, parties in interest only infrequently rely on such "mootness" principles -- and for good reason.

For example, lenders often require a final, non-appealable plan confirmation order as a condition precedent to exit financing for debtors emerging from chapter 11. Such lenders rarely rely on equitable mootness because that doctrine is too uncertain. There is no statute that renders appeals from confirmation orders moot. The standards for mootness differ among circuits. In a leading Third Circuit decision, *In re Continental Airlines*, 91 F.3d 553, 560 (3d Cir. 1996), the court applied a five-factor test for equitable mootness of appeals from a plan confirmation order. Judge (now Justice) Alito, in dissent, calls "equitable mootness" a "curious doctrine" and states that he disagrees with the majority's upholding dismissal of a confirmation order appeal. In a leading Seventh Circuit case, *In re UNR Industries*, 20 F.3d 766, 769 (7th Cir. 1994), Judge Easterbrook, writing for the court, "banish[ed] 'equitable mootness' from the (local) lexicon," and ruled (upholding dismissal of an appeal) that the issue is "whether it is prudent to upset the plan of reorganization at this late date."

As for Sections 363(m) and 364(e), which deal with asset sales and post-petition credit, those sections do not bar or "moot" appeals to the extent the appellant asserts lack of good faith on the part of an asset purchaser or credit provider. And, as might be expected, there are additional judicially recognized exceptions to these statutes. *E.g.*, *In re Swedeland*, 16 F.3d 552 (3d Cir. 1994) (appeal from order authorizing loan not moot to extent loan not fully disbursed); *In re Saybrook Mfg. Co., Inc.*, 963 F.2d 1490 (11th Cir. 1992) (appeal from cross-collateralization order not moot because such order not authorized by the Bankruptcy Code); *In re BCD Corp.*, 119 F.3d 852 (10th Cir. 1997) (appeal from sale order not moot because equitable relief available).

In sum, the current 10-day rule is long-established, well-known, serves a proper purpose, and works. It does not need to be fixed.

Dated: February 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Ware
President, Ohio State Bar Association