Passive Violations of the Automatic Stay Know When to Hold 'Em, Know When to Fold 'Em



Evan J. Atkinson Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis, LLP

> Austin, Texas (512) 685-6467 evan.atkinson@wallerlaw.com



Jason Enright Winstead, PC

Dallas, Texas (214) 745-5844 jenright@winstead.com

waller

1


Outline of Presentation

- · In re Fulton
 - Facts
 - City's Argument
 - Debtors' Argument
 - 7th Circuit's Holding
- ${\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$ Appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court
- Hypotheticals
- Questions



waller

In re Fulton, 926 F.3d 916 (7th Cir. 2019)





waller

3

Facts of the Case

- Four separate debtors' cars were impounded by the City of Chicago prior to the commencement of their chapter 13 cases
- Following commencement of the bankruptcy cases, the City refused to return the vehicles and filed unsecured claims
- In several cases, the Bankruptcy Courts sanctioned the City and ordered the return of the vehicles, yet the City still refused to return the vehicles
- Following confirmation of the debtors' plans, the City again refused to return the vehicles and, in some cases, demanded that their claims be treated as secured



waller

4

3

Procedural History

• Direct consolidated appeal to the 7th Circuit



waller

5

5

City's Arguments on Appeal

- Section 362(a)(3) operates as a stay of any *act* that would *alter* the status quo and retaining property lawfully obtained prepetition only maintains the status quo
- The automatic stay does not render a creditor's possession of collateral unlawful where the creditor lawfully repossessed or impounded collateral before bankruptcy
- There is no clear indication that Congress intended to erode past bankruptcy practice when it amended § 362(a)(3) to include "exercise control"
- The stay against acts to exercise control only apply to intangible property interests that might otherwise fall outside the scope of acts to "obtain possession" of estate property
- Debtors' interpretation of § 362(a)(3) would render § 542(a) superfluous
- Although § 542(a) imposes a mandatory duty to turn over estate property, it is not self-executing, and there are defenses/exceptions the creditor could raise (E.g., lack of adequate protection)
- Reading § 362(a)(3) to compel immediate turnover is inconsistent with Strumpf



waller

6





Also available as part of the eCourse

<u>Practical Considerations for Navigating Bankruptcy</u>

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the $39^{\rm th}$ Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference session "Passive Violations of the Automatic Stay - Know When to Hold 'Em, Know When to Fold 'Em"