

# Passive Violations of the Automatic Stay

## *Know When to Hold ‘Em, Know When to Fold ‘Em*

waller

Evan J. Atkinson  
Waller Lansden Dortch & Davis, LLP  
Austin, Texas  
(512) 685-6467  
evan.atkinson@wallerlaw.com

WINSTEAD  
ATTORNEYS

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
- Appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court
- Hypotheticals
- Questions

WINSTEAD  
ATTORNEYS

2

waller

2

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



**WINSTEAD**  
ATTORNEYS

waller

3

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

**WINSTEAD**  
ATTORNEYS

waller

4

4

## Procedural History

- Direct consolidated appeal to the 7th Circuit

## 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*

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2020 Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
39<sup>th</sup> Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference session

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