

**PRESENTED AT**

41<sup>st</sup> Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference

November 17-18, 2022

Austin, TX

**Texas Two Step and Bankruptcy vs. Mass Tort**

**Presented by:**

**Mr. Kenric D. Kattner**

**Mr. Bruce Markell**

**Mr. Theodore E. Tsekerides**

---

---

**United States Court of Appeals**  
*for the*  
**Third Circuit**

---

Case No. 22-2003

In re: LTL MANAGEMENT LLC,

*Debtor,*

\*OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF TALC CLAIMANTS,

*Appellant.*

\*(Amended per Court's Order dated 06/10/2022)

DIRECT APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY IN CH. 11 NO. 21-30589 AND ADV. PRO. NO. 21-03032

---

---

**BRIEF OF CERTAIN BANKRUPTCY LAW PROFESSORS  
AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF DEBTOR-APPELLEE**

---

---

DANIEL S. SHAMAH  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
Seven Times Square  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 326-2000

PETER FRIEDMAN  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
1625 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 383-5300

LAURA L. SMITH  
EMMA L. PERSSON  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
2501 North Harwood Street,  
Suite 1700  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(972) 360-1900

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	7
I.    THE DEBTOR’S USE OF THE BANKRUPTCY PROCESS PROVIDES BENEFITS TO ALL STAKEHOLDERS COMPARED TO CONTINUING MASS TORT LITIGATION OUTSIDE OF BANKRUPTCY .....	7
a.    Bankruptcy Offers Powerful Tools for Mass Tort Claimants .....	9
b.    The Propriety of Any Given Divisive Merger Can Be Assessed Under Applicable Law in a Bankruptcy Case.....	13
II.   THE ALTERNATIVES TO BANKRUPTCY ARE INEFFICIENT AND OFTEN RESULT IN WORSE OUTCOMES FOR KEY CREDITORS.....	14
a.    Class Certification Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 .....	15
b.    The MDL Process .....	17
CONCLUSION.....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases:</b>	
<i>Amchem Products v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	15
<i>Begier v. IRS</i> , 496 U.S. 53 (1990).....	3
<i>DBMP LLC v. Those Parties Listed on Appendix A to Complaint (In re DBMP LLC)</i> , Nos. 20-30080, 20-03004, 2021 Bankr. LEXIS 2194 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Aug. 10, 2021).....	13
<i>Denke v. PNC Bank, N.A (In re Denke)</i> , 524 B.R. 644 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 2015) .....	11
<i>In re A. H. Robins Co.</i> , 88 B.R. 742 (E.D. Va. 1988) .....	2
<i>In re Amatex Corp.</i> , 107 B.R. 856 (E.D. Pa. 1989).....	10
<i>In re Armstrong World Industries, Inc.</i> , 348 B.R. 136 (D. Del. 2006).....	12
<i>In re Badogna</i> , 331 F. App'x 962 (3d Cir. 2009).....	11
<i>In re Bestwall LLC</i> , 605 B.R. 43 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. 2019) .....	14
<i>In re Choice ATM Enters.</i> , 2015 Bankr. LEXIS 689 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. Mar. 4, 2015).....	11
<i>In re DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 870 F.3d 345 (5th Cir. 2017) .....	19
<i>In re Dow Corning Corp.</i> , 211 B.R. 545 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1997).....	2
<i>In re Federal–Mogul Global Inc.</i> , 684 F.3d 355 (3d Cir. 2012) .....	10

<i>In re Imerys Talc America</i> , Case No. 19-10289 (Bankr. D. Del. 2019) .....	12
<i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 36 B.R. 743 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984) .....	11
<i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 68 B.R. 618 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986) .....	2
<i>In re LTL Mgmt., LLC</i> , 637 B.R. 396 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2022) .....	4, 5, 14
<i>In re Mallinckrodt PLC</i> , 639 B.R. 837 (Bankr. D. Del. 2022).....	2
<i>In re Owens Corning</i> , No. 00-3837, 2006 Bankr. LEXIS 2856 (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 19, 2006) .....	2
<i>In re Owens Corning</i> , 419 F.3d 195 (3d Cir. 2005) .....	14
<i>In re Patenaude</i> , 210 F.3d 135 (3d Cir. 1999) .....	18
<i>In re PG&amp;E Corp.</i> , 617 B.R. 671 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2020) .....	2
<i>In re POC Props., LLC</i> , 580 B.R. 504 (Bankr. E.D. Wis. 2017).....	11
<i>In re Stone Webster, Inc.</i> , 279 B.R. 748 (Bankr. D. Del. 2002).....	11
<i>In re WR Grace &amp; Co.</i> , 729 F.3d 332 (3d Cir. 2013) .....	3
<i>Jones v. Chemetron Corp.</i> , 212 F.3d 199 (3d Cir. 2000) .....	12
<i>Mem'l Corp. v. BEPCO, LP (In re 15375 Mem'l Corp.)</i> , 589 F.3d 605 (3d Cir. 2009) .....	5, 7
<i>Min Wu v. Jafco Foods, Inc.</i> , No. BER-L-7317-20 (N.J. Super. Feb. 25, 2022) .....	13

<i>Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp.</i> , 527 U.S. 823 (1999).....	15, 16
<i>Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Marketing, Sales Practice, and Product Liability Litigation</i> , 15-MD-2672-CRB (JSC).....	17

**Statutes & Other Authorities:**

11 U.S.C. § 105 .....	4
11 U.S.C. § 502(c) .....	11
11 U.S.C. § 524(g) .....	4
11 U.S.C. § 1109(b) .....	11, 12
11 U.S.C. § 1121(b) .....	12
11 U.S.C. § 1121(d) .....	12
11 U.S.C. § 1129 .....	18
28 U.S.C. § 1334.....	10
28 U.S.C. § 1407 .....	17
28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) .....	19
Anthony Casey and Joshua Macey, [ <i>Texas Two-Step and the Future of Mass Tort Bankruptcy Series</i> ] <i>A Qualified Defense of Divisional Mergers</i> , Harvard Law School Bankruptcy Round Table (June 28, 2022) .....	8
Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019.....	18
Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29.....	1
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 .....	15, 16
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1)(B).....	16
Report of the National Bankruptcy Review Commission 315 (Oct. 20, 1997).....	9
Samir D. Parikh, <i>The New Mass Torts Bargain</i> , 91 FORDHAM L. REV. ____ (forthcoming 2022).....	<i>passim</i>

Samir D. Parikh, <i>Scarlet-Lettered Bankruptcy: A Public Benefit Proposal for Mass Tort Villains</i> , 117 NW. U. L. REV. ____ (forthcoming 2022) .....	3
Samir Parikh, <i>Bankruptcy is Optimal Venue for Mass Tort Cases</i> , LAW360 (Feb. 28, 2022).....	<i>passim</i>
Samir Parikh, <i>Mass Exploitation</i> , 170 U. PA. L. REV. ONLINE 53 (Feb. 2022) .....	4
Sergio Campos and Samir D. Parikh, <i>Due Process Alignment in Mass Restructurings</i> , 91 FORDHAM L. REV. ____ (forthcoming 2022).....	17
U.S. JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIG., MDL STATISTICS REPORT – DISTRIBUTION OF PENDING MDL DOCKETS BY ACTIONS PENDING 6 (2018).....	17

## INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*<sup>1</sup>

The amici curiae, whose names and affiliations are set forth in the attached Appendix, are nationally-recognized professors of law (collectively, the “Law Professors”) who teach courses and seminars in corporate governance, business law, and bankruptcy law and reorganization. The Law Professors have published numerous articles and treatises on the subject of business reorganizations and mass tort bankruptcies, provided testimony to Congress on various bankruptcy matters, and maintain a professional interest in ensuring that this Court is appropriately informed about how the bankruptcy framework is uniquely suited to address the issues affecting mass tort plaintiffs and defendants. The Law Professors’ vast experience and authorship in this area of law are critically relevant to the above-referenced appeal. The Law Professors submit this brief to explain that the circumstances surrounding the filing of this bankruptcy case do not reflect a lack of good faith, and that the Bankruptcy Court did not err in denying Appellants’ motion to dismiss the case.

---

<sup>1</sup> All parties have consented to the filing of this brief. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29, Amici state that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part. No person other than Amici or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.



## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Mass torts create a unique scale of harm and liabilities, and fairly addressing them poses substantial challenges to the U.S. legal system, particularly when the universe of all potential plaintiffs cannot be identified at a given point in time.<sup>2</sup> Litigation in state and federal courts of general jurisdiction (including multi-district litigation) has encountered various resolution obstacles, including (i) high transaction costs, (ii) protracted proceedings that extend for years, (iii) the inability to offer comprehensive settlement of all claims, (iv) failure to protect future claimants, and (v) insufficient means to protect parties from open-ended liability.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, for the past five decades, the United States Bankruptcy Code and bankruptcy courts have provided plaintiffs with substantial claims and debtors with finite resources an efficient and expeditious process to resolve their differences and create meaningful settlement funds for both current and future mass tort claimants.<sup>4</sup> The bankruptcy process offers a comprehensive response to collective action

---

<sup>2</sup> See Samir D. Parikh, *The New Mass Torts Bargain*, 91 FORDHAM L. REV. \_\_\_\_ (forthcoming 2022), available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3649611>.

<sup>3</sup> See *id.*

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., *In re Mallinckrodt PLC*, 639 B.R. 837, 850 (Bankr. D. Del. 2022); *In re PG&E Corp.*, 617 B.R. 671, 673 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2020); *In re Owens Corning*, No. 00-3837, 2006 Bankr. LEXIS 2856, at \*1 (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 19, 2006); *In re A. H. Robins Co.*, 88 B.R. 742, 747 (E.D. Va. 1988); *In re Dow Corning Corp.*, 211 B.R. 545, 562 n.16 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1997); *In re Johns-Manville Corp.*, 68 B.R. 618, 627 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986).

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2022 Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
41<sup>st</sup> Annual Jay L. Westbrook Bankruptcy Conference session  
"Texas Two Step and Bankruptcy vs. Mass Tort"