

**MASS PREFERENCE LITIGATION**  
**STRATEGIES AND PITFALLS**  
**(INCLUDING THE USE OF STREAMLINED PROCEDURES AND MEDIATION)**

Patricia B. Tomasco\*  
Jackson Walker LLP  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(512) 236-2076  
[ptomasco@jw.com](mailto:ptomasco@jw.com)  
[www.jw.com](http://www.jw.com)

\*With special thanks to Marvin Sprouse and Jack Skaggs for reviewing and research assistance.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A--	PLAINTIFF ISSUES .....	1
I.	APPLICATION OF THE <i>TWOMBLY/IQBAL</i> TO PREFERENCE ACTIONS .....	2
A.	<b>Rule 12(b)(6) Decisions Pre-<i>Twombly/Iqbal</i></b> .....	2
B.	<b>Bankruptcy Courts After the Higher <i>Twombly/Iqbal</i> Pleading Standard</b> .....	3
C.	<b>The Use of Omnibus Complaints and Multiple Defendant Cases</b> .....	5
D.	<b>Pre-Judgment Interest</b> .....	6
II.	GATEKEEPING ISSUES .....	7
A.	<b>Payments to Priority Tax or Other Priority Creditors</b> .....	7
B.	<b>Statutory Liens or Construction Trusts</b> .....	7
C.	<b>Payments for Employee Wages</b> .....	7
D.	<b>Payments for Rent</b> .....	8
E.	<b>Payments on Account of Assumed Contracts</b> .....	8
F.	<b>Payments to Secured Creditors</b> .....	8
G.	<b>Judge Jernigan’s List</b> .....	9
III.	ETHICS .....	10
A.	<b>Sanctions and Ethical Considerations</b> .....	10
B.	<b>Risk/Reward Analysis – Benefit to Unsecureds</b> .....	11
PART B--	DEFENDANT STRATEGIES.....	11
I.	COUNTERCLAIMS AND JURY TRIALS AFTER <i>STERN V.</i> <i>MARSHALL</i> .....	11
A.	<b>When Can Counterclaims be Asserted?</b> .....	11
B.	<b>Jurisdiction and Jury Trial Rights after <i>Stern v. Marshall</i></b> .....	13
II.	FEE SHIFTING STRATEGIES .....	15
A.	<b>Contractual Attorneys Fees under State Law</b> .....	16
B.	<b>Texas Fee Shifting Statute</b> .....	16
C.	<b>Attorney’s Fees As Administrative Claims</b> .....	17
D.	<b>Offer of Judgment</b> .....	18
E.	<b>Rule 37 Sanctions/Offensive Use of Requests for Admissions</b> .....	18
PART C--	STREAMLINED LITIGATION PROCEDURES .....	18
I.	MODIFIED PRETRIAL PROCEDURES.....	19

II.	MANDATORY MEDIATION PROCEDURES .....	20
III.	MODIFIED TRIAL PROCEDURES .....	20
A.	<b>Consolidated Insolvency Trial</b> .....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### FEDERAL CASES

<i>Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society</i> , 421 U.S. 240 (1975).....	15
<i>American Fidelity Fire Insur. Co. v. Construcciones Werl, Inc.</i> , 407 F. Supp., 164 (D.Va.1975).....	6
<i>In re American Telecom Corp.</i> , 319 B.R. 857 (Bankr.N.D.Ill.2004) .....	15
<i>In re Amp'd Mobile, Inc.</i> , 404 B.R. 118 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009).....	13
<i>Angell v. BER Care Inc. (In re Caremerica Inc.)</i> , 409 B.R. 737 (Bankr. E.D.N.C. 2009).....	3, 4
<i>Angell v. Haveri (In re Caremerica Inc.)</i> , 409 B.R. 346 (Bankr. E.D.N.C. 2009).....	3
<i>Armstrong v. General Growth Development Corp. (In re Clothes, Inc.)</i> , 35 B.R. 489 (Bankr. N.D. 1983).....	8
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).....	2, 3, 4
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 127 S. Ct. 1955 (2007).....	2, 4
<i>In re Berger Industrial Inc.</i> , 298 B.R. 37 (Bankr. S.D. N.Y. 2003).....	7, 10
<i>In re Beyond Words Corp.</i> , 193 B.R. 540 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 1996) .....	17
<i>In re Brook Mays Music Co.</i> , 2007 Bankr. LEXIS 2902 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. Aug. 1, 2007).....	7, 9
<i>Brown v. Morton (In re Workboats Northwest, Inc.)</i> , 201 B.R. 563 (Bankr W.D. Wash. 1996).....	8
<i>Camacho v. Texas Workforce Commission</i> , 445 F.3d 1286 (5th Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 127 S. Ct. 349 (2006) .....	15

<i>Carmack v. Zell (In re Mindy's Inc.),</i> 17 B.R. 177 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1982).....	8
<i>In re Castletons, Inc.,</i> 990 F.2d 551 (10th Cir. 1993) .....	7
<i>In re Chari,</i> 276 B.R. 206 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 2002).....	4
<i>In re Coco,</i> 67 B.R. 365 (S.D. N.Y. 1986).....	8
<i>Cohen v. Eiler ( In re Cohen),</i> 305 B.R. 886 (9th Cir. BAP 2004).....	12
<i>Compare Raleigh v. Mid American National Bank &amp; Trust Co. ( In re Stoecker),</i> 131 B.R. 979 (Bankr.N.D.Ill.1991) .....	12
<i>Conley v. Gibson,</i> 355 U.S. 41 (1957).....	2, 3
<i>In re Conners,</i> 125 B.R. 611 (Bankr.S.D.Cal.1991) .....	6
<i>In re Cybermech, Inc.,</i> 13 F.3d 818 (4th Cir. 1994) .....	6
<i>In re E.A. Nord Co.,</i> 78 B.R. 289 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 1987).....	17
<i>In re El Paso Refinery, L.P.,</i> 178 B.R. 426 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 1995).....	9
<i>In re Erin Food Services, Inc.,</i> 980 F.2d 792 (1st Cir. 1992).....	9
<i>In re Excello Press, Inc.,</i> 967 F.2d 1109 (7th Cir. 1992) .....	10
<i>In Re Execuair Corp.,</i> 125 B.R. 600 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1991).....	17
<i>Family Golf Centers, Inc. v. Acushnet Company (In re Randall's Island Family Golf Centers, Inc.),</i> 290 B.R. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).....	3, 4

<i>In re General Time Corp.</i> , 328 B.R. 243 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2005) .....	8
<i>Ginett v. Computer Task Group, Inc.</i> , 962 F.2d 1085 (2d Cir.1992).....	5
<i>Glendora v. Malone</i> , 917 F. Supp. 224 (S.D.N.Y.1996).....	5
<i>Granfinanciera, S.A. v. Nordberg</i> 109 S.Ct. 2782 (U. S. Fla. 1989).....	13
<i>Gold v. Winget (In re NM Holdings Co., LLC)</i> , 407 B.R. 232 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2009) .....	4
<i>In re Good Taste, Inc.</i> , 317 B.R. 112 (Bankr. D. Alaska 2004).....	17
<i>In re Hansen</i> , 368 B.R. 868 (Bankr. 9th Cir. 2007).....	18
<i>In re Hechinger Investment Co. of Del. Inc.</i> , 489 F.3d 568 (3d Cir. 2007).....	6
<i>In re Helig-Meyers Co.</i> , 297 B.R. 46 (Bankr. E.D. Va. 2003).....	3
<i>Intercon Research Associates, Ltd. v. Dresser Industries, Inc.</i> , 696 F.2d 53 (7th Cir.1982) .....	5, 6
<i>In re Investment Bankers, Inc.</i> , 4 F.3d 1556 (10th Cir. 1993) .....	6
<i>In re JS &amp; RB, Inc.</i> , 446 B.R. 350 (Bankr. W.D. Mo. 2011).....	8
<i>In re Jack/Wade Drilling, Inc.</i> , 258 F.3d 385 (5th Cir. 2001) .....	17
<i>Jones Truck Lines, Inc. v. Central States, Southeast and Southwest Area Pension Fund</i> ( <i>In re Jones Truck Lines, Inc.</i> , 130 F.3d 323 (8th Cir. 1997) .....	7
<i>Katchen v. Landry</i> , 383 U.S. 323 (1966).....	13, 14

<i>Kleven v. Norkus (In re Chochos),</i> 325 B.R. 780 (Bankr.N.D.Ind.2005).....	6
<i>In Re Kujawa,</i> 270 F.3d 578 (8th.....	15
<i>In re LCO Enterprises,</i> 12 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 1993) .....	8
<i>In re Labrum &amp; Doak, LLP,</i> 227 B.R. 383 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1998) .....	7
<i>Langenkamp v. Culp,</i> 499 U.S. 42 (1990).....	13, 14
<i>In re MMR Holding Corp.,</i> 203 B.R. 605 (Bankr. M.D. La. 1996) .....	8
<i>In re Madden,</i> 185 B.R. 815 (Bankr. 9th Cir. 1995).....	17
<i>In re Martinez,</i> 416 F.3d 1286 (11th Cir. 2005) .....	16
<i>In re Met-L-Wood Corp.,</i> 115 B.R. 133 (N.D. Ill. 1990) .....	17
<i>Michaels Building Co. v. Ameritrust Co., N.A.,</i> 848 F.2d 674 (6th Cir.1988) .....	5
<i>Milwaukee Cheese. In re Glob Manufacturing Corp.,</i> 567 F.3d 1291 (11th Cir. 2009) .....	6
<i>In re Milwaukee Cheese Wis., Inc.,</i> 112 F.3d 845 (7th Cir. 1997) .....	6
<i>In re Missionary Baptist Foundation Of America, Inc.,</i> 796 F.2d 752 (5th Cir. 1986) .....	9
<i>Mosley v. General Motors Corp.,</i> 497 F.2d 1330 (8th Cir.1974) .....	6
<i>In re Nuclear Imaging Systems, Inc.,</i> 277 B.R. 59 (Bankr.E.D.Pa.2002) .....	6

<i>Osterneck v. E.T. Barwick Industrial, Inc.</i> , 825 F.2d 1521 (11th Cir. 1987) .....	6
<i>In re Ozcelik</i> , 267 B.R. 485 .....	7
<i>In re Paoli R.R. Yard PCB Litigation</i> , 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000) .....	15
<i>In re Prescott</i> , 51 B.R. 751 (Bankr. W.D. Wis. 1985).....	8, 9
<i>In re Prescott</i> , 805 F.2d 719 (7th Cir. 1986) .....	8, 9
<i>In re Pro Snax Distributors, Inc.</i> , 157 F.3d 414 (5th Cir. 1998) .....	10
<i>In re Rainbow Trust</i> , 216 B.R. 77 (B.A.P. 2nd Cir. 1997).....	7
<i>Ralar Distributings, Inc. v. Rubbermaid, Inc. (In re Ralar Distributings, Inc.)</i> , 4 F.3d 62 (1st Cir.1993).....	11
<i>Reading Co. v. Brown</i> , 391 U.S. 471, 88 S. Ct. 1759, 20 L. Ed. 2d 751 (1968).....	17
<i>In re Rocor Intern., Inc.</i> , 352 B.R. 319 (Bankr. W.D. Okla. 2006) .....	7
<i>In re Salander O'Reilly Galleries</i> , 453 B.R. 106 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011).....	14
<i>In re Schwinn Bicycle Co.</i> , 200 B.R. 980 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1996) .....	9
<i>Smith v. United National Bank-Denton</i> , 966 F.2d 973 (5th Cir.1992) .....	16
<i>Spunt v Charlesbank Laundry, Inc. (In re Charlesbank Laundry, Inc.)</i> , 755 F.2 (1st Cir. 1985).....	17
<i>Stern v. Marshall</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011).....	13, 14, i
<i>Superior Toy &amp; Manufacturing Co., Inc.</i> ,	

78 F.3d 1169 (7th Cir. 1996) .....	8
<i>In re TOUSA, Inc.</i> ,	
442 B.R. 852 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 2010) .....	4, 5, 19
<i>TWA, Inc. v. Marsh USA, Inc. (In re TWA, Inc. Post Confirmation Estate)</i> ,	
305 B.R. 228 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004) .....	3
<i>In re Teligent, Inc.</i> ,	
326 B.R. 219 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....	8
<i>In re The IT Group, Inc.</i> ,	
313 B.R. 370 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004) .....	3
<i>The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors v. Martin (In re Enron Creditors Recovery Corp.)</i> ,	
376 B.R. 442 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2007).....	12, 13
<i>Travelers Casualty &amp; Surety Co. of America v. Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co.</i> ,	
549 U.S. 443, 127 S. Ct. 1199, 167 L. Ed. 2d 178 (2007).....	15, 16
<i>Turner v. Sungard Bus. System</i> ,	
91 F.3d 1418 (11th Cir.1996) .....	10
<i>In re Valley Media, Inc.</i> ,	
288 B.R. 189 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003) .....	2, 3, 4
<i>Verco Industrial v. Spartan Plastics (In re Verco Industrial)</i> ,	
704 F.2d 1134 (9th Cir.1983) .....	12
<i>In re Vision Metals, Inc.</i> ,	
325 B.R. 138 (Bankr. D. Del. 2005) .....	8
<i>Visiting Nurse Association of Tampa Bay, Inc. v. Sullivan (In re Visiting Nurse Associate of Tampa Bay, Inc.)</i> ,	
121 B.R. 114 (Bankr.M.D. Fla.1990) .....	12
<i>Woburn Associates V. Kahn (In re Hemingway Transport, Inc.)</i> ,	
954 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1992).....	17
<i>Young v. Corbin</i> ,	
889 F. Supp. 582 (N.D.N.Y.1995).....	10

## UNREPORTED CASES

<i>Angell v. Burrell (In re Caremerica Inc.),</i> 2009 WL. 2253225 (Bankr. E.D.N.C. July 28, 2009) .....	3
<i>Feltman v. Keybank, N.A. (In re Levitt and Sons, LLC),</i> 2010 WL. 1539878 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. Apr. 16, 2010) .....	5
<i>In re GB Herndon and Associates, Inc.,</i> 2011 WL. 4628805 (Bankr. D. Colo October 04, 2011) .....	14
<i>Jack Greenberg Inc. v. Grant Thornton LLP,</i> 1997 WL. 860673 (Dec. 12, 1997) .....	12
<i>In re Juliet Homes, LP,</i> 2010 WL. 5256806 (Bankr. S.D.Tex. Dec. 16, 2010) .....	4
<i>In re LMP 8500 Shoal Creek, L.L.C.,</i> 2007 WL. 2713927 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. Sept. 12, 2007).....	17
<i>N.S. Flash Foundation, Inc.,</i> 2008 WL. 4763328 (5th Cir. October 31, 2008).....	7
<i>Neilson v. Southern (In re Webvan Group, Inc.),</i> 2004 WL. 483580 (Bankr. D. Del. March 9, 2004).....	3
<i>In re Olde Prairie Block Owner, LLC,</i> 2011 WL. 3792406 (Bankr.N.D.Ill. Aug. 25, 2011).....	14
<i>Pro-Pac, Inc. v. Chapes (In re Pro-Pac, Inc.),</i> 2011 WL. 4469973 (Bankr.E.D.Wis. Sept. 27, 2011) .....	14
<i>Robinson v. Questex Media Group, LLC (In re Oxford Expo., LLC),</i> 2011 WL. 4074028 (Bankr.N.D.Miss. Sept. 13, 2011) .....	15
<i>In re Saba Enterprises Inc.,</i> 2009 WL. 3049651 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) (Sept. 19, 2009) (citations omitted).....	2
<i>In re Safety Harbor Resort and Spa,</i> 2011 WL. 3849639 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 30, 2011) .....	14, 15
<i>In re Southern Textile Knitters, Inc.,</i> 2000 WL. 33709686 (Bankr.D.S.C., Aug 18, 2000) .....	10
<i>In re Weinschneider,</i> 2004 WL. 524872 (N.D. Ill. 2004) .....	17

<i>In re White Rock Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 32114479 (Bankr. E.D. Ark. 2002) .....	17
--	----

**DOCKETED CASES**

<i>In re Enron Corp.</i> , Case No. 01-16034 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. August 30, 2005).....	20
--	----

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

11 U.S.C. § 1322(e) .....	15
11 U.S.C. § 365.....	8
11 U.S.C. § 502(h) .....	11, 12, 13, 15
11 U.S.C. § 506(b) .....	15
11 U.S.C. § 547(a) .....	2, 4, 7, 8, 12
11 U.S.C. § 547(b)(5) .....	7
11 U.S.C. § 547(c)(9).....	11
28 U.S.C. § 157(e) .....	13
28 U.S.C. § 1409(b) .....	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.....	2, 3
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.....	2, i
Fed.R.Civ.P. 20(a)(2).....	5, 6
Fed.R.Civ.P. 21 .....	6
Fed. R. Civ. P. 36.....	18
Fed. R. Civ. P. 37.....	18, i
Fed. R. Civ. P. 68.....	17, 18

As preference cases become more and more commoditized, brought in large batches, and with procedures orders entered well before any defendant knows that they have been sued, the potential for abuses increases. Several articles appeared in the ABI Journal bemoaning the lack of oversight and conflicts of interest that arise in mass preference litigation. Those articles call for legislative changes to address the issues. For example, Karen Cordry suggests that the cure for a “blunderbuss” of preference litigation brought with too little investigation is to shift the burden of proof on ordinary course to the estate. Karen Cordry, “*Some Modest Proposals on Preferences*,” ABI JOURNAL, June 2008.

Zach Mosner proposes that estates that are administratively insolvent be precluded from bringing preferences and that the Bankruptcy Code be amended to prohibit assignment of preference actions under 363. Zach Mosner, “‘*Churn*’ Noble: *Rethinking Preference Suits*,” ABI JOURNAL, July/August 2011. Until these legislative suggestions are adopted, the rank and file bankruptcy lawyer will have to create their own solutions to the problem of preference litigation run amok.

This article attempts to highlight where procedures orders, dismissal decisions and mediation orders get it wrong or could be vastly improved. It also suggests creative strategies (some untested) to change the balance of power between plaintiffs and defendants: pre-judgment interest, fee-shifting, jury trial rights, discovery sanctions and similar slings and arrows to favorably move the settlement needle. This article is not a primer on preference elements and defenses as those matters are routinely known or discussed elsewhere.

When faced with a mass preference complaint, a defendant has the choice between attempting to distinguish itself from the hordes to reach an early settlement or to play along like a prisoner in the Bataan Death March, where attrition and time will eventually wear down both plaintiff and defendant making settlement cheaper than going forward. Whether the typical dance of attrition in mass preference actions achieves justice is another matter. Defendants face unnecessary costs in the form of local counsel, travel, and attorneys’ fees when the complaint against them was based solely on the fact that a check was written during a 90-day period. Some procedures orders do not require any precision or verification by the plaintiff that a plausible preference claim exists and usually stay discovery “to avoid administrative costs.” A review of procedures orders reveals that certain of these provisions are efficient and workable, and others are simply over-reaching, slovenly or both. Most preferences are settled over the phone after informal document exchange if both sides are settlement-minded. Mediation early in the case streamlines the adversary proceeding significantly. This is particularly true if the parties exchange documents and position statements before the mediation.

## **PART A--PLAINTIFF ISSUES**

Preference litigation can be lucrative for estate counsel, but it also can be unjustifiably expensive for the estate. There is a natural bias against spending too much time investigating claims before they are brought because it is easier to let the defendants identify the weaknesses in the trustee’s case. Still, a trustee or estate representative can get caught in a situation where he has brought too many weak cases and the ensuing perception of weakness can embolden both the court and defendants. For both ethical and strategic reasons, the estate representative is well-advised to choose battles that are winnable and to avoid obviously unsupportable cases.

Efficiency should not prevail over counsel’s goal of reasonable investigation and meritorious pleadings. With respect to winnable cases, the estate is best-served when advancing every possible avenue of recovery and pleading the case with a full understanding of the facts. We begin with a juxtaposition of various pleading standards and grounds for dismissal.

## I. APPLICATION OF THE *TWOMBLY/IQBAL* TO PREFERENCE ACTIONS

The first step in the mass preference march of attrition is the filing of the complaint. Often the preference complaint will be mass produced, sometimes simply using the debtor’s check register to identify defendants. The result is a complaint that merely recites the elements of 11 U.S.C. § 547(a) without pleading specific facts as to what was the antecedent debt (or if there was one), whether the transfer was of property of the debtor or someone else, or facts showing that the transfer enabled the creditor to receive more than in a chapter 7 case.

Cases addressing what must be in a preference complaint can be divided into four overlapping constructs: before and after *Twombly/Iqbal* and for or against Judge Walsh’s opinion in *Valley Media*. The short explanation of the *Twombly/Iqbal* shift is that these two Supreme Court opinions changed the level of pleading required under FED. R. CIV. P. 8 to withstand a motion to dismiss under FED. R. CIV. P. 12. The old standard was that a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appeared “beyond doubt” that the plaintiff could prove *no* set of facts in support of its claims. *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957). *Twombly/Iqbal* changed that standard to whether the complaint is “plausible” based on the pleading of “enough factual matter to state a cognizable claim.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (2007), and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937 (2009). Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 9 apply to bankruptcy proceedings by operation of Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 7008 and 7009 with 7008 being applicable to preferences and 7009 also applicable to fraudulent transfers based on actual fraud.<sup>1</sup>

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. at 949 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). “The plausibility standard is not akin to a ‘probability requirement,’ but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Id.*

### A. Rule 12(b)(6) Decisions Pre-*Twombly/Iqbal*

Rule 12(b)(6) decisions on avoidance actions prior to 2007 run the gamut between a very liberal “notice pleading” standard and opinions that presaged the heightened pleading standards in *Twombly/Iqbal*. Judge Walsh’s opinion in *In re Valley Media, Inc.*, 288 B.R. 189 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003), set forth the “minimum standard” that preference complaints must contain:

- (a) an identification of the nature and amount of each antecedent debt and
- (b) an identification of each alleged preference transfer by

---

<sup>1</sup> Fraudulent transfer are generally subject to the heightened pleading standard of FED. RULE CIV. PROC. 9, although claims of constructively fraudulent transfers are subject to the FED. RULE CIV. PROC. 8. *See, e.g., In re Saba Enterprises Inc.*, 2009 WL 3049651 at \*9 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) (Sept. 19, 2009) (citations omitted).

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

## Title search: Mass Preference Litigation: Strategies and Pitfalls (Including the Use of Streamlined Procedures and Mediation)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
30<sup>th</sup> Annual Bankruptcy Conference session  
"Mass Preference Actions: Pros, Cons and Strategies"