

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (admitted *pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Jordan A. Kroop (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 277-6910

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
Deborah J. Newman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Robert S. Loigman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Aaron M. Lawrence (admitted *pro hac vice*)
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000

HAYWARD PLLC
Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
Paige Holden Montgomery
Spencer M. Stephens
2021 McKinney Avenue
Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 981-3300

*Counsel for Highland Capital Management,
L.P. and the Highland Claimant Trust*

*Co-Counsel for Marc S. Kirschner, as
Litigation Trustee of The Highland Litigation
Sub-Trust*

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Reorganized Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054-sgj11

**AMENDED MOTION FOR AN ORDER
EXTENDING DURATION OF TRUSTS**

The Highland Claimant Trust (“**Claimant Trust**”) and the Highland Litigation Sub-Trust (the “**Litigation Trust**,” and together with the Claimant Trust, the “**Trusts**”), in each case formed under the confirmed and effective *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital*



Management, L.P. (as Modified) [Docket No. 1808] (“**Plan**”),¹ respectfully moves the Court for entry of an order, substantially in the form attached to this motion as **Exhibit A**, extending the duration of the Trusts for one year (the “**Motion**”).² In support of this Motion, the Trusts state:

I. BACKGROUND

A. Jurisdiction and Venue

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this Motion under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the retention of jurisdiction provisions of Article XI of the Plan. This is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

B. The Plan

2. On February 22, 2021, the Court entered the *Order (i) Confirming the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (as Modified) and (ii) Granting Related Relief* [Docket No. 1943] (“**Confirmation Order**”) confirming the Plan.³ The Plan went effective on August 11, 2021 [Docket No. 2700] (“**Effective Date**”).

3. The Plan created the Trusts as of the Effective Date. The Claimant Trust was created to monetize and manage most of the Debtor’s assets, which were vested in the Claimant Trust, and distribute the proceeds to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries (*i.e.*, holders of Claimant Trust interests in Classes 8 and 9). The Claimant Trust is managed by its designated Claimant Trustee, Mr. James P. Seery, Jr., and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board. The Litigation Trust was created

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined in this Motion are defined in the Plan.

² This Motion originally sought to extend only the Claimant Trust. Rather than the Litigation Trust filing a separate and similar motion for its extension, in order to minimize the burden on the Court and the parties, the Trusts are jointly amending the Motion to seek extension of *both* Trusts. Attached hereto as **Exhibit C** is a blackline showing the differences between this Motion and the original motion filed with the Court on June 19, 2024 appearing at docket no. 4100.

³ The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Confirmation Order in all respects but one (the scope of exculpations) not relevant here. *NexPoint Advisors, L.P. v. Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P. (In re Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P.)*, 48 F.4th 419 (5th Cir. 2022).

to prosecute certain “Estate Claims” and is managed by its designated Litigation Trustee, Marc Kirschner, and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board.

C. The Trusts

4. The Claimant Trust is governed by the Claimant Trust Agreement and the Litigation Trust is governed by the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement. The Claimant Trust Agreement generally provides for, among other things: (a) the payment of or reserve for Claimant Trust Expenses (including all indemnification obligations); (b) the investment of Claimant Trust Assets in Cash and certain U.S. Government securities; (c) the orderly monetization of the Claimant Trust Assets; (d) litigation of any Causes of Action (including through the Litigation Trust); (e) resolution of all Claims, including administration of disputed claims reserves; and (f) the distribution of Cash, after reserves determined by the Claimant Trustee, to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries. The Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement provides for, among other things, the prosecution of the Estate Claims and the distribution of Cash to the Claimant Trust.

5. Section 9.1 of the Claimant Trust Agreement provides that the Claimant Trust will be dissolved when:

(a) the Litigation Trustee determines that the pursuit of Estate Claims is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such Estate Claims, (b) the Claimant Trustee determines that the pursuit of Causes of Action (other than Estate Claims) is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such Causes of Action, (c) the Claimant Trustee determines that the pursuit of sales of other Claimant Trust Assets is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such sales of Claimant Trust Assets, (d) all objections to Disputed Claims and Equity Interests are fully resolved, (e) the Reorganized Debtor is dissolved, and (f) all Distributions required to be made by the Claimant Trustee to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan have been made, but in no event shall the Claimant Trust be dissolved later than three years from the Effective Date unless the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made within the six-month period before such third anniversary (and, in the event of further extension, by order of the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made at least six months before the end of the preceding extension), determines that a fixed period extension (not to exceed two years, together with any prior extensions) is

necessary to facilitate or complete the recovery on, and liquidation of, the Claimant Trust Assets.

Section 9.1 of the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement includes a similar provision providing for the dissolution of the Litigation Trust after three years unless its term is extended by this Court.

6. The three-year sunset in these provisions will occur on August 11, 2024, unless the Trusts are extended in accordance with the terms of the Claimant Trust Agreement and the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement, respectively. That is the purpose of this Motion.

7. To date, the Trusts have accomplished a great deal. Among many other things, the Claimant Trust has successfully monetized numerous assets and made distributions to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries substantially exceeding expectations. But the Claimant Trust's work is not complete. Most significantly, substantial litigation must be fully and finally resolved before "all Distributions required to be made by the Claimant Trustee to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan" can be made.

8. As the Court is aware, most of the Claimant Trust's time and expenses have been devoted to addressing litigation initiated or caused by James Dondero and his affiliates. In addition to the many matters commenced in this Court since the Effective Date, the Claimant Trust and Mr. Seery have been forced to defend scores of appeals Mr. Dondero and his entities have filed in the District Court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.⁴

9. Focusing solely on pending matters, attached as **Exhibit B** is a list of all *unresolved* litigation—all of which involves Mr. Dondero and/or certain of his affiliates, none of whom are

⁴ Separately, although neither the Claimant Trust nor Highland is a litigant, certain of Mr. Dondero's entities are parties to litigation pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (the "**New York Litigation**") that is further impeding the Claimant Trust's ability to complete its asset monetization plan because certain funds in which Highland is invested refuse to make distributions while the litigation remains unresolved. Notably, the New York Litigation concerns the same issues that Mr. Dondero's entities pursued in Guernsey but that the Royal Court in Guernsey dismissed following an evidentiary hearing.

Claimant Trust Beneficiaries—that the Claimant Trust must address in the coming months and (perhaps, but hopefully not) years (collectively, the “**Current Litigation**”).

10. Among other things, the Claimant Trust has been forced to litigate to judgment collection actions on over \$60 million of promissory notes owing by Mr. Dondero and his affiliates (the “**Notes Judgments**”). Collecting on those notes should have been a straightforward and substantial achievement for the Claimant Trust were it not for years of litigation—during which Mr. Dondero and the other defendants fabricated a defense this Court ultimately found nonsensical and insufficient to defeat summary judgment.⁵

11. To date, the Litigation Trust has initiated an extensive adversary proceeding⁶ against dozens of defendants, successfully negotiated settlements with more than half a dozen defendants, undertaken intensive document discovery, engaged in extensive motion practice, and defended against appeals including a recent victory before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals with respect to CLO HoldCo’s attempt to re-amend its proof of claim following confirmation of the Plan. While the Kirschner Adversary has, on the Litigation Trustee’s motion, been stayed, the proceeding is not concluded and the claims remain pending. As a result, it is not possible to determine that “all Distributions required to be made by the Litigation Trustee to the Litigation Sub-Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan” have been made.

⁵ The Notes Judgments were issued by the District Court after acceptance of this Court’s Reports and Recommendations. The Notes Judgments are presently before the Fifth Circuit; the appeal has been fully briefed and oral argument has tentatively been scheduled for the week of August 5, 2024. *See* Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Case No. 23-10911, Dkt. No. 104.

⁶ *See generally* *Kirschner v. Dondero*, Adv. Pro. No. 21-03076-sgj (the “Kirschner Adversary”)

12. Because the Current Litigation (including the Kirschner Adversary) cannot be finally resolved by August 11, 2024, an extension of the Trusts is required.⁷

II. RELIEF REQUESTED

13. By this Motion, in accordance with Section IV.B.14 of the Plan, the Trusts seek to extend the Trusts' duration for an additional one year beyond the "third anniversary" of August 11, 2024, without prejudice to the rights of the Trusts to seek further extensions in accordance with the Plan. This is the Trusts' first such request.⁸

14. As noted above, Section IV.B.14 of the Plan provides for the Trusts' dissolution three years from the Effective Date, "unless the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made within the six-month period before such third anniversary ... determines that a fixed period extension (not to exceed two years ...) is necessary to facilitate or complete the recovery on, and liquidation of the Claimant Trust Assets"

15. Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b) also empowers the Court to extend unexpired periods:

when an act is required or allowed to be done at or within a specified period by [the Bankruptcy Rules] or by a notice given thereunder or by order of court, the court for cause shown may at any time in its discretion ... with or without motion or notice order the period enlarged if the request therefor is made before the expiration of the period originally prescribed or as extended by a previous order.

In addition, Bankruptcy Code § 105(a) provides that the "court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of [the Bankruptcy Code]."

⁷ In addition to managing the Current Litigation and Kirschner Adversary, a few claims remain to be resolved, and the Reorganized Debtor must complete the wind-up of the Managed Funds and monetize a handful of remaining assets (collectively, the "**Remaining Activities**"). Even if the Remaining Activities could be completed by August 11, 2024, the Motion should be granted because the Current Litigation and Kirschner Adversary are likely to continue for an extended period thereafter.

⁸ This Motion is timely. The Claimant Trust Agreement and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement require that a motion to extend the duration of the Trusts be brought "within the six-month period before such third anniversary" This Motion is brought within that six-month period. Additionally, the Trusts do not seek an extension of more than two years, as sanctioned by the Claimant Trust Agreement and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement. Although the Trusts request an extension of one year, the Trusts respectfully reserve the right to request further extensions in the future if necessary.

Accordingly, because the Trusts' third anniversary has not yet passed and this Motion is properly brought within the six-month period preceding the third anniversary as required in the Plan, the Court is authorized to grant the relief requested in this Motion.

16. As described above, the Trusts and their professionals have been diligently pursuing the monetization of assets vested by the Plan in the Trusts. The last 30 months have been eventful and highly successful in monetizing most of the Claimant Trust's assets, resolving nearly all claims, and making substantial distributions to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries, all as intended by the Plan and the near-unanimity of the creditors who voted for it in 2021.

17. Despite the significant progress the Trusts have made to date, the Trusts need more time to complete their mandate. The Trusts have not yet achieved, and cannot achieve, their ultimate goal of resolving all Claims, dissolving all entities, and completing distributions to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries as required under the Plan, in part, because of, among other things, the Current Litigation (including the Kirschner Adversary) and the need to retain funds to satisfy senior obligations, including material indemnification obligations related to pending and threatened actions against indemnified parties.

18. Accordingly, the Trusts respectfully request an extension of time to operate under the Plan for one year, through and including August 11, 2025. Such an extension is necessary, prudent, and in the best interests of all stakeholders, principal among them the Trusts' beneficiaries, and is subject to the Trusts' reservation of the right to seek further extensions as and if necessary, consistent with the terms of the Claimant Trust Agreement and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement.

III. PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Claimant Trust respectfully requests that the Court (i) enter the order attached as **Exhibit A** granting the relief requested in this Motion and (ii) grant the Claimant Trust any additional relief the Court deems appropriate.

July 1, 2024

**PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES
LLP**

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (admitted *pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Jordan A. Kroop (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 277-6910
Fax: (310) 201-0760
Email: jpomerezantz@pszjlaw.com
jmorris@pszjlaw.com
gdemo@pszjlaw.com
jkroop@pszjlaw.com
hwinograd@pszjlaw.com

-and-

HAYWARD PLLC

/s/ Zachery Z. Annable
Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
M Hayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

*Counsel for Highland Capital Management,
L.P., and the Highland Claimant Trust*

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP**

Deborah J. Newman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Robert S. Loigman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Aaron M. Lawrence (admitted *pro hac vice*)
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000

-and-

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

Paige Holden Montgomery
Spencer M. Stephens
2021 McKinney Avenue
Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 981-3300

*Co-Counsel for Marc S. Kirschner, as Litigation
Trustee of the Highland Litigation Sub-Trust*

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Reorganized Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054-sgj11

ORDER EXTENDING DURATION OF THE TRUSTS

The Court has considered the Trusts' Motion for the entry of an order extending the duration of the Claimant Trust and Litigation Trust through and including August 11, 2025 (the "**Motion**").¹ The Court finds and concludes that: (a) notice of the Motion was adequate and no additional notice of the Motion is required; (b) the Court has jurisdiction to consider the Motion under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the retention of jurisdiction provisions of the Plan; (c) this

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined in this order are defined in the Motion.

is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); (d) venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and (e) the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interest of the Debtor, its creditors, the Trusts, and their beneficiaries, and all parties in interest, and is necessary for the Trusts to complete the monetization of their assets. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Motion is GRANTED.
2. The duration of the Claimant Trust is extended from August 11, 2024, through and including August 11, 2025.
3. The duration of the Litigation Trust is extended from August 11, 2024, through and including August 11, 2025.
4. This Order is without prejudice to the Trusts' right to seek further extensions of their duration under the Plan.
5. This Court retains jurisdiction and power to hear and determine all matters arising from or related to the implementation of this Order.

###End of Order###

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B: UNRESOLVED, PENDING LITIGATION

| FIFTH CIRCUIT | | |
|--|---|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. Dondero v. Jernigan, Case No. 24-10287 | <i>Recusal Litigation:</i> Appeal of District Court decision denying Dondero's <i>Petition for a Writ of Mandamus</i> to recuse Judge Jernigan. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:23-cv-726-S, Dkt. No. 25. | Opening brief filed June 17, 2024 |
| 2. NexPoint Advisors v. HCMLP, Case No. 24-10267 | <i>Admin Claim/Contract:</i> Appeal of District Court decision affirming Bankruptcy Court's judgment (a) denying administrative claims and (b) granting HCMLP's breach of contract claims. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:22-cv-2170-S, Dkt. No. 35. | Opening brief filed June 18, 2024 |
| 3. NexPoint v. HCMLP, Case Nos. 23-10911, 23-10921 | <i>Notes Litigation:</i> Appeal of judgments entered by District Court granting HCMLP's summary judgment motion on breach of contract claims arising from breach of promissory notes. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:21-cv-0881-X, Dkt. Nos. 127, 128. | Matter fully briefed; oral argument tentatively scheduled for week of August 5, 2024. If (and only if) any judgment is reversed, the parties will either conduct a jury trial in District Court or litigate the appeal of the motion denying arbitration. |
| 4. HCMFA v. HCMLP, Case No. 23-10534 | <i>Confirmation/Gatekeeper Appeal:</i> Direct appeal of Bankruptcy Court order conforming Confirmation Order to prior Fifth Circuit decision; challenge to scope of Plan's Gatekeeper provision. | Matter fully briefed and argued on 2/8/24; remains <i>sub judice</i> . |
| 5. Dondero v. HCMLP, Case No. 22-10889 | <i>Contempt I:</i> Appeal of District Court order affirming Bankruptcy Court's contempt judgment against Dondero. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:21-cv-01590-N, Dkt. No. 42. | Opinion issued July 1, 2024 affirming order of Bankruptcy Court. |

| DISTRICT COURT | | |
|--|--|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. HMIT v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:23-cv-02071-E | <i>HMIT “Claims Trading” Appeal:</i> Appeal of Bankruptcy Court order denying leave to commence action on behalf of HCMLP against Seery and Claims Traders alleging breach of fiduciary duty and related causes of action. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt No. 3903. | Matter fully briefed; waiting to see if District Court wants oral argument. If (and only if) the Order is ever reversed, the parties will litigate the claims in the Bankruptcy Court. |
| 2. DAF v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:23-cv-1503-B | <i>DAF “HarbourVest” Appeal:</i> Appeal of Bankruptcy Court order dismissing Complaint alleging HCMLP and Seery violated SEC rules and breached fiduciary duties. <i>See</i> Adv. Pro. No. 21-03067, Dkt. Nos. 166, 167. | Matter fully briefed; waiting to see if District Court wants oral argument. If (and only if) the Order is ever reversed, the parties will litigate the claims in the Bankruptcy Court. |
| 3. HCMLP v. HCMFA, Case No. 3:21-cv-00881-X | <i>Vexatious Litigant Motion:</i> HCMLP’s motion to designate Dondero and related entities “vexatious litigants” and cross-motions to strike HCMLP’s reply. <i>See</i> USDC Dkt. Nos. 136, 137. | Matter fully briefed, including Respondents’ motion to strike HCMLP’s reply brief; parties negotiating joint request for oral argument. The Dondero parties seek discovery and an evidentiary hearing, none of which has been ordered, agreed to, or scheduled. |

| DISTRICT COURT | | |
|---|--|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 4. HCRE v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:24-cv-1479-S | <i>Appeal of “Bad Faith” Decision:</i> HCRE’s appeal of Bankruptcy Court orders (a) granting HCMLP’s motion for “bad faith” finding and (b) denying HCRE’s motion for reconsideration. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 4038, 4039, 4069. | Notice of Appeal (as amended) filed (Bankr. Dkt. No. 4074); no briefing schedule fixed. |
| 5. Dugaboy v. HCMLP, [TBD] | <i>Appeal of “Valuation Information” Decision:</i> Appeal of order granting HCMLP’s motion to dismiss Dugaboy’s Complaint seeking “valuation information” from the Claimant Trust. <i>See</i> Adv. Pro. No. 23-03038, Dkt. No. 27. | Notice of Appeal filed (Adv. Pro. No. 23-03038, Dkt. No. 30); not yet assigned; no briefing schedule fixed. |
| 6. DAF v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:21-cv-1585-S | <i>Appeal of Seery Employment Order:</i> DAF’s appeal of order denying motion for modification of Seery retention order. Bankr. Dkt. No. 2506. | Matter abated pending resolution of Contempt II. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 4070. |

| BANKRUPTCY COURT | | |
|--|--|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. HCLOM Claim Objection, Bankr. Dkt. No. 3657 | <i>HCMLP Objection to HCLOM Claim:</i> HCMLP's objection to HCLOM's scheduled claims will be litigated after Acis' related motion to intervene is determined (Bankr. Dkt. No. 3695). <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt No. 4086. | Hearing on Acis' motion to intervene scheduled for July 10; litigation of HCMLP's claim objection will follow entry of an order resolving Acis' intervention motion. |
| 2. Kirschner v. Dondero, AP No. 21-03076 | <i>Kirschner Litigation:</i> Lawsuit commenced by Litigation Trustee against Dondero and certain related parties to recover damages for fraudulent transfers, breaches of duties, and related matters. | This adversary proceeding was stayed pursuant to Court order. Adv. Proc. No. 21-03076, Dkt. No. 338. |
| 3. Dugaboy Motion to Preserve Evidence and Compel Forensic Imaging of James P. Seery, Jr.'s iPhone, Bankr. Dkt. No. 3802 | <i>Dugaboy's "Imaging" Motion:</i> Dugaboy moved to compel Seery to preserve evidence and compel forensic imaging. | Seery's deadline to respond was extended to July 7, 2023 (<i>see</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 3849), and then the matter was stayed pursuant to Court order. Bankr. Dkt. No. 3897. |
| 4. Motion for Leave to File a Delaware Complaint, Bankr. Dkt. No. 4001 | <i>HMIT "Removal" Motion:</i> On June 12, the Bankruptcy Court further stayed HMIT's motion for leave to commence as action to remove Seery as Claimant Trustee. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 4000. | An order staying HMIT's removal motion will be entered shortly. This matter will then be stayed unless HMIT seeks an interlocutory appeal or files a petition for a writ of mandamus. |

EXHIBIT C

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (admitted *pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Jordan A. Kroop (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 277-6910

HAYWARD PLLC
Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100

*Counsel for Highland Capital Management,
L.P. and the Highland Claimant Trust*

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
Deborah J. Newman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Robert S. Loigman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Aaron M. Lawrence (admitted *pro hac vice*)
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
Paige Holden Montgomery
Spencer M. Stephens
2021 McKinney Avenue
Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 981-3300

Co-Counsel for Marc S. Kirschner, as
Litigation Trustee of The Highland
Litigation Sub-Trust

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Reorganized Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054-sgj11

**~~HIGHLAND CLAIMANT TRUST'S~~ AMENDED MOTION FOR AN ORDER
EXTENDING DURATION OF ~~TRUST~~ TRUSTS**

The Highland Claimant Trust (“Claimant Trust”) and the Highland Litigation Sub-Trust
(the “Litigation Trust,” and together with the Claimant Trust, the “Trusts”), in each case

formed under the confirmed and effective *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (Asas Modified)* [Docket No. 1808] (“**Plan**”),¹ respectfully moves the Court for entry of an order, substantially in the form attached to this motion as **Exhibit A**, extending the duration of the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts for one year (the “**Motion**”).² In support of this Motion, the ~~Claimant Trust states~~Trusts state:

I. BACKGROUND

A. Jurisdiction and Venue

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this Motion under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the retention of jurisdiction provisions of Article XI of the Plan. This is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

B. The Plan

2. On February 22, 2021, the Court entered the *Order (i) Confirming the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (as Modified) and (ii) Granting Related Relief* [Docket No. 1943] (“**Confirmation Order**”) confirming the Plan.²³ The Plan went effective on August 11, 2021 [Docket No. 2700] (“**Effective Date**”).

3. The Plan created the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts as of the Effective Date ~~for the purpose of monetizing~~. The Claimant Trust was created to monetize and ~~managing~~manage most of the Debtor’s assets, which were vested in the Claimant Trust, and ~~distributing~~distribute the proceeds

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined in this ~~motion~~Motion are defined in the Plan.

² This Motion originally sought to extend only the Claimant Trust. Rather than the Litigation Trust filing a separate and similar motion for its extension, in order to minimize the burden on the Court and the parties, the Trusts are jointly amending the Motion to seek extension of both Trusts. Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a blackline showing the differences between this Motion and the original motion filed with the Court on June 19, 2024 appearing at docket no. 4100.

²³ The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the Confirmation Order in all respects but one (the scope of exculpations) not relevant here. *NexPoint Advisors, L.P. v. Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P. (In re Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P.)*, 48 F.4th 419 (5th Cir. 2022).

to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries (*i.e.*, holders of Claimant Trust interests in Classes 8 and 9). The Claimant Trust is managed by its designated Claimant Trustee, Mr. James P. Seery, Jr., [and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board. The Litigation Trust was created to prosecute certain “Estate Claims” and is managed by its designated Litigation Trustee, Marc Kirschner](#), and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board.

C. The ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts

4. The Claimant Trust is governed by the Claimant Trust Agreement, ~~which~~ [and the Litigation Trust is governed by the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement. The Claimant Trust Agreement](#) generally provides for, among other things: (a) the payment of or reserve for Claimant Trust Expenses (including all indemnification obligations); (b) the investment of Claimant Trust Assets in Cash and certain U.S. Government securities; (c) the orderly monetization of the Claimant Trust Assets; (d) litigation of any Causes of Action (including through the Litigation ~~Sub~~-Trust); (e) resolution of all Claims, including administration of disputed claims reserves; and (f) the distribution of Cash, after reserves determined by the Claimant Trustee, to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries. [The Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement provides for, among other things, the prosecution of the Estate Claims and the distribution of Cash to the Claimant Trust.](#)

5. Section 9.1 of the Claimant Trust Agreement provides that the Claimant Trust will be dissolved when:

- (a) the Litigation Trustee determines that the pursuit of Estate Claims is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such Estate Claims,
- (b) the Claimant Trustee determines that the pursuit of Causes of Action (other than Estate Claims) is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such Causes of Action,
- (c) the Claimant Trustee determines that the pursuit of sales of other Claimant Trust Assets is not likely to yield sufficient additional proceeds to justify further pursuit of such sales of Claimant Trust Assets,
- (d) all objections to Disputed Claims and Equity Interests are fully resolved,
- (e) the Reorganized Debtor is dissolved, and
- (f) all

Distributions required to be made by the Claimant Trustee to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan have been made, but in no event shall the Claimant Trust be dissolved later than three years from the Effective Date unless the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made within the six-month period before such third anniversary (and, in the event of further extension, by order of the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made at least six months before the end of the preceding extension), determines that a fixed period extension (not to exceed two years, together with any prior extensions) is necessary to facilitate or complete the recovery on, and liquidation of, the Claimant Trust Assets.

[Section 9.1 of the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement includes a similar provision providing for the dissolution of the Litigation Trust after three years unless its term is extended by this Court.](#)

6. ~~This provision's~~The three-year sunset ~~on the Claimant Trust~~in these provisions will occur on August 11, 2024, unless the ~~Claimant Trust is~~Trusts are extended in accordance with the terms of the Claimant Trust Agreement and the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement, respectively. That is the purpose of this Motion.

7. To date, the ~~Claimant Trust has~~Trusts have accomplished a great deal. Among many other things, the Claimant Trust has successfully monetized numerous assets and made distributions to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries substantially exceeding expectations. But the Claimant Trust's work is not complete. Most significantly, substantial litigation must be fully and finally resolved before "all Distributions required to be made by the Claimant Trustee to the Claimant Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan" can be made.

8. As the Court is aware, most of the Claimant Trust's time and expenses have been devoted to addressing litigation initiated or caused by James Dondero and his affiliates. In addition to the many matters commenced in this Court since the Effective Date, the Claimant Trust and Mr. Seery have been forced to defend scores of appeals Mr. Dondero and his entities have filed in the District Court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.³⁴

³⁴ Separately, although neither the Claimant Trust nor Highland is a litigant, certain of Mr. Dondero's entities are parties to litigation pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the United

9. Focusing solely on pending matters, attached as **Exhibit B** is a list of all *unresolved* litigation—all of which involves Mr. Dondero and/or certain of his affiliates, none of whom are Claimant Trust Beneficiaries—that the Claimant Trust must address in the coming months and (perhaps, but hopefully not) years (collectively, the “**Current Litigation**”).

10. Among other things, the Claimant Trust has been forced to litigate to judgment collection actions on over \$60 million of promissory notes owing by Mr. Dondero and his affiliates (the “**Notes Judgments**”). Collecting on those notes should have been a straightforward and substantial achievement for the Claimant Trust were it not for years of litigation—during which Mr. Dondero and the other defendants fabricated a defense this Court ultimately found nonsensical and insufficient to defeat summary judgment.⁴⁵

11. To date, the Litigation Trust has initiated an extensive adversary proceeding⁶ against dozens of defendants, successfully negotiated settlements with more than half a dozen defendants, undertaken intensive document discovery, engaged in extensive motion practice, and defended against appeals including a recent victory before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals with respect to CLO HoldCo’s attempt to re-amend its proof of claim following confirmation of the Plan. While the Kirschner Adversary has, on the Litigation Trustee’s motion, been stayed, the proceeding is not concluded and the claims remain pending. As a result, it is not possible to

parties to litigation pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (the “**New York Litigation**”) that is further impeding the Claimant Trust’s ability to complete its asset monetization plan because certain funds in which Highland is invested refuse to make distributions while the litigation remains unresolved. Notably, the New York Litigation concerns the same issues that Mr. Dondero’s entities pursued in Guernsey but that the Royal Court in Guernsey dismissed following an evidentiary hearing.

⁴⁵ The Notes Judgments were issued by the District Court after acceptance of this Court’s Reports and Recommendations. The Notes Judgments are presently before the Fifth Circuit; the appeal has been fully briefed and oral argument has tentatively been scheduled for the week of August 5, 2024. *See* Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Case No. 23-10911, Dkt. No. 104.

⁶ *See generally Kirschner v. Dondero*, Adv. Pro. No. 21-03076-sgj (the “Kirschner Adversary”)

determine that “all Distributions required to be made by the Litigation Trustee to the Litigation Sub-Trust Beneficiaries under the Plan” have been made.

12. ~~11.~~ Because the Current Litigation (including the Kirschner Adversary) cannot be finally resolved by August 11, 2024, an extension of the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts is required.⁵⁷

II. RELIEF REQUESTED

13. ~~12.~~ By this Motion, in accordance with Section IV.B.14 of the Plan, the ~~Claimant Trust seeks~~ Trusts seek to extend the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts's duration for an additional one year beyond the “third anniversary” of August 11, 2024, without prejudice to the rights of the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts to seek further extensions in accordance with the Plan. This is the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts's first such request.⁶⁸

14. ~~13.~~ As noted above, Section IV.B.14 of the Plan provides for the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts's dissolution three years from the Effective Date, “unless the Bankruptcy Court, upon motion made within the six-month period before such third anniversary ... determines that a fixed period extension (not to exceed two years ...) is necessary to facilitate or complete the recovery on, and liquidation of the Claimant Trust Assets”

15. ~~14.~~ Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b) also empowers the Court to extend unexpired periods:

⁵⁷ In addition to managing the Current Litigation and Kirschner Adversary, a few claims remain to be resolved, and the Reorganized Debtor must complete the wind-up of the Managed Funds and monetize a handful of remaining assets (collectively, the “**Remaining Activities**”). Even if the Remaining Activities could be completed by August 11, 2024, the Motion should be granted because the Current Litigation ~~is~~ and Kirschner Adversary are likely to continue for an extended period thereafter.

⁶⁸ This Motion is timely. ~~Section 9.1 of the~~ The Claimant Trust Agreement ~~requires~~ and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement require that a motion to extend the duration of the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts be brought “within the six-month period before such third anniversary” This Motion is brought within that six-month period. Additionally, the ~~Claimant Trust does~~ Trusts do not seek an extension of more than two years, as sanctioned by the Claimant Trust Agreement and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement. Although the ~~Claimant Trust requests~~ Trusts request an extension of one year, the ~~Claimant Trust~~ Trusts respectfully ~~reserves~~ reserve the right to request further extensions in the future if necessary.

when an act is required or allowed to be done at or within a specified period by [the Bankruptcy Rules] or by a notice given thereunder or by order of court, the court for cause shown may at any time in its discretion ... with or without motion or notice order the period enlarged if the request therefor is made before the expiration of the period originally prescribed or as extended by a previous order.

In addition, Bankruptcy Code § 105(a) provides that the “court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of [the Bankruptcy Code].”

Accordingly, because the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts's third anniversary has not yet passed and this Motion is properly brought within the six-month period preceding the third anniversary as required in the Plan, the Court is authorized to grant the relief requested in this Motion.

16. ~~15.~~ As described above, the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts and ~~its~~their professionals have been diligently pursuing the monetization of assets vested by the Plan in the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts. The last 30 months have been eventful and highly successful in monetizing most of the Claimant Trust's assets, resolving nearly all claims, and making substantial distributions to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries, all as intended by the Plan and the near-unanimity of the creditors who voted for it in 2021.

17. ~~16.~~ Despite the significant progress the ~~Claimant Trust has~~Trusts have made to date, the ~~Claimant Trust needs~~Trusts need more time to complete ~~its~~their mandate. The ~~Claimant Trust has~~Trusts have not yet achieved, and cannot achieve, ~~its~~their ultimate goal of resolving all Claims, dissolving all entities, and completing distributions to Claimant Trust Beneficiaries as required under the Plan, in part, because of, among other things, the Current Litigation (including the Kirschner Adversary) and the need to retain funds to satisfy senior obligations, including material indemnification obligations related to pending and threatened actions against indemnified parties.

18. ~~17.~~ Accordingly, the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts respectfully ~~requests~~request an extension of ~~its~~ time to operate under the Plan for one year, through and including August 11, 2025. Such an extension is necessary, prudent, and in the best interests of all stakeholders, principal among them the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts's beneficiaries, and is subject to the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts's reservation of the right to seek further extensions as and if necessary, consistent with the terms of the Claimant Trust Agreement and Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement.

III. PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Claimant Trust respectfully requests that the Court (i) enter the order attached as **Exhibit A** granting the relief requested in this Motion and (ii) grant the Claimant Trust any additional relief the Court deems appropriate.

~~Dated: June 19~~July 1, 2024

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP</p> <p>Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) John A. Morris (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Gregory V. Demo (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Jordan A. Kroop (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Hayley R. Winograd (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 13th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067 Tel: (310) 277-6910 Fax: (310) 201-0760 Email: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com jmorris@pszjlaw.com gdemo@pszjlaw.com</p> | <p><u>QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP</u> <u>Deborah J. Newman (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)</u> <u>Robert S. Loigman (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)</u> <u>Aaron M. Lawrence (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)</u> <u>51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor</u> <u>New York, NY 10010</u> <u>Telephone: (212) 849-7000</u></p> <p><u>-and-</u></p> <p><u>SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP</u> <u>Paige Holden Montgomery</u> <u>Spencer M. Stephens</u> <u>2021 McKinney Avenue</u> <u>Suite 2000</u> <u>Dallas, Texas 75201</u> <u>Telephone: (214) 981-3300</u></p> <p><u>Co-Counsel for Marc S. Kirschner,</u></p> |
|--|---|---|

jkroop@pszjlaw.com

hwinograd@pszjlaw.com

-and-

HAYWARD PLLC

/s/ Zachery Z. Annable

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com

Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste.
106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

*Counsel for Highland Capital
Management, L.P., and the
Highland Claimant Trust*

as Litigation
Trustee of the Highland Litigation
Sub-Trust

EXHIBIT A

Proposed Order

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Reorganized Debtor.

Chapter 11

Case No. 19-34054-sgj11

ORDER EXTENDING DURATION OF ~~CLAIMANT~~THE TRUST~~TRUSTS~~

The Court has considered the ~~motion of the Highland Claimant Trust~~Trusts' Motion for the entry of an order extending the duration of the Claimant Trust and Litigation Trust through and including August 11, 2025 (the "**Motion**").¹ The Court finds and concludes that: (a) notice of the Motion was adequate and no additional notice of the Motion is required; (b) the Court has jurisdiction to consider the Motion under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the retention of jurisdiction provisions of the Plan; (c) this is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); (d) venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and (e) the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interest of the Debtor, its creditors, the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts, and ~~its~~their beneficiaries, and all parties in interest, and is necessary for the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts to complete the monetization of ~~the Claimant Trust Assets~~their assets. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Motion is GRANTED.
2. The duration of the Claimant Trust is extended from August 11, 2024, through and including August 11, 2025.

¹ Capitalized terms used but not defined in this order are defined in the Motion.

3. The duration of the Litigation Trust is extended from August 11, 2024, through and including August 11, 2025.

4. ~~3.~~ This Order is without prejudice to the ~~Claimant Trust~~Trusts's right to seek further extensions of ~~its~~their duration under the Plan.

5. ~~4.~~ This Court retains jurisdiction and power to hear and determine all matters arising from or related to the implementation of this Order.

###End of Order###

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Monday, July 1, 2024 3:41:25 PM

| Input: | |
|---------------|--|
| Document 1 ID | netdocuments://4856-4670-3053/1 |
| Description | 4872-0881-4267.v9 Motion to Extend Claimant Trust--Final (FOR REDLINE) |
| Document 2 ID | netdocuments://4872-0881-4267/13 |
| Description | Highland - Motion to Extend Claimant Trust |
| Rendering set | Standard |

| Legend: | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Insertion</u> | |
| Deletion | |
| Moved from | |
| <u>Moved to</u> | |
| Style change | |
| Format change | |
| Moved deletion | |
| Inserted cell | |
| Deleted cell | |
| Moved cell | |
| Split/Merged cell | |
| Padding cell | |

| Statistics: | |
|----------------|-------|
| | Count |
| Insertions | 140 |
| Deletions | 81 |
| Moved from | 0 |
| Moved to | 0 |
| Style changes | 0 |
| Format changes | 0 |
| Total changes | 221 |

EXHIBIT B: UNRESOLVED, PENDING LITIGATION

| FIFTH CIRCUIT | | |
|---|---|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. Dondero v. Jernigan, Case No. 24-10287 | <i>Recusal Litigation:</i> Appeal of District Court decision denying Dondero's <i>Petition for a Writ of Mandamus</i> to recuse Judge Jernigan. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:23-cv-726-S, Dkt. No. 25. | Opening brief filed June 17, 2024 |
| 2. NexPoint Advisors v. HCMLP, Case No. 24-10267 | <i>Admin Claim/Contract:</i> Appeal of District Court decision affirming Bankruptcy Court's judgment (a) denying administrative claims and (b) granting HCMLP's breach of contract claims. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:22-cv-2170-S, Dkt. No. 35. | Opening brief filed June 18, 2024 |
| 3. NexPoint v. HCMLP, Case Nos. 23-10911, 23-10921 | <i>Notes Litigation:</i> Appeal of judgments entered by District Court granting HCMLP's summary judgment motion on breach of contract claims arising from breach of promissory notes. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:21-cv-0881-X, Dkt. Nos. 127, 128. | Matter fully briefed; oral argument tentatively scheduled for week of August 5, 2024. If (and only if) any judgment is reversed, the parties will either conduct a jury trial in District Court or litigate the appeal of the motion denying arbitration. |
| 4. HCMFA v. HCMLP, Case No. 23-10534 | <i>Confirmation/Gatekeeper Appeal:</i> Direct appeal of Bankruptcy Court order conforming Confirmation Order to prior Fifth Circuit decision; challenge to scope of Plan's Gatekeeper provision. | Matter fully briefed and argued on 2/8/24; remains <i>sub judice</i> . |
| 5. Dondero v. HCMLP, Case No. 22-10889 | <i>Contempt I:</i> Appeal of District Court order affirming Bankruptcy Court's contempt judgment against Dondero. <i>See</i> USDC No. 3:21-cv-01590-N, Dkt. No. 42. | Matter fully briefed and argued on 9/6/23; remains sub judice. Opinion issued July 1, 2024 affirming order of Bankruptcy |

| FIFTH CIRCUIT | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| | | Court. |

| DISTRICT COURT | | |
|--|--|--|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. HMIT v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:23-cv-02071-E | <i>HMIT “Claims Trading” Appeal:</i> Appeal of Bankruptcy Court order denying leave to commence action on behalf of HCMLP against Seery and Claims Traders alleging breach of fiduciary duty and related causes of action. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt No. 3903. | Matter fully briefed; waiting to see if District Court wants oral argument. If (and only if) the Order is ever reversed, the parties will litigate the claims in the Bankruptcy Court. |
| 2. DAF v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:23-cv-1503-B | <i>DAF “HarbourVest” Appeal:</i> Appeal of Bankruptcy Court order dismissing Complaint alleging HCMLP and Seery violated SEC rules and breached fiduciary duties. <i>See</i> Adv. Pro. No. 21-03067, Dkt. Nos. 166, 167. | Matter fully briefed; waiting to see if District Court wants oral argument. If (and only if) the Order is ever reversed, the parties will litigate the claims in the Bankruptcy Court. |
| 3. HCMLP v. HCMFA, Case No. 3:21-cv-00881-X | <i>Vexatious Litigant Motion:</i> HCMLP’s motion to designate Dondero and related entities “vexatious litigants” and cross-motions to strike HCMLP’s reply. <i>See</i> USDC Dkt. Nos. 136, 137. | Matter fully briefed, including Respondents’ motion to strike HCMLP’s reply brief; parties negotiating joint request for oral |

| DISTRICT COURT | | |
|---|--|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| | | argument. The Dondero parties seek discovery and an evidentiary hearing, none of which has been ordered, agreed to, or scheduled. |
| 4. HCRE v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:24-cv-1479-S | <i>Appeal of "Bad Faith" Decision:</i> HCRE's appeal of Bankruptcy Court orders (a) granting HCMLP's motion for "bad faith" finding and (b) denying HCRE's motion for reconsideration. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. Nos. 4038, 4039, 4069. | Notice of Appeal (as amended) filed (Bankr. Dkt. No. 4074); no briefing schedule fixed. |
| 5. Dugaboy v. HCMLP, [TBD] | <i>Appeal of "Valuation Information" Decision:</i> Appeal of order granting HCMLP's motion to dismiss Dugaboy's Complaint seeking "valuation information" from the Claimant Trust. <i>See</i> Adv. Pro. No. 23-03038, Dkt. No. 27. | Notice of Appeal filed (Adv. Pro. No. 23-03038, Dkt. No. 30); not yet assigned; no briefing schedule fixed. |
| 6. DAF v. HCMLP, Case No. 3:21-cv-1585-S | <i>Appeal of Seery Employment Order:</i> DAF's appeal of order denying motion for modification of Seery retention order. Bankr. Dkt. No. 2506. | Matter abated pending resolution of Contempt II. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 4070. |

| BANKRUPTCY COURT | | |
|---|--|---|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| 1. HCLOM Claim Objection, Bankr. Dkt. No. 3657 | <i>HCMLP Objection to HCLOM Claim:</i> HCMLP’s objection to HCLOM’s scheduled claims will be litigated after Acis’ related motion to intervene is determined (Bankr. Dkt. No. 3695). <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt No. 4086. | Hearing on Acis’ motion to intervene scheduled for July 10; litigation of HCMLP’s claim objection will follow entry of an order resolving Acis’ intervention motion. |
| 2. Kirschner v. Dondero, AP No. 21-03076 | <i>Kirschner Litigation:</i> Lawsuit commenced by Litigation Trustee against Dondero and certain related parties to recover damages for fraudulent transfers, breaches of duties, and related matters. | This adversary proceeding was stayed pursuant to Court order. Adv. Pre Proc. No. 21-03076, Dkt. No. 338. |
| 3. Dugaboy Motion to Preserve Evidence and Compel Forensic Imaging of James P. Seery, Jr.’s iPhone, Bankr. Dkt. No. 3802- | <i>Dugaboy’s “Imaging” Motion:</i> Dugaboy moved to compel Seery to preserve evidence and compel forensic imaging. | Seery’s deadline to respond was extended to July 7, 2023 (<i>see</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 3849), and then the matter was stayed pursuant to Court order. Bankr. Dkt. No. 3897. |
| 4. Motion for Leave to File a Delaware Complaint, Bankr. Dkt. No. 4001 | <i>HMIT “Removal” Motion:</i> On June 12, the Bankruptcy Court further stayed HMIT’s motion for leave to commence as action to remove Seery as Claimant Trustee. <i>See</i> Bankr. Dkt. No. 4000. | An order staying HMIT’s removal motion will be entered shortly. This matter will then be stayed unless HMIT seeks an interlocutory appeal or files a petition for a writ of |

| BANKRUPTCY COURT | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Matter | Description | Status |
| | | mandamus. |

Document comparison by Workshare Compare on Monday, July 1, 2024 4:32:48 PM

| Input: | |
|---------------|---|
| Document 1 ID | netdocuments://4873-9540-0909/1 |
| Description | 4895-1669-5753.v4 Highland Chart--Final |
| Document 2 ID | netdocuments://4873-9540-0909/2 |
| Description | 4895-1669-5753.v4 Highland Chart--Final |
| Rendering set | Standard |

| Legend: | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Insertion | |
| Deletion | |
| Moved from | |
| Moved to | |
| Style change | |
| Format change | |
| Moved deletion | |
| Inserted cell | |
| Deleted cell | |
| Moved cell | |
| Split/Merged cell | |
| Padding cell | |

| Statistics: | |
|-------------|-------|
| | Count |

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Insertions | 5 |
| Deletions | 5 |
| Moved from | 0 |
| Moved to | 0 |
| Style changes | 0 |
| Format changes | 0 |
| Total changes | 10 |