IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 1 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA 2 ATLANTA DIVISION 3 IN RE: Chapter 11 OTB HOLDING, LLC, Case No. 25-52415-SMS 5 Debtors. (Jointly Administered) TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING ON DEBTORS' UTILITIES MOTION, BIDDING 6 PROCEDURES MOTION AND DIP MOTION 7 Judge Sage M. Sigler BEFORE: DATE: April 3, 2025 8 Courtroom 1201 PLACE: 9 United States Bankruptcy Court Atlanta, Georgia 10 IN ATTENDANCE: 11 Counsel for Debtors: Jeff Dutson 12 Brooke Bean Alice Song 13 King & Spalding 1180 Peachtree St NE 14 Atlanta, GA 30309 15 16 17 18 19 Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, 20 transcript produced by transcription service 21 YourTranscriptionist.com 22 P.O. Box 1312 Fayetteville, GA 30214 404-583-3295 23 24

25

1	Appearances Cont'd	
2	Counsel for the Official	Todd C Meyers
3	Unsecured Creditors Committee	Erin E. Broderick Nathaniel DeLoatch
4		Eversheds Sutherland (US) LLP 999 Peachtree Street NE
5		Suite 2300 Atlanta, GA 30309
6		Actanca, GA 30307
7	Counsel for the U.S. Trustee	David S. Weidenbaum Alan Hinderleider
8		Office of the U.S. Trustee 362 Richard B. Russell Bldg.
9		75 Ted Turner Drive, SW Atlanta, GA 30303
10		
11	Counsel for OTB Acquisition, LLC	Eric M. English Porter Hedges LLP
12		1000 Main Street, 36th Floor Houston, TX 77002
13		
14	Counsel for JF IV Holdings, LLC	Greenberg Traurig
15		3333 Piedmont Rd NE Suite 2500, Terminus 200
16		Atlanta, GA 30305
17	Counsel for CrossFirst Bank	Lisa Wolgast Barnes & Thornburg LLP
18		Suite 2900 3340 Peachtree Rd NE
19		Atlanta, GA 30326-1693
20	Counsel for Rivertown	Laurel D. Roglen
21	Crossings Mall, LLC, ARC Landlord, Beltline/Airport	Ballard Spahr LLP 919 N. Market Street
22	Freeway, Ltd. and Acadia Realty Trust	11th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801
23		<u>-</u>
24		
25		

1	Appearances Cont'd	
2	Counsel for Katronel	Samantha Tzoberi
3	Properties LLC	Kaplan Cooper, P.C. Suite B-320
4		5775 Glenridge Drive Atlanta, GA 30328
5	Counsel for U.S. Foods	Brian L. Shaw
6		Cozen O'Connor 123 N. Wacker Dr., Ste 1800
7		Chicago, IL 60606
8	Counsel for Sankalp, LLC	Edward Berk Sauls
9		Poole Huffman, LLC 3562 Habersham at Northlake Road
10		Building J, Suite 200 Tucker, GA 30084
11		IUCKEI, GA 30004
12 13	Counsel for Regency Centers, LLP, Realty Income	Steven Yachik Kelly Drye & Warren LLP
14	Corporation	3 World Trade Center 175 Greenwich Street New York, NY 10007
15	Counsel for TSCA 250, LP	Jonathan Petree
16	counter for room 200, Er	Munsch, Hardt, Kopf & Harr, P.C.
17		500 N. Akaward St. Suite 4000
18		Dallas, TX 75201
19	Counsel for Kimco Lake	Ruel W. Smith
20	Prairie TC, L.P.	Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP Suite 1310
21		100 South Ashley Drive Tampa, FL 33602
22		
23	<u>Exhibits</u>	ID. EVD.
24	Declaration of Richard Klein	23 23
25		

PROCEEDINGS

2 1:30 p.m. 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. May I have your attention please? May I have your attention please? I will 5 now call Judge Sigler's 1:30 p.m. calendar. May I have your attention please? I'll now call Judge Sigler's 1:30 p.m. 6 calendar. In the case of OTB Holding, LLC. We have Debtors' Utilities Motion filed at docket number 10, Debtors' DIP 8 Motion filed at docket number 17 and Debtors' Bidding 10 Procedures, Bidding Procedures Motion filed at docket number 11 62. I will now take appearances of parties for the record starting with counsel for the Debtors. 12 13 MR. DUTSON: Jeff Dutson with King and Spalding on behalf of the Debtors. Also with the Brooke Bean and Alice 14 Song. 15 16 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Counsel for 17 Creditors Committee. 18 MR. MEYERS: Todd Meyers, Eversheds Sutherland for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors. Also with me 19 20 is Nathan DeLoatch. 21 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Counsel for the 22 U.S. Trustee? 23 MR. WEIDENBAUM: Yeah. Well, good afternoon, David 24 Weidenbaum and Alan Hinderleider provider for the United 25 States Trustee.

1	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right.		
2	MR. ENGLISH: Good afternoon. Eric English from		
3	Porter Hedges, LLP on behalf of the DIP Lender, OTB		
4	Acquisition, LLC.		
5	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Now, uh, I'll		
6	now take appearances of the parties that's appearing by		
7	Zoom.		
8	MS. FRANKLIN: Good morning. Allison Franklin with		
9	Greenberg Traurig on behalf of JF IV Holdings, LLC.		
10	MS. WOLGAST: Good afternoon. Lisa Wolgast from		
11	Barnes and Thornburg, on behalf of CrossFirst Bank.		
12	MS. ROGLEN: Good afternoon. Laurel Roglen of		
13	Ballard Spahr, LLP on behalf of landlord Acadia Realty		
14	Trust, the ARC landlord, Beltline/Airport Freeway, Ltd. and		
15	Rivertown Crossings Mall, LLC.		
16	MS. TZOBERI: Good afternoon. Samantha Tzoberi on		
17	behalf of Katronel Properties.		
18	MR. SHAW: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brian Shaw		
19	behalf of U.S. Foods.		
20	MR. SAULS: Berk Sauls on behalf of Sankalp, LLC.		
21	MR. YACHIK: Good afternoon. Steven Yachik on		
22	behalf of Realty, Inc., uh, Regency Centers, LP and Realty		
23	Income Corporation.		
24	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Anyone else?		
25	MR. PETREE: Good afternoon. Jonathan Petree of		

Case 25-52415-sms Doc 237 Filed 04/11/25 Entered 04/11/25 16:44:05 Desc Main Document Page 6 of 41

Munsch, Hardt, Kopf & Harr, P.C. appearing on behalf of TSCA 1 2 250, LP. 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Hold on one second, Mr. Petree. What's the name of your client again? 5 MR. PETREE: It is TSCA 250, LP. 6 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Anyone else? 7 MS. SMITH: This is Ruel Smith appearing on behalf of landlord creditor, Kimco Lake Prairie TC LP. My pro hac 8 vice admission is being filed contemporaneous and therefore 10 I'm monitoring only. 11 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. Anyone else? All right. Please hold. Judge Sigler will take the bench 12 shortly. All rise in the courtroom. Court is now in session. 13 The Honorable Sage Sigler presiding. 14 15 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. 16 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All right. In the case of 17 OTB Holding, LLC, case number 25-52415. We have Debtors' Utilities Motion filed at docket number 10, Debtors' DIP 18 Motion filed at docket number 17 and Debtors' Bidding 19 Procedures Motion filed at docket number 62. 20 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Dutson? 22 MR. DUTSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jeff 23 Dutson with King and Spalding, on behalf of the Debtors in 24 these Chapter 11 cases. Your Honor, with me today in the courtroom I have my colleagues from King and Spalding,

Brooke Bean and Alice Song. Also joined by Jonathan Titus

(ph) who's the Debtors' Chief Restructuring Officer. Andrew

Papai with Alvarez and Marsal and Richard Klein with Hilco

Corporate Finance, the Debtors' investment banker.

Your Honor, I will give just a very quick overview before we jump in. We were here before the Court on Tuesday. I'm grateful for the time that we have today to go through these three remaining motions. On March 7th, we executed an APA with our proposed stalking horse who's an affiliate of our DIP lender and we've also reached a resolution of the Committee's concerns with respect to these motions. And just recently reached a resolution with the objecting landlords that have filed objections to the relief. So, because of the hard work of all those parties for which we are grateful, we are here on what we believe will be a consensual basis with respect to these motions. If it pleases the Court, we would like to start with the DIP Motion and then go to the Bidding Procedures and then finish up the Utilities Motion.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. DUTSON: Wonderful. Your Honor, the Debtors'
DIP financing motion was filed at ECF number 17. The Debtors
filed this motion in connection with the commencement of
these cases seeking financing from their DIP lender and
authorizing the use of cash collateral and granting liens
and seeking related relief. An interim order was entered by

the Court on March 17th. The relief sought is supported by the Declaration of Jonathan Titus in his first day declaration as well as his declaration in support of the, the DIP Motion. Both of those were admitted into evidence during the first day hearing. As the Court may recall, our DIP lender in this case was not our incumbent lender. It is an affiliate of Pappas Restaurants Group and they've made the loans to the Debtors in connection with a stalking horse proposal to acquire substantially all of the Debtors' assets. They want to be the winning bidder, but they recognize that their bid is subject to higher or better offers.

In February, when they closed the - what we refer to as the prepetition bridge financing, the Debtors did not have cash and went to our existing incumbent lender, CrossFirst seeking additional cash. They were not obligated to make us anymore loans and at that time they were unable to extend us further credit. So the Debtors were very much in a difficult position, but went out seeking financing from various parties. This proposal, the bridge proposal, emerged as the one that was best for the Debtors and it was closed on February 17th, a few weeks before we filed these cases. That was in the amount of \$4 million.

In connection with the DIP Motion and the DIP financing, they offered a \$10 million new credit - new money

credit facility, which would include a roll-up of their prepetition loan. When the interim order was entered, the Debtors borrowed, with this Court's authority, \$7.5 million of that new money financing and the \$4 million was rolled up. The DIP facility carries an interest rate of 12 percent, which in our estimation is extremely reasonable given the circumstances and a facility fee of point five percent.

Importantly, all the interest and fees with respect to the DIP facility are paid in kind. Which minimizes the amount that the Debtors need to borrow.

We're now here seeking authority under the - with this motion - approval of this motion on a final basis. When the Committee was appointed, they immediately flagged a number of issues that raised concerns with them and and I'm pleased to report that after substantial negotiations between the DIP lender, the Debtors and the Committee with input from the Office of the United States Trustee, we, we - the Debtors submitted a proposed final order on Tuesday evening that included a number of changes that were part of that resolution of the Committee's concerns. I will flag just a few for the Court. The first - and then the redline was filed Tuesday evening in connection with the, with the final orders so the parties in interest can see the changes that have been made.

THE COURT: That's docket 180?

MR. DUTSON: That is correct.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. DUTSON: One is a soft marshalling concept where we defined and identified certain previously unencumbered DIP collateral. This was the Debtors' liquor licenses solely to the extent they were not subject to a prepetition lien, the proceeds of non-residential real property leasehold interest, commercial tort claims, cause of action against insiders and avoidance actions. That term, previously, unencumbered DIP collateral comes up in a number of places, but for these purposes right now the, the DIP lender agreed that when it comes to seeking repayment that they will marshal away from those and seek repayment first from DIP collateral that is not previously unencumbered DIP collateral.

We also added a challenge period to the, the order with respect to the Debtors' stipulations. In connection with that, the, the DIP lender was agreeable to that only insofar as we would parse out the funding that the DIP lender is going to make available to the Debtors with a full amount of that funding being released once the challenge period has been satisfied. So, upon entry of this final order, \$750,000 of the remaining amount will be released to the Debtors. And then the challenge period with respect to the lien releases, once that has expired, we will get an

additional \$215,000 and then when it comes to the Debtors' release of the DIP lender, that challenge period is 21 days after the entry of the order which we hope will be today, uh, the Debtors will be able to borrow the remaining amount.

Also, with respect to the previously unencumbered property, the DIP lender agreed that, that would not secure the roll-up portion of the DIP loan, the \$4 million prepetition amount. But the DIP lender is permitted to apply the other collateral first to the roll-up portion of the, of the DIP loan. There's also an important concept for the Committee. If there's a going concern sale and this is in paragraph five - if there's a going concern sale, uh, of the Debtors' assets and the APA has been terminated - so, if we're not selling to the stalking horse - terminated other than due to a material default by the Debtors, then the liens on sale excluded assets have to be released.

Part of the negotiations with the Committee involved the Committee identifying certain assets that they believed should be excluded from the sale and and that's what's reflected here. We've also will talk about APA once we get to the bidding procedures motion. Also made it clear that the APA - under the APA, they're not acquiring those sale excluded assets. The assets that are in that definition are commercial tort claims against non-trade parties, avoidance actions against non-trade parties. With respect to

both of this from the buyer's perspective it's important that the buyer - the buyer wants to acquire and then release those avoidance actions. As they continue the business they want to ensure the, the vendors that they're still doing business with are not subject to clawback actions. In the other category of sale excluded assets are causes of action, if any, against insiders of the Debtors.

Your Honor, the other - just a few other things I would flag is the Debtors agreed to increase the budget for the Committee's professionals so that they can assist the Committee in fulfilling their fiduciary duties under the Bankruptcy Code. We filed a new budget today actually, with the agreement of our DIP lender that increases the budget for the Debtors' - the Committee's professionals to \$850,000 which was the agreed upon amount.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think I've got - I have today's budget.

MR. DUTSON: And that, that budget includes the really the material changes there are \$850,000 additional
for or total for the Committee professionals. It reflects
March actuals, and then there's a million - one million
dollar incremental amount that we'll talk about in just a
second that's with respect to March rents that was the
subject of the landlords' objections. Paragraph 39 is only
other change that I would flag for the Court right now,

Case 25-52415-sms Doc 237 Filed 04/11/25 Entered 04/11/25 16:44:05 Desc Main Document Page 13 of 41

which is just some language that certain taxing authorities ask that we add into the final order and the Debtors were happy, happy to add.

THE COURT: That was the Texas entities?

MR. DUTSON: Exactly.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUTSON: Paragraph 39. So, there were a number of changes in that redline which, which I've not addressed in these comments. There have been, since that was filed, a few additional changes which I will describe to the Court at this point. And this is with respect to the few landlords that objected to the DIP financing. The concern that they raised was March rents became due before the Debtors' filed. We then filed. The Debtors did not pay any of those March rent payments. They were unable to. We then filed, got our DIP financing and we have paid April and we have budgeted amounts for May. In the budget, that was attached to the interim order, we did not have funds to pay March rents because those were due and payable prior to the petition date. The landlords raised an objection that, that negated or should negate the ability of the DIP lender to receive a 506(c) carveout and we were thankfully able to resolve that issue from their perspective through negotiations with both the landlords and our DIP lender and the Committee.

The, the primary - there's really two things that

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
address it. We have an agreed upon - agreed upon order with
language reflecting this. We've not had an opportunity to
file it with the Court. I have - there's only two kind of
material changes that I can walk through. Also happy to
provide the Court with a copy of the change pages or if that
would be helpful or --
          THE COURT: This would be an order on, on what?
          MR. DUTSON: This is, this is changes to the DIP
Order.
          THE COURT:
                     Further changes to the DIP Order
beyond what I have in front of me right now?
          MR. DUTSON:
                       That's right.
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
          MR. DUTSON: These were changes that --
          THE COURT:
                      To address the landlords' objections.
          MR. DUTSON: That's right.
          THE COURT:
                      All right. Got it. I mean, if you have
one, I can look at it while you're talking me through it.
          MR. DUTSON: May I approach?
          THE COURT:
                     Yes.
          MR. DUTSON: And what I handed you is just the
changed pages. Paragraph one is the part of the order that
approves the DIP facility and what's reflected here is the
agreement of the DIP lender to loan an additional
incremental amount of one million dollars. That incremental
```

amount will be available once the release challenge period has expired, 21 days from we hope today. And then that incremental availability shall not be used to pay any other amounts other than obligations accruing under the Debtors' non-residential real property leases during the month of March 2025. In order to make this work, we needed to obtain the consent of our prepetition secured lender CrossFirst and they, they agreed to have this money come in ahead of their liens. We view this as a very good result because it provides more money which the Debtors can potentially use to pay admin expenses associated with that March rent.

I will add that the way the APA is set up, and we'll talk a little bit more about this when we get to the bidding procedures, the stalking horse had agreed to assume those amounts regardless of whether the stalking horse was taking any particular store. So, those amounts were going to get paid. It was just a matter of timing. This potentially allows us to pay it a little more quickly.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DUTSON: We changed, in paragraph 17C, a deadline that would be in the event of default if we don't have a sale order. It previously said May 9th. We've changed that to May 16th, which is a (indiscernible) change for the Debtors. Um, we've referenced the amended Asset Purchase Agreement that was filed Tuesday evening. And then on page

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

41 of the redline this is the, the kind of second substantive change, is essentially a carveout that provides that the 506(c) waiver shall not be affected with respect to any costs and expenses payable to the objecting landlords pursuant to the Debtors' non-residential real property leases on account of regular recurring monthly obligations for the period from the petition date through March 31st, 2025. And objecting landlords would include Regency Centers Realty Income Corporation, Kite Realty Group, which is the managing agent of KRG Townsend Square, KRG Las Vegas and Centennial Gateway, Acadia Realty Trust, ARC NCCHRNC001, Beltline/Airport Freeway, Rivertown Crossing Mall and then Katronel Properties as well. THE COURT: But presumably, I mean you're using the incremental availability to pay the stub rent, so it should end up being moot and this is just a protection for the landlords, right? MR. DUTSON: That's exactly right, belt and suspenders. THE COURT: All right. MR. DUTSON: Or moot. THE COURT: Very good. MR. DUTSON: Those are the changes with respect to the DIP Order, Your Honor. For the reasons set forth in the motion, the Debtors would, would respectfully request that

the Court grant the relief requested.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Meyers? MR. MEYERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Todd Meyers, uh, Eversheds Sutherland, proposed counsel to the Official Creditors Committee. I'll be very brief. We, as Mr. Dutson noted, we from the time we were appointment - that the Committee was appointed and hired professionals, we dove into this and we've worked very hard to negotiate what we thought was an appropriate deal under the circumstances that would provide the opportunity for unsecured creditors to ultimately recover in this case. We certainly recognize the Debtors or recognized the Debtors' need for financing. However, we felt that the creditors shouldn't be worse off in that, there were certain unencumbered assets and we wanted to make sure that we had the chance to realize from those assets. And so, the, the deal that Mr. Dutson announced does give us the chance to do that. There is it's not without risk. If there is a meltdown and ultimately not a sale, then, then those previously unencumbered assets, they are pledged to the, to the DIP lender with respect to, new money and so they will in all likelihood be lost. But we're, we're hopeful and confident that there will be a sale here. And so in that event those assets will be left behind and hopefully they can be utilized for the benefit of unsecured creditors.

Just a couple of notes with respect to this 506(c) surcharge waiver. While we, we're willing to support the waiver, we did negotiate a provision that is in there that if the DIP lender calls a default and there are previous — there are budgeted and incurred expenses, those can still be paid so that it doesn't — the music doesn't just stop immediately. People that are supplying goods and services postpetition that are budgeted, should get paid and so that provision allows for that. With respect to the other provision, which Mr. Dutson just mentioned, that's still in there, about about the carveout for stub rent, um, while that shouldn't be necessary because the incremental loan is gonna hopefully pay the stub rent.

The challenge - if you remember, Mr. Dutson mentioned that, that money does - some of the money doesn't come in until the challenge period expires. The Committee has to do its diligence. I've never had a shorter challenge period than I have in this case, but we will, we will do our diligence. But if we do believe that a challenge is necessary, um, one of the, uh, one of the results of that is the DIP lender doesn't have to lend the additional money including the, the stub rent money. So, the surcharge waiver needs to - or the surcharge waiver exception for stub rent needs to stay in there until those, you know, because those periods haven't cleared.

I think that that's probably - I think that's probably it for the, the DIP Order and the DIP Motion and we are supportive of Your Honor granting that motion.

MR. WEIDENBAUM: Yeah, I'll be very quick Your
Honor. The U.S. Trustee sort of echoes what Mr. Meyer says
in connection with - I support the entry of the DIP - of the
agreed upon DIP Order. Um, after the first day hearings,
Your Honor, I know U.S. Trustee did express to Mr. Dutson
and to the Debtors' team some concerns we had with the DIP
Motion, but we also made it clear that we were not gonna be
an impediment if that - if in fact, the Debtor was able to
work something out with the Committee, which it has. So,
we're very happy to see that resolution and we approve and, um, support the agreement as it's articulated in the

THE COURT: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to be heard with respect to the DIP Motion?

order, Your Honor. Thank you.

MR. ENGLISH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Eric English from Porter Hedges on behalf of the DIP lender. I just rise to, to echo the comments that it was a lot of work to put this together. We negotiated these changes the same way we negotiated the interim order and the asset purchase agreement, uh, trying to be commercial and recognize the reasonable requests of the of the various parties in trying

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to accommodate them where we could. I think the result of, of this is an order that, that shows the good faith negotiations of all parties so, thank you. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Does anyone else wish to be heard? MS. WOLGAST: Your Honor, Lisa Wolgast on behalf of CrossFirst. We have agreed to subordinate and under certain, certain circumstances, the subordination with the DIP lender and has been, you know, obviously very - taken a big support of the Debtors in doing so. And so, we're very hopeful that, uh, you know, a robust sale certainly merits something for both us as well as (indiscernible) possible. And so, um, we hope that, that can get done. And like you said with respect to the incremental, the new million dollars, we were very as to how that could be used. And it is limited to the March rents, and that's within the order as well. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Final call. Ms. Roglen? MS. ROGLEN: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Your Honor. Laurel Roglen and Ballard Spahr on behalf of certain of the objecting landlords. I just want to echo the hard work and the appreciation that went into the resolution that's been the latest form of DIP Order and the further

incremental changes that counsel read into the record. We

have been working very well with the parties throughout this case and we're already well on our way to a resolution, but weren't there yet when we had to file our objection. So that was why we had to get those on file, but since that time we appreciate the willingness of the Debtors and the lender and Committee to all reach what I think is a commercially reasonable and appropriate resolution in this case. And we support the entry of the final DIP Order as revised.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Yachik, you turned your camera on. Would you like to be heard?

MR. YACHIK: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. Steven Yachik of Kelly, Drye & Warren on behalf of Realty Income Corporation, Kite Realty Group and Regency Centers. Just to echo what Ms. Roglen said, we're very appreciative of counsel for the DIP lenders and counsel for the Debtors for coming with us, uh, resolution that we think resolves our client's concerns, especially with respect to the carveout from the 506(c) waiver. And we also appreciate that the DIP lender is willing to be flexible to expand the loan for the purposes of funding stub rent, showing that it's willing to pay to play in these cases and provide the landlords with adequate production. So, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any final comments? All right. So, the Court has reviewed all of the changes and I appreciate the parties walking me through all

of that just to make sure that I understand exactly how some of these different mechanisms work. Similar to Mr.

Weidenbaum's comments, you know, when the DIP lender, the Debtor, the Committee and everybody else all agrees on it,

I'm not going to start picking things apart. And particularly here, I mean even the things the Court would typically be concerned about 506(c) waiver, things of that nature.

The parties have really come up with a mechanism that seems to protect everybody's interest to the best that it sort of can with the 506(c) waiver not fully coming into effect until there's been a challenge period and other various parties have gotten paid their stub rent, etcetera. So, with all of that, the Court is comfortable with the redline order. Um, well, we've got the redline at docket number 180 plus some of the additional changes that you walked me through. So, with that, the Court doesn't have any further concerns, will approve the motion. You may upload the order.

I did see somewhere in some of these papers maybe it was the the bidding procedures, but, um, you had a deadline of today to serve something? Maybe it was the cure notices. So, I can get things signed and docketed this afternoon, but just make sure - so we're - you know the Clerk's Office closes at 4:00. We do have people here later.

But we often just have to reach out to somebody in the clerk's office to ask them to docket it. Otherwise, even if I sign it, it'll just sit until the morning. So just make sure that you reach out to chambers to let us know that those orders are waiting on me so that I can sign them and get somebody in the Clerk's Office to docket them.

MR. DUTSON: Absolutely. Thank you, Your Honor. We very much appreciate that.

THE COURT: All right. So, that disposes of the DIP Motion.

MR. DUTSON: Wonderful. Your Honor, the next item that we would like to address with your permission is our Bidding Procedures Motion.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. DUTSON: This was filed at ECF number 62. By this motion, the Debtors are requesting approval of the stalking horse bid and approval of our proposed bidding procedures, including scheduling an auction to solicit the highest or best bid and approving certain bid protections in favor of our stalking horse. The motion is supported by the Declaration of Richard Klein, which we filed at ECF number 186. Your Honor, we would move that, that Declaration be moved into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objections? All right. The

Declaration of Richard Klein, docketed at docket number 186

will be admitted into evidence.

MR. DUTSON: Thank you, Your Honor. The, the bid procedures that are set forth on the motion do reflect substantial negotiations between the parties, including our DIP lender/stalking horse and the Debtors. Based on input from our investment banker and the Debtors' other advisors, we do think that the timeline set forth is sufficient to allow for a competitive marketing and sale process that will result in the highest or otherwise best bid for the Debtors' assets. The timeline is found at Page 10 and 11 at paragraph H of the proposed modified bidding procedure order, which we call at ECF number 181.

The first deadline I was gonna mention is the one that Your Honor already saw, which was today's cure notice. After consulting with our stalking - proposed stalking horse, um, we will have a few other small modifications to the, to the order that I'll go through. The one I did want to flag is that we're gonna propose to move that to April 8th. Importantly, we are also going to change the deadline to object to that. So, it'll still be 14 days after the --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DUTSON: -- the filing of that notice.

THE COURT: All right. And that's fine. I just wanted to make sure y'all are not sitting at your office waiting for an order to come if we don't know --

MR. DUTSON: What --

THE COURT: -- we need to get in on the docket.

MR. DUTSON: Thank you, Your Honor. And I should note that even with that date moving, our deadline to have the DIP Order entered under our DIP credit facility is, is today. So, we certainly are going to do everything we can and have orders ready to be uploaded as soon as we, uh, get back to the office.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. DUTSON: The proposed bid deadline is May 1st by which time other competing bidders would have to submit a qualified bid. The bidding procedures set forth, standard terms and provisions governing what constitutes a qualified bid. If needed, an auction would be held on May 6th at 10:00 a.m. at our offices here in Atlanta and then the sale objection deadline would be May 9th. The sale hearing date would be no later than ten days after the auction. I think at the last hearing we mentioned we're looking at hopefully sometime the week of May 12th. If it works with the Court's calendar, we would request that it be closer to the end of that week and potentially even May 16th. The deadline to consummate the sale transaction remains May 24th.

Your Honor, the - we did attach a proposed order as Exhibit A to the motion, a modified proposed order which reflected some of the concessions from the stalking horse

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

buyer as well as well some concessions from the Debtors was filed at ECF number 181. I think that the primary item I would flag with respect to those - to that amended order is the reduction of the breakup fee from \$600,000 to \$550,000. The bid protection is in favor of the stalking horse. And I should backup and note that I think when Hilco was retained, the Debtors were not - we were hopeful, but not particularly optimistic that we would have a stalking horse by the time we filed these cases. And we technically didn't, but we had a party, when we filed, that was funding us and very interested in signing up a stalking horse agreement, which I think was far more than any of us had expected. And they've come forward and they set the floor for the, for the sale process. And from the Debtors' standpoint, they're obviously credit bidding their DIP and providing some additional cash consideration.

One of the things that the Debtors were certainly very careful to ensure was reflected in that agreement, is the assumption of certain postpetition liabilities to ensure that the postpetition wages - that the March rent - the postpetition portion of the March rent and other, other items were taken care of and that's reflected in the APA. In exchange for serving as that floor bid, the stalking horse and the Debtors negotiated bidding protections consisting of a breakup fee and an expense reimbursement capped at

2

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

\$350,000. We believe these bid protections are consistent with the market for sale this type after consulting with our investment banker and particularly with the reduction in the breakup fee that came after the filing of the APA are very comfortable with those bid protections.

Your Honor, I mentioned the order that was filed. A lot of those changes were at the Committee's request and a few at the landlords' request. I won't, I won't belabor all of those. I mentioned the reduction in the breakup fee. The, the other thing to note is the bid protections or the bidding procedures order will refer to the amended and restated APA, which was also filed Tuesday night. With respect to that document, a few of the important changes, we inserted the definition of - well, revised the definition of excluded claims to include those excluded sale assets that we refer to in the DIP Order to ensure that when the sale closes, those assets stay with the estate. We clarify that liquor licenses other than those for the continuing restaurants and for any New Jersey restaurants. So continuing in New Jersey are purchased. Anything else remains with the Debtors.

The other significant change is the addition of a designation rights period under the APA. And this essentially, in short, will give the buyer the ability to continue negotiating with landlords with respect to stores

2

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that may be on the bubble. That, that may not necessarily be ones that the buyer would wanna take, absent certain concessions from the landlords. So, to the extent those negotiations are ongoing, we can still close. And the final decision as to whether to assume or reject that lease would be deferred, potentially up to 30 days. There's the concept in there of a transition services agreement which would ensure that all the costs of that process are borne by the stalking horse. The Debtors don't have funds to do that. This is a credit bid. So, it will be important to ensure that the stalking horse bears those costs. But we think that, that additional 30 days will be helpful to the process and also potentially for other bidders, increase the value of the Debtors' assets. THE COURT: And will it be noted? So, when the assumption and assignment notices go out, will a landlord know if they're subject to this designation rights period? They, they, they won't know when the MR. DUTSON: cure notice goes out. THE COURT: Okay. MR. DUTSON: But I believe we'll know before the sale hearing, two days before the auction. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Two days before closing.

MR. DUTSON: Before closing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. DUTSON: So we would file before, before we close, we could let people know if they're an assumed lease and then if they're designation rights lease, there would be ongoing negotiations and then another notice would be filed with respect to whether they are then assumed --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DUTSON: -- and if they're not assumed, they would be rejected. The last assumed liability that I was gonna mention that was added, is with respect to the Hilco real estate advisor. We negotiated with the DIP lender to assume any liabilities related to that agreement. That agreement actually has not been approved by the Court yet. It was something that the Debtors determined after we filed these cases that it would be helpful to have a real estate advisor negotiating with the landlords on the Debtors' behalf. We do have an agreement that's in final form and I believe we'll be in a position to file that motion for approval today. It's been shared with - the agreement has been shared with our DIP lender and with the Committee as well.

THE COURT: And whatever fees are associated with that are already in the budget I assume?

MR. DUTSON: They, um, they're not in the budget, but the APA - the revised APA provides that the buyer will

assume all of those costs.

THE COURT: Gotcha.

MR. DUTSON: So, the buyer sort of gets the benefit of that - all that effort. And so the - because the Debtors don't have cash to pay the fees, the buyer will be paying those fees that come due.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DUTSON: That, Your Honor, was the the last change I was gonna highlight with respect to the revised order that we filed. Just like with the DIP Order, we do have a few changes in a redline. It's not been filed yet. We've just been working on it up until this, this hearing. I have a copy that I can share with the Court that might be helpful.

THE COURT: Yes, please approach.

MR. DUTSON: This again is just changed pages. The first page reflects some cleanup changes, including inserting the date of this hearing, April 3rd. The next, uh, change is in paragraph B. That paragraph used to refer to the agreement, which was a defined term in the motion, which was our stalking horse purchase agreement that was filed when we filed the motion. The changes now define the term agreement to be the amended restated APA, which was filed Tuesday night and, and part of the negotiation among the parties. We have a clean-up change on the next page. The

next substantive change is paragraph - is page ten, and this pops up in a few, few pages later as well. The original bidding procedures contemplated a publication notice in the Wall Street Journal. Given the nature of this case, we had discussions with our stalking horse and they agreed for cost reasons, we could not publish the sale notice.

I believe our Bar Date Motion, which we filed this week, will be heard in a few weeks, still contemplates notice by publication. So, there will be a publication notice with respect to the claims in this case it's just not with respect to the sale.

THE COURT: That makes sense.

MR. DUTSON: Um, page 11, you'll see the change for the serving of the cure notice will now be April 8th to give the parties some additional time. The cure projection deadline will be April 22nd. The next page is page 12.

Paragraphs 8 and 9 have been deleted because those were the publication notice that we just spoke about. Uh, one of the requests from the landlords that was reflected in the order that was filed on Tuesday night was that the bidders submit additional adequate assurance of future performance information. Parties have the ability to request copies of those. The order that was filed said that the notice that you can request that would be in the auction notice. The auction notice is served on the full creditors matrix.

Whereas, the cure notice, which is what this would really apply to, is served on a more limited universe. In order to be cost conscious, we thought it prudent to move that notice from the auction notice to cure notice.

THE COURT: Makes sense.

MR. DUTSON: The next several pages are just paragraphs that have changed. The next substantive change is that adequate assurance information point being moved, like we said, from the auction notice to the cure notice. We added the date for the APA. We, uh, made some changes to the signature block. Not, not because Ms. Beane or Ms. Song are leaving the firm, but just to again, get it down to three pages and save a little bit of money.

THE COURT: Always important to get it on --

MR. DUTSON: That's right.

THE COURT: -- as few, few pages as possible.

MR. DUTSON: The next change you'll see with respect to the cure notice is just funneling out that cure objection deadline to the 22nd of April, of April because we'll be filing it later. And then the, the addition that we spoke about with respect to, um, the cure notice. And those, those are the proposed changes that were not reflected in the redline that was filed, but that we would propose be included within the order. The Debtors believe that the bidding procedures and the bidding protections in the

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that.

stalking horse APA are appropriate and reasonable in the sound exercise of their business judgment. They were definitely negotiated at arm's length and in good faith and we would respectfully request that they be approved by the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Meyers? MR. MEYERS: Again for record, Todd Meyers for the Official Committee. Your Honor, I should have mentioned earlier that Mr. Ryan Maupin in the courtroom with Deloitte He's leading the engagement for them. They are the Committee's proposed financial advisor and he's assisting the Committee, among other things, with the sale process. Your Honor, I think, Mr. Dutson, adequately covered it. The Committee had several comments to the bid procedures. We, we were interested in negotiating down the the bid protections. Obviously, the lower those are, the more money there is available for others. There was a modest change. We certainly were hoping for more, but in the overall package between the DIP and the bid procedures, it was acceptable. Obviously there are a bunch of consultation rights for the Committee with respect to the bid procedures so that we make sure that, you know, nobody is precluded from being in the game without us knowing about it and having some input in

One other, one other change we made that relates

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to the bid procedures, but it was actually change in the DIP Order. It relates to the milestones. You know the milestones are in the DIP Order and in the credit agreement. The Committee was very focused on the possibility that, um, that there would need to be an extension. The DIP lender was unwilling to extend those milestones as part of the DIP, but we made clear in the DIP Order with a change that, that the Debtor is not bound by Court order to those dates. It's a default if the Debtor misses those dates, and we all know a default is serious and we don't think that likely. But it does give the Debtor, who controls its own rules in essence for the auction or the Committee if it were to come into Court - convince Your Honor that notwithstanding a default, that it made sense to extend the deadline, we would at least have the opportunity to do that. And so, that was a change that we negotiated with that we thought was important.

Finally, the the Hilco real estate advisor application. We are looking at that and we'll provide comments to the Debtor. We haven't signed off on that yet, but we, you know, we certainly respect that Hilco, is, is, um, very knowledgeable in that area. We just need to make sure. We had a lot of paper flowing back and forth last week. We just haven't had a chance to to fully sign off on that or get our comments to the Debtor, but we will and I expect - I, I don't expect that there will be an objection

to that employment. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 MR. MEYERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Weidenbaum? 5 MR. WEIDENBAUM: Your Honor, just like with the DIP Order, Mr. Dutson was kind enough to provide an audience 6 for Mr. Hinderleider and myself to express some concerns that we had with the Bid Procedures Motion, but we also made it clear that if they were able to work out a deal with the 10 Committee, we'd be okay and that's where we are today. We 11 stand in support of, uh, the request by the Debtor, Your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Does anyone else wish to be heard with respect to the Bid Procedures Motion? 14 I don't see anyone else on Zoom at the moment. All right. 15 16 Well, thank you for walking me through those changes. 17 Certainly, I understand the Committee would also - would always like a further reduction, as would of course the 18 Court and the Debtor. But, you know, there was some 19 20 reduction to the break-up fee and, and looking at it, I 21 mean, it's not at the low end of the spectrum necessarily, 22 but it's within the range of reasonableness that we see for 23 break-up fees in these types of cases. 24 So with all of that, I'm just looking at what, what other notes I scribbled down here. I appreciate the

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

explanation on the leases. I mean we've got, you know, in addition to the Committee, we also have some very active landlords' counsel. So, I - if they had any concerns about that process, someone would have spoken up by now. So, with all of that, the Court is comfortable with the changes and the bid procedures generally will approve that motion and you may upload that order. MR. DUTSON: Thank you very much, Your Honor. THE COURT: And then do we wanna pick the hearing date? MR. DUTSON: We do. Uh, and I think after consulting with the parties subject, of course, to the Court's availability, later in that week and even ideally, the the 16th of May would be wonderful if that happens to work for the Court. THE COURT: All right. I - we have the, the bankruptcy section of the Atlanta Bar has the Pollard Award on Thursday anyway and I definitely don't wanna get sideways with folks for scheduling hearings when you know the bar wants everybody to be there. And I will be there. So I can do Friday. What time is best for you on Friday? I don't know if you have folks traveling. MR. DUTSON: Morning would be --THE COURT: Okay, 10:00 a.m.?

MR. DUTSON: 10:00 a.m. would be wonderful.

All right, 10:00 a.m. on Friday the 1 THE COURT: 2 16th. 3 MR. DUTSON: Your Honor, I think that just leaves our Utilities Motion and if it's okay with the Court, I will 5 yield the podium to Ms. Beane. 6 THE COURT: Yes. Thank you. 7 MR. DUTSON: Thank you. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Beane. 8 9 MS. BEANE: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Your 10 Honor. Uh, for the record, Brooke Beane of King and 11 Spalding, counsel for the Debtors. The last item on our agenda today is, as Mr. Dutson said, the Utilities Motion 12 that was filed at ECF number 10. Interim relief was entered 13 14 on this motion at ECF number 51. As stated in the motion, the Debtors used various utilities for operation and 15 16 business - water and sewer, natural gas, waste, among 17 others. The list of utility providers was attached to the 18 motion as Exhibit A. In accordance with Section 3660 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtors are required to provide utility 19 20 providers of adequate assurance in exchange for not cutting 21 off services and I, I will say, in accordance with the 22 interim the Debtors have deposited the adequate assurance 23 deposit into the adequate assurance account. 24 As I'm sure Your Honor saw, we did have one objection that was filed to the entry (indiscernible) relief

at ECF number 113. That objection largely was an objection to the adequate assurance deposit for those utility providers and happy to report that that's been resolved as reflected by the withdrawal of the objection at ECF number 168. Um, we did not receive any other formal or informal comments to the final order. We are finalizing one other, uh, one other resolution with the party that reached out on adequate assurance, but that should be done either today or tomorrow. But otherwise, we have not receive any other formal or informal objections to the motion. Unless, Your Honor, has any question, would ask that the final order be granted. And I, I apologize. I should know we did file it, a revised form of proposed final order at ECF number 183. That solely reflects a couple clean-up changes to mirror the language to show it was an interim order.

THE COURT: That was really my only question. So, the withdrawal of the objection, whatever that resolution was, which I don't, if I'm not signing it in the order, I quess I --

MS. BEANE: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- don't need to know. But the order there really weren't any substantial changes to the order so, okay.

MS. BEANE: No. The only changes, yeah. The only changes as shown on ECF 183, are clean-up changes. One of

which is to just reflect that the final hearing was moved to today as opposed to March 28th. And then the changes in paragraph one and paragraph three are clean-up changes that match the language in the interim order.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very well. Does anyone wish to be heard with respect to the utilities motion? All right. Well, as you indicated, the only objection on the docket has been withdrawn and all looks in order to the Court. So, I will grant the motion. You may upload that order.

MS. BEANE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. DUTSON: Your Honor, that's all we have on the agenda today. We have a hearing, uh, April 16th that has one or two items already set. But I think that's our next omnibus date and the Debtors will, of course, continue with their sale process.

THE COURT: All right. So, okay. So, we have the date on April 16th. We will have the sale hearing on May the 16th. Do you want an omnibus date sometime in between those two in late April or early May? And I mean, I can give you some options. So I do have a 711 calendar on the 30th, so you could always set down anything you wanted then. But if we're gonna have a courtroom of people come - which I'm happy to have people come down don't get me wrong. But, um,

Case 25-52415-sms Doc 237 Filed 04/11/25 Entered 04/11/25 16:44:05 Desc Main Document Page 40 of 41

1	just so that people aren't waiting around, you can always	
2	contact chambers and we can give you a specially set time.	
3	So you're not waiting through the rest of the calendar.	
4	MR. DUTSON: I think that would be our preference	
5	would be - at this point in time I don't think we know of	
6	any needs	
7	THE COURT: Okay.	
8	MR. DUTSON: for a hearing on that date, but we	
9	might reach out and see if the Court is available for	
10	another omnibus date.	
11	THE COURT: Okay. That, that's fine. Uh, that's	
12	fine. All right. Well, then I will see you back here on	
13	April the 16th unless something pops up before then. The	
14	Court is adjourned. Thank you all.	
15	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.	
16	[END OF AUDIO]	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	YourTranscriptionist.com P.O. Box 1312	
23	Fayetteville, GA 30214 404-583-3295	
24		
25		

CERTIFICATE

I, Felicia A. Harris, court approved transcriber, certify that pages 1 through 40 represent a true and correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter; that this transcript was done to the best of my ability based on what I heard on the audio recording itself.

This 10th day of April, 2025.

10 /s/ Felicia A. Harris

Felicia A. Harris
YourTranscriptionist.com