TRUSTEE'S COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, ENFORCEMENT OF THE AUTOMATIC STAY, ACCOUNTING AND SEGREGATION AND SEQUESTRATION OF PROCEEDS

- 1 -

27

| Са | se 2:08-bk-21752-BB Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 27 | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Alfred H. Siegel, as Trustee for the Chapter 7 estate of INDYMAC BANCORP, INC. Plaintiff, v. FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, Defendant. Particles COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, ENFORCEMENT OF THE AUTOMATIC STAY, ACCOUNTING, AND SEGREGATION AND SEGREGATION OF PROCEEDS FROM SALE PENDING DETERMINATION OF ALLOCATION OF PROCEEDS | | | |
| 9 10 | ${\bf COMPLAINT^1}$ | | | |
| 11 | Plaintiff Alfred H. Siegel (the "Trustee"), solely in his capacity as | | | |
| 12 | | | | |
| 13 | through his undersigned attorneys, for this Complaint avers upon knowledge as to | | | |
| 14 | himself and his own acts, and upon information and belief as to all other matters as | | | |
| 15 | follows: | | | |
| 16 | NATURE OF THE CASE | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | On February 23, 2009, the Bankruptcy Court directed the Trustee to file under seal those textual references within the Trustee's Complaint for Declaratory Relief, | | | |
| 19 | Enforcement of the Automatic Stay, Accounting, and Segregation and Sequestration of Proceeds from Sale Pending Determination of Allocation of Proceeds that the | | | |
| 20 | Trustee, in good faith, believes are subject to the <u>Stipulated Protective Order Re:</u> <u>Confidentiality and Non-Disclosures</u> entered into by the Parties on January 27, 2009 (the "Protective Order"). The Bankruptcy Court further directed the Trustee to redact any text in the Complaint that the Trustee, in good faith, believes is subject to | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| | the Protective Order. Accordingly in furtherance of the Bankruptcy Court's directive as well as the Protective Order between the Parties, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, | | | |
| 23 | which the Trustee has filed under seal, is a complete and unredacted version of this Complaint. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2, which the Trustee has filed under seal, is a document that contains the text that the Trustee has redacted from the Complaint in the order in which that text would otherwise have appeared in the Complaint (with | | | |
| | | | | |
| | references to the relevant paragraphs in the Complaint where the text would otherwise have appeared). With respect to the remaining exhibits, to the extent the Trustee believes, in good faith, an exhibit is subject to the Protective Order, it has | | | |
| 20 27 | filed that exhibit under seal and has noted the same herein. | | | |
| 28 | - 2 - | | | |
| _0 | TRUSTEE'S COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, ENFORCEMENT OF THE AUTOMATIC STAY, ACCOUNTING AND SEGREGATION AND SEQUESTRATION OF PROCEEDS | | | |

12

16

23

24 25

26 27

28

- 1. This action stems from a dispute regarding the extent to which assets 2 | being sold by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") – acting in its 3 capacity as Receiver for IndyMac Bank, F.S.B (the "Bank") and as Conservator for 4 IndyMac Federal Bank, F.S.B. ("New IndyMac") – in connection with its sale of the 5 | banking operations of New IndyMac (the "Transaction") belong, in whole or in part, **6** to the Debtor's Chapter 7 estate ("Estate").
- 2. As set forth more fully below, confronted with the impending closing of 8 the Transaction and limited cooperation from the FDIC, the Trustee has made every effort to identify the extent of the Estate's interests in these assets expeditiously and 10 | brings this action to preserve the Estate's rights, given the incomplete information 11 provided to the Trustee.
- 3. The Trustee does not seek to interfere with the impending closing of the 13 | Transaction, but only to protect the Estate's rights with respect to any assets that the **14** FDIC is or may be selling as part of the Transaction and that may constitute property 15 \parallel of the Estate.
- 4. To that end, this action seeks a declaratory judgment delineating the 17 respective rights of the parties with respect to the disputed assets as well as remedies 18 in aid of the automatic stay in effect under Bankruptcy Code section 362, 11 U.S.C. 19 \ 362, including an accounting of all assets subject to the sale, the segregation and sequestration of funds by the FDIC pending a determination of ownership rights to 21 | these assets, and the imposition of a constructive trust to any assets that are identified as property of Debtor and, hence, the bankruptcy estate.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 157, 1334 and 2201.

- 6. This adversary proceeding has been commenced in accordance with
 Rule 7001 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure and is a core proceeding
 under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b).
- 7. Venue is proper as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1409 because this adversary proceeding is related to and arises in the Debtor's bankruptcy case pending in this District.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendant FDIC because the FDIC has submitted to this Court's jurisdiction by filing a proof of claim with the Bankruptcy Court on November 25, 2008 and by appearing in this Bankruptcy Court in connection with the above captioned Bankruptcy Case. Separate and apart from the Court's jurisdiction over Defendant FDIC, the Court has exclusive jurisdiction over property of the Estate. 28 U.S.C. § 1334(e)(1).

PARTIES

Plaintiff

9. The Plaintiff in this Adversary Proceeding is the Trustee solely in his capacity as Chapter 7 Trustee.

Defendant

10. The Defendant in this Adversary Proceeding is the FDIC, as Receiver for the Bank and as Conservator for New IndyMac.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

21 11. On July 11, 2008, the Office of Thrift Supervision (the "OTS") closed
22 the Bank. On July 17, 2008, the OTS placed the Bank into receivership. On
23 information and belief, substantially all of the assets of the Bank were transferred to
24 New IndyMac and the FDIC was appointed Receiver for the Bank and Conservator
25 for New IndyMac.

26

27

12.

6

9

17

18

23

24|

27

28

4 incomplete and accompanied by broad disclaimers regarding their potential 5 | inaccuracies. 13. On August 4, 2008, Alfred H. Siegel was duly appointed interim Chapter 7 Trustee. Mr. Siegel was confirmed as permanent trustee on December 4, 8 | 2008.

On July 31, 2008, the Debtor filed a petition for relief under Chapter 7

- 14. At the time the Bank was seized by the OTS and placed into FDIC 10 receivership, the FDIC gained control of the books and records of both the Bank and 11 | the Debtor because those books and records were physically maintained at the Bank. 12 | Shortly after the Trustee's interim appointment, the Trustee learned that the Debtor's 13 books and records were in the FDIC's custody, control and possession. The Trustee diligently made various attempts to obtain access to the Debtor's books and records 15 so as to identify, among other things, the Debtor's assets and otherwise to investigate 16 the financial affairs of the Debtor. Despite such efforts, the FDIC afforded the Trustee only limited access to the Debtor's books and records.
 - 15. Upon information and belief, on January 2, 2009, the FDIC signed a letter of intent to sell the banking operations of New IndyMac to a thrift holding company, IMB HoldCo LLC, which is controlled by IMB Management Holdings LP. Press releases issued at or around that time indicated that the Transaction was expected to close in late January or early February 2009.
- Because (i) the FDIC had not publicly disclosed the letter of intent or documents related to the Transaction, (ii) the Trustee, at that point in time, had only 25 | limited access to the Debtor's books and records and former employees, despite prior requests to obtain access to the same, and (iii) the Schedules of Assets and Liabilities

1 and Statements of Financial Affairs filed by the Debtor were accompanied by broad 2 disclaimers regarding their incompleteness and potential inaccuracies, the Trustee 3 had no means to precisely identify the assets subject to the Transaction or to evaluate 4 the Debtor's interest in them. However, the limited documents that were in the 5 possession of the Trustee raised concerns that the FDIC, as Receiver for the Bank 6 and Conservator for New IndyMac, may possess assets of the Debtor and, therefore, property of the Estate.

Accordingly, the Trustee filed a Motion for Expedited Issuance of Order 9 Authorizing Production of Documents and Oral Examination Pursuant to F.R.B.P. 10 2004 (the "2004 Motion") on January 12, 2009. A hearing was held on January 15, 11 2009 wherein the Court granted the Motion. The Order granting the Motion was 12 | issued on January 21, 2009 (the "Order"), and it required the FDIC: (1) to make 13 | available for review and copying the 188 boxes of documents from the Investigations **14** Inventory ("Index") provided by the FDIC that the Trustee identified in the first 15 | bullet at 22:9-14 of Exhibit 2 to the 2004 Motion, (2) to make available for review 16 and copying additional boxes of documents from the Index that the Trustee identified 17 and that were reasonably likely to contain information of the kind specified in the 18 second bullet at 22:15-23:3 of Exhibit 2 to the 2004 Motion, (3) to produce to the Trustee documents identified on the 2004 Motion's Exhibit 2 at paragraph 2 and, with respect to paragraph 3 of the 2004 Motion, to produce documents pertaining to the subject matter examination topics 1, 2, and 4 on page 24 of the 2004 Motion's Exhibit 3, and (4) to make available for oral examination concerning the examination 23 topics set forth in the 2004 Motion's Exhibit 3 (with the exception of item 3 thereof) two individuals.

25

24|

19

8

26

27

- 18. Despite the Order, the FDIC produced documents subject to production under the Order in an untimely fashion, thereby impeding the review and analysis of them by the Trustee that the 2004 Motion and Order contemplated. Inter alia,
 - a. The FDIC's production of the first and second categories of materials discussed in paragraph 17 was not substantially complete until February 10, 2009 (due to an inadvertent error, the production was completed in full and received by the Trustee on February 13, 2009).
 - b. The FDIC waited until February 17, 2009—the evening before the first deposition required by the Order—to produce nearly 15,000 pages of documents responsive to the third category of materials discussed in paragraph 17. This made it virtually impossible for the Trustee's counsel to review such documents prior to the deposition or to question the deponent, David Cooley, about them.
 - c. On February 20, 2009, after the completion of the second deposition required by the Order, the FDIC withdrew claims of privilege as to, and produced for the first time, over 800 documents (totaling nearly 50,000 pages). Withdrawing its claim of privilege as to these documents after the second deposition made it impossible for the Trustee's counsel to make use of such documents in connection with either of the ordered depositions.
 - d. Most importantly, as of the date hereof, the FDIC still has not produced <u>any</u> schedules (either in draft or final form) to the various draft purchase and sale agreements it has produced, which would identify the specific assets (including physical assets) that are subject to the Transaction. Such omissions from the FDIC's productions are especially troubling in light of Mr. Cooley's February 18, 2009 examination testimony that the

5

22 || 23

27

28

FDIC had shared with the purchasers some of the schedules of assets as well as some of the schedules of excluded assets to the draft purchase and sale agreements it had produced. (See Ex. 3, Cooley Tr. at 156:16-21.)

- 19. In addition to the deficiencies in the FDIC's document production under 6 the Order, the FDIC failed to produce a witness who could, as required under the Order, address what assets comprise the Transaction, what the FDIC's 8 representations were with respect to such assets, or the specific basis or bases upon 9 which the FDIC believes that such assets are the property of New IndyMac. Indeed, 10 after examining Mr. Cooley, who was not sufficiently knowledgeable or well-11 | informed to fully address these issues, the Trustee requested that the FDIC substitute 12 one of the two individuals Mr. Cooley identified as having personal knowledge of 13 | the assets subject to the Transaction or another individual with the knowledge of the 14 same in place of George Alexander, the second of the FDIC's deponents. The FDIC 15 rejected the Trustee's request, indicating that the Trustee could either proceed with 16 the examination of Mr. Alexander or cancel that examination in exchange for being 17 able to pose five interrogatories (including subparts) to the FDIC regarding the 18 physical asset category of furniture, fixtures and equipment only. Lacking any 19 alternatives, the Trustee examined Mr. Alexander on February 20, 2009. Mr. **20** Alexander was unable to speak with any precision on key aspects of the Order's examination topics. (See Ex. 4, February 19, 2009 letter from B. Klubes to A. Ickowitz.)
 - 20. Despite the FDIC's approach to its discovery obligations under the Order, the Trustee has managed to gather evidence in the form of documents and certain oral testimony of Messrs. Cooley and Alexander to indicate that the FDIC has possession of a number of assets of the Debtor and, therefore, the Estate, of

12

13

14

16 **17**

15

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

1 substantial value. The FDIC does not dispute the Estate's ownership of these assets, 2 but only represents that those assets are not subject to the Transaction.

21. In addition, the Trustee has identified other categories of assets with 4 respect to which, based on documentary and testimonial evidence, it remains unclear 5 as to whether such assets are owned by the Estate or the Bank, and/or whether such assets are subject to the Transaction.

ESTATE ASSETS OR POTENTIAL ASSETS AT ISSUE

- 22. As described in more detail in the following sections of this Complaint, 9 the Trustee alleges upon knowledge or on information and belief that the FDIC has offered or may be offering for sale as part of the Transaction the following assets comprising property of the Estate:
 - a. assets identified on the Debtor's Trial Balance as of July 11, 2008, the date of the bankruptcy filing, as well as securities identified by the FDIC as owned by the Debtor;
 - b. certain tangible property that the FDIC's own list of physical assets, which was provided to prospective purchasers of New IndyMac assets, indicates belonged to the Debtor and, thus, is now property of the Estate;
 - c. other physical assets (including furniture, fixtures, equipment, and leasehold improvements) that may belong both to the Debtor and to New IndyMac (the "Shared Assets") because (i) such assets are located in facilities that the Debtor and the Bank shared and in which departments and employees that were shared by the Debtor and the Bank operated, (ii) the Expense Allocation Agreement between the Debtor and the Bank as well as corporate policies and practices regarding how to allocate depreciation of these assets, demonstrate that

28

- the Debtor and the Bank shared expense and depreciation attributable to such assets;
- d. additional tangible assets, including a generator and furniture and cabling at two distinct facilities the Debtor shared with the Bank, which the Debtor appears to have purchased with its own funds; and
- e. software and applications that appear to have been purchased and used solely by the Debtor or shared by the Debtor and the Bank (collectively, and as described in greater detail below, the "Disputed Property").
- 23. The FDIC succeeds only to the rights held by the Bank prior to receivership and, thus, has no right to sell the above-referenced assets or to deprive the Estate of adequate compensation for the value of such assets. Because these assets are property of the Estate, the Estate's interest in such property extends to the proceeds received from the sale, 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(6), and such assets must be eliminated from the sale and turned over to the Trustee or, if sold, the proceeds of their sale must be remitted to the Estate promptly following the closing of the transaction.

I. UNDISPUTED ASSETS OF THE DEBTOR IDENTIFIED ON THE DEBTOR'S JULY 11, 2008 TRIAL BALANCE AND OTHER SECURITIES

- 24. The July 11, 2008 Trial Balance of the Debtor (the "Trial Balance") identifies numerous assets of the Debtor. (Ex. 5.)
- 25. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (See Ex. 2.)
- 26. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)

- 10 -

26

27

28

27. Because these assets are the undisputed property of the Estate, they
2 cannot be part of the Transaction.

II. TANGIBLE PROPERTY OWNED BY "BUSINESS UNIT 21"

- 28. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (See Ex. 2.)
- 29. "Business Unit 21" is the accounting designation used by the Debtor and the Bank to signify "IndyMac Bancorp, Inc." (See Ex. 7, IndyMac Bancorp, Inc. & Subs., 2008 Taxable Income—Fed, As of 6/30/2008.)
- 9 30. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
- 31. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (See Ex. 2.)
- 13 32. In light of the above, the Debtor had and the Trustee has the exclusive right to sell or otherwise alienate these assets. The FDIC has no demonstrated basis to assert the Bank's ownership interest in these assets, and thus no corresponding right to sell them.

17 III. ASSETS SHARED BETWEEN THE DEBTOR AND THE BANK

- 33. The Debtor, along with its subsidiaries and affiliates, occupied office space in three locations in Pasadena, California (the "Pasadena Facilities"), which served as the corporate headquarters of the Debtor. The three locations that constitute the Pasadena Facilities are:
 - a. The "Foothill" facility, located at 3475 Foothill Boulevard, Pasadena,
 California 91107;
 - b. The "Lake" facility, located at 155 North Lake Avenue, Pasadena,
 California 91101; and
 - c. The building at 888 East Walnut Street, Pasadena, California, 91101.

27

28

Agreement that Bank be responsible to compensate Bancorp, to the extent deemed appropriate by management of Bank and Bancorp, for any services or activities that benefit such wholly-owned subsidiaries to the same extent as would be applicable if they had been for the direct benefit of Bank (Ex. 15 at 1.)

- 42. Depreciation of physical assets –such as office equipment -- located at the Foothill and Lake facilities was allocated among all business units located within those facilities, including both the Debtor and the Bank business units. (Ex. 16, 9 Expense Allocation Spreadsheet.)
- Thus, based on the shared services and compensation arrangements
 contemplated by the Expense Allocation Agreement as well as policies and practices
 governing allocation of depreciation, the Debtor and the Bank shared expenses and
 depreciation attributable to Corporate Shared Services and office space.
- 44. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)
- 45. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 46. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)
 - 47. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)
 - 48. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See</u> Ex. 2.)
- 49. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)

- 13 -

27

28

- 1 50. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's
 2 directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See</u> Ex. 2.)
 - 51. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 52. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)
 - 53. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See Ex. 2</u>.)
- 54. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's
 10 directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 55. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
- 13 56. The Trustee is unable to verify whether any Shared Assets are subject to
 14 the Transaction, as no schedules of physical assets have been produced in connection
 15 with the draft Purchase and Sale Agreements. In light of the above, however, the
 16 Trustee believes that Shared Assets are likely subject to the sale.

IV. FOOTHILL GENERATOR & "LAKE" FURNITURE AND CABLING

Foothill Generator

- 57. Upon information and belief, in or around 2006, the Debtor purchased a generator for its Foothill facility ("Foothill generator") then valued at approximately \$1.5 million. (Ex. 19, Compliance and Technology Committee—2006 Capital Expenditures Presentation" dated February 27, 2006 at 6).
- 58. The Foothill facility is one of at least three buildings previously utilized as the joint headquarters of the Debtor and the Bank. (Ex. 12).

- 14 -

16

18

19

21

22

24 25

26

27 28

- 59. Upon information and belief, Debtor purchased the Foothill generator 2 using "Corporate" funds, not "Mortgage Bank" or other funds. (Ex.19).
- 60. Upon information and belief, "Corporate" funds are funds belonging to 4 the Debtor.
- 61. As owner of the Foothill generator, the Estate holds the exclusive right 6 to sell or otherwise alienate its asset, and the Bank has no ownership interest or corresponding right to sell it.
 - This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
- 63. The Trustee cannot determine whether the Foothill generator is subject 11 to the transaction, as no schedules of assets (including physical assets) have been 12 produced to the Trustee in connection with the draft Purchase and Sale Agreements. 13 In light of the above, however, the Trustee believes that the Foothill generator may **14** be subject to the transaction.

15 | Lake <u>Facility Furniture/Cabling</u>

- In or around 2006, the Debtor purchased furniture and cabling for its 64. 17 Lake facility then valued at \$3,762,812.00 ("Lake facility furniture and cabling"). (See Ex. 19).
 - The Lake facility is one of at least three buildings comprising the 65. Pasadena Facilities, at which the Debtor and the Bank shared office space. See ¶ 33, supra.
- 66. Upon information and belief, the Debtor purchased the Lake facility 23 || furniture and cabling using "Corporate" funds, not Mortgage Bank or other funds. (See Ex. 19).
 - 67. Upon information and belief, "Corporate funds" are funds belonging to the Debtor.

14

15 16

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 **26**

27

28

- 68. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's 2 directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
- 69. The Trustee cannot determine whether the furniture and cabling 4 purchased by the Debtor for the Lake facility are subject to the Transaction, as no schedules of assets (including physical assets) have been produced to the Trustee in 6 connection with the various draft Purchase and Sale Agreements. In light of the above, however, the Trustee believes that furniture and cabling owned by the Debtor 8 is likely subject to the sale.

PURCHASED SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS AND SYSTEMS V.

- Upon information and belief, software was a significant cost to and asset 70. 11 of the Debtor and the Bank.
- 71. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's 13 directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 72. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
- 73. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's 17 directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 74. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 75. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's directive as set forth in footnote 1, <u>supra</u>. (<u>See</u> Ex. 2.)
 - 76. The Expense Allocation Agreement provides, in pertinent part: WHEREAS, Bancorp may perform services or engage in activities that benefit Bank or one of its wholly-owned subsidiaries; it being the intention of this Agreement that Bank be responsible to compensate Bancorp, to the extent deemed appropriate by management of Bank and Bancorp, for any services or

85. The controversy between the Trustee and the FDIC is real and 25 | immediate. Whether the Disputed Property is property of the Estate is material as it

26

27

5

10

13

16

21

22

26

27

28

1 affects the Trustee's ability to require the FDIC to return such property to the Estate or, if sold, to pay the proceeds of the sale of such property to the Estate.

Under 11 U.S.C. § 105 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 & 2202, the Trustee is 86. 4 entitled to a declaratory judgment that the Disputed Property and the proceeds of the Disputed Property resulting from the Transaction constitute property of the Estate.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Enforcement of 11 U.S.C. §362(a)(3)

- 87. The Trustee repeats and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 86 as if set forth fully herein.
- 88. Bankruptcy Code Section 362(a)(3) prohibits "any act to obtain 11 possession of property of the estate or of property from the estate or to exercise control over property of the estate." 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(3).
- 89. The Bankruptcy Code permits the Court to "issue any order, process, or 14 | judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." 11 **15** U.S.C. § 105(a).
- 90. Because there are assets of the Debtor that are subject to the Transaction, 17 putting in place a mechanism that permits the transaction to proceed while ensuring 18 that the Estate's interest in these assets is protected as to the proceeds from sale, and 19 that the proceeds are promptly remitted to the Trustee is necessary to protect the 20 | Estate's interest in property of the Estate and to enforce the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(3).
- Accordingly, the Trustee is entitled to an order directing that the Estate's 23 | interest in any property of the Estate that is the subject of the Transaction will extend to the proceeds from the Transaction and that such proceeds shall be promptly **25** remitted to the Trustee following the closing of the Transaction.

17

20

21

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Accounting and Sequestration of Certain Funds from Transaction into Escrow Account Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a))

- 92. The Trustee repeats and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 91 as if set 5 forth fully herein.
- 93. The Bankruptcy Code permits the Court to "issue any order, process, or 7 | judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." 11 U.S.C. § 105(a).

Accounting

- The Trustee seeks an order directing the FDIC to conduct an accounting 94. 11 of all assets subject to the Transaction in order to identify any assets owned, in whole 12 or part, by the Estate.
- 95. An accounting is a just and appropriate remedy to enable the Trustee to 14 determine the nature, amount and extent of the Estate's interest in the assets at issue 15 as well as any amounts the FDIC is required to remit to the Trustee as provided in 16 the Second Cause of Action.
- 96. The Trustee is entitled to an order directing the FDIC to conduct an 18 accounting of all assets subject to the Transaction in order to identify any assets 19 owned, in whole or part, by the Estate.

Sequestration

The Trustee is also entitled to an order requiring the FDIC to segregate 97. and sequester proceeds of the Transaction relating to assets about which the Parties 23 dispute ownership and requiring the FDIC to place such proceeds in an escrow 24 account until the Court is able to determine which Party is entitled to the value of 25 || such assets.

26

27

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Imposition of a Constructive Trust

- 98. The Debtor repeats and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 97 as if set forth fully therein.
- 99. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), a bankruptcy court may "issue any order, 6 process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." This broad grant of authority vested in the bankruptcy court includes the 8 authority to impose a constructive trust in any case involving the wrongful acquisition or detention of assets to which another has a superior ownership interest.
- 100. The evidence the Trustee has amassed to date indicates that certain 11 assets made available for sale by the FDIC belong, in fact, to the Estate. The FDIC 12 has refused to cooperate adequately in providing the information necessary to 13 | identify the full extent to which the Estate has an ownership interest in the assets 14 subject to the Transaction and has, thus far, even failed to disclose whether certain 15 assets are subject to the Transaction.
- 101. This paragraph redacted pursuant to the Protective Order and the Court's 17 directive as set forth in footnote 1, supra. (See Ex. 2.)
 - 102. To the extent assets offered by the FDIC for sale in fact belong, in whole or part, to Estate, the FDIC holds these assets in trust for the bankruptcy estate.
- 103. Accordingly, the Debtor requests that the Court impose a constructive trust on any assets subject to the Transaction identified or that have yet to be identified as owned, in whole or part, by the Estate, entitling the Estate to recover 23 those assets or, if sold, the fair value of those assets upon a judicial determination or **24** negotiated agreement as to the extent of the Estate's interest in them.

25 **26**

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

16

18

19

20

27

RELIEF REQUESTED

Wherefore, the Debtor respectfully requests that the Court enter 3 | judgment as follows:

- On the First Cause of Action, for declaratory relief that the Disputed A. 5 Property and the proceeds of the Disputed Property resulting from the Transaction constitute property of the Estate;
- On the Second Cause of Action, for equitable relief directing that the B. 8 Estate's interest in any property of the Estate that is the subject of the Transaction 9 will extend to the proceeds from the Transaction and that such proceeds arising out 10 of the sale of property in which the Estate has an interest are promptly remitted to the 11 Trustee following the closing of the Transaction;
- C. On the Third Cause of Action, for equitable relief directing the FDIC to 13 | segregate and sequester proceeds from the Transaction in an amount representing the 14 fair value of the Disputed Assets, and to place these segregated and sequestered 15 proceeds in an escrow account pending a judicial or mutually agreed upon determination as to the parties' respective rights to these assets;
- D. On the Fourth Cause of Action, for equitable relief imposing a 18 constructive trust for the benefit of the Estate on any assets subject to the Transaction 19 that have been identified or have yet to be identified as owned by the Debtor and, thus, the Estate, entitling the Estate to recover the value of these assets from the 21 FDIC; and

22

1

2

4

7

12

16||

17

23

24

25 **26**

27

Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc

Case 2:08-bk-21752-BB

Case 2:08-bk-21752-BB Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc Main Document Page 23 of 27 2007 USBC, Central District of California FORM B104 (08/07)

| ADVERSARY PROCEEDING COVER SHEE (Instructions on Page 2) | ADVERSARY PROCEEDING NUMBER (Court Use Only) | |
|---|--|--|
| PLAINTIFFS | DEFENDANTS | |
| | | |
| ATTORNEYS (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone No.) | ATTORNEYS (If I | Known) |
| | | |
| PARTY (Check One Box Only) | PARTY (Check O | |
| □ Debtor □ U.S. Trustee/Bankruptcy Admin | □ Debtor | ☐ U.S. Trustee/Bankruptcy Admin |
| ☐ Creditor ☐ Other ☐ Trustee | ☐ Creditor☐ Trustee | ☐ Other |
| | | |
| CAUSE OF ACTION (WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE OF ACT | | ALL U.S. STATUTES INVOLVED) |
| (Number up to five (5) boxes starting with lead cause of action as 1 | | use as 2, second alternative cause as 3, etc.) |
| FRBP 7001(1) – Recovery of Money/Property | FRBP 7001(6) – I | Dischargeability (continued) |
| 11-Recovery of money/property - §542 turnover of property | | eability - §523(a)(5), domestic support |
| 12-Recovery of money/property - §547 preference | _ | eability - §523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury eability - §523(a)(8), student loan |
| ☐ 13-Recovery of money/property - §548 fraudulent transfer | | eability - §523(a)(15), divorce or separation obligation |
| 14-Recovery of money/property - other | | n domestic support) eability - other |
| FRBP 7001(2) – Validity, Priority or Extent of Lien | EDDD 7004/7\ | Iniunativa Daliaf |
| 21-Validity, priority or extent of lien or other interest in property | FRBP 7001(7) – I | relief – imposition of stay |
| FRBP 7001(3) – Approval of Sale of Property | | relief – other |
| 31-Approval of sale of property of estate and of a co-owner - §363(h) | FRBP 7001(8) Su | bordination of Claim or Interest |
| FRBP 7001(4) – Objection/Revocation of Discharge | _ ` ` ` | ation of claim or interest |
| 41-Objection / revocation of discharge - §727(c),(d),(e) | FRRP 7001(9) De | eclaratory Judgment |
| , | 91-Declarato | , , |
| FRBP 7001(5) – Revocation of Confirmation 51-Revocation of confirmation | 1 1 | Determination of Removed Action ation of removed claim or cause |
| FRBP 7001(6) – Dischargeability | | |
| 66-Dischargeability - §523(a)(1),(14),(14A) priority tax claims 62-Dischargeability - §523(a)(2), false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud 67-Dischargeability - §523(a)(4), fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny | 02-Other (e.g | se – 15 U.S.C. §§78aaa et.seq. g. other actions that would have been brought in state nrelated to bankruptcy case) |
| (continued next column) | Γ | |
| ☐ Check if this case involves a substantive issue of state law | ☐ Check if this | s is asserted to be a class action under FRCP 23 |
| ☐ Check if a jury trial is demanded in complaint | Demand \$ | - |
| Other Relief Sought | | |
| | | |

Case 2:08-bk-21752-BB

Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Main Document

Page 24 of 27

FORM B104 (08/07), page 2 2007 USBC, Central District of California BANKRUPTCY CASE IN WHICH THIS ADVERSARY PROCEEDING ARISES NAME OF DEBTOR BANKRUPTCY CASE NO. DISTRICT IN WHICH CASE IS PENDING **DIVISIONAL OFFICE** NAME OF JUDGE RELATED ADVERSARY PROCEEDING (IF ANY) **PLAINTIFF DEFENDANT** ADVERSARY PROCEEDING NO. DISTRICT IN WHICH ADVERSARY IS PENDING **DIVISIONAL OFFICE** NAME OF JUDGE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PLAINTIFF) PRINT NAME OF ATTORNEY (OR PLAINTIFF) DATE

INSTRUCTIONS

The filing of a bankruptcy case creates an "estate" under the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court which consists of all of the property of the debtor, wherever that property is located. Because the bankruptcy estate is so extensive and the jurisdiction of the court so broad, there may be lawsuits over the property or property rights of the estate. There also may be lawsuits concerning the debtor's discharge. If such a lawsuit is filed in a bankruptcy court, it is called an adversary proceeding.

A party filing an adversary proceeding must also must complete and file Form 104, the Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet. unless the party files the adversary proceeding electronically through the court's Case Management/Electronic Case Filing system (CM/ECF). (CM/ECF captures the information on Form 104 as part of the filing process.) When completed, the cover sheet summarizes basic information on the adversary proceeding. The clerk of court needs the information to process the adversary proceeding and prepare required statistical reports on court activity.

The cover sheet and the information contained on it do not replace or supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, the Bankruptcy Rules, or the local rules of court. The cover sheet, which is largely selfexplanatory, must be completed by the plaintiff's attorney (or by the plaintiff if the plaintiff is not represented by an attorney). A separate cover sheet must be submitted to the clerk for each complaint filed.

Plaintiffs and Defendents. Give the names of the plaintiffs and defendants exactly as they appear on the complaint.

Attorneys. Give the names and addresses of the attorneys, if known.

Party. Check the most appropriate box in the first column for the plaintiffs and the second column for the defendants.

Demand. Enter the dollar amount being demanded in the complaint.

Signature. This cover sheet must be signed by the attorney of record in the box on the second page of the form. If the plaintiff is represented by a law firm, a member of the firm must sign. If the plaintiff is pro se, that is, not presented by an attorney, the plaintiff must sign.

| | 1752-BB Doc 258 File | | Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc |
|--|--|---|---|
| , | | | TORGOOK OSE ONE |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Attorney for Plaintiff | | | - |
| | TATES BANKRUPTCY COUR L DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| In re: | | | CHAPTER |
| | | | CASE NUMBER |
| | | Debtor. | ADVERSARY NUMBER |
| | | Plaintiff(s), | (The Boxes and Blank Lines below are for the Court's Use Only) (Do Not Fill Them In) |
| | vs. | | SUMMONS AND NOTICE OF |
| | | Defendant(s). | STATUS CONFERENCE |
| with the Court a written pl response to the party shore responsive pleading by demanded in the Complair | eading, in duplicate, in responsions wn in the upper left-hand corner to the corner in the upper left-hand corner in the upper | se to the Compla er of this page. , the Court may e | you. If you wish to defend yourself, you must file aint. You must also send a copy of your writter Unless you have filed in duplicate and served a enter a judgment by default against you for the relies been set for: |
| Hearing Date: | Time: | Courtroo | m: Floor: |
| ☐ 255 East Temple St | reet, Los Angeles | ☐ 411 W | est Fourth Street, Santa Ana |
| ☐ 21041 Burbank Bot | ılevard, Woodland Hills | 1415 S | State Street, Santa Barbara |
| ☐ 3420 Twelfth Street | , Riverside | | |
| to conduct the trial of the ole lodged with the Court at lea | case on the date specified, inst | ead of holding a e date set forth a | e less than two (2) hours, the parties may stipulate Status Conference. Such a stipulation must be bove and is subject to Court approval. The Cour ticipated length of the trial. |
| | | | JON D. CERETTO |
| Date of Issuance: | | (| Clerk of the Bankruptcy Court |
| | | 1 | Ву: |
| | | | Deputy Clerk |

January 2009 (COA-SA) F 7004-1

Case 2:08-bk-21752-BB Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc summon Nation Potential Range 26 of 27 Fage 2 F 7004 F 7004-1

| | Odminions and Notice of Otalus Conferen | icc rage | | 7001 |
|-------|---|------------|-----------|------|
| In re | (SHORT TITLE) | | CASE NO.: | |
| | | Debtor(s). | | |

NOTE: When using this form to indicate service of a proposed order, **DO NOT** list any person or entity in Category I. Proposed orders do not generate an NEF because only orders that have been entered are placed on a CM/ECF docket.

| | Name | Signature |
|--|--|--|
| I declare under penalty of perjury unde | r the laws of the United State | ☐ Service information continued on attached page s of America that the foregoing is true and correct. |
| served): Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/and/or entity(ies) by personal delivery, o | or controlling LBR, on r (for those who consented in lge here constitutes a declara | Service information continued on attached page ION OR EMAIL (indicate method for each person or entity I served the following person(s) writing to such service method) by facsimile transmission ation that mailing to the judge will be completed no later |
| bankruptcy case or adversary proceedii | erved the following person(s) ng by placing a true and corre r with an overnight mail servic | and/or entity(ies) at the last known address(es) in this ct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States e addressed as follow. Listing the judge here constitutes |
| Order(s) and Local Bankruptcy Rule(s) | ("LBR"), the foregoing docum | NIC FILING ("NEF") - Pursuant to controlling General nent will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary lectronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at |
| A true and correct copy of the foregoing in chambers in the form and manner re | | will be served or was served (a) on the judge |
| A true and correct copy of the foregoin | a document described as | |
| I am over the age of 18 and not a party | to this bankruptcy case or a | dversary proceeding. My business address is: |
| PRO | OOF OF SERVICE C | OF DOCUMENT |

F 7004-1 January 2009 (COA-SA)

Case 2:08-bk-21752-BB Doc 258 Filed 02/23/09 Entered 02/23/09 15:40:18 Desc Summons and Notice of Status Conference of Page 3 F 7004 F 7004-1

| In re | (SHORT TITLE) | | CASE NO.: |
|-------|---------------|------------|-----------|
| | | Debtor(s). | |

ADDITIONAL SERVICE INFORMATION (if needed):

This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California. F 7004-1 January 2009 (COA-SA)