

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

In re:

MONTREAL MAINE & ATLANTIC
RAILWAY, LTD.

Debtor.

Bk. No. 13-10670
Chapter 11

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE APPEAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§ 158(a)(3) AND FED. R. BANKR. P. 8001(b) AND 8004**

Robert J. Keach, the chapter 11 trustee¹ (the “Appellant”) of Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. (the “Debtor”) hereby moves, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8001(b) and 8004, for an order granting the Appellant leave to appeal from an interlocutory order of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Maine (the “Bankruptcy Court”), granting in part, and denying in part, the Appellant’s objections to certain proofs of claim filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited (“NBSR”) and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited (“MNR” and, collectively with NBSR, the “Appellees”).² Leave to appeal should be granted because the Order involves a controlling issue of law for which there exists a substantial ground for difference of opinion and because the appeal materially advances the ultimate termination of litigation on multiple issues between

¹ In accordance with the Trustee’s Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation, dated July 15, 2015 (As Amended on October 8, 2015) [D.E. 1822] (the “Plan”), upon the Effective Date of the Plan (which occurred on December 22, 2015, *see* D.E. 1927), Robert J. Keach is no longer the chapter 11 trustee of the Debtor’s estate, but is the Estate Representative of the Post-Effective Date Estate (as defined in the Plan). *See* Plan § 6.1(a). For the sake of continuity, Mr. Keach will continue to be referred to as the chapter 11 trustee.

² Attached hereto as Exhibit A, is a true and correct copy of the Order Sustaining in Part and Overruling in Part Trustee’s Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims are Duplicative of Others, and Such Others are Improperly Asserted as Administrative and/or Priority Claims, dated February 26, 2016 [D.E. 2034] (the “Order”).

Appellant and the Appellees. In further support of this Motion, the Appellant states the following:

I. Jurisdiction, Venue and Basis for Relief

1. The United States District Court for the District of Maine (the “District Court”) has jurisdiction to entertain this motion seeking leave to appeal an interlocutory order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(b)(1), (6) and Rule 83.6(c) of the District Court’s local rules (the “Local Rules”), the District Court has authority to refer and has referred this matter to the United States Bankruptcy Appellate Panel for the First Circuit (the “BAP”).

2. The relief sought in this motion is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004.

II. Statement of Facts

A. Events Leading to the Commencement of the Bankruptcy Case and Appointment of Appellant as Trustee

3. From January 2003 until May 2014, the Debtor operated an integrated international shortline freight railroad system (the “System”) with its wholly owned Canadian subsidiary, Montréal Maine & Atlantic Canada Co. (“MMA Canada”). The System originally included 510 route miles of track in Maine, Vermont, and Québec, comprising a substantial component of the transportation systems of Northern Maine, Northern New England, Québec and New Brunswick.

4. On July 6, 2013, an unmanned eastbound Debtor train with 72 carloads of crude oil, a buffer car, and 5 locomotive units derailed in Lac-Mégantic, Québec (the “Derailment”). The Derailment set off several massive explosions, destroyed part of downtown Lac-Mégantic, and is presumed to have killed 47 people. A large quantity of oil was released into the environment, necessitating an extensive cleanup effort. As a result of the Derailment and the

related injuries, deaths and property damage, lawsuits were filed against the Debtor in both the United States and Canada.

5. After the Derailment, Canadian train activity was temporarily halted between Maine and Québec on the MMA Canada line, resulting in the Debtor losing much of its freight business. Consequently, the Debtor's aggregate gross revenues decreased drastically to approximately \$1 million per month.

6. On August 7, 2013, the Debtor filed a voluntary petition for relief commencing in the Bankruptcy Court a case (the "Bankruptcy Case") under chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the "Bankruptcy Code"). Simultaneously, MMA Canada filed for protection under Canada's Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (Court File No. 450-11-000167-134). On August 21, 2013, the Office of the United States Trustee (the "UST") appointed the Appellant to serve as trustee in the Debtor's Bankruptcy Case pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1163 [D.E. 64].

B. The Debtor's Schedules and the Proofs of Claim

7. On September 11, 2013, the Debtor filed its schedules of assets and liabilities and statement of financial affairs [D.E. 216] (the "Schedules"). The Schedules list (a) MNR as having a non-contingent, liquidated and undisputed general unsecured claim in the amount of \$144,276.00 (the "Scheduled MNR Claim") and (b) NBSR as having a contingent, unliquidated and disputed claim owed by MMA Canada in the amount of \$2,351,245.00. *See* Schedule F (Creditors Holding Unsecured Nonpriority Claims), pp. 134, 150 of 244.

8. On June 13, 2014, MNR filed Proofs of Claim Nos. 242-1 (the "MNR Duplicate Claim") and 257-1 ("Claim 257") and NBSR filed Proofs of Claim Nos. 243-1 (the "NBSR Duplicate Claim") and, collectively with the MNR Duplicate Claim, the "Duplicated Claims")

and 259-1 (“Claim 259” and, collectively with Claim 257, the “Asserted 1171(b) Claims”). The MNR Duplicate Claim was identical to Claim 257 and the NBSR Duplicate Claim was identical to Claim 259.

9. Claim 257 asserts claims in the aggregate amount of \$335,101.19 arising from “freight services provided to the Debtor in connection with interline rail shipments.” See Claim No. 257. The proof of claim asserts a priority claim under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code in the amount of approximately \$167,228.89 as follows:

Of the total claims asserted in this Proof of Claim, approximately \$167,228.89 are secured by equitable liens against all property of the Debtor under the Six Month Rule applicable in federal court receiverships, and are entitled to priority pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1171(b). See *in re Boston and Maine Corporation*, 634 F.2d 1359 (1st Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 450 U.S. 982 (1981); *Southern Railway v. Flournoy*, 301 F.2d 847 (4th Cir. 1962); *Miltenberger v. Logansport*, 106 U.S. 286 (1882); *Kneeland v. Bass Foundry*, 140 U.S. 592 (1891); *Finance Co. v. Charleston*, 62 F. 205 (4th Cir. 1894). The claims qualify for treatment under the Sixth Month Rule, and are entitled to priority under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, because they (i) relate to current operating expenses incurred by the Debtor that were indispensable to the ongoing operation of the Debtor’s railroad, (ii) were incurred within six months prior to the commencement of the Debtor’s reorganization case, and (iii) were for goods or services that were provided in expectation that they would be paid out of current operating revenue and not in reliance on the Debtor’s general credit.

Claim 257, Attachment A.

10. Claim 259 asserts claims in the aggregate amount of \$2,164,471.30 arising from “[f]reight services provided to the Debtor in connection with interline rail shipments.” See Claim No. 259. The proof of claim asserts a priority claim under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code in an amount not less than \$1,971,834.67, as follows:

Not less than \$1,971,834.67 of the claims asserted in this Proof of Claim are secured by equitable liens against all property of the Debtor under the Six Month Rule applicable in federal court receiverships, and are entitled to priority pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1171(b). See *in re Boston and Maine Corporation*, 634 F.2d 1359 (1st Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 450 U.S. 982 (1981); *Southern Railway v. Flournoy*, 301 F.2d 847 (4th Cir. 1962); *Miltenberger v. Logansport*, 106 U.S. 286 (1882); *Kneeland v. Bass Foundry*, 140 U.S. 592 (1891); *Finance Co. v. Charleston*, 62 F.

205 (4th Cir. 1894). The claims qualify for treatment under the Sixth Month Rule, and are entitled to priority under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, because they (i) relate to current operating expenses incurred by the Debtor that were indispensable to the ongoing operation of the Debtor's railroad, (ii) were incurred within six months prior to the commencement of the Debtor's reorganization case, and (iii) were for goods or services that were provided in expectation that they would be paid out of current operating revenue and not in reliance on the Debtor's general credit.

Claim 257, Attachment A.

C. The Preference Litigation

11. On August 6, 2015, the Appellant commenced an adversary proceeding against NBSR which is currently pending before the Bankruptcy Court under case caption, Keach v. New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited, Adv. Proc. No. 15-01016 (the "NBSR Preference Litigation"). The Appellant's complaint under sections 547 and 550 of the Bankruptcy Code seeks the avoidance and recovery of approximately \$1,006,623.10 in preferential transfers received by NBSR during the 90-day period prior to the Petition Date (the "NBSR Preference Claim").

12. On the same date, the Appellant likewise commenced litigation against MNR seeking to avoid and recover preferential transfers received by MNR in the approximate amount of \$185,957.70 (the "MNR Preference Claim" and, collectively with the NBSR Preference Claim, the "Preference Claims"). The adversary case against MNR is currently pending before the Bankruptcy Court under case caption, Keach v. Maine Northern Railway Company, Adv. Proc. No. 15-01017 (the "MNR Preference Litigation" and, collectively with the NBSR Preference Litigation, the "Preference Litigation").

13. On September 29, 2015, the Appellees answered the complaints filed against them by the Appellant and on October 16, 2015, the Bankruptcy Court entered pretrial scheduling orders in both the NBSR Preference Litigation and the MNR Preference Litigation.

The pretrial scheduling orders in both cases were subsequently amended to extend the fact and expert discovery deadlines to May 15, 2016 and April 14, 2016, respectively.

D. The Claim Objection Proceedings Before the Bankruptcy Court

14. On October 19, 2015, the Appellant filed the Trustee's Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims are Duplicative of Others, and Such Others are Improperly Asserted as Administrative and/or Priority Claims [D.E. 1826] (the "Claim Objection"). The Claim Objection sought an order disallowing the Duplicate Claims in their entirety and allowing the Asserted 1171(b) Claims (subject to a reservation of rights with respect to the amount of such claims) only as general unsecured claims against the Debtor. Claim Objection, ¶ 20.

15. Specifically, with respect to the Asserted 1171(b) Claims, the Appellant argued that, as a matter of law in this circuit, pre-petition interline freight claims such as the claims asserted by the Appellees do not qualify as "six-month claims." Claim Objection, ¶ 24 (*citing In re Boston & Maine Corp.*, 600 F.2d 307, 308, 310 (1st Cir. 1979) ("Boston & Maine I").

16. As an independent basis for disqualifying the Asserted 1171(b) Claims as "six-month claims," the Appellant further argued that, in furnishing services to the Debtor, the Appellees relied—not on the Debtor's operating revenues at the time the service was provided—but upon the Debtor's general credit and specific security and payment arrangements dictated by the Appellees. *Id.* at ¶ 29 (*citing In re Boston & Maine Corp.*, 634 F.2d 1359, 1379-80, 1382 (1st Cir. 1980) ("Boston & Maine II"). By way of support, the Appellant pointed to the Appellees' decision to opt out of the Interline Settlement System (the "ISS")—a credit risk mitigation system which, in effect, is a central clearing house for all participating railroads to net accounts

receivable and payable with respect to other participating railroads' shares of the freight revenue invoiced to a customer by the originating railroad—in favor of an agreement with the Debtor pursuant to which the Debtor's and the Appellees' share of freight revenue was invoiced jointly either by the Debtor or an originating railroad participating in the ISS. Id. at ¶¶ 7-8.

17. As further evidence of the Appellees' reliance on the Debtor's general credit, the Appellant pointed to the Debtor's financing arrangement with Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company ("Wheeling") pursuant to which the Debtor granted a security interest to Wheeling in accounts receivable and certain inventory. Id. at ¶ 9. The Appellant contends that the Appellees' knowledge of Wheeling's first priority security interest in receivables establishes that the Appellees were relying solely upon the Debtor's credit as opposed to its daily or weekly cash flow. Id. at ¶ 10.

18. On November 12, 2015, the Appellees filed the Response of New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company to Trustee's Objection to Proofs of Claim [D.E. 1855] ("Appellee's Response"). Appellees argued that Boston & Maine I did not address the issue of whether interline freight claims qualify as "six-month claims." Appellee's Response, pp. 3-8. On the other hand, they argued, Boston & Maine II explicitly held that *per diem* claims, such as those asserted by interlining railroads, constitute "six-month claims" entitled to priority. Id.

19. Next, the Appellees argued that neither their decision to opt out of the ISS nor the existence of Wheeling's first priority security interest in receivables is indicative of the Appellees' reliance upon the Debtor's general credit in providing services to the Debtor. Id. at pp. 8-13. Instead, the Appellees pointed to a "payment swap" process allegedly instituted by the

Debtor and the Appellees through their course of dealing as evidence that the Appellees relied exclusively upon the Debtor's operating revenues in providing freight services to the Debtor. Id.

20. On November 19, 2015, the Appellant and the Appellees filed the Stipulation with Regard to Trustee's Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited [D.E. 1877] (the "Stipulations"). The Stipulations included, *inter alia*, agreement among the Appellant and the Appellees that: (a) the Duplicate Claims would be withdrawn; (b) at all times relevant, Wheeling held a valid security interest in the Debtor's accounts receivable and certain inventory; (c) the Debtor was a participant in the ISS but the Appellees were not participating railroads in the ISS; (d) by agreement, the Debtor acted as the billing railroad when either MNR or NBSR originated traffic and interchanged with the Debtor, as well as when the Debtor originated traffic and interchanged with either of the Appellees; (e) the Debtor collected from the ISS freight revenue attributable to freight services provided by the Appellees in connection with shipments originated by other carriers that were interchanged by such carriers with the Debtor, and by the Debtor with the Appellees. Stipulation, ¶¶ 1-4.

21. Further, the Debtors and the Appellees agreed:

6. **Issues to be Determined.** The Parties agree, in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7042(b), made applicable to this matter by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014(c), that the hearing on November 20, 2015 will address solely whether the claims asserted by the MN/NB Railways in Proofs of Claim 257 and 259 qualify as "six-month" claims entitled to priority under Section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code. The amount of such claims shall be determined at a subsequent hearing, if required.

Stipulation, ¶ 6.

22. The next day, the Appellant filed the Trustee's Reply in Support of Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims are Duplicative of

Others, and Such Others are Improperly Asserted as Administrative and/or Priority Claims [D.E. 1878] (the “Appellant’s Response”).

23. The Appellant rebutted the Appellees’ argument that the Appellees relied on the Debtor’s operating revenues by pointing both to Wheeling’s security interest and to the course of dealing between the parties. Specifically, the Appellant argued that the Appellees cannot reasonably argue they relied solely upon the Debtor’s encumbered cash flow when the Appellees had no assurance that those funds would be used to satisfy their claims. Appellant’s Response, ¶ 6. Second, the Appellant asserted that the Appellees’ business arrangement with the Debtor necessitated a reliance on the Debtor’ general credit because: (a) the Appellees lacked dominion over the Debtor’s cash, and the receivables ultimately to be remitted to the Appellees were comingled with the rest of the Debtor’s receivables; and (b) the Debtor could have, and often did, use the cash to pay other operating expenses in advance of paying the Appellees. Appellant’s Response, ¶ 7.

24. In addition, the Appellant argued that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are in the nature of interchange charges—not freight services or goods—and therefore are not meaningfully distinct from the “interline” claims the First Circuit determined in *Boston & Maine*. I are *per se* not entitled to section 1171(b) priority status. Appellant’s Response, ¶¶ 10-11. Finally, the Appellant argued that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims were not necessary to the Debtor’s operation and therefore also fail the “necessity” test under section 1171(b). *Id.* at ¶ 12.

25. The Bankruptcy Court held an evidentiary hearing on November 20, 2015 during which testamentary evidence was submitted. Following the hearing the hearing the Bankruptcy Court directed the parties to submit simultaneous post-trial briefs on or before December 10, 2015.

26. On December 10, 2014, the Appellant filed the Trustee's Post-Trial Brief in Support of Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims are Duplicative of Others, and Such Others are Improperly Asserted as Administrative and/or Priority Claims [D.E. 1911] (the "Appellant's Brief"). The Appellant reiterated his argument that interchange charges are *per se* general unsecured claims in this jurisdiction and asserted that the Appellees still had not established that the charges forming the basis for the Asserted 1171(b) Claims were necessary operating expenses of the Debtor. Appellant's Brief, ¶¶ 3-10. Finally, the Appellant argued that the Appellees did not rely on the Debtor's cash flow, but instead on a special security arrangement orchestrated among the Appellees and their affiliate and parent company. *Id.* at ¶¶ 11-17.

27. In the Post-Hearing Brief of New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company in Support of the Allowance of their Proofs of Claim filed on December 10, 2015 [D.E. 1913] (the "Appellees' Brief"), the Appellees argued that the charges giving rise to the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are priority claims as a matter of First Circuit law under *Boston & Maine II*. Appellees' Brief, pp. 4-5. The Appellees further challenged the Appellant's argument that the charges were for services necessary to the Debtor's operations. *Id.* at pp. 7-9. Finally, the Appellees reiterated their earlier arguments that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims arise out of services provided in reliance upon the Debtor's operating cash. *Id.* at pp. 12-15.

28. On February 5, 2016, the Bankruptcy Court issued oral findings of fact and conclusions of law in support of its determination that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are entitled

to priority under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code.³ Specifically, the Bankruptcy Court determined that Boston & Maine II reversed Boston & Maine I and, therefore, that charges of the type forming the basis for the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are not *per se* general unsecured claims. 2/5/16 Hrg. Tr., 15:18-16:3. Next, the Bankruptcy Court found that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims represented charges for services which were necessary to the Debtor's operations and, therefore, that the necessity prong of the 1171(b) test had been satisfied. *Id.* at 17:14-17. Finally, the Bankruptcy Court held that the Appellees established their reliance on the Debtor's operating revenues in satisfaction of the reliance prong of the test. *Id.* at 20:8-21:7.

29. On February 26, 2016, the Bankruptcy Court entered the Order which states, in relevant part,

The Asserted 1171(b) Claims, to the extent allowed, are afforded priority status under § 1171(b). The amount of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims is not determined by this Order, and thus those Asserted 1171(b) Claims are not allowed in any amount at this time. The Appellant's rights to object to the amount of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are fully reserved.

Order, ¶ 3.

III. Issues of Law Presented by Appeal and Relief Sought

30. Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004(b), the Appellant hereby designates the following questions presented by this appeal:

- a. Whether the Bankruptcy Court's holding that interline charges of the type forming the basis for the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are not *per se* general unsecured claims is in error, as a matter of law, and, in addition, in conflict with established precedent in this jurisdiction?
- b. Whether the Bankruptcy Court clearly erred in finding that the Appellees sufficiently established that the charges forming the basis for the Asserted 1171(b) Claims constituted charges for services indispensable to the Debtor's operations in satisfaction of the necessity prong of the 1171(b) test?

³ Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004(b)(1)(E), a transcript of the February 5, 2016 oral opinion is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** (the "2/5/16 Hrg. Tr.").

- c. Whether the Bankruptcy Court clearly erred in finding that the Appellees sufficiently established their reliance upon the Debtor's operating revenues to satisfy the reliance prong of the 1171(b) test given the uncontroverted testimony, *inter alia*, (1) that the Appellees instead relied on collateral and security arrangements put into place by the Appellees; (2) that the Appellees instead relied upon the Debtor's collecting of the Appellees' funds via the ISS system rather than any payment from the Debtor; and (3) that the Appellees consented to modifications in the payment arrangements which required the Appellees to extend credit for up to 120 days per transaction ?

31. By this appeal, the Appellant seeks a reversal of the Order as a matter of law and as based upon clearly erroneous findings of fact and the entry of an order remanding this Bankruptcy Case to the Bankruptcy Court with instructions to sustain the Appellant's objection to allowance of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims as priority claims.

IV. Argument in Support of Leave to Appeal

A. Standards for Granting Leave to Appeal Under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3)

32. The District Court's jurisdiction to hear appeals is delineated by 28 U.S.C. § 158 which provides, in pertinent part, that the "district courts . . . shall have jurisdiction to hear appeals . . . with leave of the court, from interlocutory orders and decrees, of bankruptcy judges entered in cases and proceedings referred to the bankruptcy judges under section 157 of this title." 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(b)(1), (6) and Local Rule 83.6(b), the District Court has referred appeals in this jurisdiction to the BAP.

33. To appeal from an interlocutory order, an appellant must file a notice of appeal and a motion seeking leave to appeal within fourteen days of the date of entry of the order being appealed. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8002(a), 8004(a). The Order, which was entered on January 26, 2016, explicitly stated:

Notwithstanding the minute entry at DE 1947, this Order constitutes the ruling and judgment on the matters read into the record on February 5, 2016. The time period within which the parties must appeal this Order in accordance with the Bankruptcy Rules thus runs from the date hereof.

Order, ¶ 4. Accordingly, the deadline for filing a notice of appeal and motion seeking leave to appeal an interlocutory order is March 11, 2016.⁴

34. Section 158(a)(3) does not articulate a standard or test for determining whether an appellate court should exercise its discretion to hear an appeal of an interlocutory order. However, courts in this jurisdiction regularly look to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) which governs the certification of interlocutory orders to circuit courts of appeal. Fleet Data Processing Corp. v. Branch (In re Bank of New England Corp.), 218 B.R. 643, 652 (1st Cir. B.A.P. 1998). *See also*, Watson v. Boyajian (In re Watson), 309 B.R. 652, 659 (1st Cir. B.A.P. 2004); Murphy v. Internal Revenue Service, 2014 WL 840255 *1 (D. Me. March 4, 2014); JB I v. The Directors and Officers of JBI (In re Jackson Brook Institute), 280 B.R. 1, 4 (D. Me 2002).

35. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), courts appropriately exercise their discretion to hear an appeal where “(1) the ‘order involves a controlling question of law’ (2) ‘as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion’ and (3) whether ‘an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation.’” Bank of New England, 218 B.R. at 652.

Courts have stated that interlocutory certification under section 1292(b), and the leave to appeal under section 158(a)(3), should be used ‘sparingly and only in exceptional circumstances.’ However, courts have also reasoned that discretion under section 158(a)(3) is greater than that afforded under section 1292(b), and that the bankruptcy context requires a more flexible view of finality. Hence, courts have advocated a more pragmatic and liberal approach in determining the appealability of bankruptcy court orders.

Murphy, 2014 WL 840255 at *1 (*quoting* BancBoston Real Estate Capital Corp. v. JBI Assoc. Ltd. P’ship, 227 B.R. 569, 581-82 (D. Me. 2014).

⁴ Contemporaneously with the filing of this Motion, the Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004(a).

B. The Order Involves a Controlling Question of Law

36. An order satisfies the first prong of the test when the outcome of the case is dependent upon a question of law; no alternate theory exists upon which a party could succeed. Watson, 309 B.R. at 660 (*citing* Bank of New England, 218 B.R. at 652). *See also*, Jackson Brook Institute, 280 B.R. at 5.

37. The Appellees claim priority under section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and that is the only basis for priority on which the Appellees have relied. If the Appellees cannot establish a priority claim under section 1171(b), there is no other statute under which they can successfully claim priority status.

38. The Claim Objection challenged the priority interest asserted by the Appellees. All other issues, including the extent to which the Asserted 1171(b) Claims should be allowed, have been reserved until a later date. The Stipulation explicitly limited the November 20, 2015 proceedings to the issue of whether the Asserted 1171(b) Claims do, in fact, qualify for priority status under section 1171(b) and the Order to be appealed explicitly recognizes that “the only issue addressed at the Hearing was whether the Asserted 1171(b) Claims claims [sic] qualify as ‘six-month’ claims entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. § 1171(b) of the Code.” Order, ¶ C.

39. While the Order does not resolve the extent to which the Asserted 1171(b) Claims should be allowed, it does decide the question as to whether those claims should be afforded priority. The legal findings in the Order are premised upon an examination of section 1171(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and case law construing that statute.

40. Since the Order presents a question of law as to the applicability of section 1171(b) to the Asserted 1171(b) Claims and that statute—as construed by applicable case law—

is the only basis on which the Appellees can claim priority status, the first prong of the 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) test is satisfied.

C. *Substantial Grounds for Difference of Opinion Exist*

41. “Substantial grounds for difference of opinion exist where the proposed interlocutory appeal presents one or more difficult and pivotal questions of law not settled by controlling authority.” Watson, 309 B.R. at 660 (*citing* Bank of New England, 218 B.R. at 652).

42. Throughout the proceedings before the Bankruptcy Court, the Appellant consistently maintained that controlling authority in this jurisdiction explicitly mandates against priority treatment of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims. At the same time, the Appellees consistently argued that controlling authority in this jurisdiction clearly weighs in favor of priority treatment. The Bankruptcy Court recognized this tension when discussing the task of applying the three-prong test to determine whether a claim constitutes a “six-month” claim:

I note at the outset that this is not necessarily an easy concept to apply, which might have explained why at the end of oral argument, after hearing the exact same evidence and hearing the same testimony, both Mr. Lepene and you, Mr. Keach, argued the answer was clear. And I had to do then—what I had to do was different. And I struggled with that. And I think Courts have struggled with that.

I found at least one commentator in Five Bankruptcy Services LED, Section 46:67 say something I thought was observant. Quote, ‘It is difficult, [if] not impossible, to identify from prior decisions any unified principle or group of principles to be applied when claimant requests priority for prepetition claim in railroad reorganization pursuant to 1171(b). Each case has been decided based on its unique facts and Courts’ analysis of equities asserted by the competing parties.’

2/5/16 Hrg. Tr., 14:20-15:11.

43. While the Appellant continues to assert that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are *per se* general, unsecured claims under persuasive, if not controlling authority in this jurisdiction, the Bankruptcy Court’s comments, commentary on this statute, case law construing the statute

and, most significantly, the findings and conclusions contained in the Order, are all evidence that substantial grounds for differing opinions exist with respect to this issue.

D. The Appeal of this Order Materially Advances the Ultimate Termination of the Claims Adjudication Process

44. “An interlocutory appeal materially advances the ultimate termination of the litigation where resolution of the issue on appeal ‘greatly assists’ in resolving the underlying matter, and does not unnecessarily delay resolution of the underlying matter.” Watson, 309 B.R. at 660 (*citing* Bank of New England, 218 B.R. at 652). “This element overlaps the ‘controlling question of law’ factor, in that both are directed toward assuring that the interlocutory review will advance the resolution of this underlying action.” Fleet Data Processing Corp., 218 B.R. at 654.

45. In the bankruptcy context, claims are rarely resolved in a vacuum. In this case, the Appellees are seeking payment on the Asserted 1171(b) Claim at the same time they are defending against preference claims in the Preference Litigation currently pending before the Bankruptcy Court. If the Asserted 1171(b) Claim is a general unsecured claim, the claim may be disallowed as a result of the pending Preference Litigation under section 502(d) of the Bankruptcy Code. If those claims have the 1171(b) priority, some authority exists to the effect that—and the Bankruptcy Court in this case has ruled—section 502(d) cannot be used to disallow the Asserted 1171(b) Claim. Thus, the issue of basic claim allowance cannot move forward until the issue on appeal is resolved. The parties have an opportunity to negotiate all of these claims in an expedient manner which would limit costs and expenses for all parties. However, the most critical step in resolving those issues, is obtaining a final determination as to the priority, if any, of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims.

46. A final determination as to priority would also allow the parties to evaluate the *value* of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims in relation to other claims. (As section 1171(b) claims, the claims may be paid in full; as unsecured claims, the claims have a much lower current value). Once that value is determined, the Appellant and the Appellees can negotiate the offsetting pre-petition and preference claims. Accordingly, an immediate appeal of the Order would facilitate a resolution to both the claims adjudication process with respect to the Asserted 1171(b) Claims and the Preference Litigation.

47. In addition, under the confirmed plan in this Bankruptcy Case, funds are being reserved for the Asserted 1171(b) Claims. *See* Order Confirming Trustee's Revised First Amended Plan of Liquidation Dated July 15, 2015 and Authorizing and Directing Certain Actions in Connection Therewith [D.E. 1801], § F, ¶ 85. If it is determined on appeal that such claims do not have a section 1171(b) priority, such funds will be released to pay additional distributions to the victims of the Derailment. Accordingly, resolution of the appeal will advance the Bankruptcy Case by determining the final amount of the payment to the victims.

V. Conclusion

48. The Appellant should be granted leave to appeal the Order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8004 because the Order resolves controlling and significant issues of law which impact not only the adjudication of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims but also the Preference Litigation, and the distributions to victims under the confirmed plan.

Dated: March 10, 2016

ROBERT J. KEACH, CHAPTER 11
TRUSTEE OF MONTREAL MAINE &
ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD.

By his attorneys:

/s/ Sam Anderson, Esq.

Sam Anderson, Esq.

Lindsay K. Zahradka, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

BERNSTEIN, SHUR, SAWYER & NELSON, P.A.

100 Middle Street

P.O. Box 9729

Portland, ME 04104

Telephone: (207) 774-1200

Facsimile: (207) 774-1127



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

In re:)
)
 MONTREAL MAINE &) Chapter 11
 ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD.,) Case No.: 13-10670
)
 Debtor.)

**ORDER SUSTAINING IN PART AND OVERRULING IN PART TRUSTEE’S
OBJECTION TO PROOFS OF CLAIM FILED BY NEW BRUNSWICK SOUTHERN
RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED AND MAINE NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY
LIMITED ON THE BASIS THAT CERTAIN OF SUCH CLAIMS ARE DUPLICATIVE
OF OTHERS, AND SUCH OTHERS ARE IMPROPERLY ASSERTED AS
ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR PRIORITY CLAIMS**

This matter came before the Court on the *Trustee’s Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims Are Duplicative of Others, and Such Others Are Improperly Asserted as Secured and/or Priority Claims* (the “Objection”) (Docket Entry “DE” 1826) filed by Robert J. Keach, the chapter 11 trustee (the “Trustee”) of Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. (the “Debtor” or “MMA”), in relation to (a) Proofs of Claim No. No. 242-1 (the “MN Duplicate Claim”) and 257-1 (“Claim 257”) filed by Maine Northern Railway Company Limited (“MN Railway”) and (b) Proofs of Claim No. 243-1 (“NB Duplicate Claim,” and together with the MN Duplicate Claim, the “Duplicate Claims”) and 259-1 (“Claim 259,” and together with Claim 257, the “Asserted 1171(b) Claims”) filed by New Brunswick Southern Railway Company Limited (“NB Railway”, and together with MN Railway, the “Claimant Railways”). After such notice and opportunity for hearing as was required by the United States Bankruptcy Code (the “Code”), the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, and the Local

Bankruptcy Rules for the District of Maine, and after due consideration of, among other things, the Objection, the Response of the Claimant Railways to the Objection (DE 1855), the Trustee's Reply (DE 1878), the Stipulations of the parties (the "Stipulations") (DE 1877), the admissions and other filings of the parties, and the testimony and documentary evidence presented at the November 20, 2015 evidentiary hearing held in this matter (the "Hearing"); and for the reasons set forth on the record by the Court on February 5, 2016¹, the Court made certain findings of fact and conclusions of law in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7002. Several of those factual findings and conclusions of law are as follows²:

A. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a) and 1334(b), and Rule 83.6 of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Maine, this Court has jurisdiction over the Objection, including but not limited to, the Asserted 1171(b) Claims and the Duplicate Claims.

B. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2), and the Court has constitutional authority to enter judgment in this matter.

C. Pursuant to the Stipulations, the only issue addressed at the Hearing was whether the Asserted 1171(b) Claims claims qualify as "six-month" claims entitled to priority under 11 U.S.C. §1171(b) of the Code. If so, the amount of such claims would be determined at a subsequent hearing, if required.

D. Based upon the unique facts of this matter and the Court's analysis of the equities asserted by MMA, on the one hand, and the Claimant Railways, on the other, the Claimant Railways met their burden of establishing that the Asserted 1171(b) Claims qualify as claims that are entitled to priority under §1171(b) of the Code because:

¹ A transcript of the hearing is set forth at DE 1955.

² This Order does not enumerate all of the factual findings and conclusions of law set forth at the Hearing and no special significance is intended by that fact.

(1) the Asserted 1171(b) Claims represent current operating expenses that were necessarily incurred by MMA in connection with its on-going operations;

(2) the Asserted 1171(b) Claims were incurred within six months prior to the commencement of this case; and

(3) the services that are the subject of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims were provided to MMA with the expectation that they would be paid for out of the current operating revenues of MMA, and not in reliance on its general creditworthiness.

For these reasons, as well as those set forth on the record at the Hearing, it is hereby

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that:

1. The Objection is sustained in part and overruled in part, as set forth herein.
2. The Duplicate Claims shall be disallowed in their entireties and expunged from the Debtor's claims register.
3. The Asserted 1171(b) Claims, to the extent allowed, are afforded priority status under § 1171(b). The amount of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims is not determined by this Order, and thus those Asserted 1171(b) Claims are not allowed in any amount at this time. The Trustee's rights to object to the amount of the Asserted 1171(b) Claims are fully reserved.
4. Notwithstanding the minute entry at DE 1947, this Order constitutes the Court's ruling and judgment on the matters read into the record on February 5, 2016. The time period within which parties must appeal this Order in accordance with the Bankruptcy Rules thus runs from the date hereof.

Dated: February 26, 2016

/s/Peter G. Cary
Peter G. Cary
Chief Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court
District of Maine



1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

2 DISTRICT OF MAINE

3 Case No. 13-10670-pgc

4 - - - - - x

5 In the Matter of:

6

7 MONTREAL MAINE & ATLANTIC RAILWAY LTD.,

8

9 Debtor.

10

11 - - - - - x

12

13 U.S. Bankruptcy Court

14 District of Maine

15 537 Congress Street

16 2nd Floor

17 Portland, Maine 04101

18

19 February 5, 2016

20 9:00 AM

21

22 B E F O R E:

23 HON PETER G. GARY

24 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

25

1 **Hearing on Judge's Oral Opinion**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Transcribed by: Nicole Yawn**

1 **A P P E A R A N C E S :**

2 **OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE**

3 **Attorney for the U.S. Trustee**

4 **537 Congress Street**

5 **Room 303**

6 **Portland, ME 04101**

7

8 **BY: ROBERT J. KEACH, ESQ.**

9

10 **BERNSTEIN, SHUR, SAWYER & NELSON**

11 **Attorney for the U.S. Trustee**

12 **100 Middle Street**

13 **Portland, ME 04104-5029**

14

15 **BY: LINDSAY K. ZAHRADKA, ESQ.**

16

17 **THOMPSON HINE LLP**

18 **Attorney for New Brunswick Southern and Northern Maine**

19 **3900 Key Center**

20 **127 Public Square**

21 **Cleveland, OH 44114-1291**

22

23 **BY: ALAN R. LEPENE, ESQ. (TELEPHONIC)**

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE CLERK: -- the honorable Peter Gary presiding.
Be seated.

THE COURT: Good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning.

THE COURT: We're here on the Montreal Maine &
Atlantic Railway Ltd case, Chapter 11, case number 13-10670.
And we have Ms. Zahradka and Mr. Keach here for -- or on
behalf of the trustee.

Good morning.

MS. ZAHRADKA: Good morning, Your Honor.

MR. KEACH: Good morning.

THE COURT: And do we have Mr. Lepene on the phone
for New Brunswick Southern and Maine Northern or Northern
Maine?

MR. LEPENE: Yes, Your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning.

So I'm going to read an oral decision this
morning. I'm also going to read parts of the stipulation.
I'm doing this to try to put in one place the complete
decision. In that case, if there's further review, at least
a reviewing Court can initially look to just one place. So
it's for that convenience.

So this is my oral decision concerning the

1 objections of Chapter 11 Trustee Robert J. Keach, Trustee to
2 the proofs of claim filed by Maine Northern Railway Company,
3 Maine Northern, and the New Brunswick Southern Railway
4 Company, LTD, New Brunswick. I may refer to these railways
5 collectively as claimant railways. I note at the hearing
6 and in some of the various pleadings, sometimes they're
7 referred to as the Irving Railroad.

8 The claimant railways assert that certain of their
9 claims against the debtor, Montreal Maine & Atlantic
10 Railway, Ltd., Debtor for MMA, are priority claims under 11
11 U.S.C. Section 1171(b). When I refer to section numbers on
12 their own, I'm referring to the bankruptcy format from 1978
13 code. This decision contains my findings of fact and
14 conclusions of law in accordance with Federal Rule of
15 Bankruptcy Procedures 7002.

16 In reaching this decision, I've considered, among
17 other things, the trustee's written objections, document --
18 or docket entry 1826; the joint response of the claimant
19 railways, 1855; the trustee's reply, 1878; the stipulations
20 of the parties, 1877; the admissions and other filings of
21 the parties in this case; and the evidence presented at the
22 November 20th, 2015 testimonial hearing, which evidence
23 included the admitted exhibits and the testimony of Carl
24 Hansen (ph), general manager of Corporate Credit Financial
25 for all the Irving companies, including the claimant

1 railways, and Ian Simpson, general manager of the claimant
2 railways.

3 Actually, I'd like to take one minute and thank
4 the parties and their counsel for the materials you provided
5 to me. They're excellent. They were very helpful.
6 Notwithstanding they disagreed with each other, but they
7 were very helpful.

8 And I also want to thank the attorneys and the
9 witnesses for the excellent presentation at the hearing.
10 I've only been a judge for a year -- two years and a month,
11 but I found that one of the most professional, thorough,
12 civil, and efficient hearings I've had the pleasure to
13 preside over.

14 Background -- one thing you did to make my job
15 easier is that you provided certain stipulations, which
16 helped to focus the hearing, focus my analysis. Those
17 stipulations are set forth, as I said, in 1877 for trying to
18 unify the record in one place. I'm going to repeat some of
19 them here. To the extent there's any discrepancy between
20 what I say here and those listed at 1877, 1877 controls.
21 Here they are.

22 Maine Northern's proof of claim, 242-1, and New
23 Brunswick's proof of claim, 243-1, the duplicate claims, are
24 withdrawn and expunged in their entirety from MMA's claims
25 register. Maine Northern's proof of claim, 257-1, and New

1 Brunswick's proof of claim, 259-1, are not withdrawn and are
2 referred to today as the 1171(b) claims. For purposes of
3 resolving the objection to the 1171(b) claims, the Wheeling
4 and Lake Erie Railway Companies at all times held valid
5 security interests in the debtor's accounts receivable and
6 certain inventory and proceeds to secure obligations due
7 under a line of credit and a (ph) security agreement dated
8 in June of 2009.

9 MMA was a participating railroad in the Interline
10 Settlement System, the ISS. Claimant railways weren't. The
11 ISS provides a certain central clearinghouse for
12 participating railroads involved in the interchange of
13 freight traffic among multiple rail carriers to settle
14 accounts receivable and accounts payable arising from the
15 interchange of such traffic.

16 Railroads participating in the ISS that originate
17 traffic are known as billing railroads, and they invoice the
18 customer for all freight charges from the point of origin to
19 the point of destination, even if the shipment is
20 interchanged with other railroads along the route.

21 Customers are responsible for paying the billing railroad
22 the entire invoice, and the billing railroad is responsible
23 for paying the other railroads involved in the shipment
24 their share of the proceeds representing the freight charges
25 earned by them.

1 Railroads that participate in the ISS calculate on
2 a monthly basis the accounts receivable and accounts payable
3 arising from the interchange of traffic that are due and
4 owing each participant. The payment of the net amount due
5 and owing is made on the second business day of each month.
6 By agreement with the claimant railways, MMA acted as the
7 billing railroad. When either claimant railway originated
8 traffic, it interchanged with MMA as well as when MMA
9 originated traffic, it interchanged with either of the
10 claimant railroads.

11 MMA also collected from the ISS freight revenue
12 attributable to freight services provided by the claimant
13 railways in connection with shipments originated by other
14 carriers that were interchanged by such carriers with MMA
15 and by MMA with the claimant railways. For the purposes of
16 the claims, parties stipulated that, other than \$1,952
17 claimed by New Brunswick for repair of cars owned or leased
18 by the debtor other than 5,146 claimed by Maine Northern for
19 repair of cars owned or leased by the debtor, inspection
20 services provided by Maine Northern, the claims of the
21 claimant railways, if any, result from the fact that MMA
22 collected funds, either directly from customers or via the
23 ISS, and did not pay amounts to the claimant railways.

24 The Irving Companies, as defined as Irving Pulp &
25 Paper, Ltd, Irving Paper, Ltd, and J.D. Irving, Ltd are

1 affiliates of both of the claimant railways and customers of
2 MMA. During the six-month period preceding the filing,
3 claimant railways and the Irving Paper Companies, on the one
4 hand, MMA, on the other, would settle their respective
5 accounts receivable and accounts payable by arranging
6 concurrent exchange of wire transfers and checks.

7 The issue before me is whether the claims asserted
8 by the claimant railways in the 1171(b) claims qualify as 6-
9 month claims titled to priority under 1171(b). The amount
10 of such claims shall be determined at a subsequent hearing,
11 if required. So in addition to these stipulations, I found
12 the following -- I find that the following facts were
13 established at the hearing or otherwise. And by otherwise,
14 I mean they may have been determined by the prior filings or
15 prior representations. And those facts are as follows.

16 The MMA claimants railway business relationship
17 began approximately in 2003. As the debtor indicated in its
18 first amended disclosure statement, from January 2003 until
19 May 2014, the debtor and the wholly owned Canadian
20 subsidiary, MMA Canada, operated on an integrated
21 international short line freight railroad system. This
22 system originally included 510 route miles of track in
23 Maine, Vermont, Quebec and were operated from the debtor's
24 principle office in Hermon, Maine.

25 The system was a substantial component of the

1 transportation systems in Northern Maine, Northern New
2 England, Quebec, and New Brunswick. And it provided the
3 shortest rail transportation route between Maine and
4 Montreal and was a critical rail artery between St. John and
5 New Brunswick and Montreal.

6 In 2003, at the time when MMA and the claimant
7 railways began doing business, Mr. Hansen had concerns that
8 MMA would not be able to pay Irving. MMA and the claimant
9 railways established a weekly payment swap system. In
10 Mr. Hansen's words, quote, "Basically, Irving Paper and
11 Irving Pulp & Paper's funds would flow into my department
12 once a week. We'd get hold of MMA, and we'd agree that
13 simultaneously I'd send them their wire transfer and they
14 would the same second send the wire transfer back to me for
15 monies owed to New Brunswick Southern," end quote.

16 In terms of the amount of cash that was being sent
17 from Irving to MMA compared to the amount of cash that MMA
18 was sending to Irving, Irving's was by far larger initially.
19 These transfers were done virtually simultaneously.
20 Mr. Hansen's stated reason for establishing this -- agreeing
21 to this system was that he was determined that the claimant
22 railways were not going to rely on MMA's credit to make sure
23 they got paid.

24 Mr. Simpson testified that the decision not to
25 participate in the ISS was not influenced by the credit

1 worthiness of MMA. The claimant railways could have
2 withheld transferring money to MMA by wire if MMA did not
3 pay the amounts due to Irving.

4 Until June or July of 2012 this arrangement
5 worked. Then things changed. As the debtor described in
6 the first amended disclosure statement, in the two years
7 leading up to the commencement of this case, the debtor --
8 the Chapter 11 case -- the debtor benefited from a dramatic
9 increased use of trains to move oil from the Central and
10 Western regions of the U.S. to refineries in the East.

11 United States and Canadian oil drillers were
12 producing oil faster than the new pipelines could be built.
13 Trains were needed to transport crude oil to refineries.
14 Prior to the derailment, the debtor had been hauling 500,000
15 barrels of oil monthly through Quebec and Maine. Due to
16 this business, the debtor enjoyed a significant increase in
17 gross revenue. For a short time, positive net operating
18 income, although needed (ph), capital expenditures remained
19 deferred and underfunded.

20 This resulted in an increase in oil shipments
21 carried by the MMA and interchanged with the claimant
22 railways for delivery to St. John. Beginning in 2012, the
23 amounts owed by MMA for interline freight services provided
24 by the claimant railways began to exceed the amounts owed by
25 Irving to MMA. As Mr. Hansen put it at trial, "Well, the

1 shipment of oil would have been coming out of the Dakotas by
2 C.T. They would hit MMA's line."

3 "They would interchange with MMA. Then the oil
4 would come. The train would come down through until it hit
5 New Brunswick Southern's line. New Brunswick Southern would
6 transport it then into St. John, New Brunswick. And the
7 cost, our share, Irving's share -- it would bring it from
8 where we would interfaced with St. John, became excessive,
9 quite high."

10 Turning to the burden of proof, I don't think
11 that's any -- of any dispute. Section 502(a) provides that,
12 quote, "A claim or interest, proof of which is filed under
13 Section 501 of this title, is deemed allowed unless a party
14 and interest objects," end quote. If an objection is filed
15 in court after notice and hearing, quote, "shall allow such
16 claim, except to the extent the claim is unenforceable
17 against the debtor, property of the debtor," end quote.
18 That's 502(b)(1).

19 The burden is on the objecting party to put forth
20 evidence sufficient to negate the prima facie validity of
21 the claim. If the objecting party produces such evidence,
22 the burden shifts back to the claimant to prove the validity
23 of its claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Given the
24 travel of this case, I conclude the burden is on the
25 claimant railways to establish that their claims are

1 priority claims under Section 1171(b).

2 Trustee argues that these claims fail for several
3 reasons. Generally, the reasons are, one, interline charges
4 are per se unsecured claims as a matter of law; two,
5 claimant railways have failed to establish that the
6 interline charges were necessary operating expenses of MMA;
7 three, the claimant railways failed to establish that they
8 provided services or goods to MMA with the expectation that
9 they'd be paid for current operating revenues, not in
10 reliance on MMA's general credit worthiness.

11 As a sort of subset of this argument, the trustee
12 asserted that the claimant railways established a, quote,
13 "special security arrangement," end quote, with MMA, which
14 exempts them from the protections of the six-months rule.
15 I'll address those three arguments in that order.

16 One, interline charges cannot be 1171(b) claims as
17 a matter of law. Obviously, I've got to first look at
18 1171(b), which provides, quote, "any unsecured claim against
19 the debtor that would have been entitled to priority, if a
20 receiver in equity of the property of the debtor had been
21 appointed by federal court on the date of the order for
22 relief on its title shall be entitled to the same priority
23 in the case of its chapter (ph)," end quote.

24 This section codified a long-established equitable
25 doctrine called the six-months rule applied in railroad

1 receivership cases that permitted receivers to pay certain
2 necessary expenses incurred in the period immediately
3 preceding the receivership. See in re: Boston and Maine
4 Corp., 634 F.2d 1359, 1366 through 79.

5 As is clear -- or maybe not so clear -- from the
6 language of this rule, it does not set forth terms or
7 conditions which give rise to a priority. There's no test
8 to do. That job is left to the courts.

9 In the Boston and Maine II case, the one that I
10 cited a minute ago, 634 F.2d 1359, is a good place to start.
11 That Court wrote that, "A claim will be entitled to priority
12 under 1171(b) when it, one, represents a current operating
13 expense necessarily incurred; two, was incurred within six
14 months before the reorganization petition was filed; and
15 three, the goods or services were delivered in the
16 expectation that they would be paid for out of current
17 operating revenues of the railroad and not in reliance on
18 the railroad's general credit." I note at the outset --
19 that's the end of the three-part test.

20 I note at the outset that this is not necessarily
21 an easy concept to apply, which might have explained why at
22 the end of oral argument, after hearing the exact same
23 evidence and hearing the same testimony, both Mr. Lepene and
24 you, Mr. Keach, argued that the answer was clear. And I had
25 to do then -- what I had to do was different. And I

1 struggled with that. And I think Courts have struggled with
2 that.

3 I found at least one commentator in Five
4 Bankruptcy Services LED, Section 46:67 say something I
5 thought was observant. Quote, "It is difficult, it not
6 impossible, to identify from prior decisions any unified
7 principle or group of principles to be applied when claimant
8 requests priority for prepetition claim in railroad
9 reorganization pursuant to 1171(b). Each case has been
10 decided based on its unique facts and Courts' analysis of
11 equities asserted by the competing parties."

12 So the trustee argues that -- let me just make
13 sure I have something here. Turning to the first argument
14 of the trustee. Trustee argues that the freight services
15 provided to MMA in connection with the interline rail
16 shipments cannot, as a matter of law, constitute 1171(b)
17 claims. I disagree.

18 I read Boston and Maine II to have reversed the
19 decision of District Court, which denied priority treatment
20 of the claims of interlining railroads which sought six-
21 month priority status for their per diem claims. Other
22 Courts have done that also. Finance Company vs. Charleston,
23 62 F. 205.

24 So my conclusion was that, as a matter of law, the
25 mere fact that the claims are for interline freight services

1 does not exclude them from possible priority consideration.
2 So if the claimant railways can -- I find they pass that
3 first challenge by the trustee. And if the claimant
4 railways can satisfy the judicially established three
5 elements required for the 1171(b) claims, then they're
6 entitled to priority treatment. So let's turn to that.

7 Looking first at the necessity of the charges, the
8 testimony of Mr. Hansen and Mr. Simpson as well as the
9 debtor's statements in its first amended disclosure
10 statement lead me to conclude that the claimant railways
11 meet this element. The testimony by Mr. Simpson established
12 that the inability of MMA to interchange traffic with the
13 claimant railways on the, quote, "critical rail artery,"
14 quote, between St. John and Montreal would have had a
15 significant adverse effect on MMA's operations, including,
16 among other things, the possible loss of business with
17 Irving as well as a reduction in revenue.

18 Ian Simpson testified at trial regarding the
19 freight services provided to MMA. He confirmed the
20 importance of MMA -- importance to MMA of the critical rail
21 artery between Montreal and St. John. He characterized it
22 as the most direct, economical, and practical route for the
23 shipment of oil to the refineries in St. John.

24 At trial, he further testified that the impact on
25 MMA's operation if they had been unable to interchange

1 traffic with the Irving Railroad, would have been
2 significant in negative ways. He also testified that the
3 only way that MMA could get traffic into St. John would be
4 through the claimant railways' lines for final delivery. In
5 cross-examination by the trustee, he did admit it would not
6 be impossible for MMA to technically interchange with
7 another carrier to indirectly deliver product. But he said
8 it would not be practical or economical.

9 Simpson had firsthand knowledge of MMA's efforts
10 to solicit Irving Paper Company's (indiscernible) business.
11 Although the testimony of Mr. Hansen on some of these issues
12 was blunted by the trustee on cross-examination, I conclude
13 that the persuasive testimony of Mr. Simpson on these facts
14 was not controverted. Based upon this and the other
15 evidence adduced at the hearing, I conclude that the
16 claimant railways satisfied their burden on the necessity
17 issue. I don't ascribe to the narrow view of what a
18 necessity is. I find that it is sufficient claims are for a
19 current expense, goods and services and bringing ordinary
20 operation of the rail.

21 The second element, the six-month element --
22 there's no meaningful challenge as to that. So I conclude
23 that the claimant railways meet their burden.

24 Now turning to, I think, what's the heart of it is
25 the third element, that the goods or services were delivered

1 in the expectation that they be paid for out of current
2 operating revenues of the railway and not in reliance on the
3 railroad's general credit. I admit that element is not
4 easily applied and is susceptible to the arguments that
5 parties made in the closing arguments. As a matter of
6 common sense, these alternatives are not mutually exclusive.

7 A party dealing with a railroad might well rely on
8 both the current operating revenues of the railroad as well
9 as its general credit. A credit manager of any entity
10 dealing with a railroad could plausibly testify that it
11 relied on the current operating revenues of the railroad
12 rather than its general credit, or perhaps more closer to
13 the truth, that it relied more on the railroad's current
14 operating revenues than its general credit. Thus, arguably,
15 anybody dealing with a railroad within six months of
16 bankruptcy could potentially be entitled to a priority
17 claim.

18 Had the claimant railroads been dealing with MMA
19 in the manner in which it did prior to the oil shipments,
20 2012, this case would have been easier for me. And the
21 trustee's argument would have been more powerful for me.
22 When the oil started shipping, however, that arrangement
23 changed.

24 MMA could not -- as was testified at the hearing,
25 MMA could not afford to keep current on payments owed to the

1 claimant railways under the new reality of the new -- post-
2 2012. And it proposed an alternative, which the claimant
3 railways accepted. Under this new system, the interline
4 freight charges incurred in connection with oil shipments
5 would be carved out of the swap arrangement and instead,
6 those charges would be paid to the claimant railways on
7 MMA's receipt of payment from the ISS of the amounts owed to
8 MMA for such shipments.

9 Carl Hansen testified about the claimant railways'
10 reasons for doing so. Quote, "Once I was briefed a bit on
11 what this ISS was, I felt comfortable enough that monies
12 would be coming into MMA without any hiccups, so to speak,
13 and that shortly thereafter, within a matter of days, I
14 would be paid the monies owed by MMA for the transportation
15 of oil on our lines." Mr. Hansen emphasized at trial that
16 this new arrangement was not, in his view, based upon the
17 claimant railways' reliance on MMA's general credit
18 worthiness.

19 "Q: Mr. Hansen, in providing freight services in
20 connection with the interchange of traffic, the MMA, did
21 Irving Railroads rely on MMA's general credit worthiness?"

22 Mr. Hansen's answer -- Absolutely not.

23 Q: What did the Irving Railroads rely upon?

24 Answer by Mr. Hansen -- "We relied upon them being
25 paid out of the ISS system, which I felt was secure and that

1 meant I would be paid shortly thereafter." End of
2 Mr. Hansen's quotes here.

3 Mr. Simpson supported this testimony. Quote, "We
4 expected prompt payment. Because when ISS -- when they
5 received their money from the ISS, they were receiving their
6 share and our share. And that's what we were looking for.
7 When they got paid, we were to be paid."

8 Based on testimony like this as well as other
9 evidence presented at the hearing, I conclude that the
10 claimant railways met their burden as to the third element
11 of the 1171(b) claims. Testimony shows that, in order to
12 keep the interchange of services going between the parties,
13 claimant railways agreed to wait for the ISS system to
14 process payment and then to pay -- the ISS to pay them to
15 MMA before MMA would pay the claimant railways. I do not
16 conclude that this was reliance on MMA's credit, nor do I
17 conclude that this was some sort of special security
18 arrangement which excepts the claimant railways from the
19 protection of the six-months rule. I didn't find anything
20 in that deal or that arrangement that had incorporated
21 common conditions of the commercial credit, security
22 interests, and the like.

23 I do not find that the existence of the Wheeling
24 line of credit changes my conclusion. Mr. Hansen was not
25 aware that MMA had a line of credit with Wheeling, he so

1 testified. Mr. Simpson admitted he was aware of it, quote,
2 "anecdotally," end quote, but had no knowledge of how it,
3 quote, "worked," end quote, and was not familiar with it.
4 Nobody, according to the testimony, ever advised Mr. Hansen
5 or Mr. Simpson that MMA's ability to pay claimant railroads
6 was dependent on MMA being able to draw on the Wheeling line
7 of credit.

8 So based upon the unique facts and my analysis of
9 the equities asserted by MMA, on one hand, and the claimant
10 railroads, on the other, I conclude that the claimant
11 railways have met their burden. The claims shall be allowed
12 as 1171(b) claims.

13 Now, the stipulations indicate that the amount of
14 the claims will be determined at a subsequent hearing, if
15 required. I throw in as a suggestion -- and I've said a lot
16 here. I'm sure the parties want to digest it. And they can
17 figure out what kind of further process is required.

18 So my proposal, subject to both of your input, is
19 that you submit a brief status report in 14 days and the
20 status report indicate whether a further hearing's required.
21 If so, at that time, also submit a proposed joint pretrial
22 order. And you can contact the clerk's office to arrange
23 for the hearing time. But that's just my stab at a
24 proposal. And I'm open to ideas.

25 And maybe I begin with you, Mr. Keach?

1 MR. KEACH: Your Honor, I think my suggestion is
2 that Mr. Lepene and I talk with respect to the issues
3 relating to the amount. It may very well be that we can
4 stipulate as to the amount relatively quickly and actually
5 allow Your Honor to enter a sort of unified final judgment
6 based on that stipulation. And then the parties can decide
7 what they want to do with that input. But --

8 THE COURT: Okay. And one of the reasons that I
9 wanted to put all of this in this fashion is I thought that
10 somebody might be not happy with what I'm doing. So I
11 wanted to try to streamline it as best I could.

12 So fine. Why don't we do that? What do you
13 think? Fourteen days?

14 MR. KEACH: Easily within 14 days. I suspect
15 sooner. I'm not sure about Mr. Lepene's schedule, but I
16 suspect it's really not going to be that difficult.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 Mr. Lepene, your thoughts on this?

19 MR. LEPENE: I would agree with Mr. Keach and what
20 you have proposed, Your Honor. And I will plan to call
21 Mr. Keach. And I'm sure we can accomplish that within 14
22 days.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

24 Mr. Keach, anything else this morning?

25 MR. KEACH: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank

1 you.

2 THE COURT: Thank you.

3 Mr. Lepene, anything from you?

4 MR. LEPENE: Nothing further, Your Honor. Thank
5 you.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

7 The Court will be adjourned.

8 THE DEPUTY: All rise.

9 (Whereupon, these proceedings were concluded at 9:29
10 AM)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1		I N D E X	
2		R U L I N G	
3			Page
4	Trustee's Objection to		21
5	Claimant Railways Proofs of Claim		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Nicole Yawn certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Nicole Yawn

February 10, 2016

Veritext Legal Solutions
330 Old Country Road
Suite 300
Mineola, NY 11501

&	3	advised 21:4	ascribe 17:17
& 1:7 3:10 4:7 5:9 8:24 10:11	300 25:24 303 3:5	affiliates 9:1 afford 18:25	assert 5:8 asserted 9:7 13:12 15:11 21:9
0	330 25:23 3900 3:19	ago 14:10 agree 10:12 22:19	atlantic 1:7 4:8 5:9
04101 1:17 3:6 04104-5029 3:13	4	agreed 20:13 agreeing 10:20	attorney 3:3,11,18 attorneys 6:8
1	44114-1291 3:21 46:67 15:4	agreement 7:7 8:6 alan 3:23	attributable 8:12 aware 20:25 21:1
1 12:18 1,952 8:16 10 25:10 100 3:12 11 4:8 5:1,10 11:8 11501 25:25 1171 5:11 7:2,3 9:8 9:9 13:1,16,18 14:12 15:9,16 16:5 20:11 21:12 127 3:20 13-10670 1:3 4:8 1359 14:4,10 1366 14:4 14 21:19 22:14,21 1826 5:18 1855 5:19 1877 5:20 6:17,20 6:20 1878 5:19 1978 5:12	5	allow 12:15 22:5 allowed 12:13 21:11	b
	5 1:19 5,146 8:18 500,000 11:14 501 12:13 502 12:11,18 510 9:22 537 1:15 3:4	alternatives 19:2 alternatives 18:6 amended 9:18 11:6 16:9 amount 8:4 9:9 10:16,17 21:13 22:3 22:4	b 1:22 5:11 7:2,3 9:8,9 12:18 13:1,16 13:18 14:12 15:9,16 16:5 20:11 21:12 back 10:14 12:22 background 6:14 bankruptcy 1:1,13 1:24 5:12,15 15:4 18:16
	6	amounts 8:23 11:3 11:23,24 19:7	barrels 11:15
	6 9:8 62 15:23 634 14:4,10	analysis 6:16 15:10 21:8	based 15:10 17:14 19:16 20:8 21:8 22:6
	7	anecdotally 21:2	basically 10:10
	7002 5:15 79 14:4	answer 14:24 19:22 19:24	basis 8:2
	9	anybody 18:15	began 9:17 10:7 11:24
	9:00 1:20	applied 13:25 15:7 18:4	beginning 11:22
	a	apply 14:21	behalf 4:10
2	ability 21:5	appointed 13:21	benefited 11:8
2003 9:17,18 10:6	able 10:8 21:6	approximately 9:17	bernstein 3:10
2009 7:8	absolutely 19:22	arguably 18:14	best 22:11
2012 11:4,22 18:20 19:2	accepted 19:3	argued 14:24	billing 7:17,21,22 8:7
2014 9:19	accomplish 22:21	argues 13:2 15:12 15:14	bit 19:10
2015 5:22	accounts 7:5,14,14 8:2,2 9:5,5	argument 13:11 14:22 15:13 18:21	blunted 17:12
2016 1:19 25:10	accurate 25:4	arguments 13:15 18:4,5	boston 14:3,9 15:18
205 15:23	acted 8:6	arising 7:14 8:3	brief 21:19
20th 5:22	addition 9:11	arrange 21:22	briefed 19:10
21 24:4	address 13:15	arrangement 11:4 13:13 18:22 19:5,16 20:18,20	bring 12:7
242-1 6:22	adduced 17:15	arranging 9:5	bringing 17:19
243-1 6:23	adjourned 23:7	artery 10:4 16:13 16:21	brunswick 3:18 4:15 5:3,4 8:17 10:2,5,15 12:5,5,6
257-1 6:25	admissions 5:20		brunswick's 6:23 7:1
259-1 7:1	admit 17:5 18:3		
2nd 1:16	admitted 5:23 21:1		
	adverse 16:15		

<p>built 11:12 burden 12:10,19,22 12:24 17:16,23 20:10 21:11 business 8:5 9:16 10:7 11:16 16:16 17:10</p>	<p>checks 9:6 cited 14:10 civil 6:12 claim 5:2 6:22,23 6:25 7:1 12:12,16 12:16,21,23 13:18 14:11 15:8 18:17 24:5 claimant 5:5,8,18 5:25 6:1 7:10 8:6,7 8:10,12,15,21,23 9:1,3,8 10:6,8,21 11:1,21,24 12:22,25 13:5,7,12 15:7 16:2 16:3,10,13 17:4,16 17:23 18:18 19:1,2 19:6,9,17 20:10,13 20:15,18 21:5,9,10 24:5 claimants 9:16 claimed 8:17,18 claims 5:9,10 6:23 6:24 7:2,3 8:16,20 9:7,8,9,10 12:25 13:1,2,4,16 15:17 15:20,21,25 16:5 17:18 20:11 21:11 21:12,14 clear 14:5,5,24 clearinghouse 7:11 clerk 4:2 clerk's 21:22 cleveland 3:21 closer 18:12 closing 18:5 code 5:13 codified 13:24 collected 8:11,22 collectively 5:5 come 12:4,4 comfortable 19:11 coming 12:1 19:12 commencement 11:7 commentator 15:3 commercial 20:21</p>	<p>common 18:6 20:21 companies 5:25 7:4 8:24 9:3 company 5:2,4 15:22 company's 17:10 compared 10:17 competing 15:11 complete 4:21 component 9:25 concept 14:21 concerning 4:25 concerns 10:7 conclude 12:24 16:10 17:12,15,22 20:9,16,17 21:10 concluded 23:9 conclusion 15:24 20:24 conclusions 5:14 concurrent 9:6 conditions 14:7 20:21 confirmed 16:19 Congress 1:15 3:4 connection 8:13 15:15 19:4,20 consideration 16:1 considered 5:16 constitute 15:16 contact 21:22 contains 5:13 controls 6:20 controverted 17:14 convenience 4:24 corp 14:4 corporate 5:24 cost 12:7 counsel 6:4 country 25:23 court 1:1,13 4:4,7 4:14,18,23 12:15 13:21 14:11 15:19 22:8,17,23 23:2,6,7 courts 14:8 15:1,10 15:22</p>	<p>credit 5:24 7:7 10:22,25 13:10 14:18 18:3,9,9,12 18:14 19:17,21 20:16,21,24,25 21:7 critical 10:4 16:13 16:20 cross 17:5,12 crude 11:13 current 13:9 14:12 14:16 17:19 18:1,8 18:11,13,25 customer 7:18 customers 7:21 8:22 9:1</p>
<p>c</p>			<p>d</p>
<p>c 3:1 4:1 25:1,1 c.t. 12:2 calculate 8:1 call 22:20 called 13:25 canada 9:20 canadian 9:19 11:11 capital 11:18 carl 5:23 19:9 carried 11:21 carrier 17:7 carriers 7:13 8:14 8:14 cars 8:17,19 carved 19:5 case 1:3 4:8,8,22 5:21 11:7,8 12:24 13:23 14:9 15:9 18:20 cases 14:1 cash 10:16,17 center 3:19 central 7:11 11:9 certain 5:8 6:15 7:6 7:11 14:1 certify 25:3 challenge 16:3 17:22 changed 11:5 18:23 changes 20:24 chapter 4:8 5:1 11:8 13:23 characterized 16:21 charges 7:18,24 13:3,6,16 16:7 19:4 19:6 charleston 15:22</p>			<p>d 4:1 24:1 dakotas 12:1 date 13:21 dated 7:7 day 8:5 days 19:13 21:19 22:13,14,22 deal 20:20 dealing 18:7,10,15 18:18 debtor 1:9 5:9,10 8:18,19 9:17,19 11:5,7,8,14,16 12:17,17 13:19,20 debtor's 7:5 9:23 16:9 decide 22:6 decided 15:10 decision 4:19,22,25 5:13,16 10:24 15:19 decisions 15:6 deemed 12:13 deferred 11:19 defined 8:24 deliver 17:7 delivered 14:15 17:25 delivery 11:22 17:4 denied 15:19 department 10:11</p>

<p>dependent 21:6 deputy 23:8 derailment 11:14 described 11:5 destination 7:19 determined 9:10,14 10:21 21:14 diem 15:21 different 14:25 difficult 15:5 22:16 digest 21:16 direct 16:22 directly 8:22 disagree 15:17 disagreed 6:6 disclosure 9:18 11:6 16:9 discrepancy 6:19 dispute 12:11 district 1:2,14 15:19 docket 5:18 doctrine 13:25 document 5:17 doing 4:21 10:7 19:10 22:10 dramatic 11:8 draw 21:6 drillers 11:11 due 7:6 8:3,4 11:3 11:15 duplicate 6:23</p>	<p>element 16:11 17:21,21,25 18:3 20:10 elements 16:5 emphasized 19:15 england 10:2 enjoyed 11:16 enter 22:5 entire 7:22 entirety 6:24 entitled 13:19,22 14:11 16:6 18:16 entity 18:9 entry 5:18 equitable 13:24 equities 15:11 21:9 equity 13:20 erie 7:4 esq 3:8,15,23 establish 12:25 13:5 13:7 established 9:13 10:9 13:12,24 16:4 16:11 establishing 10:20 evidence 5:21,22 12:20,21,23 14:23 17:15 20:9 exact 14:22 examination 17:5 17:12 exceed 11:24 excellent 6:5,9 excepts 13:14 20:18 excessive 12:8 exchange 9:6 exclude 16:1 exclusive 18:6 exhibits 5:23 existence 20:23 expectation 13:8 14:16 18:1 expected 20:4 expenditures 11:18 expense 14:13 17:19</p>	<p>expenses 13:6 14:2 explained 14:21 expunged 6:24 extent 6:19 12:16</p> <p style="text-align: center;">f</p> <p>f 1:22 15:23 25:1 f.2d 14:4,10 facie 12:20 fact 5:13 8:21 15:25 facts 9:12,15 15:10 17:13 21:8 fail 13:2 failed 13:5,7 familiar 21:3 far 10:18 fashion 22:9 faster 11:12 february 1:19 25:10 federal 5:14 13:21 felt 19:11,25 figure 21:17 filed 5:2 12:12,14 14:14 filing 9:2 filings 5:20 9:14 final 17:4 22:5 finance 15:22 financial 5:24 find 9:12 16:2 17:18 20:19,23 findings 5:13 fine 22:12 first 9:18 11:6 13:17 15:13 16:3,7 16:9 firsthand 17:9 five 15:3 floor 1:16 flow 10:11 focus 6:16,16 following 9:12,12 follows 9:15 foregoing 25:3 format 5:12 forth 6:17 12:19 14:6</p>	<p>found 6:11 9:11 15:3 fourteen 22:13 freight 7:13,18,24 8:11,12 9:21 11:23 15:14,25 16:19 19:4 19:19 funds 8:22 10:41 further 4:22 16:24 21:17,20 22:25 23:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">g</p> <p>g 1:23 4:1 gary 1:23 4:2 general 5:24 6:1 13:10 14:18 18:3,9 18:12,14 19:17,21 generally 13:3 give 14:7 given 12:23 going 4:19,20 6:18 10:22 20:12 22:16 good 4:4,5,6,11,12 4:13,17,18 14:10 goods 13:8 14:15 17:19,25 gross 11:17 group 15:7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">h</p> <p>hand 9:4 21:9 hansen 5:24 10:7 11:25 16:8 17:11 19:9,15,19,24 20:24 21:4 hansen's 10:10,20 19:22 20:2 happy 22:10 hauling 11:14 hearing 2:1 5:5,22 6:9,16 9:10,13 12:15 14:22,23 17:15 18:24 20:9 21:14,23 hearing's 21:20 hearings 6:12 heart 17:24</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">e</p> <p>e 1:22,22 3:1,1 4:1,1 24:1 25:1 earned 7:25 easier 6:15 18:20 easily 18:4 22:14 east 11:10 easy 14:21 economical 16:22 17:8 effect 16:15 efficient 6:12 efforts 17:9 either 8:7,9,22</p>	<p>ex</p>	<p>f</p>	<p>g</p>

<p>held 7:4 helped 6:16 helpful 6:5,7 hermon 9:24 hiccup 19:12 high 12:9 hine 3:17 hit 12:2,4 hold 10:12 hon 1:23 honor 4:12,17 22:1 22:5,20,25 23:4 honorable 4:2</p>	<p>interchanged 7:20 8:8,9,14 11:21 interest 12:12,14 interests 7:5 20:22 interfaced 12:8 interline 7:9 11:23 13:3,6,16 15:15,25 19:3 interlining 15:20 international 9:21 inventory 7:6 invoice 7:17,22 involved 7:12,23 irving 5:7,25 8:24 8:24,25,25 9:3 10:8 10:10,11,17,18 11:3 11:25 16:17 17:1,10 19:21,23 irving's 10:18 12:7 iss 7:10,11,16 8:1 8:11,23 10:25 19:7 19:11,25 20:4,5,13 20:14 issue 9:7 17:17 issues 17:11 22:2</p>	<p>keep 18:25 20:12 key 3:19 kind 21:17 knowledge 17:9 21:2 known 7:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">i</p> <p>lake 7:4 language 14:6 larger 10:18 law 5:14 13:4,17 15:16,24 lead 16:10 leading 11:7 leased 8:17,19 led 15:4 left 14:8 legal 25:22 lepen 3:23 4:14,17 14:23 22:2,18,19 23:3,4 lepen's 22:15 lindsay 3:15 line 7:7 9:21 12:2,5 20:24,25 21:6 lines 17:4 19:15 listed 6:20 llp 3:17 long 13:24 look 4:23 13:17 looking 16:7 20:6 loss 16:16 lot 21:15</p> <p style="text-align: center;">m</p> <p>maine 1:2,7,14,17 3:18 4:7,15,16 5:2,3 5:9 6:22,25 8:18,20 9:23,24 10:1,3 11:15 14:3,9 15:18 manager 5:24 6:1 18:9 manner 18:19 materials 6:4 matter 1:5 13:4,17 15:16,24 18:5 19:13</p>	<p>mean 9:14 meaningful 17:22 meant 20:1 meet 16:11 17:23 mere 15:25 met 20:10 21:11 middle 3:12 miles 9:22 mineola 25:25 minute 6:3 14:10 mma 5:10 7:9 8:6,8 8:8,11,14,15,21 9:2 9:4,16,20 10:6,8,8 10:12,17,17 11:1,2 11:2,21,23,25 12:3 13:6,8,13 15:15 16:12,19,20,20 17:3 17:6 18:18,24,25 19:8,12,14,20 20:15 20:15,25 21:6,9 mma's 6:24 10:22 12:2 13:10 16:15,25 17:9 19:7,17,21 20:16 21:5 money 11:2 20:5 monies 10:15 19:11 19:14 month 6:10 8:5 9:2 9:9 15:21 17:21 monthly 8:2 11:15 months 13:14,25 14:14 18:15 20:19 montreal 1:7 4:7 5:9 10:4,5 16:14,21 morning 4:4,5,6,11 4:12,13,17,18,20 22:24 move 11:9 multiple 7:13 mutually 18:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">n</p> <p>n 3:1 4:1 24:1 25:1 narrow 17:17 necessarily 14:13 14:20 necessary 13:6 14:2</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">i</p> <p>ian 6:1 16:18 ideas 21:24 identify 15:6 ii 14:9 15:18 immediately 14:2 impact 16:24 importance 16:20 16:20 impossible 15:6 17:6 inability 16:12 included 5:23 9:22 including 5:25 16:15 income 11:18 incorporated 20:20 increase 11:16,20 increased 11:9 incurred 14:2,13,13 19:4 indicate 21:13,20 indicated 9:17 indirectly 17:7 indiscernible 17:10 influenced 10:25 initially 4:23 10:18 input 21:18 22:7 inspection 8:19 integrated 9:20 interchange 7:12,15 8:3 12:3 16:12,25 17:6 19:20 20:12</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">j</p> <p>j 3:8 5:1 j.d. 8:25 january 9:18 job 6:14 14:8 john 10:4 11:22 12:6,8 16:14,21,23 17:3 joint 5:18 21:21 judge 1:24 6:10 judge's 2:1 judgment 22:5 judicially 16:4 july 11:4 june 7:8 11:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">k</p> <p>k 3:15 keach 3:8 4:9,13 5:1 14:24 21:25 22:1,14 22:19,21,24,25</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">k</p> <p>keep 18:25 20:12 key 3:19 kind 21:17 knowledge 17:9 21:2 known 7:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;">l</p> <p>lake 7:4 language 14:6 larger 10:18 law 5:14 13:4,17 15:16,24 lead 16:10 leading 11:7 leased 8:17,19 led 15:4 left 14:8 legal 25:22 lepen 3:23 4:14,17 14:23 22:2,18,19 23:3,4 lepen's 22:15 lindsay 3:15 line 7:7 9:21 12:2,5 20:24,25 21:6 lines 17:4 19:15 listed 6:20 llp 3:17 long 13:24 look 4:23 13:17 looking 16:7 20:6 loss 16:16 lot 21:15</p> <p style="text-align: center;">m</p> <p>maine 1:2,7,14,17 3:18 4:7,15,16 5:2,3 5:9 6:22,25 8:18,20 9:23,24 10:1,3 11:15 14:3,9 15:18 manager 5:24 6:1 18:9 manner 18:19 materials 6:4 matter 1:5 13:4,17 15:16,24 18:5 19:13</p>	<p>mean 9:14 meaningful 17:22 meant 20:1 meet 16:11 17:23 mere 15:25 met 20:10 21:11 middle 3:12 miles 9:22 mineola 25:25 minute 6:3 14:10 mma 5:10 7:9 8:6,8 8:8,11,14,15,21 9:2 9:4,16,20 10:6,8,8 10:12,17,17 11:1,2 11:2,21,23,25 12:3 13:6,8,13 15:15 16:12,19,20,20 17:3 17:6 18:18,24,25 19:8,12,14,20 20:15 20:15,25 21:6,9 mma's 6:24 10:22 12:2 13:10 16:15,25 17:9 19:7,17,21 20:16 21:5 money 11:2 20:5 monies 10:15 19:11 19:14 month 6:10 8:5 9:2 9:9 15:21 17:21 monthly 8:2 11:15 months 13:14,25 14:14 18:15 20:19 montreal 1:7 4:7 5:9 10:4,5 16:14,21 morning 4:4,5,6,11 4:12,13,17,18,20 22:24 move 11:9 multiple 7:13 mutually 18:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">n</p> <p>n 3:1 4:1 24:1 25:1 narrow 17:17 necessarily 14:13 14:20 necessary 13:6 14:2</p>

<p>necessity 16:7 17:16 17:18 needed 11:13,18 negate 12:20 negative 17:2 nelson 3:10 net 8:4 11:17 new 3:18 4:15 5:3,4 6:22,25 8:17 10:1,2 10:5,15 11:12 12:5 12:5,6 19:1,1,3,16 nicole 2:25 25:3,6 northern 3:18 4:15 4:15 5:2,3 8:18,20 10:1,1 northern's 6:22,25 note 5:5 14:18,20 notice 12:15 notwithstanding 6:6 november 5:22 number 4:8 numbers 5:11 ny 25:25</p>	<p>operating 11:17 13:6,9 14:12,17 18:2,8,11,14 operation 16:25 17:20 operations 16:15 opinion 2:1 oral 2:1 4:19,25 14:22 order 13:15,21 20:11 21:22 ordinary 17:19 origin 7:18 originally 9:22 originate 7:16 originated 8:7,9,13 outset 14:18,20 owed 10:15 11:23 11:24 18:25 19:7,14 owing 8:4,5 owned 8:17,19 9:19</p>	<p>payable 7:14 8:2 9:5 paying 7:21,23 payment 8:4 10:9 19:7 20:4,14 payments 18:25 period 9:2 14:2 permitted 14:1 persuasive 17:13 peter 1:23 4:2 petition 14:14 pgc 1:3 ph 5:24 7:7 11:18 13:23 phone 4:14 pipelines 11:12 place 4:21,23 6:18 14:10 plan 22:20 plausibly 18:10 pleadings 5:6 pleasure 6:12 point 7:18,19 portland 1:17 3:6 3:13 positive 11:17 possible 16:1,16 post 19:1 potentially 18:16 powerful 18:21 practical 16:22 17:8 preceding 9:2 14:3 prepetition 15:8 preponderance 12:23 presentation 6:9 presented 5:21 20:9 preside 6:13 presiding 4:2 pretrial 21:21 prima 12:20 principle 9:24 15:7 principles 15:7 prior 9:14,15 11:14 15:6 18:19 priority 5:10 9:9 13:1,19,22 14:7,11</p>	<p>15:8,19,21 16:1,6 18:16 procedures 5:15 proceedings 23:9 25:4 proceeds 7:6,24 process 20:14 21:17 produces 12:21 producing 11:12 product 17:7 professional 6:11 prompt 20:4 proof 6:22,23,25 7:1 12:10,12 proofs 5:2 24:5 property 12:17 13:20 proposal 21:18,24 proposed 19:2 21:21 22:20 protection 20:19 protections 13:14 prove 12:22 provided 6:4,15 8:12,20 10:2 11:23 13:8 15:15 16:19 provides 7:11 12:11 13:18 providing 19:19 public 3:20 pulp 8:24 10:11 purposes 7:2 8:15 pursuant 15:9 put 4:21 11:25 12:19 22:9</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">o</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">p</p> <p>p 3:1,1 4:1 page 24:3 paid 10:23 13:9 14:16 18:1 19:6,14 19:25 20:1,7,7 paper 8:25,25 9:3 10:10 17:10 paper's 10:11 part 14:19 participant 8:4 participate 8:1 10:25 participating 7:9,12 7:16 parties 5:20,21 6:4 8:16 15:11 18:5 20:12 21:16 22:6 parts 4:20 party 12:13,19,21 18:7 pass 16:2 pay 8:23 10:8 11:3 14:1 20:14,14,15 21:5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">q</p> <p>qualify 9:8 quebec 9:23 10:2 11:15 quickly 22:4 quite 12:9 quote 10:10,15 12:12,14,15,17 13:12,13,18,23 15:5 16:13,14 19:10 20:3 21:1,2,3,3</p>	

quotes 20:2	refer 5:4,11	reviewing 4:23	shipping 18:22
r	referred 5:7 7:2	rise 14:7 23:8	short 9:21 11:17
r 1:22 3:1,23 4:1 25:1	referring 5:12	road 25:23	shortest 10:3
rail 7:13 10:3,4 15:15 16:13,20 17:20	refineries 11:10,13 16:23	robert 3:8 5:1	shortly 19:13 20:1
railroad 5:7 7:9,21 7:22 8:7 9:21 13:25 14:17 15:8 17:1 18:7,8,10,11,15	regarding 16:18	room 3:5	shows 20:11
railroad's 14:18 18:3,13	regions 11:10	route 7:20 9:22 10:3 16:22	shur 3:10
railroads 7:12,16 7:17,20,23 8:1,10 15:20 18:18 19:21 19:23 21:5,10	register 6:25	rule 5:14 13:14,25 14:6 20:19	significant 11:16 16:15 17:2
railway 1:7 4:8 5:2 5:3,10 7:4 8:7 9:16 18:2	relating 22:3	ruling 24:2	simpson 6:1 10:24 16:8,11,18 17:9,13 20:3 21:1,5
railways 5:4,5,8,19 6:1,2 7:10 8:6,13,15 8:21,23 9:1,3,8 10:7 10:9,22 11:1,22,24 12:25 13:5,7,12 16:2,4,10,13 17:4 17:16,23 19:1,3,6,9 19:17 20:10,13,15 20:18 21:11 24:5	relationship 9:16	s	simultaneously 10:13,19
reaching 5:16	relatively 22:4	s 3:1 4:1	six 9:2 13:14,25 14:13 15:20 17:21 18:15 20:19
read 4:19,20 15:18	reliance 13:10 14:17 18:2 19:17 20:16	satisfied 17:16	solicit 17:10
reality 19:1	relied 18:11,13 19:24	satisfy 16:4	solutions 25:22
really 22:16	relief 13:22	sawyer 3:10	somebody 22:10
reason 10:20	rely 10:22 18:7 19:21,23	schedule 22:15	sooner 22:15
reasons 13:3,3 19:10 22:8	remained 11:18	se 13:4	sort 13:11 20:17 22:5
receipt 19:7	reorganization 14:14 15:9	seated 4:3	sought 15:20
receivable 7:5,14 8:2 9:5	repair 8:17,19	second 8:5 10:14 17:21	southern 3:18 4:15 5:3 10:15 12:5
received 20:5	repeat 6:18	section 5:11,11 12:11,13 13:1,24 15:4	southern's 12:5
receiver 13:20	reply 5:19	secure 7:6 19:25	speak 19:12
receivers 14:1	report 21:19,20	security 7:5,7 13:13 20:17,21	speaker 4:5,6
receivership 14:1,3	representations 9:15	see 14:3	special 13:13 20:17
receiving 20:5	representing 7:24	send 10:13,14	square 3:20
record 6:18 25:4	represents 14:12	sending 10:18	st 10:4 11:22 12:6,8 16:14,21,23 17:3
reduction 16:17	requests 15:8	sense 18:6	stab 21:23
	required 9:11 16:5 21:15,17,20	sent 10:16	start 14:10
	resolving 7:3	services 8:12,20 11:23 13:8 14:15 15:4,14,25 16:19 17:19,25 19:19 20:12	started 18:22
	respect 22:2	set 6:17 14:6	stated 10:20
	respective 9:4	settle 7:13 9:4	statement 9:18 11:6 16:10
	response 5:18	settlement 7:10	statements 16:9
	responsible 7:21,22	share 7:24 12:7,7 20:6,6	states 1:1 11:11
	result 8:21	shifts 12:22	status 15:21 21:19 21:20
	resulted 11:20	shipment 7:19,23 12:1 16:23	stipulate 22:4
	revenue 8:11 11:17 16:17	shipments 8:13 11:20 15:16 18:19 19:4,8	stipulated 8:16
	revenues 13:9 14:17 18:2,8,11,14		stipulation 4:20 22:6
	reversed 15:18		
	review 4:22		

[stipulations - zahradka]

<p>stipulations 5:19 6:15,17 9:11 21:13 streamline 22:11 street 1:15 3:4,12 struggled 15:1,1 subject 21:18 submit 21:19,21 subsequent 9:10 21:14 subset 13:11 subsidiary 9:20 substantial 9:25 sufficient 12:20 17:18 suggestion 21:15 22:1 suite 25:24 supported 20:3 sure 10:22 15:13 21:16 22:15,21 susceptible 18:4 suspect 22:14,16 swap 10:9 19:5 system 7:10 9:21,22 9:25 10:9,21 19:3 19:25 20:13 systems 10:1</p>	<p>thing 6:14 things 5:17 11:5 16:16 think 12:10 15:1 17:24 22:1,13 third 17:25 20:10 thompson 3:17 thorough 6:11 thought 15:5 22:9 thoughts 22:18 three 13:7,15 14:15 14:19 16:4 throw 21:15 time 10:6 11:17 21:21,23 times 7:4 title 12:13 13:22 titled 9:9 today 7:2 track 9:22 traffic 7:13,15,17 8:3,8,9 16:12 17:1,3 19:20 train 12:4 trains 11:9,13 transcribed 2:25 transcript 25:3 transfer 10:13,14 transferring 11:2 transfers 9:6 10:19 transport 11:13 12:6 transportation 10:1 10:3 19:14 travel 12:24 treatment 15:19 16:6 trial 11:25 16:18,24 19:15 true 25:4 trustee 3:2,3,11 4:10 5:1,1 13:2,11 15:12,14,14 16:3 17:5,12 trustee's 5:17,19 18:21 24:4</p>	<p>truth 18:13 try 4:21 22:11 trying 6:17 turn 16:6 turning 12:10 15:13 17:24 two 6:10 11:6 13:4 14:13</p> <p style="text-align: center;">u</p> <p>u.s. 1:13,24 3:2,3,11 11:10 u.s.c. 5:11 unable 16:25 underfunded 11:19 unenforceable 12:16 unidentified 4:5,6 unified 15:6 22:5 unify 6:18 unique 15:10 21:8 united 1:1 11:11 unsecured 13:4,18 use 11:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v</p> <p>valid 7:4 validity 12:20,22 various 5:6 veritext 25:22 vermont 9:23 view 17:17 19:16 virtually 10:19 vs 15:22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">w</p> <p>wait 20:13 want 6:8 21:16 22:7 wanted 22:9,11 way 17:3 ways 17:2 week 10:12 weekly 10:9 western 11:10 wheeling 7:3 20:23 20:25 21:6 wholly 9:19 wire 9:6 10:13,14 11:2</p>	<p>withdrawn 6:24 7:1 withheld 11:2 witnesses 6:9 words 10:10 worked 11:5 21:3 worthiness 11:1 13:10 19:18,21 written 5:17 wrote 14:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p>x 1:4,11 24:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">y</p> <p>yawn 2:25 25:3,6 year 6:10 years 6:10 11:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">z</p> <p>zahradka 3:15 4:9 4:12</p>
t			
<p>t 25:1,1 take 6:3 talk 22:2 technically 17:6 telephonic 3:23 terms 10:16 14:6 test 14:7,19 testified 10:24 16:18,24 17:2 18:24 19:9 21:1 testify 18:10 testimonial 5:22 testimony 5:23 14:23 16:8,11 17:11 17:13 20:3,8,11 21:4 thank 6:3,8 22:23 22:25 23:2,4,6</p>			

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE PANEL
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

BAP NO. ME 16-_____

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-10670

MONTREAL MAINE & ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD.,
Debtor.

ROBERT J. KEACH, solely in his capacity as the chapter
11 trustee for MONTREAL, MAINE & ATLANTIC RAILWAY, LTD.,
Appellant,

v.

NEW BRUNSWICK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED
and MAINE NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY LIMITED,
Appellees.

_____, U.S. Bankruptcy Appellate Panel Judge.

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE APPEAL PURSUANT TO
28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) AND FED. R. BANKR. P. 8001(b) AND 8004**

Upon consideration of the Motion for Leave to File Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8001(b) and 8004 (the “Motion”) filed by Robert J. Keach, the chapter 11 trustee¹ (the “Appellant”) of Montreal Maine & Atlantic Railway, Ltd. (the “Debtor”), and the Panel having determined in its discretion that leave to appeal the Order Sustaining in Part and Overruling in Part Trustee’s Objection to Proofs of Claim Filed by New Brunswick

¹ In accordance with the Trustee’s Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation, dated July 15, 2015 (As Amended on October 8, 2015) [D.E. 1822] (the “Plan”), upon the Effective Date of the Plan (which occurred on December 22, 2015, *see* D.E. 1927), Robert J. Keach is no longer the chapter 11 trustee of the Debtor’s estate, but is the Estate Representative of the Post-Effective Date Estate (as defined in the Plan). *See* Plan § 6.1(a). For the sake of continuity, Mr. Keach will continue to be referred to as the chapter 11 trustee.

Southern Railway Company Limited and Maine Northern Railway Company Limited on the Basis that Certain of Such Claims are Duplicative of Others, and Such Others are Improperly Asserted as Administrative and/or Priority Claims, dated February 26, 2016, and the oral findings read into the record by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Maine on February 5, 2016, is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3), the Motion is hereby **GRANTED**.

FOR THE PANEL:

Dated:

By: _____