IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

In re:	Chapter 11
AEARO TECHNOLOGIES LLC,[1]	Case No. 22-02890-JJG-11
Debtor.	

JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS THE DEBTORS' BANKRUPTCY CASES PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY CODE SECTION 1112(b)

The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors for Tort Claimants – Related to Use of Combat Arms Version 2 Earplugs (the "CAE Committee"),[2] the estate fiduciary for creditors injured by the Combat Arms Earplugs Version 2 ("CAEv2"), and over two hundred thousand CAEv2 claimants – veterans, active-duty servicemembers, civilian contractors, and consumers – represented by the law firms on the signature pages of this motion, hereby jointly move to dismiss these chapter 11 cases for cause under Bankruptcy Code section 1112(b).

---

[1] The debtors and debtors-in-possession (the "Debtors") in these cases, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's federal tax identification number, are set forth in the *Order (I) Directing Joint Administration of Chapter 11 Cases and (II) Granting Related Relief*, entered by the Court for each consolidated Debtor [Bankr. D.I. 37–42]. The location of the Debtors' service address for the purposes of these cases is 7911 Zionsville Road, Indianapolis, Indiana 46268.

As required by Local Bankruptcy Rule B-1015-1(b)(5), this motion is being filed in identical form in each of the six cases – No. 22-02890-JJG-11, No. 22-02891-JJG-11, No. 22-02892-JJG-11, No. 22-02893-JJG-11, No. 22-02894-JJG-11, No. 22-02895-JJG-11, and No. 22-02896-JJG-11 – that are jointly administered under Lead Case No. 22-02890-JJG-11.

References to "Bankr. D.I. __" are to docket entries in the lead case. References to "Adv. D.I. __" are to docket entries in *Aearo Technologies LLC v. Parties Listed on Appendix A to the Complaint (In re Aearo Technologies LLC)*, Adversary Proceeding No. 22-50059 (Bankr. S.D. Ind.). References to "MDL D.I. __" are to docket entries in *In re 3M Combat Arms Earplug Prods. Litig.*, No. 19-2885 (N.D. Fla.) ("MDL"). Aside from Exhibit A hereto, references to "Ex. __" are to the trial exhibits admitted by the Court on the record at the preliminary injunction hearing. Unless otherwise indicated, internal quotation marks and internal citations are omitted from case citations.

[2] On August 30, 2022, the Office of the United States Trustee appointed the CAE Committee [Bankr. D.I. 393].

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. From the first day of this bankruptcy, the Debtors have touted their Funding Agreement with 3M Company ("3M") as the cornerstone of these chapter 11 cases: "The Funding Agreement … ensures that these chapter 11 cases will be fully funded, including administrative expenses, general unsecured claims, and any ultimate plan trust," all with "no repayment obligation to 3M …." First Day Decl. [Bankr. D.I. 11] ¶ 12.[3] This Funding Agreement, in turn, was directly modeled on a similar agreement between Johnson & Johnson ("J&J") and its wholly-owned subsidiary, LTL Management LLC ("LTL"). Under that agreement, the subsidiary "has a funding backstop, not unlike an ATM disguised as a contract, that it can draw on to pay liabilities without any disruption to its business or threat to its financial viability." *In re LTL Mgmt. LLC*, ___ F.4th ___, 2023 WL 1098189, 2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 2323, slip op. at 52 (3d Cir. Jan. 30, 2023) ("*LTL*").[4] The Debtors' lead counsel testified that the J&J / LTL "form" was the base from which the Funding Agreement here was built:

> Q: What did Kirkland do to prepare this draft funding and indemnification agreement?
>
> A: My understanding is that we reviewed some of the more recent funding agreements used in mass tort cases, including most notably the LTL Chapter 11 case….
>
> Q: And how did Kirkland decide what terms to include in the funding agreement?
>
> A: We took the LTL form. We updated it for, among other things, names, et cetera, format, nature of the case, the identity of the debtors…. [Nov. 9, 2022 Hr'g 78:14–79:9.]

---

[3] *See also* Funding Agreement at Recital B (describing the agreement as ensuring that each Debtor will always "have assets with a value greater than its Liabilities and will have financial capacity sufficient to satisfy its obligations as they become due in the ordinary course of its business").

[4] For ease of reference, a copy of the slip opinion in *LTL* is hereto as Exhibit A.

2. Having modeled the Funding Agreement here on J&J and LTL, it is little surprise that the Debtors have relied consistently on the lower court decisions in the LTL bankruptcy as precedent, both in this Court and the Seventh Circuit:

- "Addressing mass torts through a legislative scheme enacted by Congress within the bankruptcy system … provides a judicially accepted means of aggregating and resolving mass tort claims." *Debtors' Motion for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief* [Adv. D.I. 2] at 4 (quoting *In re LTL Mgmt. LLC*, 637 B.R. 396, 411 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2022)).

- "Because they facilitate the core goals of the chapter 11 process, courts have granted preliminary injunctions of this nature in similar mass tort bankruptcies." *Id.* at 30 (citing *In re LTL Mgmt. LLC*, 638 B.R. 291, 322 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2022)).

- "MR. HUSNICK: "I think the best decision summarizing all of the circuit law that deals with 362, 105(a), the general equitable powers of the Bankruptcy Court really is the *LTL* decision." Aug. 17, 2022 Hr'g Tr. at 119:6–120:1.

- "Your Honor, these arguments … have been repeatedly rejected by courts with far worse fact [patterns] than ours. It was rejected in the *LTL* case, most notably and most recently." *Id.* at 155:10-14.

See also Opening Brief for Debtors-Appellants [D.I. 29], *In re Aearo Technologies LLC*, No. 22-2606 (7th Cir. Dec. 12, 2022) at 36-55 (relying on lower court *LTL* decisions throughout).

3. The decision in *LTL* – reversing the lower court rulings on which the Debtors so heavily rely and remanding with instructions to dismiss LTL's bankruptcy – knocks the props out from under these cases and requires their dismissal. Judge Ambro's opinion in *LTL* explains why a solvent subsidiary's uncapped, non-recourse funding commitment from its solvent parent company forecloses invocation of the Bankruptcy Code's extraordinary protections – even though the subsidiary has been named as a defendant in substantial tort litigation.[5] Tellingly, *LTL* mirrors

[5] *See, e.g.*, Ex. A at 52–55 (finding that LTL's "funding backstop" necessarily means that LTL "was not in financial distress" and thus "cannot show its petition served a valid bankruptcy purpose"); *id*. at 48–51 (explaining why "LTL did not have any likely need in the present or the near-term, or even in the *(footnote continued)*

in many ways this Court's analysis in its *Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction* [Adv. D.I. 143] (the "PI Order"), which rests on the undisputed fact that "whatever liability the [CAEv2 cases] generate – in bankruptcy, outside of bankruptcy, stay in place, or no stay – Aearo can satisfy such liability by making a payment request [to 3M] under the Funding Agreement." *Id*. at 31–32.[6]

4. Bankruptcy is powerful medicine that is reserved for entities in genuine financial distress. *See LTL* [Ex. A] at 55 (explaining that the Code's "ability to redefine fundamental rights of third parties" means that "only those facing financial distress can call on bankruptcy's tools to do so"); *In re Scheffler*, 86 B.R. 576, 579 (Bankr. W.D. Wis. 1986) ("The Bankruptcy Code was intended to provide relief for financially distressed debtors…. In order for there to be a good faith bankruptcy filing … the debtor must need relief from financial distress."). Where a full "funding backstop" (like the funding agreement in *LTL*, and the Funding Agreement here) "mitigates any financial distress foreseen on [the] petition date," *LTL* [Ex. A] at 55, and where a debtor does not "have any likely need in the present or the near-term, or even in the long-term, to exhaust its funding rights to pay [tort] liabilities," *id*. at 50, then bankruptcy just is not an available option – regardless of any subjective intent:

> Good intentions – such as to protect [a non-debtor parent's] brand or comprehensively resolve litigation – do not suffice ….. What counts to access the Bankruptcy Code's safe harbor is to meet its intended purposes.

---

long-term, to exhaust its funding rights to pay talc liabilities"). *See also id*. at 42 ("[M]ass tort liability can push a debtor to the brink. But to measure the debtor's distance to it, courts must always weigh not just the scope of liabilities the debtor faces, but also the capacity it has to meet them.").

[6] The Debtors have appealed the PI Order to the Seventh Circuit (in part in reliance on the now-reversed *LTL* precedent), but they have not challenged the proposition that non-debtor 3M is ultimately the entity that will bear the full cost of all CAEv2 liability. Nor has 3M itself disputed this point. To the contrary, 3M has embraced it in filings in other courts. *See, e.g.*, Petition for Permission to Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) [D.I. 1], *3M Company v. Christopher Aaby*, Case No. 23-90001, at 3 (11th Cir. Jan. 3, 2023) ("3M has entered into an uncapped Funding Agreement to fully, finally, and fairly resolve" the CAEv2 liability); *see also id*. ("3M has assumed financial responsibility for resolution of this matter pursuant to the uncapped Funding Agreement.").

> Only a putative debtor in financial distress can do so. LTL was not. Thus we dismiss its petition.

Id. at 18.[7] The inquiry is concerned solely with the specific debtor(s) under the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court (rather than any nondebtor parent or affiliate), *id*. at 43–45,[8] and the proper focus is on the situation as it existed the day the bankruptcy petition was filed (rather than any pre-funding-agreement past or hypothetical point in the unknowable future), *id*. at 46–54.[9]

5. Here, just as in *LTL*, the Debtors were not in any financial distress when they invoked this Court's jurisdiction. As of the petition date, 3M was and always had been the singular focus of CAEv2 litigation; the Debtors had paid not one dollar of liability or expense. Their current and future obligations to CAEv2 creditors were 100% backstopped by 3M under the Funding Agreement, and no other circumstances necessitated reorganization. Like the debtor in *LTL*, the Debtors here entered bankruptcy "highly solvent with access to cash to meet comfortably [their]

---

[7] The Ninth Circuit nicely explained that lack of good faith is not akin to a *mens rea* or scienter element:

> The term "good faith" is somewhat misleading. Though it suggests that the debtor's subjective intent is determinative, this is not the case. Instead, the "good faith" filing requirement encompasses several, distinct equitable limitations that courts have placed on Chapter 11 filings. Courts have implied such limitations to deter filings that seek to achieve objectives outside the legitimate scope of the bankruptcy laws…. While the case law refers to … dismissals for "bad faith" filing, it is probably more accurate in light of the precise language of section 1112(b) to call them dismissals "for cause."

In re Marsch, 36 F.3d 825, 828 (9th Cir. 1994).

[8] *LTL* explains that under *Butner v. United States,* 440 U.S. 48, 55 (1979), sole debtor LTL's status as a separate corporate entity meant that its rights and obligations had to be examined on their own, "independent of any other entity. That means we focus on [LTL's] assets, liabilities, and, critically, the funding backstop it has in place to pay those liabilities." Ex. A at 44. *See also In re Wheaton Oaks Off. Partners Ltd. P'ship*, 27 F.3d 1234, 1241 (7th Cir. 1994) (similarly following *Butner*).

[9] *LTL* emphasizes this temporal point heavily, explaining that the subsidiary was not "in financial distress *when it filed its Chapter 11 petition*," *id*. at 46 (emphasis added), and criticizing the bankruptcy court for relying on "back-of-the-envelope forecasts of hypothetical worst-case scenarios," *id*. at 49, that may or may not ultimately come to pass. Viewed from the proper petition-date vantage point, it was clear that "LTL did not have any likely need in the present or the near-term, or even in the long-term, to exhaust its funding rights" from J&J. *Id*. at 50. The *LTL* opinion further highlights that a projection cannot assume each claim "would go to and succeed at trial," but instead must consider "the possibility of meaningful settlement, as well as successful defense and dismissal, of claims." *Id.* at 49.

liabilities as they [come] due for the foreseeable future," including by virtue of the "funding backstop" provided by their parent company. *LTL* [Ex. A] at 51. *See also id*. (quoting the very same funding agreement recital that was copied into the Funding Agreement here, *see supra* n.3, *i.e.*, that LTL had "assets having a value at least equal to its liabilities" and the "financial capacity sufficient to satisfy its obligations as they become due in the ordinary course of business").

6. On these facts – which are substantially similar to *LTL*, including an even more payee-friendly Funding Agreement – the Debtors did not enter bankruptcy on account of any financial distress and thus their cases are subject to dismissal.[10] The *LTL* court rested its decision solely on this fact, and went no further. Ex. A at 53–54 ("Because LTL was not in financial distress, it cannot show its petition served a valid bankruptcy purpose and was filed in good faith under Code § 1112(b)."). A separate and independent ground for dismissal was alluded to but ultimately not resolved:

> Because we conclude LTL's petition has no valid bankruptcy purpose, we need not ask whether it was filed "merely to obtain a tactical litigation advantage." [*In re 15375 Mem'l Corp. v. BEPCO, L.P.*, 589 F.3d 605, 618 (3d Cir. 2009).] Yet it is clear LTL's bankruptcy filing aimed to beat back talc litigation in trial courts…. While we ultimately leave the question unaddressed, a filing to change the forum of litigation where there is no financial distress raises, as it did in [*In re SGL Carbon Corp*., 200 F.3d 154,

---

[10] The Third Circuit's *LTL* decision is in harmony with the standards employed in the Seventh Circuit. Here, as in the Third Circuit, financial distress is a critical and independent component of the good faith test. *E.g.*, *In re Scheffler*, 86 B.R. 576, 579 (Bankr. W. D. Wis. 1986) ("In order for there to be a good faith bankruptcy filing there must be real debts, real creditors, and the debtor must need relief from financial distress."); *see also, e.g.*, *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. 820, 830 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2004) ("The test is whether the debtor has a business justification for thwarting a judgment creditor's collection activity and forcing them to accept other (possibly reduced) future payment rights under a reorganization plan in lieu of assets crucial to operating the business. This justification does not exist if the debtor could have satisfied a judgment with funds and savings that were not being used to operate a business."); s*ee also In re N.R. Guaranteed Ret., Inc.*, 112 B.R. 263, 273 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1990), *aff'd*, 119 B.R. 149 (N.D. Ill. 1990) (recognizing that while no particular type of financial distress is required for a filing, "if the debtor's business could continue unimpaired, without a bankruptcy filing, a creditor whose rights are impacted by the filing has 'cause' for relief, independent of the other factors listed in the decisions on good faith in filing").

> 169 (3d Cir. 1999)], the specter of "abuse which must be guarded against to protect the integrity of the bankruptcy system." [Ex. A at 54 n.19.]

7. Even more egregious tactical forum shopping is present here. The record leaves no room for doubt that the Debtors, who seemingly answer only to 3M, filed a petition for relief to use "the tools of bankruptcy" to try to force an unfavorable outcome on CAEv2 claimants to the benefit of 3M, under the guise of "efficiency" and purported equitable treatment. Seventh Circuit law has recognized such conduct as a basis for dismissal of bankruptcy cases for upwards of 80 years. *See In re Cook*, 104 F.2d 981, 985 (7th Cir. 1939) (dismissing petition filed "to escape the jurisdiction of another court where the day of reckoning … was at hand"). And absent the consent of a super-majority of CAEv2 claimants, there would simply be no possible path to reorganization, which would further warrant dismissal. To the extent the Court deems it necessary to go beyond the dispositive analysis in *LTL*, dismissal of these cases as an improper litigation tactic is also amply warranted.

* * *

8. At one point during the trial on the Debtors' preliminary injunction motion, the Court remarked that it "would be really nifty if LTL's appeal were actually decided." Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 45:21-22. The *LTL* decision ultimately came roughly five months after this Court denied the Debtors' request for injunctive relief, but the Third Circuit's analysis in *LTL* dovetails perfectly with the facts adduced at trial and the findings this Court made in the PI Order, including but not limited to the Funding Agreement. The same facts and analysis are also dispositive as to the Debtors' entitlement to be in bankruptcy at all.

II. BACKGROUND

A. 3M's CAEv2 Liability, Dissatisfaction with the MDL, and Attempt to Forum Shop

9. The CAEv2 tort litigation was sparked by a *qui tam* action styled *United States ex rel. Moldex-Metric, Inc. v. 3M Company*, Case No. 16-1533 (D.S.C. May 12, 2016), which alleged that 3M defrauded the United States military by knowingly concealing defects in the earplugs it manufactured and sold to the government. 3M settled the *qui tam* action with the United States for over $9 million paid only by 3M. Private personal-injury litigation followed. One of the first suits, filed in December 2018, named 3M and "Doe" defendants (not Aearo), and alleged that 3M's defective CAEv2 earplugs caused hearing loss and tinnitus. Ex. 71. Hundreds of veterans with similar injuries sued soon after. Facing suits nationwide, 3M supported centralization through the MDL process and on April 3, 2019, the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation consolidated the actions before the MDL court. MDL D.I. 1. Similar lawsuits have been consolidated in Minnesota. PI Order at 5.

10. For the next three and a half years, 3M – and only 3M – vigorously litigated the MDL: "negotiating for governing procedural and logistical rules; engaging in common corporate, military, and expert discovery, as well as case-specific discovery for 19 bellwether plaintiffs; completing case-specific discovery and dispositive motions practice for 374 Wave 1 cases; and extensively briefing (and orally arguing, as appropriate) issues ranging from the applicability of the federal officer removal statute (as to certain claims) and the federal government contractor defense (as to all design defect and failure to warn claims) to more than 260 motions in limine, 109 *Daubert* challenges, 42 case-specific summary judgment motions, 47 choice of law disputes, and 21 post-trial motions," among other issues. MDL D.I. 3610. 3M used the MDL process to its advantage, but ultimately faced a number of litigation setbacks that left it dissatisfied.

11. In July 2020, the MDL court ruled against 3M on the government contractor defense. MDL D.I. 1280. That ruling is currently on appeal before the Eleventh Circuit and the appeal is proceeding with relief from stay. Bankr. D.I. 548. The MDL court also adopted a bellwether process that resulted in 16 trials,[11] encompassing 19 plaintiffs before nine different trial judges. Adv. D.I. 122 ¶¶ 36–37, 125. The verdicts, the first of which was reached in April 2021, have been decidedly in plaintiffs' favor, with 13 plaintiff verdicts and six defense verdicts. *Id.* By March 2022, the majority of the bellwether trials in the MDL had concluded, and the MDL court had commenced issuing "wave orders" returning 1,500 cases (Waves 1 through 3) to the district courts in which they were originally filed. Aug. 16 Hr'g Tr. 181:19–24.

12. Faced with these litigation setbacks, in March 2022, 3M General Counsel Kevin Rhodes assembled a team of 3M executives to work on "Project Crane," to explore "strategic alternatives to managing 3M's litigation." Aug. 16 Hr'g Tr. 179:15–181:17, 185:4–11; Ex. GF (July 23, 2022 Board minutes at 7). Minutes from a 3M board meeting reveal that Project Crane served as 3M's "liability risk management" strategy with respect to the CAEv2 litigation. Ex. GF (May 9–10, 2022 3M Board minutes at 6–7).

13. On July 22, 2022, 3M's Board received "an update on MDL court-order mediation and settlement discussions." Ex. GF (July 22, 2022 3M Board minutes at 2); Aug. 16 Hr'g Tr. 184:3–17. The next day, on July 23, 2022, 3M's Board received a presentation on "potential subsidiary chapter 11 proceedings," a "potential funding and indemnification agreement," and the sufficiency of "$1 billion in trust funding." Ex. GF (July 23, 2022 3M Board minutes at 8); Aug.16 Hr'g Tr. 185:12–16. At the meeting, 3M's board resolved to empower an authorized 3M signatory

[11] 3M selected nine cases, plaintiffs selected nine cases, and the MDL court selected seven cases. Adv. D.I. 122 ¶ 30.

to execute the Funding Agreement. Ex. GF (July 23 3M Board minutes at 14–16); Aug. 16 Hr'g Tr. 184:18–185:23. The 3M board resolution indicates that, by July 23, 2022, the 3M board had determined that the MDL had "not provided a pathway to" resolving the CAEv2 litigation and had "determined that [3M] should instead seek to resolve the claims [including those asserted against 3M] *through* a chapter 11 process of the Aearo Entities." Ex. GF (July 23 3M Board minutes at 15 (emphasis added)). The Funding Agreement was drafted initially by Kirkland & Ellis at the request of 3M (not the Debtors) as part of Project Crane's objective of furthering 3M's "liability risk management" of CAEv2 litigation. Exs. AG, GF.

14. The Debtors and 3M entered into the Funding Agreement on July 25, 2022, one day before the petition date. Ex. 2. Mr. Dai signed for 3M and Mr. Stein signed for the Debtors. Ex. 2.[12] The Funding Agreement provides uncapped funding, whether in bankruptcy or outside of bankruptcy, to pay all of the Debtors' liabilities (including, without limitation, liabilities for CAEv2 claims)[13] whenever the Debtors' assets or income are ***or are projected to be*** insufficient, in exchange for the Debtors assuming the obligation to indemnify 3M for payments made under the Funding Agreement. Ex. 2 at 6–7, 9–10 (definition of "Permitted Funding" and §2). The Funding Agreement's definition of "Commitment" expressly states "the Commitment does not serve as a cap on [3M's] funding obligations or otherwise limit [3M's] Payments under the terms of this Agreement." Ex. 2 at 4. 3M also fully funds any indemnification obligations that the Debtors may owe to 3M under the Funding Agreement. Ex. 2 at 7 (Permitted Funding Use at (c)).

---

[12] Mr. Stein and Roger Meltzer, the other independent director on the board of the Debtors, determined that the Funding Agreement raised a "conflict" with 3M and, as a result, only they had the corporate authority to bind the Debtors to the Funding Agreement. Aug. 16 Tr. at 215:5–20.

[13] The Funding Agreement further provides that 3M will fully fund administrative expenses in the bankruptcy cases and any professional fees the Debtors may incur ancillary to the CAEv2 earplug liabilities. Ex. 2 at 6 (Permitted Funding Use at (a) & (b)(iv)).

Stated differently, if 3M asserts an indemnity claim against the Debtors, the Debtors are entitled to have 3M pay the Debtors in order to satisfy the indemnity owed to 3M. PI Order at 9–11.

15. The stated purpose of these cases was to "permanently protect the Debtors and 3M from further [CAEv2] claims," First Day Decl. ¶ 51, and to find an alternative liability resolution strategy to the CAEv2 litigation. *See* PI Order at 7 (the Debtors pursued bankruptcy as a "strategic alternative[] to the MDL"). In the Debtors' first day filings and at their first day hearing, the Debtors excoriated the MDL court as "out-of-control" and "broken." The Debtors' counsel stated on the record: "I don't think that there's a single MDL in history that is as broken as this one is. … I am blaming the district judge, … the heart of our problem comes out of her court." July 27 Hr'g Tr. 38:23–24, 39:20–23, 42:20–43:2. Counsel then explained the timing of the bankruptcy filing: "Judge Rodgers … is about to remand thousands of cases back …. So the out-of-control docket now becomes an out-of-control remand docket." July 27 Hr'g Tr. 43:3–9. The Debtors' informational brief criticized the MDL court for a "frenetic bellwether cadence," "gutted defenses," and "tainted ... trials," decrying the MDL as "a recent and extreme example of the systemic shortcomings of traditional litigation." Info. Br. 43 & 52. The Debtors' first day declaration likewise disparaged the MDL as "unmanageable." First Day Decl. ¶ 38.

16. Soon thereafter, the MDL court observed "it seems to me that the funding and the indemnity agreement were structured for the sole purpose of resolving 3M's liability in bankruptcy as opposed to under this Court's jurisdiction rather than to validly reorganize Aearo." MDL Aug. 11 Hr'g Tr. 27:12–17. More recently, the MDL court sanctioned 3M for its "[c]ontumacious conduct and bad faith tactics" in "devis[ing] a scheme to oust the Congressionally-established system for resolving mass tort disputes in Article III courts and install its new favored forum (for the moment, anyway), an Article I court, at the helm." MDL D.I. 3610 at 1 & 7. After recounting

how 3M supported centralization in the MDL and voluntarily participated in those proceedings for years, the MDL court concluded on the ample record before it that 3M put the Debtors into bankruptcy "[n]ot because any of the entities was facing a *bona fide* threat of financial distress, and not due to managerial or operational difficulties that were jeopardizing the entities' continued viability," but rather because of "good old-fashioned forum shopping, solely – and admittedly – designed to evade dissatisfactory legal rulings and verdicts in the MDL, and to avoid potential future liability of a *non-debtor*, 3M, in the tort system." *Id.* at 7–8. The MDL court went on:

> 3M itself was not willing to pay the price of admission to an Article I forum – here, reorganization and submission to the oversight of the bankruptcy court. Not to be denied, the company hatched a workaround. Aearo would file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection but seek an extension of the statutory automatic stay of litigation to 3M, who would never file a bankruptcy petition itself.… Aearo would be recast as the "real-party defendant" when it comes to CAEv2 claims…. If successful, 3M would reap all the benefits of bankruptcy with none of the attendant burdens.

Id. at 8–9. In the face of this "brazen abuse of the litigation process" and "bad faith," the MDL court sanctioned 3M by precluding it "from attempting to avoid any portion of its alleged liability for the CAEv2 claims in this litigation by shifting blame to the Aearo defendants, as a sanction for the company's explicit statements and conduct establishing itself as the sole responsible party for nearly four years in the MDL and its bad faith reversal of that position solely to serve its strategic objectives in bankruptcy."[14] *Id.* at 10, 17 & 21.

[14] This litigation posture now accords with the facts: 3M manufactured, marketed, sold, and distributed the CAEv2 earplugs; 3M fraudulently concealed the product's defects from the U.S. military and the servicemembers who relied on the earplug to keep them safe; 3M silently pulled the product from the market without disclosing its defects; and 3M paid millions to settle the *qui tam* allegations of its fraudulent conduct. In short, 3M is the "real party defendant" here who is responsible for the harms alleged in the CAEv2 litigation.

B. The Debtors Are Operationally Sound and Have No Need to Reorganize

17. The Debtors operate an approximately $100 million business "sitting inside of a $35 billion conglomerate." Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 58:14–13. In addition to their own products, the Debtors produce products (but not any CAEv2 earplugs) for 3M, resulting in an additional $25 million a year in revenue. Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 61:11–14. The Debtors generate approximately $15 million to $20 million in cash flow. 3M acquired the Debtors in 2008 and "upstreamed" its Head, Eye, Ear, Hearing, and Face Safety business, which includes the manufacturing, marketing, and selling of CAEv2 earplugs, to 3M in 2010. PI Order at 4. That upstream generated a receivable on the Debtors' books of approximately $965 million that, as of the petition date, remained unpaid by 3M and was available to pay the totality of all adverse verdicts, plus legal fees, in the CAEv2 litigation at that time, even if the Debtors had been called upon to pay such amounts (which they had not). *Id.*

18. As of the petition date, the ongoing CAEv2 litigation had no impact on the Debtors' business. Chief Restructuring Officer John Castellano testified that the Debtors are operationally healthy and that but for tort liabilities, the Debtors "wouldn't have any reason to seek bankruptcy protection." Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 154:19–155:11. No employee of the Debtors or of the Debtors' non-debtor subsidiaries testified at any trial or deposition in the CAEv2 litigation or had to collect or review documents in connection with the litigation. Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 165:16–166:25. This Court found no evidence of workforce distraction or managerial difficulties, PI Order at 34–35, and 3M continues to provide services to the Debtors under the Shared Services Agreement. Aug. 15 Hr'g Tr. 162:16–23. No exigent circumstances led to the filing of these cases or the preliminary injunction motion. Aug. 17 Hr'g Tr. 62:1–4. Indeed, excluding the costs of administering these cases, the Debtors have remained profitable during the pendency of the bankruptcy. *See, e.g.*, Bankr. D.I. 948 & 1025 (November & December MORs).

19. By virtue of the Funding Agreement, the Debtors ultimately face no risk from the CAEv2 litigation. The Funding Agreement requires 3M to fund a request for payment of CAEv2 liabilities if the Debtors' assets are "***or are projected to be*** … insufficient to pay or satisfy such Liabilities or amounts in full and otherwise maintain the Minimum Balance," which is defined as $5 million cash on hand held, in the aggregate, by the Debtors. Ex. 2 at 7 & 8 (emphasis added). As the testimony at the preliminary injunction hearing confirmed, and as the Court found in the PI Order, this provision converts the definition of "Permitted Funding Use" from an actual requirement that the Debtors liquidate themselves into a mathematical exercise: the Debtors' assets can safely be "projected to be" less than any measure of 3M's multi-billion-dollar CAEv2 liabilities – and that fact can be readily ascertained without interrupting the Debtors' cash flow or liquidating the Debtors' assets. Aug. 16 Hr'g Tr. 275:19–23.

20. In short, the funds necessary to operate the Debtors' financially healthy operations (which no longer have anything to do with earplugs) are in no way put at risk by the claims asserted in the CAEv2 litigation. Rather, 3M is contractually obligated and financially able to furnish the funds necessary to pay creditor claims in these cases. The Funding Agreement is thus accurate in its recitation that "each of the [Debtors] will have assets with a value greater than its Liabilities and will have financial capacity to satisfy its obligations as they become due in the ordinary course of its business, including with respect to any [CAEv2 liabilities]." Ex. 2 at 2.

21. The financial strength of the Debtors' parent company, 3M, is likewise undisputed. 3M is a Fortune 500 company and the maker of some of the most ubiquitous and well-known products in the world, including Scotch® tape and Post-it® notes. Ex. GL at 5. As this Court found, "[t]he evidence that Aearo … presented in support of the PI Motion emphasizes that 3M is more than able to honor the Funding Agreement, even if the [CAEv2 litigation] proceed[s]." PI

Order at 34; *see also id.* at 34 n.16 (noting that the Debtors "provid[ed] evidence to establish that 3M has more than enough financial wherewithal to honor the Funding Agreement"). That evidence included, among other things, the testimony of the Debtors' independent director that negotiations over the Funding Agreement considered 3M's financial wherewithal and viability, and that the independent directors concluded, after thorough investigation, that 3M was a viable funding source. Aug. 16 Tr. 229:20–231:11, 238:7–22; Ex. 142 (July 14, 2022 Board minutes with presentation on "the strong financial position of 3M" after Healthcare Group spinoff).

22. 3M touts a "strong" "liquidity profile" and "credit profile" in its securities filings. According to SEC filings as of year-end 2021, 3M has an A1 credit rating from Moody's and an A+ from Standard & Poor's, net sales of over $35 billion, and free cash flow of over $5.8 billion. Ex. GL at 13, 39, 45. Over the past three years 3M has distributed more than $13 billion to its shareholders in the form of dividends and share buybacks. And on the same day 3M caused the commencement of these bankruptcy cases, 3M announced a planned spinoff of its healthcare business. By way of comparison, the $347 million that 3M had expended on litigation defense costs, even when coupled with the amount of total adverse verdicts (less than $300 million excluding interest), which 3M was actively appealing or from which it was seeking post-trial relief, is merely a fraction of what 3M expends annually on dividend payments and share buy-backs. Aug. 16, 2022 Hr'g Tr. 186:17–187:1 (total of all fees and expenses incurred in defense of CAEv2 amounts to $347 million); MDL D.I. 3610 at 7 (noting jury verdicts "totaling nearly $300,000,000"); Form 8-K, 3M Company (January 24, 2023) at 4 (stating that "3M returned $4.8 billion to shareholders via dividends and gross share repurchases" in the last year).

23. Finally, when the CAE Committee sought discovery with respect to 3M's ability to honor its commitments under the Funding Agreement, both 3M and the Debtors refused to produce

responsive materials. They asserted that 3M's financial capacity "is neither relevant nor necessary given [CAEv2 claimants'] position at the hearing on the Debtors' Preliminary Injunction Motion and the particular issues in these cases." 3M's Responses to the CAE Committee's December 13, 2022 Priority Requests, at ¶ 3; Debtors' Responses to the CAE Committee's December 13, 2022 Priority Requests, at ¶ 3. Thus, by both the Debtors' and 3M's own telling, 3M's financial wherewithal is undisputed.

III. GOOD FAITH STANDARD

24. Bankruptcy cases are subject to dismissal for "cause," subject to limited exceptions not relevant here:

> Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (c), on request of a party in interest, and after notice and a hearing, the court shall convert a case under this chapter to a case under chapter 7 or dismiss a case under this chapter, whichever is in the best interests of creditors and the estate, for cause unless the court determines that the appointment under section 1104(a) of a trustee or an examiner is in the best interests of creditors and the estate.

11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)(1). That is true regardless of whether a debtor has filed a plan or has reached the end of its exclusivity period. *In re Woodbrook Assocs.*, 19 F.3d 312, 317 (7th Cir. 1994) ("A Chapter 11 case can be dismissed at any time.").

25. The Bankruptcy Code enumerates certain specific examples of cause, but these statutory examples are not exclusive, and courts uniformly hold that the absence of good faith is cause for dismissal. *See, e.g.*, *In re Madison Hotel Assocs.*, 749 F.2d 410, 426 (7th Cir. 1984) ("It is generally recognized that 'good faith' is a threshold prerequisite to securing Chapter 11 relief, and that the lack of such good faith constitutes 'cause,' sufficient for dismissal under 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)."); *In re Castleton Assocs. Ltd. P'Ship*, 109 B.R. 347, 349–50 (Bankr. S.D. Ind. 1989) (same). A lack of good faith does not require a finding of subjective bad faith, malfeasance, or intentional abuse. *See, e.g.*, *In re Grieshop*, 63 B.R. 657, 663 (N.D. Ind. 1986) (dismissal even

where debtor was not "motivated by ill will"). Rather, good faith centers on whether the case was filed to achieve "a legitimate reorganization objective within the scope of the Bankruptcy Code," rather than for "tactical reasons unrelated to reorganization." *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 828. *See also supra* n.7 (quoting the Ninth Circuit's decision in *In re Marsch*, 36 F.3d 825, to the same effect).

26. *LTL* is the most recent reaffirmation and most directly applicable exposition of the good faith inquiry. In it, the Third Circuit characterized the test as consisting of two distinct questions:

- Whether the petition serves a valid bankruptcy purpose, which requires that the debtor is in some degree of "financial distress"; and
- Whether the bankruptcy was "filed merely to obtain a tactical litigation advantage."

Ex. A at 34 (citing, *inter alia*, *In re Integrated Telecom Express, Inc.*, 384 F.3d 108, 128 (3d Cir. 2004)). *LTL* makes clear that the debtors themselves (not any non-debtors) are the proper focus, *see id*. at 43–45, and the relevant timeframe is the date the petition was filed, *see id*. at 46–54. *See also supra* nn. 8–9 (discussing these aspects of *LTL* in greater detail).

27. The Third Circuit's case law is well-developed on the topic of good faith and is fully consistent with Seventh Circuit law. *See generally In re N.R. Guaranteed Ret.*, 112 B.R. at 272 (explaining the development of case law in this area).[15] Courts in the Seventh Circuit agree that financial distress is a critical element of a good faith filing and an independent ground for

[15] Although some lower courts in the Seventh Circuit have set out multi-factor tests with respect to good faith, these exercises are "neither exhaustive nor mandatory," *In re Lake Michigan Beach Pottawattamie Resort LLC*, 547 B.R. 899, 905 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2016), and in general are of little use. *See, e.g.*, *Marrs v. Motorola, Inc.*, 577 F.3d 783, 788 (7th Cir. 2009) ("Multifactor tests with no weight assigned to any factor are bad enough from the standpoint of providing an objective basis for a judicial decision; multifactor tests when none of the factors is concrete are worse.").

dismissal,[16] and that a bankruptcy case filed merely to gain a tactical litigation advantage is subject to dismissal.[17] Indeed, with respect to the latter point, the Seventh Circuit's decision in *In re Cook* is particularly pointed in holding that a bankruptcy filing cannot properly be used to "escape the jurisdiction of another court." 104 F.2d at 985. All of this is consistent with case law from other Circuits.[18]

---

[16] *See id*. at 272-73; *In re Tekena USA, LLC*, 419 B.R. 341, 349 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2009); *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 830; *In re MGN Co., III*, 116 B.R. 654, 658 (Bankr. S.D. Ind. 1989); *In re Scheffler*, 86 B.R. at 579; *In re Collins*, 250 B.R. 645, 657-58 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2000).

[17] *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 830, 835 (dismissal is proper where a bankruptcy is "merely being used as a tactic to delay pursuit of [creditors'] rights," including to frustrate collection of a judgment, collaterally attack a judgment, or "shop for a more favorable forum"); *In re Cap. Equity Land Tr. No. 2140215*, 646 B.R. 463, 477 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2022) (dismissing case "filed in response to the state court tax sale proceeding" as a "litigation tactic"); *In re Posner*, 610 B.R. 586 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2019) ("Filing bankruptcy to circumvent pending litigation is an indication of bad faith.").

[18] *See*, *e.g.*, *In re Premier Auto. Servs., Inc.*, 492 F.3d 274, 280-81 (4th Cir. 2007) (affirming dismissal of chapter 11 petition as a bad faith filing where the debtor was not "experiencing financial difficulties" and filed to gain a litigation advantage over an adversary); *In re Cedar Shore Resort, Inc.*, 235 F.3d 375, 377-81 (8th Cir. 2000) (affirming bad faith dismissal of chapter 11 petition where debtor had already solved its financial problems and filed for the sole purpose of disposing of shareholders' lawsuit); *In re Marsch*, 36 F.3d at 828-29 (dismissal of chapter 11 petition for cause was proper where the debtor had the financial means to pay its debts and petition was filed as a litigation tactic); *Furness v. Lilienfield*, 35 B.R. 1006, 1013 (D. Md. 1983) ("The Bankruptcy provisions are intended to benefit those in genuine financial distress. They are not intended to be used as a mechanism to orchestrate pending litigation."); *In re HBA East, Inc.*, 87 B.R. 248, 259–60 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1988) ("As a general rule where, as here, the timing of the filing of a Chapter 11 petition is such that there can be no doubt that the primary, if not sole, purpose of the filing was a litigation tactic, the petition may be dismissed as not being filed in good faith."); *In re Moog*, 159 B.R. 357, 361 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 1993) (explaining that "if the timing of the filing [of the petition] is such that the court concludes that the primary, if not sole purpose, of the filing was litigation tactic, the petition may be dismissed and that "frustrating the legitimate processes of a non-bankruptcy forum" is inconsistent with congressional intent of the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Karum Grp., Inc.*, 66 B.R. 436 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 1986) (case dismissed where debtor filed as a litigation tactic to avoid posting supersedeas bond); *In re Golden Ocala P'ship*, 50 B.R. 552 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1985) (chapter 11 not designed to resolve internal fights between feuding shareholders); *In re Ofty Corp.*, 44 B.R. 479 (Bankr. D. Del. 1984) (bankruptcy case filed to circumvent liquidation orders in state court dismissed as a bad faith filing); *In re Wally Findlay Galleries (N.Y.) Inc.*, 36 B.R. 849 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984) (bankruptcy case dismissed where intent was to relitigate rather than to reorganize).

IV. ARGUMENT

A. The Debtors Were Not, Are Not, and Cannot Be In Financial Distress

28. A "valid bankruptcy purpose" includes preserving a going concern or maximizing the value of a debtor's estate, and, importantly, it "assumes a debtor in financial distress." *LTL* [Ex. A] at 34. Case law in the Seventh Circuit and around the country is clear that the "most basic" ground "for dismissal of a Chapter 11 case is that the filing is unnecessary." *In re N.R. Guaranteed Retirement*, 112 B.R. at 272. The presence of this element is outcome determinative and establishes cause for dismissal "independent" of whether the movant can establish the other factors discussed in the case law. *Id*. at 273.

29. For example, the debtor in *LTL* faced "massive" tort liabilities and was party to a pre-bankruptcy agreement pursuant to which the costs of the debtor's bankruptcy case and payment of creditors' claims were backstopped by a funding commitment from a non-debtor affiliate. *LTL* [Ex. A] at 45–54. Because the debtor had "a funding backstop, not unlike an ATM disguised as a contract, that it can draw on to pay liabilities without any disruption to its business or threat to its financial viability," the court concluded that the debtor "was not in financial distress" and thus its bankruptcy case was subject to dismissal. *Id.* at 52–54. The court observed that J&J's "triple A-rated payment obligation for LTL's liabilities … weakened LTL's case to be in bankruptcy," because "the bigger a backstop a parent company provides a subsidiary, the less fit that subsidiary is to file." *Id.* at 55.

30. Just as in *LTL*, the Debtors in these cases were, at the time of the bankruptcy filing, "highly solvent with access to cash to meet comfortably [their] liabilities as they [come] due for the foreseeable future," including by virtue of the "funding backstop" provided by their highly profitable non-debtor parent, 3M. *LTL* [Ex. A] 51. These cases do not involve a trade-off between maximizing the value of assets necessary to support the Debtors' operations versus funding

creditors' claims. Rather, by virtue of 3M's uncapped, non-recourse commitment under the Funding Agreement, 3M is contractually obligated (and financially able) to backstop payment of allowed creditor claims in full without any risk to the operation of the Debtors' financially healthy businesses, whether the Debtors are in bankruptcy or not. In other words, "the debtor's business could continue unimpaired, without a bankruptcy filing," *In re Local Union 722*, 414 B.R. at 450, and these bankruptcy cases are "merely being used as a tactic to delay" the pursuit of "creditors' nonbankruptcy collection rights … without any offsetting benefits to the creditor body." *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 830; *cf.* Aug. 17 Hr'g Tr. 58:8–59:25 (Mr. Stein's testimony that subsection (b)(i) of the definition of "Permitted Funding Use" in the Funding Agreement "provides significant flexibility in relation to considering alternate paths to resolve the claims," which is only available outside of bankruptcy).

31. Moreover, the mass tort litigation the Debtors faced as of the Petition Date, even while voluminous and mounting, had not caused the kind of immediate financial distress to the Debtors (or even to 3M for that matter) for which the invocation of bankruptcy protection is made in good faith. In *LTL*, the Third Circuit observed that "[f]inancial distress must not only be apparent, but it must be immediate enough to justify a filing." *LTL* [Ex. A] at 39. "[A]n attenuated possibility standing alone that a debtor may have to file for bankruptcy in the future does not establish good faith." *Id.* The court explained:

> Risks associated with premature filing may be particularly relevant in the context of a mass tort bankruptcy. Inevitably those cases will involve a bankruptcy court estimating claims on a great scale – introducing the possibility of undervaluing future claims (and underfunding assets left to satisfy them) and the difficulty of fairly compensating claimants with wide-ranging degrees of exposure and injury. On the other hand, a longer history of litigation outside of bankruptcy may provide a court with better guideposts when tackling these issues. [*Id.* at 40.]

32. These risks at the are forefront here. While the Debtors invoke bankruptcy to (under)estimate the totality of all CAEv2 claims, as of the petition date, the Debtors had not paid a single penny in CAEv2 litigation expense or liability; the 16 adverse bellwether verdicts had all been appealed (and were bonded by 3M alone); even if the verdicts are affirmed and (in a change of *status quo*) collected from the Debtors, the Debtors had a near $1 billion receivable from 3M sufficient to pay them in full; and the Debtors were under zero operational and financial pressure as a result of the litigation. In short, just like *LTL*, the Debtors' bankruptcy filing was made without any immediate financial distress, thereby raising all of the concerns of a premature filing against which the Third Circuit cautioned in *LTL*.

33. No amount of subjective good faith can save a petition filed by an entity not in financial distress. Thus, any professed belief by the Debtors or 3M that bankruptcy is a more efficient forum to resolve CAEv2 claims, even if sincere, "is not enough" and "cannot displace the rule that resort to Chapter 11 is appropriate only for entities facing financial distress." *LTL* [Ex. A] at 56. "This safeguard ensures that claimants' pre-bankruptcy remedies – here, the chance to prove to a jury of their peers injuries claimed by a [defective] product – are disrupted only when necessary." *Id.* What matters is the objective fact that the contingent tort liabilities in question are fully backstopped by 3M's uncapped, nonrecourse funding commitment. Those liabilities cannot serve to justify the filing of these cases by admittedly financially healthy entities.

34. It is difficult to imagine a more directly on-point decision than *LTL*. Indeed, in virtually every instance the names "LTL" and "J&J" could simply be replaced with "Aearo" and "3M" and the analysis would line up perfectly. To the extent there are differences, they either militate more strongly in favor of dismissal (*e.g.*, J&J's funding obligation in *LTL* was capped at $61.5 billion, whereas 3M's funding obligation here is uncapped), or they are irrelevant (*e.g.*, the

fact that the Debtors operate a business – albeit one that has nothing to do with earplugs, whereas the debtor in *LTL* at most was the owner of a passive royalty stream). The material facts are the same, and thus the result – dismissal – should be the same as well.

B. The Bankruptcy Was Filed To Secure A Tactical Litigation Advantage

35. Bankruptcy cases are also subject to dismissal when they are used as mere litigation tactics. Courts ask whether a putative reorganization is merely "a mechanism to orchestrate pending litigation," *In re Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 120, an effort "to distribute value directly from a creditor to a company's shareholders," *id*. at 129, or "primarily [about] protecting" non-debtors, such as a corporate parent, "from liability in pending litigations," *BEPCO*, 589 F.3d at 608 & 624 – none of which are valid reorganizational aims. Regardless of the particular language used, the fundamental principle is that a debtor cannot use bankruptcy for "tactical reasons unrelated to reorganization," *In re Tekena USA* 419 B.R. at 349, including (as particularly relevant here) to "pressure [litigation] plaintiffs to accept the company's settlement terms," *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 167, or "to escape the jurisdiction of another court where the day of reckoning for … acts of misconduct was at hand," *In re Cook*, 104 F.2d at 985.

36. Lack of financial distress is often closely related to the use of bankruptcy as a mere litigation tactic. As one court from within this Circuit has explained:

> A truly unnecessary Chapter 11 case imposes improper burdens both on creditors and on the bankruptcy system. The creditors are arbitrarily required to accept rights in bankruptcy in place of their … rights under non-bankruptcy law (at the very least, the automatic stay is imposed upon them), and the bankruptcy system is required to waste its resources, possibly interfering with the processes of other court systems.

In re N.R. Guaranteed Ret., 112 B.R. at 272. The factors are related because "the more that the bankruptcy case appears to be a forum-shopping attempt" for non-bankruptcy litigation, the less the debtor has a legitimate "need for the type of bankruptcy relief contemplated by the Bankruptcy

Code." *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 832. As such, bankruptcy cases that are filed to "collaterally attack" the judgments of other courts and "shop for a more favorable forum" should be dismissed because they are aimed at obtaining a tactical advantage in non-bankruptcy litigation, as opposed to pursuing a legitimate need to reorganize. *Id.* at 835; *see also id.* at 833 ("A desire to avoid paying a disputed debt that [a debtor] is capable of satisfying," without imperiling the debtor's business operations is not sufficient to demonstrate a legitimate need for bankruptcy.).

37. The record here – including the Debtors' own statements and filings – compels the conclusion that 3M instigated these bankruptcy cases to change forums and escape adverse rulings by the MDL court, as well as to trigger a stay of non-bankruptcy litigation against non-debtor 3M (a request made concurrently with the filing of the petitions, but ultimately denied by the PI Order) and disadvantage CAEv2 claimants in that litigation.[19] *Cf. In re Cook*, 104 F.2d at 985; *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 835; *In re N.R. Guaranteed Retirement*, 112 B.R. at 272. The bankruptcy filing was "good old-fashioned forum shopping, solely – and admittedly – designed to evade dissatisfactory legal rulings and verdicts in the MDL," as the MDL court explained. The Funding Agreement was structured to resolve non-debtor 3M's liability in bankruptcy as opposed to under the MDL court's jurisdiction; it has no other purpose. *See also* PI Order at 7 (the Debtors pursued bankruptcy as a "strategic alternative[] to the MDL"); Aug. 17 Hr'g Tr. 129:12–15 (rejecting notion that the Bankruptcy Court be "the watchdog of the federal judiciary").

[19] As this Court has emphasized, support of the CAEv2 claimants will be essential for confirming any plan in these cases. Nov. 10 Hr'g Tr. 17:7–11 ("[I]mportantly, such a plan … to be confirmed would need a super majority of support from creditors, meaning that most creditors would actually be agreeing to the proposed channeling injunction and release.") & 22:7–16 (admonishing that dismissal of the case for bad faith will be available should the bankruptcy become a stall tactic rather than a vehicle for resolution of claims).

38. *SGL Carbon* is instructive. There, the court considered whether a chapter 11 bankruptcy "filed by a financially healthy company in the face of potentially significant civil antitrust liability" should be dismissed as a bad faith filing under section 1112(b) and concluded under the above-cited standards that such a filing "lacks a valid reorganizational purpose and, therefore, lacks the requisite good faith." 200 F.3d at 156. As here, there was "no serious evidence" that any claimed distraction from the litigation "posed a 'serious threat' to the company's operational well being," and "the company was financially healthy at the time of the filing." *Id.* at 162–63. Rather than filing to effectuate a legitimate reorganization, this record compelled the conclusion that the debtor filed for bankruptcy "to put pressure on [litigation] plaintiffs to accept the company's settlement terms" and "to gain tactical litigation advantages." *Id.* at 167. The court concluded such a filing "lacks a valid reorganizational purpose and consequently lacks good faith making it subject to dismissal 'for cause' under 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)." *Id.* at 169.

39. Presciently, the *SGL Carbon* court observed that "the Bankruptcy Code presents an inviting safe harbor" for companies "that face massive potential liability and litigation costs … to rapidly conclude litigation [and] enable a continuation of their business." *Id*. The court cautioned that "this lure creates the possibility of abuse which must be guarded against to protect the integrity of the bankruptcy system and the rights of all involved in such proceedings." *Id.* The Debtors' bankruptcy cases are the very type of misuse of process warned about in *SGL Carbon*. They are aimed at obtaining a tactical advantage in non-bankruptcy litigation, as opposed to pursuing a legitimate need to reorganize. *In re Liptak*, 304 B.R. at 835. At bottom, 3M's mere "desire to avoid paying a disputed debt" that it is fully "capable of satisfying," *id*. at 833, is a misuse of this Court's jurisdiction, and these cases should be dismissed as such.

V. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons set forth above, these bankruptcy cases should be dismissed.

Dated: February 3, 2023
Indianapolis, Indiana

Respectfully submitted,

RUBIN & LEVIN, P.C.

/s/ Meredith R. Theisen

Deborah J. Caruso
Meredith R. Theisen
135 N. Pennsylvania St., Suite 1400
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Tel: (317) 634-0300
Fax: (317) 263-9411
Email: dcaruso@rubin-levin.net
mtheisen@rubin-levin.net

Indiana Counsel for the CAE Committee

KTBS LAW LLP

/s/ Michael L. Tuchin

Michael L. Tuchin (*pro hac vice*)
Robert J. Pfister
Sasha M. Gurvitz (*pro hac vice*)
Nir Maoz (*pro hac vice*)
1801 Century Park East, 26th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 407-4000
Fax: (310) 407-9090

OTTERBOURG P.C.

/s/ Melanie L. Cyganowski

Melanie L. Cyganowski (*pro hac vice*)
Adam C. Silverstein (*pro hac vice*)
Jennifer S. Feeney (*pro hac vice*)
Pauline McTernan (*pro hac vice*)
230 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10169
Tel: (212) 661-9100
Fax: (212) 682-6104

Co-Lead Counsel for the CAE Committee

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

/s/ David J. Molton

David J. Molton (*pro hac vice*)
Jeffrey L. Jonas (*pro hac vice*)
Seven Times Square
New York, NY 10036
Tel: (212) 209-4800
Fax: (212) 209-4801

Special Litigation Counsel for the CAE Committee

CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED

/s/ Kevin C. Maclay

Kevin C. Maclay (*pro hac vice*)
Todd E. Phillips (*pro hac vice*)
Kevin M. Davis (*pro hac vice*)
One Thomas Circle, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 862-5000
Fax: (202) 429-3301

Special Mass Tort and Negotiation Counsel for the CAE Committee

AYLSTOCK, WITKIN, KREIS & OVERHOLTZ, PLLC
/s/ Bryan F. Aylstock
Bryan F. Aylstock (*pro hac vice*)
Brad Bradford (*pro hac vice*)
Douglass A. Kreis
Jennifer M. Hoekstra (*pro hac vice*)
17 East Main Street, Suite 200
Pensacola, FL 32502
Tel: (850) 202-1010

Counsel to CAE Committee Co-Lead James Beal and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

SEEGER WEISS LLP
/s/ Christopher A. Seeger
Christopher A. Seeger (*pro hac vice*)
David R. Buchanan (*pro hac vice*)
Caleb A. Seeley(*pro hac vice*)
Maxwell H. Kelly (*pro hac vice*)
55 Challenger Road, 6th Floor
Ridgefield Park, New Jersey 07660
Tel: (973) 639-9100
Fax: (973) 679-8656

Counsel to CAE Committee Co-Lead LaShaunda Parker Freeman and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

THE GORI LAW FIRM
/s/ Beth Gori
Beth Gori
Evan Buxner
Sara M. Salger
156 N. Main St.
Edwardsville, IL 62025
Tel: (618) 659-9833

Counsel to CAE Committee Member Remi Beautiful Bald Eagle and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LAMINACK, PIRTLE & MARTINES
/s/ Thomas W. Pirtle
Thomas W. Pirtle
5020 Montrose Blvd., 9th Floor
Houston, TX 77006
Tel: (713) 292-2750

Counsel to CAE Committee Member Guillermo Camarillorazo and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN LLP
/s/Elizabeth Cabraser
Kenneth S. Byrd
Mark P. Chalos
Elizabeth Cabraser
Avery Halfon
222 Second Avenue South, Suite 1640
Nashville, TN 37201
Tel: (615) 313-9000

Counsel to CAE Committee Member William Darnell and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PARAFINCZUK WOLF, P.A.
/s/ Justin Parafinczuk
Justin Parafinczuk
Jason Wolf
Steve Resnick
Pembroke Pines Professional Centre
9050 Pines Blvd., Suite 450-02
Pembroke Pines, Florida 33024
Tel: (215) 431-8264

Counsel to CAE Committee Member Grayson Story and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

WEITZ AND LUXENBERG, PC
/s/ Lisa Nathanson Busch
Lisa Nathanson Busch (*pro hac vice*)
Justine Delaney
700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
Tel: (212) 558-5567

Counsel to CAE Committee Member Debra Weir and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PAUL LLP
/s/ Richard M. Paul II
Richard M. Paul II (*pro hac vice*)
Ashlea Schwarz (*pro hac vice*)
601 Walnut, Suite 300
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Tel: (816) 984-8100

Counsel to CAE Committee Member Grayson Story and Certain CAEv2 Claimants

CLARK LOVE & HUTSON, GP

/s/ Shelley Hutson
Shelley Hutson (*pro hac vice*)
Clayton Clark (*pro hac vice*)
Michael Moreland (*pro hac vice*)
440 Louisiana Street
Suite 1600
Houston, TX 77002
Tel: (713) 757-1400

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
/s/ Adam Wolfson
Adam Wolfson (*pro hac vice*)
Eric D. Winston (*pro hac vice*)
865 South Figueroa Street
10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 443-3000

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BAILEY GLASSER, LLP

/s/ David L. Selby, II
David L. Selby, II (*pro hac vice*)
Katherine Charonko
209 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Tel: (304) 345-6555

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BRYANT LAW CENTER MASS TORTS DIVISION, PSC
/s/ David G. Bryant
David G. Bryant
601 Washington Street
Paducah, KY 42003
Tel: (270) 442-1422

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LEVIN, PAPANTONIO, RAFFERTY, PROCTOR, BUCHANAN, O'BRIEN, BARR, & MOUGEY, P.A.
/s/ Brian Barr
Brian Barr
W. Troy Bouk
316 S. Baylen St., Suite 600
Pensacola, FL 32502
Tel: (850) 435-7155

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

GRANT & EISENHOFER, P.A.

/s/ Sindhu S. Daniel
Sindhu S. Daniel
123 Justison Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: (302) 622-7000

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

CIRESI CONLIN LLP

/s/ Michael A. Sacchet

Michael A. Sacchet
225 S. 6th St., Suite 4600
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 361-8220

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

ROGERS, PATRICK, WESTBROOK & BRICKMAN LLC

/s/ Elizabeth Middleton Burke

Elizabeth Middleton Burke
1037 Chuck Dawley Blvd., Bldg A
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464
Tel: (843) 727-6500

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

WILSON LAW, P.A.

/s/ Kimberly Wilson White

Kimberly Wilson White
434 Fayetteville St., Ste. 2060
Raleigh, NC 27601
Tel: (919) 890-0180

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

TRACEY & FOX LAW FIRM

/s/ Sean Tracey

Sean Tracey
440 Louisiana St., Suite 1901
Houston, TX 77002
Tel: (713) 495-2333

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

THOMAS J. HENRY LAW

/s/ Thomas J. Henry

Thomas J. Henry
5711 University Heights Blvd. #101
San Antonio, TX 78249
Tel: (210) 874-2615

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

THE CARLSON LAW FIRM

/s/ Ruth Rizkalla, Esq.

Ruth Rizkalla, Esq.
1500 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 500
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Tel: (800) 359-5690

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BAILEY COWAN HECKAMAN PLLC

/s/ K. Camp Bailey

K. Camp Bailey
Robert W. Cowan
Aaron M. Heckaman
Four Oaks Place
1360 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 2300
Houston, TX 77056
Tel: (713) 425-7100

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL, LLP

/s/ Thomas P. Cartmell

Thomas P. Cartmell
4740 Grand Ave., Suite 300
Kansas City, MO 64112
Tel: (816) 701-1100

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BEASLEY ALLEN

/s/ Leigh O'Dell

Leigh O'Dell
218 Commerce St
Montgomery, AL 36104
Tel: (334) 269-2343

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

SIMMONS HANLY CONROY

/s/ Daniel Blouin

Daniel Blouin
John Foley
Trent Miracle
One Court Street
Alton, IL 62002
Tel: (618) 259-2222

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PULASKI KHERKHER, PLLC
/s/ Steve Faries
Steve Faries
2925 Richmond Ave., Suite 1725
Houston, TX 77098
Tel: (713) 664-4555

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

CORNELL LAW, PLLC
/s/ Katherine L. Cornell
Katherine L. Cornell
5020 Montrose, 9th Floor
Houston, TX 77006
Tel: (713) 332-2785

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

JUNELL & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
/s/ Harris Junell
Harris Junell
Deborah K. Levy
Karen H. Beyea-Schroeder
3737 Buffalo Speedway, 18th Floor
Houston, Texas 77098
Tel: (713) 221-3750

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BURNETT LAW FIRM
/s/ Riley L. Burnett, Jr.
Riley L. Burnett, Jr.
3737 Buffalo Speedway, 18th Floor
Houston, Texas 77089
Tel: (832) 413-4410

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BLASINGAME, BURCH, GARRARD & ASHLEY, P.C.
/s/ Henry G. Garrard, III
Henry G. Garrard, III
Sara Schramm
440 College Ave., Suite 320
P.O. Box 832
Athens, GA 30603
Tel: (706) 354-4000

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

HENINGER GARRISON DAVIS, LLC
/s/ Taylor Bartlett
Taylor Bartlett
W. Lewis Garrison
2224 First Avenue North
Birmingham, AL 35213
Tel: (205) 326-3336

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

DOUGLAS & LONDON, PC
/s/ Virginia Anello
Virginia Anello
59 Maiden Lane
6th Floor
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 566-7500

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

MOSTYN LAW
/s/ Michael A. Burns
Michael A. Burns
3810 West Alabama Street
Houston, TX 77027
Tel: (713) 714-0000

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

MONSOUR LAW FIRM
/s/ Douglas C. Monsour
Douglas C. Monsour
404 N. Green St.
Longview, TX 75601
Tel: (903) 758-5757

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

NABERS LAW FIRM
/s/ Scott Nabers
Scott Nabers
3737 Buffalo Speedway, #1850
Houston, TX77098
Tel: (713) 422-1200

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

MORGAN & MORGAN
/s/ Paul J. Pennock
Paul J. Pennock
850 3rd Avenue
Suite 402
Brooklyn, NY 11232
Tel: (212) 738-6299

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

WATTS GUERRA LLP
/s/ Mikal Watts
Erin Rogiers
Mikal Watts
5726 W. Hausman
Suite 119
San Antonio, TX 78249
Tel: (210) 447-0500

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP
/s/ Andre M. Mura
Andre M. Mura
Amy Zeman
505 14th St., Suite 1110
Oakland, CA 94612
Tel: (510) 350-9717

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LANIER LAW FIRM
/s/ Rachel Lanier
Rachel Lanier
10940 West Sam Houston Pkwy
Suite 100
Houston, TX 77064
Tel: (800) 723-3216

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

ROBINSON CALCAGNIE, INC.
/s/ Mark P. Robinson, Jr.
Mark P. Robinson, Jr.
19 Corporate Plaza
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel.: (949) 720-1288

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BEGGS & LANE, RLLP
/s/ J. Nixon Daniel
J. Nixon Daniel
501 Commendencia Street
Pensacola, FL 32502
Tel: (850) 469-3306

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PENDLEY, BAUDIN & COFFIN, L.L.P.
/s/ M. Palmer Lambert
M. Palmer Lambert
100 Poydras Street, Suite 2225
New Orleans, Louisiana 70163-2800
Tel: (504) 355-0086

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

STUEVE SIEGEL HANSON LLP
/s/ Abby E. McClellan
Abby E. McClellan
460 Nichols Road, Suite 200
Kansas City, MO 64112
Tel: (816) 714-7100

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

GOZA & HONNOLD
/s/ Bradley D. Honnold
Bradley D. Honnold
9500 Nall Ave.
Suite 400
Overland, KS 66207
Tel: (913) 451-3433

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

MESSNER REEVES LLP
/s/ Renee Finch
Renee Finch
1550 Wewatta Street
Suite 710
Denver, CO 80202
Tel: (303) 623-1800

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON PHILLIPS GROSSMAN, LLP
/s/ Kristian Rasmussen
Kristian Rasmussen
2701 S Le Jeune Rd. 10th Floor
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Tel: (786) 206-8306 ext. 5224

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

CORY WATSON, PC
/s/ Ernest Cory
Ernest Cory
2131 Magnolia Ave., S.
Birmingham, AL 35205
Tel: (205) 328-2200

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

COLSON HICKS
/s/ Roberto Martinez
Roberto Martinez
255 Alhambra Circle
Unit Penthouse
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Tel: (305) 476-7400

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PITTMAN, DUTTON, HELLUMS, BRADLEY & MANN, P.C
/s/ Christopher Hellums
Christopher Hellums
2001 Park Place North
1100 Park Place Tower
Birmingham, AL 35203
Tel: (205) 322-8880

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

ONDER LAW, LLC
/s/ Jim Onder
Jim Onder
110 East Lockwood Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63119
Tel: 314-963-9000

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

HAIR SHUNNARAH TRIAL ATTORNEYS
/s/ Kyle C. Usner
Kyle C. Usner
3540 S. I-10 Service Rd. W, Ste 300
Metairie, LA 70001
Tel: (504) 684-5200

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

THE KUYKENDALL GROUP, LLC
/s/ Frederick T. Kukendall, III
Frederick T. Kukendall, III
P.O. Box 2129
Fairhope, AL 36533
Tel: 205-252-6127

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP
/s/ Yvonne M. Flaherty
Yvonne M. Flaherty
100 Washington Ave South, #2200
Minneapolis MN 55401
Tel: 612-339-6900

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

JOHNSON BECKER, PLLC
/s/ Timothy Becker
Timothy Becker
Stacy Hauer
444 Cedar Street
Suite 1800
St. Paul, MN 55101
Tel: (612) 436-1800

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

PARKER WAICHMAN LLP
/s/ Raymond C. Silverman
Raymond C. Silverman
Melanie H. Muhlstock
6 Harbor Park Drive
Port Washington, NY 11050
Tel: (516) 466-6500

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

SHUNNARAH VAIL TRIAL ATTORNEYS, P.C.
/s/ A. Paige Caraway
A. Paige Caraway
120 18th Street South, Suite 101
Birmingham, AL 35233
Tel.: (205) 983-8652

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

ANAPOL WEISS

/s/ Thomas Anapol
Thomas Anapol
130 North 18th Street, Suite 1600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: (215) 735-1130

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

THE DILORENZO LAW FIRM, LLC

/s/ Joel L. Dilorenzo
Joel L. Dilorenzo
505 20th Street North # 1275
Birmingham, AL 35203
Tel: (205) 212-9988

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

ABRAHAM, WATKINS, NICHOLS, SORRELS, AGOSTO & AZIZ
/s/ Muhammad S. Aziz
Muhammad S. Aziz
800 Commerce
Houston, TX 77002
Tel: (713) 222-7211

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

BARON & BUDD PC

/s/ Andrew Gardener
Andrew Gardener
3102 Oak Lawn Avenue
Suite 1100
Dallas, TX 75219
Tel: (214) 521-3605

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

LAW OFFICE OF L. PAUL MANKIN APC
/s/ L. Paul Mankin
L. Paul Mankin
4655 Cass Street
Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92109
Tel: (800) 219-3577

Counsel to Certain CAEv2 Claimants

Exhibit A

PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Nos. 22-2003, 22-2004, 22-2005, 22-2006, 22-0007,
22-2008, 22-2009, 22-2010, 22-2011

In re: LTL MANAGEMENT, LLC
Debtor

LTL MANAGEMENT, LLC

v.

THOSE PARTIES LISTED ON APPENDIX A TO COMPLAINT
AND JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-1000

*OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF TALC CLAIMANTS,
Appellant in case Nos. 22-2003, 22-2004 and 22-2005

*OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF TALC CLAIMANTS;
PATRICIA COOK;
EVAN PLOTKIN; RANDY DEROUEN; KRISTIE DOYLE,
as estate representative of Dan Doyle; KATHERINE TOLLEFSON;
TONYA WHETSEL, as estate representative of Brandon Wetsel;
GIOVANNI SOSA; JAN DEBORAH MICHELSON-BOYLE,

Appellants in case Nos. 22-2006, 22-2007 and 22-2008

ARNOLD & ITKIN LLP, on behalf of certain personal injury claimants represented by Arnold & Itkin,
Appellant in case No. 22-2009

AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS & OVERHOLTZ PLLC, on behalf of more
than three thousand holders of talc claims,
Appellant in case Nos. 22-2010 and 22-2011

*(Amended per Court's Order dated 06/10/2022)

Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court
for the District of New Jersey
(District Court No.: 21-bk-30589; 21-ap-03032)
Bankruptcy Judge: Honorable Michael B. Kaplan

Argued September 19, 2022

Before AMBRO, RESTREPO, and FUENTES, Circuit Judges

(Opinion filed: January 30, 2023)

Brad J. Axelrod
Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom
One Rodney Square
920 North King Street, 7th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Caitlin K. Cahow
Brad B. Erens
Jones Day
110 North Wacker Drive
Suite 4800
Chicago, IL 60606

Paul R. DeFilippo
Wollmuth, Maher & Deutsch
500 Fifth Avenue
12th Floor
New York, NY 10110

Kristen R. Fournier
King & Spalding
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Kathleen A. Frazier
Shook, Hardy & Bacon
600 Travis Street
JP Morgan Chase Tower, Suite 3400
Houston, TX 77002

Gregory M. Gordon
Daniel B. Prieto
Mark W. Rasmussen
Amanda Rush
Jones Day
2727 North Harwood Street
Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201

Robert W. Hamilton
Jones Day
901 Lakeside Avenue
North Point
Cleveland, OH 44114

James M. Jones
Jones Day
500 Grant Street
Suite 4500
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Neal K. Katyal **(Argued)**
Sean M. Marotta
Hogan Lovells US
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Columbia Square
Washington, DC 20004

Glenn M. Kurtz
Jessica C. Lauria
White & Case
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

James N. Lawlor
Joseph F. Pacelli
Wollmuth, Maher & Deutsch
500 Fifth Avenue
12th Floor
New York, NY 10110

C. Kevin Marshall
Jones Day
51 Louisiana Avenue, N. W.
Washington, DC 20001

John R. Miller, Jr.
Miller, Kistler, Campbell, Miller, Williams & Benson
124 North Allegheny Street
Bellefonte, PA 16823

Matthew L. Tomsic
Rayburn, Cooper, Durham
227 West Trade Street
Suite 1200
Charlotte, NC 28202

Lyndon M. Treeter
Wollmuth, Maher & Deutsch
12th Floor
New York, NY 10110

Counsel for Debtor-Appellee

Melanie L. Cyganowski
Adam C. Silverstein
Otterbourg
230 Park Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10169

Angelo J. Genova
Genova Burns
494 Broad Street
Newark, NJ 07102

Jeffrey A. Lamken **(Argued)**
MoloLamken
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
The Watergate
Washington, DC 20037

Jonathan S. Massey
Massey & Gail
1000 Maine Avenue, S. W.
Suite 450
Washington, DC 20024

David J. Molton
Michael S. Winograd
Brown Rudnick
7 Times Square
47th Floor
New York, NY 10036

Counsel for Petitioner-Appellant Official Committee of Talc Claimants

Matthew I.W. Baker
Genova Burns
494 Broad Street
Newark, NJ 07102

Sunni P. Beville
Shari I. Dwoskin
Jeffrey L. Jonas
Brown Rudnick
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

Donald W. Clarke
Wasserman, Jurista & Stolz
110 Allen Road
Suite 304
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Daniel Stolz
Genova Burns LLC
110 Allen Road
Suite 304
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Jennifer S. Feeney
Otterbourg
230 Park Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10169

Leonard M. Parkins
Charles M. Rubio
Parkins & Rubio
700 Milam Street
Pennzoil Place, Suite 1300
Houston, TX 77002

Robert J. Stark
Brown Rudnick
7 Times Square
47th Floor
New York, New York 10036

Counsel for Petitioner Official Committee of Talc Claimants I

Jeffrey M. Dine
Karen B. Dine
Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones
780 Third Avenue
34th Floor
New York, NY 10017

Matthew Drecun
David C. Frederick **(Argued)**
Ariela Migdal
Gregory G. Rapawy
Kellogg Hansen Todd Figel & Frederick
1615 M Street, N.W.
Sumner Square, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

Laura D. Jones
Peter J. Keane
Colin R. Robinson
Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones
919 North Market Street
P. O. Box 8705, 17th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Isaac M. Pachulski
Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard
Suite 2300
Los Angeles, CA 00067

Counsel for Respondent Arnold & Itkin, LLP

Samuel M. Kidder
Nir Maoz
Robert J. Pfister
Michael L. Tuchin
Klee, Tuchin, Bogdanoff & Stern
1801 Century Park East
26th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Paul J. Winterhalter
Offit Kurman
99 Wood Avenue South
Suite 302
Iselin, NJ 08830

Counsel for Respondent Aylstock, Witkin, Kreis & Overholtz, PLLC

Allen J. Underwood, II
Lite, DePalma, Greenberg & Afanador
570 Broad Street
Suite 1201
Newark, NJ 07102

Counsel for Respondent DeSanto Canadian Class Action Creditors

Mark Tsukerman
Cole Schotz
1325 Avenue of the Americas
19th Floor
New York, NY 10019

Felice C. Yudkin
Cole Schotz
25 Main Street
Court Plaza North, P.O. Box 800
Hackensack, NJ 07601

Counsel for Respondent Claimants
Represented by Barnes Law Group

Arthur J. Abramowitz
Alan I. Moldoff
Ross J. Switkes
Sherman, Silverstein, Kohl, Rose & Podolsky
308 Harper Drive
Suite 200, Eastgate Corporate Center
Moorestown, NJ 08057

Kevin W. Barrett
Maigreade B. Burrus
Bailey & Glasser
209 Capitol Street
Charleston, WV 25301

Thomas B. Bennett
Brian A. Glasser
Bailey & Glasser
1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Suite 540
Washington, DC 20007

Michael Klein
Evan M. Lazerowitz
Lauren A. Reichardt
Erica J. Richards
Cullen D. Speckhart
Cooley
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001

James C. Lanik
Jennifer B. Lyday
Thomas W. Waldrep
Waldrep, Wall, Babcock & Bailey
370 Knollwood Street
Suite 600
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

Kevin L. Sink
Waldrep, Wall, Babcock & Bailey
3600 Glenwood Avenue
Suite 210
Raleigh, NC 27612

Counsel for Respondent Official Committee
of Talc Claimants II

Lauren Bielskie
Jeffrey M. Sponder
Office of United States Trustee
1085 Raymond Boulevard
One Newark Center, Suite 2100
Newark, NJ 07102

Sean Janda **(Argued)**
United States Department of Justice
Appellate Section
Room 720
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20530

Counsel for Amicus Appellant United States Trustee

Cory L. Andrews
John M. Masslon, II
Washington Legal Foundation
2009 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Counsel for Amicus Appellee Washington Legal Foundation

R. Craig Martin
DLA Piper
1202 North Market Street
Suite 2100
Wilmington, DE 19801

Ilana H. Eisenstein
DLA Piper
1650 Market Street
One Liberty Place, Suite 5000
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Counsel for Amici Appellees United States Chamber of Commerce and American Tort Reform Association

Natalie D. Ramsey
Robinson & Cole
1650 Market Street
One Liberty Place, Suite 3030
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Counsel for Amicus Appellant Erwin Chemerinsky

Jaime A. Santos
Benjamin T. Hayes
Goodwin Procter
1900 N. Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Counsel for Amici Appellees National Association of Manufacturers and Product Liability Advisory Council, Inc.

Sean E. O'Donnell
Stephen B. Selbst
Steven B. Smith
Herrick Feinstein
2 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Counsel for Amici Appellants Kenneth Ayotte, Susan Block-Lieb, Jared Ellias, Bruce A. Markell, Yesha Yadav, Robert K. Rasmussen and Diane Lourdes Dick

Peter M. Friedman
O'Melveny & Myers
1625 Eye Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 2006

Emma L. Persson
Laura L. Smith, Esq.
O'Melveny & Myers
2501 North Harwood Street
Suite 1700
Dallas, TX 75201

Daniel S. Shamah
O'Melveny & Myers
7 Times Square
Time Square Tower, 33rd Floor
New York, NY 10036

Counsel for Amici Appellees Samir Parikh, Anthony Casey, Joshua C. Macey and Edward Morrison

Glen Chappell
Allison W. Parr
Hassan A. Zavareei
Tycko & Zavareei
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1010
Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Amicus Appellant Public Justice

Jeffrey R. White
American Association for Justice
777 6th Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20001

Counsel for Amicus Appellant American Association of Justice

Thomas A. Pitta
Emmet, Marvin & Martin
120 Broadway
32nd Floor
New York, NY 10005

Counsel for Amici Appellants Maria Glover, Andrew Bradt, Brooke Coleman, Robin Effron, D. Theodore Rave, Alan M. Trammell, and Adam Zimmerman

OPINION OF THE COURT

AMBRO, Circuit Judge

Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. ("Old Consumer"), a wholly owned subsidiary of Johnson & Johnson ("J&J"), sold healthcare products with iconic names branded on consumers' consciousness—Band-Aid, Tylenol, Aveeno, and Listerine, to list but a few. It also produced Johnson's Baby Powder, equally recognizable for well over a century as a skincare product. Its base was talc, a mineral mined and milled into a fine powder. Concerns that the talc contained traces of asbestos spawned in recent years a torrent of lawsuits against Old Consumer and J&J alleging Johnson's Baby Powder has caused ovarian cancer and mesothelioma. Some of those suits succeeded in verdicts, some failed (outright or on appeal), and others settled. But more followed into the tens of thousands.

With mounting payouts and litigation costs, Old Consumer, through a series of intercompany transactions primarily under Texas state law, split into two new entities: LTL Management LLC ("LTL"), holding principally Old Consumer's liabilities relating to talc litigation and a funding support agreement from LTL's corporate parents; and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. ("New Consumer"), holding virtually all the productive business assets previously held by Old Consumer. J&J's stated goal was to isolate the talc liabilities in a new subsidiary so that entity could file for

Chapter 11 without subjecting Old Consumer's entire operating enterprise to bankruptcy proceedings.

Two days later, LTL filed a petition for Chapter 11 relief in the Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of North Carolina. That Court, however, transferred the case to the Bankruptcy Court for the District of New Jersey.

Talc claimants there moved to dismiss LTL's bankruptcy case as not filed in good faith. The Bankruptcy Court, in two thorough opinions, denied those motions and extended the automatic stay of actions against LTL to hundreds of nondebtors that included J&J and New Consumer. Appeals followed and are consolidated before us.

We start, and stay, with good faith. Good intentions—such as to protect the J&J brand or comprehensively resolve litigation—do not suffice alone. What counts to access the Bankruptcy Code's safe harbor is to meet its intended purposes. Only a putative debtor in financial distress can do so. LTL was not. Thus we dismiss its petition.

I. BACKGROUND

A. J&J, Baby Powder, and Old Consumer

The story of LTL begins with its parent company, J&J. It is a global company and household brand well-known to the public for its wide range of products relating to health and well-being. Many are consumer staples, filling pharmacies, supermarkets, and medicine cabinets throughout the country and beyond.

One of these products was Johnson's Baby Powder, first sold by J&J in 1894. It became particularly popular, being used by or on hundreds of millions of people at all stages of life.

J&J has not always sold baby powder directly, though. In 1979, it transferred all assets associated with its Baby Products division, including Johnson's Baby Powder, to Johnson & Johnson Baby Products Company ("J&J Baby Products"), a wholly owned subsidiary (the "1979 Spin-Off"). A series of further intercompany transactions in ensuing decades ultimately transferred Johnson's Baby Powder to Old Consumer.

So since 1979 only Old Consumer and its predecessors, and not J&J, have directly sold Johnson's Baby Powder. LTL maintains that the 1979 Spin-Off included an agreement between J&J and J&J Baby Products that makes Old Consumer, as successor to the latter, responsible for indemnifying J&J for all past, present, and future liabilities stemming from Johnson's Baby Powder. Thus, according to LTL, Old Consumer was liable for all claims relating to Johnson's Baby Powder, either directly or indirectly through its responsibility to indemnify J&J.

B. Baby Powder Litigation

Talc triggered little litigation against J&J entities before 2010. There had been but a small number of isolated claims alleging the products caused harms such as talcosis (a lung disease caused by inhalation of talc dust or talc), mesothelioma (a cancer of organ membranes, typically in the lungs, associated with exposure to asbestos), and rashes. But trials in

2013 and 2016 resulted in jury verdicts for plaintiffs alleging Old Consumer's talc-based products caused ovarian cancer. Despite the first resulting in no monetary award, and the second being reversed on appeal, these trials ushered in a wave of lawsuits alleging Johnson's Baby Powder caused ovarian cancer and mesothelioma.[1] Governmental actions, including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's finding of asbestos traces in a sample of Johnson's Baby Powder in 2019 and Health Canada's confirmation in 2021 of its 2018 finding of a significant association between exposure to talc and ovarian cancer, also heightened J&J's and Old Consumer's potential exposure.

With the door wide open, over 38,000 ovarian cancer actions (most consolidated in federal multidistrict litigation in New Jersey) and over 400 mesothelioma actions were pending against Old Consumer and J&J when LTL filed its Chapter 11 petition. Expectations were for the lawsuits to continue, with thousands more in decades to come. The magnitude of the award in one case also raised the stakes. There, a Missouri jury awarded $4.69 billion to 22 ovarian cancer plaintiffs, reduced on appeal to $2.24 billion to 20 plaintiffs who were not dismissed. *Ingham v. Johnson & Johnson*, 608 S.W.3d 663 (Mo. Ct. App. 2020), *cert. denied,* 141 S. Ct. 2716 (2021).

---

[1] The talc litigation also involves claims regarding Shower to Shower, a different talc-containing product initially produced by J&J and later by Old Consumer and its predecessors. LTL maintains intercompany transactions involving J&J and Old Consumer ultimately made the latter responsible for all claims stemming from Shower to Shower. Because the talc litigation concerns mainly Johnson's Baby Powder, for convenience references herein to that name may include other talc products.

Yet other trials reaching verdicts for plaintiffs were not so damaging to J&J entities. Since 2018, damages in all other monetary awards to plaintiffs that were not reversed averaged about $39.7 million per claim. Moreover, Old Consumer and J&J often succeeded at trial. According to LTL's expert, of 15 completed ovarian cancer trials, only *Ingham* resulted in a monetary award for the plaintiffs that was not reversed; and of 28 completed mesothelioma trials, fewer than half resulted in monetary awards for the plaintiffs that were not reversed (and many of those were on appeal at the time of LTL's bankruptcy filing). In addition, Old Consumer and J&J often avoided trial before bankruptcy, settling roughly 6,800 talc-related claims for just under $1 billion in total and successfully obtaining dismissals without payment of about 1,300 ovarian cancer, and over 250 mesothelioma, actions.

Undoubtedly, the talc litigation put financial pressure on Old Consumer. Before LTL's petition, it paid approximately $3.5 billion for talc-related verdicts and settlements. It also paid nearly $1 billion in defense costs, and the continuing run rate was between $10 million to $20 million per month. LTL's expert identified talc-related costs as a primary driver that caused the income before tax of J&J's Consumer Health business segment (for which Old Consumer was the primary operating company in the U.S.) to drop from a $2.1 billion profit in 2019 to a $1.1 billion loss in 2020.

Old Consumer also faced billions in contested indemnification obligations to its bankrupt talc supplier, Imerys Talc America, Inc. and affiliates (collectively "Imerys"), as well as parties who had owned certain of Imerys's talc mines. These remained after J&J's settlement

proposal of about $4 billion to $5 billion in the Imerys bankruptcy case—which, per LTL, had been tentatively agreed by attorneys for talc plaintiffs—ultimately fell through by June 2021. An LTL representative testified that, if that proposal succeeded, it would have settled (subject to an opt-out) virtually all ovarian cancer claims in the multidistrict tort litigation and corresponding additional claims against J&J entities in the Imerys case. Old Consumer was also the target of both state and federal talc-related governmental complaints and investigations, as well as securities and shareholder actions, that could result in their own financial penalties and defense costs. LTL's expert opined, and the Bankruptcy Court accepted, that the total talc-related liabilities threatened Old Consumer's ability to make substantial talc-related payments from working capital or other readily marketable assets while funding its costs of operations (including marketing, distribution, research and development).

Still, Old Consumer was a highly valuable enterprise, estimated by LTL to be worth $61.5 billion (excluding future talc liabilities), with many profitable products and brands. And much of its pre-filing talc costs were attributable to the payment of one verdict, *Ingham*, a liability J&J described in public securities filings as "unique" and "not representative of other claims." App. 2692-93. Further, while it allocated all talc-related payments to Old Consumer per the 1979 Spin-Off, J&J functionally made talc payments from its accounts and received an intercompany payable from Old Consumer in return. Addressing the scope of its litigation exposure in an October 2021 management representation letter to its auditors, J&J valued its and its subsidiaries' probable and reasonably estimable contingent loss for products liability litigation, including for talc, under Generally Accepted Accounting

Principles ("GAAP"), at $2.4 billion for the next 24 months.[2] It also continued to stand by the safety of its talc products and deny liability relating to their use.

Consistent with their fiduciary duties, and likely spurred by the U.S. Supreme Court's denial of certiorari in *Ingham*, members of J&J's management explored ways to mitigate Old Consumer's exposure to talc litigation. In a July 2021 email with a ratings agency, J&J's treasurer described a potential restructuring that would capture all asbestos liability in a subsidiary to be put into bankruptcy.

C. Corporate Restructuring and Divisional Merger

On October 12, 2021, Old Consumer moved forward with this plan, undergoing a corporate restructuring relying principally on a merger under Texas law. Counterintuitively, this type of merger involves "the division of a [Texas] entity into two or more new . . . entities." Tex. Bus. Orgs. Code Ann. § 1.002(55)(A); *see generally id.* §§ 10.001 *et seq*. When the original entity does not survive the merger, it allocates its property, liabilities, and obligations among the new entities according to a plan of merger and, on implementation, its separate existence ends. *Id*. §§ 10.003, 10.008(a)(1). Except as otherwise provided by law or contract, no entity created in the merger is "liable for the debt or other obligation" allocated to any other new entity. *Id.* § 10.008(a)(4). In simplified terms, the merger splits a legal entity into two, divides its assets

[2] Adam Lisman, assistant controller for J&J, suggested in his trial testimony that it was J&J's general policy to consider the next 24 months when calculating contingent costs under GAAP.

and liabilities between the two new entities, and terminates the original entity. While some pejoratively refer to it as the first step in a "Texas Two-Step" when followed by a bankruptcy filing, we more benignly call it a "divisional merger."

In our case, Old Consumer's restructuring was designed as a series of reorganizational steps with the divisional merger at center.[3] Ultimately, the restructuring created two new entities, LTL and New Consumer, and on its completion Old Consumer ceased to exist. It also featured the creation of a Funding Agreement, which had Old Consumer stand in momentarily as the payee, but ultimately (after some corporate maneuvers[4]) gave LTL rights to funding from New Consumer and J&J.

---

[3] A slightly abbreviated summary of the many steps is as follows. Old Consumer merged into Chenango Zero, LLC, a Texas limited liability company and indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of J&J ("Chenango Zero"), with Chenango Zero surviving the merger. Chenango Zero (formerly Old Consumer) effected a divisional merger under the Texas Business Organizations Code by which two new Texas limited liability companies were created, Chenango One LLC ("Chenango One") and Chenango Two LLC ("Chenango Two"), and Chenango Zero ceased to exist. Chenango One then converted into a North Carolina limited liability company and changed its name to "LTL Management LLC." Chenango Two merged into Curahee Holding Company Inc., the direct parent company of LTL ("Curahee"). Curahee survived the merger and changed its name to "Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc." (now New Consumer).

[4] On the day of the divisional merger, the Funding Agreement was executed by Chenango Zero (formerly Old Consumer), as

As the most important step, the merger allocated LTL responsibility for essentially all liabilities of Old Consumer tied to talc-related claims.[5] This meant, among other things, it would take the place of Old Consumer in current and future talc lawsuits and be responsible for their defense.

Old Consumer also transferred to LTL assets in the merger, including principally the former's contracts related to talc litigation, indemnity rights, its equity interests in Royalty A&M LLC ("Royalty A&M"), and about $6 million in cash. Carved out from Old Consumer and its affiliates just before the divisional merger, Royalty A&M owns a portfolio of royalty streams that derive from consumer brands and was valued by LTL at approximately $367.1 million.

Of the assets Old Consumer passed to LTL, most important were Old Consumer's rights as a payee under the Funding Agreement with J&J and New Consumer. On its transfer, that gave LTL, outside of bankruptcy, the ability to cause New Consumer and J&J, jointly and severally, to pay it cash up to the value of New Consumer for purposes of satisfying any talc-related costs as well as normal course

---

payee, along with J&J and Curahee, as payors. Then, per the divisional merger, LTL was allocated rights as payee under the Funding Agreement, replacing Chenango Zero. Chenango Two (which assumed Old Consumer's assets not allocated to LTL) then merged into Curahee, one of the two original payors, and became New Consumer.

[5] LTL's liability was for all talc claims except those where the exclusive remedy existed under a workers' compensation statute or similar laws.

expenses. In bankruptcy, the Agreement gave LTL the right to cause New Consumer and J&J, jointly and severally, to pay it cash in the same amount to satisfy its administrative costs and to fund a trust, created in a plan of reorganization, to address talc liability for the benefit of existing and future claimants. In either scenario, there were few conditions to funding and no repayment obligation.[6] The value of the payment right could not drop below a floor defined as the value of New Consumer measured as of the time of the divisional merger, estimated by LTL at $61.5 billion, and was subject to increase as the value of New Consumer increased after it.[7]

On the other side of the divisional-merger ledger, New Consumer received all assets and liabilities of Old Consumer not allocated to LTL. It thus held Old Consumer's productive business assets, including its valuable consumer products, and, critically, none of its talc-related liabilities (except those related to workers' compensation). After this, the organizational chart was reshuffled to make New Consumer the direct parent company of LTL.

---

[6] For LTL to require J&J and New Consumer to fund, certain customary representations and warranties made by LTL must be true, such as those addressing its good standing under state law, the due authorization of the Funding Agreement, and the absence of any required governmental approval. And LTL must not have violated its covenants, specifically, that it will use the funds for only permitted uses and materially perform its indemnification obligations owed to New Consumer for all talc liabilities as set out in the plan of divisional merger.

[7] In each calculation of New Consumer's value, its obligation under the Funding Agreement is not included.

When the ink dried, LTL—having received Old Consumer's talc liability, rights under the Funding Agreement, a royalties business, and cash—was prepared to fulfill its reason for being: a bankruptcy filing. Meanwhile, New Consumer began operating the business formerly held by Old Consumer and would essentially remain unaffected (save for its funding obligation) by any bankruptcy filing of LTL.

LTL became in bankruptcy talk the "bad company," and New Consumer became the "good company." This completed the first steps toward J&J's goal of "globally resolv[ing] talc-related claims through a chapter 11 reorganization without subjecting the entire Old [Consumer] enterprise to a bankruptcy proceeding." App. 450 (Decl. of John Kim 6).

D. LTL Bankruptcy Filing and Procedural History

On October 14, 2021, two days after the divisional merger, LTL filed a petition for Chapter 11 relief in the Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of North Carolina. It also sought (1) to extend the automatic stay afforded to it under the Bankruptcy Code to talc claims arising from Johnson's Baby Powder asserted against over six hundred nondebtors (the "Third-Party Claims"), including affiliates such as J&J and New Consumer, as well as insurers and third-party retailers (all nondebtors collectively the "Protected Parties"), or alternatively, (2) a preliminary injunction enjoining those claims. LTL's first-day filings described the bankruptcy as an effort to "equitably and permanently resolve all current and future talc-related claims against it through the consummation of a plan of reorganization that includes the establishment of a [funding] trust." App. 3799 (LTL's Compl. for Decl. and Inj. Relief 2); App. 316 (LTL's Info. Br. 1).

A month later, the North Carolina Bankruptcy Court issued an order enjoining Third-Party Claims against the Protected Parties. But the order expired after 60 days and would not bind a subsequent court. The next day, following motions from interested parties (including representatives for talc claimants) and a Show Cause Order, the Court transferred LTL's Chapter 11 case to the District of New Jersey under 28 U.S.C. § 1412. It rejected what it viewed as LTL's effort to "manufacture venue" and held that a preference to be subject to the Fourth Circuit's two-prong bankruptcy dismissal standard[8] could not justify its filing in North Carolina. App. 1515 (N.C. Transfer Order 10).

[8] In the Fourth Circuit, a court can only dismiss a bankruptcy petition for lack of good faith on a showing of the debtor's "subjective bad faith" and the "objective futility of any possible reorganization." *Carolin Corp. v. Miller,* 886 F.2d 693, 694 (4th Cir. 1989). The Bankruptcy Court in the District of New Jersey described this as a "much more stringent standard for dismissal of a case for lacking good faith" than the Third Circuit's test. App. 13 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 13). Perhaps not by coincidence then, debtors formed by divisional mergers and bearing substantial asbestos liability seem to prefer filing in the Fourth Circuit, with four such cases being filed in the Western District of North Carolina in the years before LTL's filing. *See In re Bestwall LLC*, Case No. 17-31795 (Bankr. W.D.N.C.); *In re DBMP LLC*, Case No. 20-30080 (Bankr. W.D.N.C.); *In re Aldrich Pump LLC*, Case No. 20-30608 (Bankr. W.D.N.C.); *In re Murray Boiler LLC*, Case No. 20-30609 (Bankr. W.D.N.C.).

With the case pending in the Bankruptcy Court for the District of New Jersey, the Official Committee of Talc Claimants (the "Talc Claimants' Committee") moved to dismiss LTL's petition under § 1112(b) of the Bankruptcy Code as not filed in good faith. Soon after, Arnold & Itkin LLP, on behalf of talc claimants it represented ("A&I"), also moved for dismissal on the same basis. LTL opposed the motions. Two other law firms—including Aylstock, Witkin, Kreis & Overholtz, PLLC, on behalf of talc claimants ("AWKO")—joined the motions. For ease of reference, we refer collectively to the Talc Claimants' Committee, A&I, and AWKO as the "Talc Claimants."

At the same time, LTL urged the New Jersey Bankruptcy Court to extend the soon-to-expire order enjoining Third-Party Claims against the Protected Parties. The Talc Claimants' Committee and AWKO opposed this motion.

In February 2022, the Bankruptcy Court held a five-day trial on the motions to dismiss and LTL's third-party injunction motion. It denied soon thereafter the motions to dismiss and granted the injunction motion. App. 1, 57, 140, 194 (Mot. to Dismiss Op.; Mot. to Dismiss Order; Third-Party Inj. Op.; Third-Party Inj. Order).

In its opinion addressing the motions to dismiss, the Bankruptcy Court applied Third Circuit case law and held that LTL filed its bankruptcy petition in good faith. The Court ruled the filing served a valid bankruptcy purpose because it sought to resolve talc liability by creating a trust for the benefit of claimants under § 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code. At a high level, that provision allows a debtor satisfying certain conditions to establish, in a plan of reorganization, a trust for

the benefit of current and future claimants against which an injunction channels all asbestos litigation.[9] The Court highlighted what it viewed as several benefits of claims administration through a § 524(g) trust, compared to mass asbestos litigation in trial courts, including the possibility it could resolve claims more efficiently (from both a cost and time perspective), ensure more balanced recoveries among claimants, and preserve funds for future claimants.

The Court also held LTL was in financial distress. It focused on the scope of litigation faced by Old Consumer (and transferred to LTL), the historic costs incurred by Old Consumer in connection with talc litigation, and the effect of these costs on its business. It suggested that extrapolating this talc liability into the future showed the "continued viability of all J&J companies [was] imperiled." App. 36 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 36). Yet it appeared to doubt LTL would completely exhaust its payment right under the Funding Agreement. App. 35 (*Id.* at 35).

Finally, the Court determined LTL's corporate restructuring and bankruptcy were not undertaken to secure an unfair tactical litigation advantage against talc claimants, but constituted "a single integrated transaction" that did not prejudice creditors and eliminated costs that would otherwise be imposed on Old Consumer's operating business had it been subject to bankruptcy. App. 43 (*Id.* at 43). The Court ultimately saw the bankruptcy forum as having a superior ability, compared to trial courts, to protect the talc claimants'

[9] Under certain conditions, the injunction can also channel to the trust claims against third parties affiliated with the debtor. 11 U.S.C. § 524(g)(4).

interests, viewing this as an "unusual circumstance[]" that precluded dismissal under 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)(2). App. 13 (*Id*. at 13 n.8).

At the same time the Bankruptcy Court grappled substantively with existing Circuit case law, it made much of LTL's novel design and the reasons for it. Its bankruptcy, the Court believed, presented a "far more significant issue" than equitable limitations on bankruptcy filings: "which judicial system [better served talc claimants]—the state/federal court trial system, or a trust vehicle established under a chapter 11 reorganization plan . . . [in Bankruptcy Court]." App. 12-13 (*Id*. at 12-13). Answering this question, it provided a full defense of its "strong conviction that the bankruptcy court is the optimal venue for redressing the harms of both present and future talc claimants in this case." App. 19 (*Id.* at 19).[10]

The Talc Claimants timely appealed the Bankruptcy Court's order denying the motions to dismiss. The Talc Claimants' Committee and AWKO also appealed the order enjoining Third-Party Claims against the Protected Parties. On request of the Talc Claimants, the Bankruptcy Court certified the challenged orders to our Court under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2).

---

[10] In the separate opinion explaining its order preserving the injunction of Third-Party Claims against Protected Parties, the Court held that "unusual circumstances" warranted extension of the automatic stay to those claims under Bankruptcy Code §§ 362(a)(1) and 362(a)(3). It also held that Bankruptcy Code § 105(a) provided it independent authority to issue a preliminary injunction enjoining them. App. 140 (Third-Party Inj. Op.).

In May 2022, we authorized direct appeal of the orders under the same statute.

The Bankruptcy Court had jurisdiction of the bankruptcy case under, *inter alia*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(a) and 1334(a).[11] We have jurisdiction of the appeals under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2)(A).

II. ANALYSIS

A. Standard of Review

We review for an abuse of discretion the Bankruptcy Court's denial of the motions to dismiss the Chapter 11 petition for lack of good faith. *In re 15375 Mem'l Corp. v. BEPCO, L.P.*, 589 F.3d 605, 616 (3d Cir. 2009). That exists when the decision "rests upon a clearly erroneous finding of fact, an errant conclusion of law, or an improper application of law to fact." *Id.* (citation omitted). We give fresh (*i.e.*, plenary or *de novo*) review to a conclusion of law and review for clear error findings of fact leading to the decision. *Id.*

Facts subject to clear-error review include those that are basic, "the historical and narrative events elicited from the evidence presented at trial . . .," and those that are inferred, which are "drawn from basic facts and are permitted only when, and to the extent that, logic and human experience indicate a probability that certain consequences can and do

[11] The parties contest whether the Bankruptcy Court had jurisdiction to issue the order enjoining the Third-Party Claims against the Protected Parties. Dismissing LTL's petition obviates the need to reach that question.

follow from the basic facts." *Universal Mins., Inc. v. C.A. Hughes & Co.*, 669 F.2d 98, 102 (3d Cir. 1981). These are distinguished from an "ultimate fact," which is a "legal concept with a factual component." *Id.* at 103. Examples include negligence or reasonableness. *Wells Fargo, N.A. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (In re HomeBanc Mortg. Corp.)*, 945 F.3d 801, 810 (3d Cir. 2019). Reviewing an ultimate fact, "we separate [its] distinct factual and legal elements . . . and apply the appropriate standard to each component." *Universal Mins.*, 669 F.2d at 103.

Concluding a bankruptcy petition is filed in good faith is an "ultimate fact." *BEPCO*, 589 F.3d at 616. While the underlying basic and inferred facts require clear-error review, the culminating determination of whether those facts support a conclusion of good faith gets plenary review as "essentially[] a conclusion of law." *Id*. A conclusion of financial distress, like the broader good-faith inquiry of which it is a part, likewise is subject to mixed review. Whether financial distress exists depends on the underlying basic facts, such as the debtor's ability to pay its current debts, and inferred facts, such as projections of how much pending and future liabilities (like litigation) could cost it in the future. But the conclusion, like good faith, gets a fresh look.

B. Good Faith

Chapter 11 bankruptcy petitions are "subject to dismissal under 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b) unless filed in good faith." *BEPCO*, 589 F.3d at 618 (citing *NMSBPCSLDHB, L.P. v. Integrated Telecom Express, Inc. (In re Integrated Telecom Express, Inc.)*, 384 F.3d 108, 118 (3d Cir. 2004)). Section 1112(b) provides for dismissal for "cause." A lack of good

faith constitutes "cause," though it does not fall into one of the examples of cause specifically listed in the statute. *See In re SGL Carbon Corp.*, 200 F.3d 154, 159-62 (3d Cir. 1999). Because the Code's text neither sets nor bars explicitly a good-faith requirement, we have grounded it in the "equitable nature of bankruptcy" and the "purposes underlying Chapter 11." *Id.* at 161-62 ("A debtor who attempts to garner shelter under the Bankruptcy Code . . . must act in conformity with the Code's underlying principles.").

Once at issue, the burden to establish good faith is on the debtor. *BEPCO*, 589 F.3d at 618 (citing *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 118); *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 162 n.10. We "examine the totality of facts and circumstances and determine where a petition falls along the spectrum ranging from the clearly acceptable to the patently abusive." *BEPCO*, 589 F.3d at 618 (internal quotation marks omitted) (citing *Integrated Telecom,* 384 F.3d at 118). Though a debtor's subjective intent may be relevant, good faith falls "more on [an] objective analysis of whether the debtor has sought to step outside the 'equitable limitations' of Chapter 11." *Id.* at 618 n.8 (citing *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 165).

"[T]wo inquiries . . . are particularly relevant": "(1) whether the petition serves a valid bankruptcy purpose[;] and (2) whether [it] is filed merely to obtain a tactical litigation advantage." *Id.* at 618 (internal quotation marks omitted) (citing *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 119-20). Valid bankruptcy purposes include "preserv[ing] a going concern" or "maximiz[ing] the value of the debtor's estate." *Id.* at 619. Further, a valid bankruptcy purpose "assumes a debtor in financial distress." *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 128.

C. Financial Distress as a Requirement of Good Faith

Our precedents show a debtor who does not suffer from financial distress cannot demonstrate its Chapter 11 petition serves a valid bankruptcy purpose supporting good faith. We first applied this principle in *SGL Carbon*. The debtor there filed for Chapter 11 protection in the face of many antitrust lawsuits—in its words, to "protect itself against excessive demands made by plaintiffs" and "achieve an expeditious resolution of the claims." 200 F.3d at 157. But we dismissed the petition for lack of good faith, relying on the debtor's strong financial health. *Id.* at 162-70. We rejected arguments that the suits seriously threatened the company and could force it out of business, suggesting the magnitude of potential liability would not likely render it insolvent. *Id.* at 162-64. And the filing was premature, as one could be later made—without risking the debtor's ability to reorganize—at a time a company-threatening judgment occurred. *Id.* at 163. Finally, in considering whether the petition served a valid bankruptcy purpose, we discerned none in light of the debtor's substantial equity cushion and a lack of evidence suggesting it had trouble paying debts or impaired access to capital markets. *Id.* at 166. Were the debtor facing "serious financial and/or managerial difficulties at the time of filing," the result may have been different. *Id.* at 164.

Integrated Telecom made clear that "good faith *necessarily requires* some degree of financial distress on the part of a debtor." 384 F.3d at 121 (emphasis added). That debtor was a non-operating, nearly liquidated shell company that was "highly solvent and cash rich at the time of the bankruptcy." *Id.* at 124. And its financial condition was key to the petition's dismissal. We said that Chapter 11 could not

improve its failing business model nor resolve pending securities litigation in a way that increased recoveries for creditors. *Id.* at 120-26. Thus the proceeding could preserve no "value that otherwise would be lost outside of bankruptcy," showing those problems were not the kinds of financial issues Chapter 11 aimed to address. *Id.* at 120, 129. And absent financial distress, the debtor's desire to benefit from certain Code provisions (such as those capping claims for future rents) could not justify its presence in bankruptcy. *Id.* at 126-29.

We note that, when considering the whole of the circumstances in these decisions, we evaluated rationales for filing offered by the debtor that were only modestly related to its financial health—even after recognizing it was not in financial distress. Yet we rejected all of them and stuck to the debtor's financial condition. *Id.*; *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 167-68.

The theme is clear: absent financial distress, there is no reason for Chapter 11 and no valid bankruptcy purpose. "Courts, therefore, have consistently dismissed . . . petitions filed by financially healthy companies with no need to reorganize under the protection of Chapter 11. . . . [I]f a petitioner has no need to rehabilitate or reorganize, its petition cannot serve the rehabilitative purpose for which Chapter 11 was designed." *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 122 (quoting *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 166).

But what degree of financial distress justifies a debtor's filing? To say, for example, that a debtor must be in financial distress is not to say it must necessarily be insolvent. We recognize as much, as the Code conspicuously does not contain any particular insolvency requirement. *See SGL Carbon*, 200

F.3d at 163; *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 121. And we need not set out any specific test to apply rigidly when evaluating financial distress. Nor does the Code direct us to apply one.

Instead, the good-faith gateway asks whether the debtor faces the kinds of problems that justify Chapter 11 relief. Though insolvency is not strictly required, and "no list is exhaustive of all the factors which could be relevant when analyzing a particular debtor's good faith," *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 166 n.16, we cannot ignore that a debtor's balance-sheet insolvency or insufficient cash flows to pay liabilities (or the future likelihood of these issues occurring) are likely always relevant. This is because they pose a problem Chapter 11 is designed to address: "that the system of individual creditor remedies may be bad for the creditors *as a group* when there are *not enough assets to go around*." *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 121 (second set of italics added) (quoting Thomas H. Jackson, *The Logic and Limits of Bankruptcy Law* 10 (1986)).

Still, we cannot today predict all forms of financial difficulties that may in some cases justify a debtor's presence in Chapter 11. Financial health can be threatened in other ways; for instance, uncertain and unliquidated future liabilities could pose an obstacle to a debtor efficiently obtaining financing and investment. As we acknowledged in *SGL Carbon*, certain financial problems or litigation may require significant attention, resulting in "serious . . . managerial difficulties." 200 F.3d at 164. Mass tort cases may present these issues and others as well, like the exodus of customers and suppliers wary of a firm's credit-risk. *See, e.g.*, Mark J. Roe, *Bankruptcy and Mass Tort*, 84 Colum. L. Rev. 846, 855 (1984) (describing the "adverse" and "severe" effects large-

scale, future tort claims may have on a firm). So many spokes can lead to financial distress in the right circumstances that we cannot divine them all. What we can do, case-by-case, is consider all relevant facts in light of the purposes of the Code.

Financial distress must not only be apparent, but it must be immediate enough to justify a filing. "[A]n attenuated possibility standing alone" that a debtor "may have to file for bankruptcy in the future" does not establish good faith. *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 164; *see, e.g., Baker v. Latham Sparrowbush Assocs. (In re Cohoes Indus. Terminal, Inc.)*, 931 F.2d 222, 228 (2d Cir. 1991) ("Although a debtor need not be *in extremis* in order to file[,] . . . it must, at least, face such financial difficulty that, if it did not file at that time, it could anticipate the need to file in the future."). Yet we recognize the Code contemplates "the need for early access to bankruptcy relief to allow a debtor to rehabilitate its business before it is faced with a hopeless situation." *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 163. A "financially troubled" debtor facing mass tort liability, for example, may require bankruptcy to "enable a continuation of [its] business and to maintain access to the capital markets" even before it is insolvent. *Id.* at 169.

Still, encouragement of early filing "does not open the door to premature filing." *Id.* at 163. This may be a fine line in some cases, but our bankruptcy system puts courts, vested with equitable powers, in the best position to draw it.

Risks associated with premature filing may be particularly relevant in the context of a mass tort bankruptcy. Inevitably those cases will involve a bankruptcy court estimating claims on a great scale—introducing the possibility of undervaluing future claims (and underfunding assets left to

satisfy them)[12] and the difficulty of fairly compensating claimants with wide-ranging degrees of exposure and injury. On the other hand, a longer history of litigation outside of bankruptcy may provide a court with better guideposts when tackling these issues.[13]

To take a step back, testing the nature and immediacy of a debtor's financial troubles, and examining its good faith more generally, are necessary because bankruptcy significantly disrupts creditors' existing claims against the debtor: "Chapter 11 vests petitioners with considerable powers—the automatic

---

[12] *See* Report of the National Bankruptcy Review Commission 343-44 (Oct. 20, 1997) (recognizing claims-estimation accuracy is an important component of the integrity of the mass tort bankruptcy process and noting underestimation of claims occurred in the Johns-Manville case, one of the earliest asbestos bankruptcy cases, while also pointing to the adequate funding of trusts in subsequent cases to show those risks are surmountable).

[13] For instance, the A.H. Robins claimants' trust has been recognized as one that functioned effectively and remained solvent for years. There the Court and stakeholders had the benefit of data from 15 years of tort litigation by A.H. Robins before its filing. *See* Report of the National Bankruptcy Review Commission 328 n.813, 344-45 (Oct. 20, 1997) (citing Jack B. Weinstein, *Individual Justice in Mass Tort Litigation: The Effect of Class Actions, Consolidations, and other Multiparty Devices* 280 n.88, 326 n.149 (Northwestern Press 1995), and Ralph R. Mabey & Peter A. Zisser, *Improving Treatment of Future Claims: The Unfinished Business Left by the Manville Amendments,* 69 Am. Bankr. L.J. 487, 497 n.45 (1995)).

stay, the exclusive right to propose a reorganization plan, the discharge of debts, etc.—that can impose significant hardship on particular creditors. When *financially troubled* petitioners seek a chance to remain in business, the exercise of those powers is justified." *Integrated Telecom*, 384 F.3d at 120 (emphasis added) (citing *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 165-66). Accordingly, we have said the availability of certain debtor-favored Code provisions "assume[s] the existence of a valid bankruptcy, which, in turn, assumes a debtor in financial distress." *Id.* at 128. Put another way, "Congress designed Chapter 11 to give those businesses teetering on the verge of a fatal financial plummet an opportunity to reorganize on solid ground and try again, not to give profitable enterprises an opportunity to evade contractual or other liability." *Cedar Shore Resort, Inc v. Mueller (In re Cedar Shore Resort, Inc.)*, 235 F.3d 375, 381 (8th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Our confidence in the conclusion that financial distress is vital to good faith is reinforced by the central role it plays in other courts' inquiries.[14] Chapter 11's legislative history also

[14] *See, e.g.*, *Little Creek Dev. Co. v. Commonw. Mortg. Corp. (In re Little Creek Dev. Co.)*, 779 F.2d 1068, 1072 (5th Cir. 1986) ("Determining whether the debtor's filing for relief is in good faith depends largely upon the bankruptcy court's on-the-spot evaluation of the debtor's financial condition, motives, and the local financial realities."); *Cedar Shore Resort, Inc.*, 235 F.3d at 379-80 (in evaluating good faith, courts "consider the totality of the circumstances, including . . . the debtor's financial condition, motives, and the local financial realities"; dismissing petition, in part, because the debtor was "not in dire financial straits"); *In re James Wilson Assocs.*, 965 F.2d 160,

suggests it was meant to "deal[] with the reorganization of a financially distressed enterprise." *SGL Carbon*, 200 F.3d at 166 (quoting S. Rep. No. 95-989, at 9, *reprinted in* 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5787, 5795).

The takeaway here is that when financial distress is present, bankruptcy may be an appropriate forum for a debtor to address mass tort liability. Our *SGL Carbon* decision specifically addressed this in distinguishing the financial distress faced by Johns-Manville in its Chapter 11 case. It was prompted by a tide of asbestos litigation that, but for its filing, would have forced the debtor to book a $1.9 billion liability reserve "trigger[ing] the acceleration of approximately $450

---

170 (7th Cir. 1992) (recognizing that, while the Code permits a firm to file though it is not insolvent, such filings usually involve "impending insolvency"); *Cohoes Indus. Terminal*, 931 F.2d at 228 (in the context of whether a petition was frivolous under Bankruptcy Rule 9011, stating "[a]lthough a debtor need not be *in extremis* in order to file[,] . . . it must, at least, face such financial difficulty that, if it did not file at that time, it could anticipate the need to file in the future"); *see also, e.g.*, *Barclays-Am./Bus. Credit, Inc. v. Radio WBHP, Inc.* (*In re Dixie Broad., Inc.)*, 871 F.2d 1023, 1027-28 (11th Cir. 1989) (stating that whether a debtor is "financially distressed" is one factor evidencing bad faith and that "the Bankruptcy Code is not intended to insulate 'financially secure' [debtors]"); *Carolin Corp.*, 886 F.2d at 701 (one prong of the good-faith inquiry is meant to ensure the petition bears "some relation to the statutory objective of resuscitating a financially troubled [debtor]") (brackets in original) (citing *Connell v. Coastal Cable T.V., Inc. (In re Coastal Cable T.V., Inc.)*, 709 F.2d 762, 765 (1st Cir. 1983)).

million of outstanding debt, [and] possibly resulting in a forced liquidation of key business segments." *In re Johns-Manville Corp.*, 36 B.R. 727, 730 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984). That created a "compelling need [for the debtor] to reorganize in order to meet" its obligations to creditors. *Id.* This urgency stood in stark contrast to the circumstances in *SGL Carbon*, where the debtor faced no suits, or even liquidated judgments, that threatened its ongoing operations.

A.H. Robins Company, before its bankruptcy, faced financial woes like Johns-Manville's, in both cases caused by mass product liabilities litigation. Before filing, Robins had only $5 million in unrestricted funds and a "financial picture . . . so bleak that financial institutions were unwilling to lend it money." *In re A.H. Robins Co., Inc.*, 89 B.R. 555, 558 (Bankr. E.D.V.A. 1988). The Court concluded Robins "had no choice but to file for relief under Chapter 11." *Id.*

And in Dow Corning's Chapter 11 case, the Court described the company's resolve to address mass tort liability as "a legitimate effort to rehabilitate a solvent but *financially-distressed* corporation." *In re Dow Corning Corp.*, 244 B.R. 673, 676-77 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 1999) (emphasis added). It specifically recognized that "the legal costs and logistics of defending the worldwide product liability lawsuits against the [d]ebtor threatened its vitality by depleting its financial resources and preventing its management from focusing on core business matters." *Id.* at 677.

These cases show that mass tort liability can push a debtor to the brink. But to measure the debtor's distance to it, courts must always weigh not just the scope of liabilities the debtor faces, but also the capacity it has to meet them. We now

go there, but only after detouring to a problem particular to our case: For good-faith purposes, should we judge the financial condition of LTL by looking to Old Consumer—the operating business with valuable assets, but damaging tort liability, that the restructuring and filing here aimed to protect? Or should we look to LTL, the entity that actually filed for bankruptcy? Or finally, like the Bankruptcy Court, should we consider "the financial risks and burdens facing both Old [Consumer] and [LTL]"? App. 14 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 14).

D. Only LTL's Financial Condition is Determinative.

Weighing the totality of facts and circumstances might seem on the surface to require that we evaluate the state of affairs of both Old Consumer and LTL when judging the latter's financial distress. That said, we must not underappreciate the financial reality of LTL while unduly elevating the comparative relevance of its pre-bankruptcy predecessor that no longer exists. Even were we unable to distinguish the financial burdens facing the two entities, we can distinguish their vastly different sets of available assets to address those burdens. On this we part from the Bankruptcy Court.

Thus for us, the financial state of LTL—a North Carolina limited liability company formed under state law and existing separate from both its predecessor company (Old Consumer) and its newly incorporated counterpart company (New Consumer)—should be tested independent of any other entity. That means we focus on its assets, liabilities, and, critically, the funding backstop it has in place to pay those liabilities.

Doing so reflects the principle that state-law property interests should generally be given the same effect inside and outside bankruptcy: "Property interests are created and defined by state law. Unless some federal interest requires a different result, there is no reason why such interests should be analyzed differently simply because an interested party is involved in a bankruptcy proceeding." *Butner v. United States,* 440 U.S. 48, 55 (1979). No one doubts that the state-law divisional merger passed talc liabilities to LTL. Why in bankruptcy would we recognize the effectiveness of this state-law transaction, but at the same time ignore others that augment LTL's assets, such as its birth gift of the Funding Agreement? To say the financial condition of Old Consumer prior to the restructuring—which was not bolstered by such a contractual payment right—determines the availability of Chapter 11 to LTL would impose on the latter a lookback focused on the nonavailability of a funding backstop to what is now a nonentity.

Instead, we must evaluate the full set of state-law transactions involving LTL to understand the makeup of its financial rights and obligations that, in turn, dictate its financial condition. Even were we to agree that the full suite of reorganizational steps was a "single integrated transaction," App. 43 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 43), this conclusion does not give us license to look past its effect: the creation of a new entity with a unique set of assets and liabilities, and the elimination of another. Only the former is in bankruptcy and subject to its good-faith requirement. *See* Ralph Brubaker, *Assessing the Legitimacy of the "Texas Two-Step" Mass-Tort Bankruptcy*, 42 No. 8 Bankr. L. Letter NL 1 (Aug. 2022) (observing that the Bankruptcy Code is designed to address the financial distress of the entity *in* bankruptcy).

We cannot say a "federal interest requires a different result." *See Butner*, 440 U.S. at 55. That is because the Bankruptcy Code is an amalgam of creditor-debtor tradeoffs balanced by a Congress that assumed courts applying it would respect the separateness of legal entities (and their respective assets and liabilities). "[T]he general expectation of state law and of the Bankruptcy Code . . . is that courts respect entity separateness absent compelling circumstances calling equity . . . into play." *In re Owens Corning,* 419 F.3d 195, 211 (3d Cir. 2005). Put differently, as separateness is foundational to corporate law, which in turn is a predicate to bankruptcy law, it is not easily ignored. It is especially hard to ignore when J&J's pre-bankruptcy restructuring—ring-fencing talc liabilities in LTL and forming the basis for this filing—depended on courts honoring this principle.

The Bankruptcy Code is designed in important part to protect and distribute a debtor's assets to satisfy its liabilities. It strains logic then to say the condition of a defunct entity should determine the availability of Chapter 11 to the only entity subject to it. To do so would introduce uncertainty regarding how far back and to what entities a court can look when evaluating a debtor's financial distress.

Thus, while we agree with the Bankruptcy Court that both entities are part of our discussion of financial distress, the financial condition of Old Consumer is relevant only to the extent it informs our view of the financial condition of LTL itself.

E. LTL Was Not in Financial Distress.

With our focus properly set, we now evaluate the financial condition of LTL. It is here we most disagree with

the Bankruptcy Court, as it erred by overemphasizing the relevance of Old Consumer's financial condition. And while we do not second-guess its findings on the scope and costs of talc exposure up to the filing date, we do not accept its projections of future liability derived from those facts.

After these course corrections, we cannot agree LTL was in financial distress when it filed its Chapter 11 petition. The value and quality of its assets, which include a roughly $61.5 billion payment right against J&J and New Consumer, make this holding untenable.

The Funding Agreement merits special mention. To recap, under it LTL had the right, outside of bankruptcy, to cause J&J and New Consumer, jointly and severally, to pay it cash up to the value of New Consumer as of the petition date (estimated at $61.5 billion) to satisfy any talc-related costs and normal course expenses. Plus this value would increase as the value of New Consumer's business and assets increased. App. 4316-17 (Funding Agreement 4-5, § 1 Definition of "JJCI Value").[15] The Agreement provided LTL a right to cash that was very valuable, likely to grow, and minimally conditional. And this right was reliable, as J&J and New Consumer were highly creditworthy counterparties (an understatement) with the capacity to satisfy it.

[15] While, as described above, the uses for which LTL may draw on the payment right change in bankruptcy (*i.e.*, LTL is permitted to draw on it to fund a claimant trust and satisfy administrative expenses), we focus on the rights available to it just prior to its filing for good-faith purposes.

As for New Consumer, it had access to Old Consumer's cash-flowing brands and products along with the profits they produced, which underpinned the $61.5 billion enterprise value of New Consumer as of LTL's filing. And the sales and adjusted income of the consumer health business showed steady growth in the last several years when talc costs were excluded. Most important, though, the payment right gave LTL direct access to J&J's exceptionally strong balance sheet. At the time of LTL's filing, J&J had well over $400 billion in equity value with a AAA credit rating and $31 billion just in cash and marketable securities. It distributed over $13 billion to shareholders in each of 2020 and 2021. It is hard to imagine a scenario where J&J and New Consumer would be unable to satisfy their joint obligations under the Funding Agreement. And, of course, J&J's primary, contractual obligation to fund talc costs was one never owed to Old Consumer (save for the short moment during the restructuring that it was technically a party to the Funding Agreement).

Yet the Bankruptcy Court hardly considered the value of LTL's payment right to its financial condition. True, it noted its jurisdictional authority could "ensure that [LTL] pursue[d] its available rights" under the Funding Agreement. App. 43 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 43). But, in discussing LTL's financial condition, the Court was "at a loss to understand, why—merely because [LTL] contractually has the right to exhaust its funding options [under the Funding Agreement]"—it was "not to be regarded as being in 'financial distress.'" App. 35 (*Id.* at 35). It speculated that a draw on the payment right could force J&J to deplete its available cash or pursue a forced liquidation of New Consumer and have a "horrific impact" on those companies. *Id.* The assumption seems to be that, out of concern for its affiliates, LTL may avoid drawing

on the payment right to its full amount. But this is unsupported and disregards the duty of LTL to access its payment assets.

Ultimately, whether this assumption was made or not, the Bankruptcy Court did not consider the full value of LTL's backstop when judging its financial condition. And at the same time it acutely focused on how talc litigation affected *Old Consumer*. *See, e.g.,* App. 34 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 34) ("The evidence confirms that the talc litigation . . . forced *Old [Consumer]* into a loss position in 2020"); App. 36 (*Id.* at 36) ("*Old [Consumer]* was not positioned to continue making substantial [t]alc [l]itigation payments"); App. 38 (*Id.* at 38) ("*Old [Consumer]* need not have waited until its viable business operations were threatened past the breaking point") (emphasis added in each citation). Directing its sight to Old Consumer and away from the Funding Agreement's benefit to LTL essentially made the financial means of Old Consumer, and not LTL, the lodestar of the Court's financial-distress analysis. This misdirection was legal error.

We also find a variable missing in the Bankruptcy Court's projections of future liability for LTL extrapolated from the history of Old Consumer's talc litigation: the latter's successes. To reiterate, before bankruptcy Old Consumer had settled about 6,800 talc-related claims for under $1 billion and obtained dismissals of about 1,300 ovarian cancer and over 250 mesothelioma claims without payment. And a minority of the completed trials resulted in verdicts against it (with some of those verdicts reversed on appeal). Yet the Court invoked calculations that just the legal fees to defend all existing ovarian cancer claims (each through trial) would cost up to $190 billion. App. 37 (*Id.* at 37). It surmised "one could argue" the exposure from the existing mesothelioma claims

alone exceeded $15 billion. App. 17 (*Id.* at 17). These conjectures ballooned its conclusion that, "[e]ven without a calculator or abacus, one can multiply multi-million dollar or multi-billion dollar verdicts by tens of thousands of existing claims, let alone future claims," to see that "the continued viability of all J&J companies is imperiled." App. 36 (*Id.* at 36).

What these projections ignore is the possibility of meaningful settlement, as well as successful defense and dismissal, of claims by assuming most, if not all, would go to and succeed at trial. In doing so, these projections contradict the record. And while the Bankruptcy Court questioned the continuing relevance of the past track record after *Ingham* and the breakdown of the Imerys settlement talks, this assumes too much too early. Nothing in the record suggests *Ingham*—one of 49 pre-bankruptcy trials and described even by J&J as "unique" and "not representative," App. 2692-93—was the new norm. Nor is there anything that shows all hope of a meaningful global or near-global settlement was lost after the initial Imerys offer was rebuffed. The Imerys bankruptcy remained a platform to negotiate settlement. And the progression of the multidistrict litigation on a separate track would continue to sharpen all interested parties' views of mutually beneficial settlement values.

Finally, we cannot help noting that the casualness of the calculations supporting the Court's projections engenders doubt as to whether they were factual findings at all, but instead back-of-the-envelope forecasts of hypothetical worst-case scenarios. Still, to the extent they were findings of fact, we cannot say these were inferences permissibly drawn and entitled to deference. *See Universal Mins.*, 669 F.2d at 102.

And as we locate no other inferences or support in the record to bear the Court's assertion that the "talc liabilities" "far exceed [LTL's] capacity to satisfy [them]," we cannot accept this conclusion either.[16] App. 23 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 23).

In this context, it becomes clear that, on its filing, LTL did not have any likely need in the present or the near-term, or even in the long-term, to exhaust its funding rights to pay talc liabilities. In the over five years of litigation to date, the aggregate costs had reached $4.5 billion (less than 7.5% of the $61.5 billion value on the petition date), with about half of these costs attributable to one ovarian cancer verdict, *Ingham*,

---

[16] Because we arrive at the same result assuming the Bankruptcy Court was correct to determine LTL was responsible to indemnify J&J for *all* talc costs it incurs, we need not opine on this conclusion. Still, we note certain pertinent factors lack full discussion in the Court's analysis of the indemnity agreement relating to Johnson's Baby Powder in the 1979 Spin Off. App. 163-69 (Third-Party Inj. Op. 24-30). For example, it is not obvious LTL must indemnify J&J for the latter's independent, post-1979 conduct that is the basis of a verdict rendered against it. *See* App. 4957 (Agreement for Transfer of Assets and Bill of Sale 5 ¶ 4) (Old Consumer's predecessor agrees to assume and indemnify J&J against "all . . . liabilities and obligations of every kind and description *which are allocated on the books or records of J&J* as pertaining to the BABY Division.") (emphasis added). It is also not clear the indemnity should be read to reach punitive damage verdicts rendered against J&J for its own conduct. Additionally, the Court never discussed how it reached its conclusion that Old Consumer assumed responsibility from J&J for *all* claims relating to Shower to Shower.

to date an outlier victory for plaintiffs. While the number of talc claims had surged in recent years, still J&J, as of October 2021, valued the probable and reasonably estimable contingent loss for its products liability litigation, including for talc, under GAAP, at $2.4 billion for the next two years. Further, though settlement offers are only that, we do not disregard LTL's suggestion that $4 billion to $5 billion was at one time considered by plaintiffs' lawyers to be in the ballpark to resolve virtually all multidistrict ovarian cancer claims as well as corresponding additional claims in the Imerys bankruptcy. And as noted, we view all this against a pre-bankruptcy backdrop where Old Consumer had success settling claims or obtaining dismissal orders, and where, at trial, ovarian cancer plaintiffs never won verdicts that withstood appeal outside of *Ingham* and mesothelioma plaintiffs had odds of prevailing that were less than stellar.

From these facts—presented by J&J and LTL themselves—we can infer only that LTL, at the time of its filing, was highly solvent with access to cash to meet comfortably its liabilities as they came due for the foreseeable future. It looks correct to have implied, in a prior court filing, that there was not "*any imminent or even likely need of [it] to invoke the Funding Agreement to its maximum amount or anything close to it.*" App. 3747 (LTL's Obj. to Mots. for Cert. of Direct Appeal 22) (emphasis added). Indeed, the Funding Agreement itself recited that LTL, after the divisional merger and assumption of that Agreement, held "assets having a value at least equal to its liabilities and had financial capacity sufficient to satisfy its obligations as they become due in the ordinary course of business, *including any [t]alc [r]elated [l]iabilities*." App. 4313 (Funding Agreement 1, ¶ E) (emphasis added).

We take J&J and LTL at their word and agree. LTL has a funding backstop, not unlike an ATM disguised as a contract, that it can draw on to pay liabilities without any disruption to its business or threat to its financial viability. It may be that a draw under the Funding Agreement results in payments by New Consumer that in theory might someday threaten its ability to sustain its operational costs. But those risks do not affect LTL, for J&J remains its ultimate safeguard. And we cannot say any potential liquidation by LTL of Royalty A&M—a collection of bare rights to streams of payments cobbled together on the eve of bankruptcy—to pay talc costs would amount to financial distress. Plus LTL had no obligation, outside of bankruptcy, to sell those assets for cash before drawing on the Funding Agreement.

At base level, LTL, whose employees are all J&J employees, is essentially a shell company "formed," almost exclusively, "to manage and defend thousands of talc-related claims" while insulating at least the assets now in New Consumer. App. 449 (Decl. of John Kim 5). And LTL was well-funded to do this. As of the time of its filing, we cannot say there was any sign on the horizon it would be anything but successful in the enterprise. It is even more difficult to say it faced any "serious financial and/or managerial difficulties" calling for the need to reorganize during its short life outside of bankruptcy. *SGL Carbon,* 200 F.3d at 164.[17]

[17] In saying the nature of the payment right and a lack of meaningful operations show that LTL did not suffer from sufficient kinds of financial distress, we focus on the special circumstances here and do not suggest the presence of these

But what if, contrary to J&J's statements, *Ingham* is not an anomaly but a harbinger of things to come? What if time shows, with the progression of litigation outside of bankruptcy, that cash available under the Funding Agreement cannot adequately address talc liability? Perhaps at that time LTL could show it belonged in bankruptcy. But it could not do so in October 2021. While LTL inherited massive liabilities, its call on assets to fund them exceeded any reasonable projections available on the record before us. The "attenuated possibility" that talc litigation may require it to file for bankruptcy in the future does not establish its good faith as of its petition date. *Id.* at 164. At best the filing was premature.[18]

In sum, while it is unwise today to attempt a tidy definition of financial distress justifying in all cases resort to Chapter 11, we can confidently say the circumstances here fall outside those bounds. Because LTL was not in financial

---

characteristics would preclude a finding of financial distress in every case.

[18] Some might read our logic to suggest LTL need only part with its funding backstop to render itself fit for a renewed filing. While this question is also premature, we note interested parties may seek to "avoid any transfer" made within two years of any bankruptcy filing by a debtor who "receive[s] less than a reasonably equivalent value in exchange for such transfer" and "became insolvent as a result of [it]." 11 U.S.C. § 548(a). So if the question becomes ripe, the next one might be: Did LTL receive reasonably equivalent value in exchange for forgoing its rights under the Funding Agreement?

distress, it cannot show its petition served a valid bankruptcy purpose and was filed in good faith under Code § 1112(b).[19]

F. "Unusual Circumstances" Do Not Preclude Dismissal

The Bankruptcy Court held, as an independent basis for its decision, that even if LTL's petition were not filed in good faith, § 1112(b)(2) of the Code authorized it nonetheless to deny dismissal. For a petition to be saved under that provision, a court must identify "unusual circumstances establishing that . . . [dismissal] is not in the best interests of creditors and the estate." 11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)(2). The debtor (or any other party in interest) must also establish "the grounds for . . . [dismissal] include an act or omission" (1) "for which there exists a reasonable justification" and (2) "that will be cured within a reasonable period of time." *Id*.

The Bankruptcy Court ruled that "the interests of current tort creditors and the absence of viable protections for future tort claimants outside of bankruptcy . . . constitute such

[19] Because we conclude LTL's petition has no valid bankruptcy purpose, we need not ask whether it was filed "merely to obtain a tactical litigation advantage." *BEPCO,* 589 F.3d at 618. Yet it is clear LTL's bankruptcy filing aimed to beat back talc litigation in trial courts. Still "[i]t is not bad faith to seek to gain an advantage from declaring bankruptcy—why else would one declare it?" *James Wilson Assoc.*, 965 F.2d at 170. While we ultimately leave the question unaddressed, a filing to change the forum of litigation where there is no financial distress raises, as it did in *SGL Carbon*, the specter of "abuse which must be guarded against to protect the integrity of the bankruptcy system." 200 F.3d at 169.

'unusual circumstances' as to preclude . . . dismissal." App. 13 (Mot. to Dismiss Op. 13 n.8). But what is unusual instead is that a debtor comes to bankruptcy with the insurance accorded LTL. Our ground for dismissal is LTL's lack of financial distress. No "reasonable justification" validates that missing requirement in this case. And we cannot currently see how its lack of financial distress could be overcome. For these reasons, we go counter to the Bankruptcy Court's conclusion that "unusual circumstances" sanction LTL's Chapter 11 petition.

III. CONCLUSION

Our decision dismisses the bankruptcy filing of a company created to file for bankruptcy. It restricts J&J's ability to move thousands of claims out of trial courts and into bankruptcy court so they may be resolved, in J&J's words, "equitably" and "efficiently." LTL Br. 8. But given Chapter 11's ability to redefine fundamental rights of third parties, only those facing financial distress can call on bankruptcy's tools to do so. Applied here, while LTL faces substantial future talc liability, its funding backstop plainly mitigates any financial distress foreseen on its petition date.

We do not duck an apparent irony: that J&J's triple A-rated payment obligation for LTL's liabilities, which it views as a generous protection it was never required to provide to claimants, weakened LTL's case to be in bankruptcy. Put another way, the bigger a backstop a parent company provides a subsidiary, the less fit that subsidiary is to file. But when the backstop provides ample financial support to a debtor who then seeks shelter in a system designed to protect those without it, we see this perceived incongruity dispelled.

That said, we mean not to discourage lawyers from being inventive and management from experimenting with novel solutions. Creative crafting in the law can at times accrue to the benefit of all, or nearly all, stakeholders. Thus we need not lay down a rule that no nontraditional debtor could ever satisfy the Code's good-faith requirement.

But here J&J's belief that this bankruptcy creates the best of all possible worlds for it and the talc claimants is not enough, no matter how sincerely held. Nor is the Bankruptcy Court's commendable effort to resolve a more-than-thorny problem. These cannot displace the rule that resort to Chapter 11 is appropriate only for entities facing financial distress. This safeguard ensures that claimants' pre-bankruptcy remedies—here, the chance to prove to a jury of their peers injuries claimed to be caused by a consumer product—are disrupted only when necessary.

Some may argue any divisional merger to excise the liability and stigma of a product gone bad contradicts the principles and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code. But even that is a call that awaits another day and another case. For here the debtor was in no financial distress when it sought Chapter 11 protection. To ignore a parent (and grandparent) safety net shielding all liability then foreseen would allow tunnel vision to create a legal blind spot. We will not do so.

We thus reverse the Bankruptcy Court's order denying the motions to dismiss and remand this case with the instruction to dismiss LTL's Chapter 11 petition. Dismissing its case annuls the litigation stay ordered by the Court and makes moot the need to decide that issue.