

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JUNE 2018

EDITOR'S NOTE: A SUPREME RULING ... AND MUCH MORE!

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**U.S. SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES SCOPE OF SECURITIES
SAFE HARBOR**

Stuart I. Gordon and Matthew V. Spero

**CYBERSECURITY AND POTENTIAL HEALTHCARE BANKRUPTCY:
THE CONTINUING INTERSECTION OF DATA AND DISASTER**

Leslie A. Berkoff and Stephen Breidenbach

**NINTH CIRCUIT HOLDS THAT JOINT PLAN COVERING MULTIPLE
DEBTORS MUST BE APPROVED BY ONLY ONE IMPAIRED CLASS
PER PLAN, NOT ONE IMPAIRED CLASS PER DEBTOR**

Paul M. Basta, Alan W. Kornberg, and Brian S. Hermann

**NEW YORK BANKRUPTCY COURTS GRAPPLE WITH TERRITORIAL
LIMITS OF U.S. BANKRUPTCY CODE**

Rick Antonoff, Michael B. Schaedle, Bryan J. Hall, and Matthew E. Kaslow

P.O.D. ACCOUNTS RESTRICTING BANK'S RIGHT OF SETOFF

Sara McNamara and James A. Sheriff

**IRS PROVIDES SAFE HARBOR VALUATION METHODS FOR
TAX-FREE REORGANIZATIONS**

John K. Sweet, L. Wayne Pressgrove, Jr., Abraham N.M. Shashy, Jr.,
Jonathan Talansky, Robert Beard, and John G. Green, Jr.

**THE NEW TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT—IMPLICATIONS FOR
LOAN MARKETS**

Eschi Rahimi-Laridjani and Andrew R. Walker



LexisNexis

Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

VOLUME 14

NUMBER 4

JUNE 2018

Editor's Note: A Supreme Ruling . . . and Much More! Steven A. Meyerowitz	155
U.S. Supreme Court Clarifies Scope of Securities Safe Harbor Stuart I. Gordon and Matthew V. Spero	158
Cybersecurity and Potential Healthcare Bankruptcy: The Continuing Intersection of Data and Disaster Leslie A. Berkoff and Stephen Breidenbach	163
Ninth Circuit Holds That Joint Plan Covering Multiple Debtors Must Be Approved by Only One Impaired Class Per Plan, Not One Impaired Class Per Debtor Paul M. Basta, Alan W. Kornberg, and Brian S. Hermann	181
New York Bankruptcy Courts Grapple with Territorial Limits of U.S. Bankruptcy Code Rick Antonoff, Michael B. Schaedle, Bryan J. Hall, and Matthew E. Kaslow	185
P.O.D. Accounts Restricting Bank's Right of Setoff Sara McNamara and James A. Sheriff	192
IRS Provides Safe Harbor Valuation Methods for Tax-Free Reorganizations John K. Sweet, L. Wayne Pressgrove, Jr., Abraham N.M. Shashy, Jr., Jonathan Talansky, Robert Beard, and John G. Green, Jr.	196
The New Tax Cuts and Jobs Act—Implications for Loan Markets Eschi Rahimi-Laridjani and Andrew R. Walker	199

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Kent K. B. Hanson, J.D., at 415-908-3207

Email: kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

Example: Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2018 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SCOTT L. BAENA

Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP

LESLIE A. BERKOFF

Moritt Hock & Hamroff LLP

TED A. BERKOWITZ

Farrell Fritz, P.C.

ANDREW P. BROZMAN

Clifford Chance US LLP

MICHAEL L. COOK

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP

MARK G. DOUGLAS

Jones Day

MARK J. FRIEDMAN

DLA Piper

STUART I. GORDON

Rivkin Radler LLP

PATRICK E. MEARS

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

DERYCK A. PALMER

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

PRATT'S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2018 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, please access www.copyright.com or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844.

Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, No. 18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, Attn: Customer Service, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342-9907.

IRS Provides Safe Harbor Valuation Methods for Tax-Free Reorganizations

*By John K. Sweet, L. Wayne Pressgrove, Jr., Abraham N.M. Shashy, Jr., Jonathan Talansky, Robert Beard, and John G. Green, Jr.**

The Internal Revenue Service released a Revenue Procedure, which details a safe harbor that will permit taxpayers to utilize average-price methods for purposes of determining stock consideration values in corporate reorganizations. The authors of this article discuss the Revenue Procedure.

The Internal Revenue Service (the “IRS”) has released Revenue Procedure 2018-12 (the “Revenue Procedure”) detailing a safe harbor that will permit taxpayers to utilize average-price methods for purposes of determining stock consideration values in corporate reorganizations. The Revenue Procedure is helpful to corporations that engage in acquisitions intended to qualify as tax-free reorganizations where the consideration is a mix of stock and cash (or other property). In particular, the Revenue Procedure should give transacting parties the ability to determine with certainty whether a given transaction satisfies the continuity of interest (“COI”) doctrine when the acquisition agreement uses average-price methods to set the value of stock consideration.

BACKGROUND

In order for a corporate transaction to qualify as a tax-free reorganization under the Internal Revenue Code (the “Code”) it must, among other things, satisfy the COI doctrine. The purpose of the COI doctrine is to prevent a transaction from qualifying for non-recognition treatment if the transaction more closely resembles a sale rather than a reorganization. In general, the doctrine requires shareholders of the target corporation to preserve a substantial part of their proprietary interest in the target corporation by receiving stock in the acquiring corporation. Treasury Regulations and prevailing opinion practice both reflect the view that an acquisition will generally satisfy the COI doctrine if at least 40 percent of the total consideration, by value, received by a target corporation’s shareholders consists of stock of the acquiring corporation.

Prior to 2005, an acquiring corporation’s stock had to be valued as of the transaction’s closing date for purposes of determining whether the 40 percent

* John K. Sweet (jsweet@kslaw.com), L. Wayne Pressgrove, Jr. (wpressgrove@kslaw.com), Abraham N.M. Shashy, Jr. (hshashy@kslaw.com), and Jonathan Talansky (jtalansky@kslaw.com) are partners, Robert Beard (rbeard@kslaw.com) is a senior associate, and John G. Green, Jr. (jgreen@kslaw.com) is an associate in the tax practice of King & Spalding LLP.

threshold was met. This “Closing Date Rule” can cause problems if an acquiring corporation’s stock falls in value between the date the parties agree to undertake a transaction (the signing date) and the date the transaction becomes effective (the closing date). Under these circumstances, a consideration mix that satisfied the COI requirement at signing could fail to satisfy the requirement at closing due to the decline in value of the stock component. To alleviate this concern, the Treasury Department issued final regulations (the “Final Regulations”) that implemented the “Signing Date Rule.” Under that rule, if transacting parties have entered into a binding contract that provides for “fixed consideration,” the transaction’s consideration is valued, for purposes of measuring COI, at the end of the last business day prior to the signing date. Consequently, the COI calculation will not be affected by fluctuations in the value of the acquiring corporation’s stock after signing. In cases where the Signing Date Rule does not apply due to the absence of fixed consideration, COI continues to be evaluated at the time of closing. Thus, the existence or absence of “fixed consideration” is a key factor under the Final Regulations. Generally speaking, fixed consideration exists if the contract specifies a number of acquirer shares, an amount of cash, and a description of any other property for which each share of target corporation stock will be exchanged. The Final Regulations provide several helpful rules that treat consideration as fixed despite common contingencies relating to escrows, dissenting shareholders, and shareholder-election features that allow holders to choose between cash and stock consideration.

Consideration is not fixed, however, where the parties adopt economic terms that insulate target shareholders from post-signing fluctuations in the value of the acquirer’s stock. For example, if a merger agreement provides that each share of target stock will be converted into \$50 of cash and \$50 of acquirer stock, measured using the trading price on the day before closing, consideration is not fixed because the number of shares delivered will be adjusted to offset changes in value between signing and closing. Fixed consideration is also absent if the acquisition agreement includes provisions that increase or decrease the amount of cash consideration to offset changes in the value of acquirer stock.

NEW SAFE HARBOR FOR AVERAGE-PRICE METHODS

In the Revenue Procedure, the IRS acknowledged that transacting parties commonly use average trading price methods to value stock consideration and that such methods often are a more reliable standard for determining stock value than utilizing a single day’s trading price. The IRS concluded that taxpayers should be able to rely on these methods to evaluate COI compliance.

Under the Revenue Procedure, if taxpayers use one of three safe harbor valuation methods (a “Safe Harbor Valuation”) to determine the value of

acquirer stock for purposes of setting “the number of shares of each class of [acquirer] stock, the amount of money, and any other property” to be included in the consideration mix, then the Safe Harbor Valuation can also be used to value the stock for COI purposes in lieu of the value that would normally apply under the Signing Date Rule or the Closing Date Rule. The three permitted Safe Harbor Valuation methods are: (1) the average of the daily volume weighted average prices of a stock, (2) the average of the daily average high-low trading prices for a stock, or (3) the average of the daily closing prices of a stock. Each of these three methods must be applied over a “Measuring Period” of between five and 35 consecutive trading days. If the Signing Date Rule applies, the Measuring Period must end no earlier than three trading days before the day prior to signing and no later than the day prior to signing (or, if earlier, the last pre-signing trading day). Similarly, if the Closing Date Rule applies, the Measuring Period must end no earlier than three trading days before closing and no later than the closing date (or the last pre-closing trading day).

In order to use one of the Safe Harbor Valuation methods, taxpayers must otherwise satisfy the requirements for reorganizations in Code Sections 368 and 354. The safe harbor can, however, be used to ensure a failure to satisfy the COI requirement, in which case an otherwise-qualifying transaction would not be treated as a reorganization. In addition, the stock at issue must be traded on a national securities exchange, and the transacting parties must treat the transaction consistently (either as a reorganization or not). Finally, the acquisition agreement must include provisions identifying the chosen Safe Harbor Valuation method, the applicable Measuring Period and the applicable national securities exchange, and the transaction must close in a manner consistent with these provisions of the agreement.

The Revenue Procedure is effective with respect to transactions that have an effective date on or after January 23, 2018. The IRS will consider requests for rulings and determination letters with respect to issues to which the safe harbor does not apply, as well as issues involving the applicability of the safe harbor.