

Meme Stock Buyers Must Heed Bankruptcy Code Provisions

By **Michael Handler and Andrew Michaelson**

(September 28, 2022, 4:11 PM EDT)

Financial news headlines of 2020 and 2021 were dominated by investors piling into distressed and secularly challenged companies with high leverage.

To the surprise of no one, many of these companies took advantage of the interest in their equity by issuing new stock and using the proceeds to pay down debt and shore up liquidity.

Although meme stock investing has been tempered in 2022 due to, among other things, the Federal Reserve System raising interest rates and high inflation, it briefly made a comeback in the trading activity of beleaguered retailer Bed Bath & Beyond, or BBBY.

In sum, BBBY's stock rose from a low of around \$4.60 to a high of \$30.06 over the course of three weeks as retail investors piled into the name in a speculative frenzy based on a short squeeze theory rather than the company's operating financial prospects.

The stock came back down to earth, however, when major holder Ryan Cohen disclosed in a U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission filing that he — through his holding company, RC Ventures LLC — sold all of his BBBY company stock.

Now, BBBY is facing an investor lawsuit asserting, among others, claims for violations of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, Rule 10b-5 and Section 20(a) of the Exchange Act based on allegations relating to Cohen's stock sale.

Although BBBY has raised incremental liquidity and likely postponed a potential Chapter 11 filing, it is far from out of the woods, especially if it has a poor holiday season. Indeed, on Sept. 1, the S&P Global Ratings lowered its issue-level rating on BBBY's senior unsecured notes to CCC- from CCC.

Given that BBBY is facing private securities lawsuits amid the risk it will have to file for Chapter 11 protection in the future, it serves as the perfect talking point for the importance of understanding Section 510(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, which subordinates claims held by investors on account of damages arising from the purchase or sale of the debtor's or an affiliate of the debtor's securities as further set forth below.



Michael Handler



Andrew
Michaelson

Overview of Section 510(b)

Section 510(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that for purposes of bankruptcy distributions,

a claim arising from rescission of a purchase or sale of a security of the debtor or of an affiliate of the debtor, for damages arising from the purchase or sale of such a security, or for reimbursement or contribution allowed under Section 502 on account of such a claim, shall be subordinated to all claims or interests that are senior to or equal the claim or interest represented by such security, except that if such security is common stock, such claim has the same priority as common stock.

While the term "security" is defined in Section 101(49) of the Bankruptcy Code and includes debt instruments,[1] most of the relevant case law under Section 510(b) involves equity securities. Courts have construed Section 510(b) broadly to include a wide variety of causes of actions arising out of securities transactions.[2]

Congress enacted Section 510(b) to prevent equity holders — who would normally be at the bottom of the bankruptcy distribution — from using equity-related litigation claims to bootstrap their way to being *pari passu* with general unsecured claims, which would otherwise include civil litigation claims.[3]

Unlike equitable subordination under Section 510(c), subordination under Section 510(b) is mandatory — i.e., it is not within the debtor's discretion to apply it.

Section 510(b) Applied to a Hypothetical Bankruptcy

The impact of Section 510(b) is perhaps best conveyed through a hypothetical.

RocketCo, a highly leveraged public company engaged in a secularly declining business exacerbated by COVID-19, observes a significant spike in its stock price notwithstanding no discernable change in its business outlook.

With its equity reaching a new 52-week high on a daily basis, RocketCo commences a secondary stock offering, the proceeds of which are used to pay down some of its debt and for general corporate purposes.

RocketCo completes the secondary offering; however, it is still highly leveraged and navigating significant secular and nonsecular headwinds to its operating business. Many months later, as stock market exuberance fades and investors sober up, RocketCo's stock bottoms out.

RocketCo's meme stock investors, with their diamond hands — i.e., they never sell — have significant losses on their RocketCo stock holdings and are not happy.

The meme stock investors begin to file securities class actions against RocketCo alleging, among other things, that RocketCo's offering memorandum for its secondary stock offering contained material misstatements or half-truths in violation of Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act.[4]

Meanwhile, RocketCo is running out of money and eventually negotiates a comprehensive balance sheet restructuring and recapitalization that proposes to refinance its senior debt, equitize its junior bond debt — including a new money equity rights offering — and wipe out its existing equity.

RocketCo and its funded debt creditors seek to effectuate this restructuring through a prepackaged Chapter 11 bankruptcy, with the holders of general unsecured claims unimpaired and riding through unaffected by the bankruptcy cases.

This means that all general unsecured claims, including contingent unliquidated claims — e.g., pending litigation claims — remain unaffected by the bankruptcy cases and plan discharge, and are proposed to be paid in full in the ordinary course.

The RocketCo plan, however, provides that existing equity claims and "securities claims subordinated pursuant to Section 510(b)" are not entitled to any recovery and are deemed to reject the plan under Section 1126(g) of the Bankruptcy Code. Thus, not only is existing equity wiped out, the RocketCo Plan discharges the pending RocketCo securities litigation claim as well.

Although the meme stock investors could object to the RocketCo plan, they are in an incredibly tough position for a variety of reasons, including the following:

- Given RocketCo's significant new money need and equitization of the bonds, no credible RocketCo valuation shows equity in the money, as the junior bond debt claims are significantly impaired;
- Unless they successfully petition the Bankruptcy Court to appoint a committee of equity holders under Section 1102(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code,[5] the meme investors will need to pay for their restructuring adviser fees out-of-pocket;
- Among the primary factors bankruptcy courts look at when determining whether to appoint an equity committee is the likelihood of debtor solvency, which cannot be demonstrated here;[6]
- Any credible challenge to the debtors' proposed plan valuation will require expensive litigation, including expert witnesses;
- Depending on the jurisdiction, the direct — i.e., held by the third-party equity holder plaintiffs and not the company itself — securities litigation claims against nondebtor entities, such as RocketCo's directors, insurers or lenders, may be released under the RocketCo plan;[7] and
- Any derivative claims against the board or other third parties relating to the RocketCo securities litigation claims are bankruptcy estate claims and will be part of the releases provided by the debtor to third parties under the RocketCo plan.

Conclusion

In sum, equity holders in bankruptcy almost always have an extremely tough time realizing any recovery on account of their equity holdings because most debtors are deeply insolvent at the time of filing a bankruptcy case.

Any securities law claims that equity holders have — whether liquidated to settlement/judgment or pending court disposition — will not be elevated in the debtor's claim waterfall as a result of Section 510(b).

If history is any guide, at least some of the distressed companies that have seen their common stock rise

even as their business prospects remain dim will find themselves in bankruptcy at some point in the near future.

Thus, it is incumbent upon investors to think about how specific Bankruptcy Code provisions may affect their recoveries in such companies, particularly with respect to lesser-known Bankruptcy Code provisions such as Section 510(b).

For aggrieved meme stock investors, any hope they may have that their equity losses in a meme stock investor-favored company will be mitigated by a successful securities litigation suit should be tempered by the risk and likelihood such company files for bankruptcy.

Michael R. Handler and Andrew Michaelson are partners at King & Spalding LLP.

The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, or Portfolio Media Inc., or any of its or their respective affiliates. This article is for general information purposes and is not intended to be and should not be taken as legal advice.

[1] When a claimant holds a direct debt claim, there is less of a need to resort to damages arising from the purchase of the debt instrument, since both roads generally get you to the same recovery against the debtor. As noted, it is the attempt to elevate a claim arising from an equity security to the debt level that generally necessitates the Section 510(b) inquiry.

[2] See 4 Collier on Bankruptcy ¶ 510.04[3] (Richard Levin & Henry J. Sommer eds., 16th ed.).

[3] See *In Re Telegroup, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 133, 142 (3d Cir. 2002).

[4] Meme stock investors could also assert claims under Section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933 for damages caused by untrue statements of fact or material omissions of fact within registration statements. This would relieve the meme stock investors of the burden to establish scienter—they need not prove intent to defraud to prevail under Section 11— though plaintiffs would instead face the difficult task of establishing that they had purchased shares RocketCo sold in the secondary stock offering, and not shares that had been previously trading in the market.

[5] Section 1102(a)(2) provides in relevant part that "on request of a party in interest, the court may order the appointment of additional committees of creditors or of equity security holders if necessary to assure adequate representation of creditors or of equity security holders". (emphasis added). The U.S. Trustee may appoint an official committee of equity security holders pursuant to Section 1102(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

[6] See *In re Oneida Ltd.*, 2006 WL 1288576, at *2 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. May 4, 2006) (noting that "one of the principal issues on any motion for the appointment of an equity committee is whether the debtor is solvent or it appears likely that there will be a return (or a substantial return) for equity").

[7] Notwithstanding the plain language of Section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code, which provides (in relevant part) that "discharge of a debt of the debtor does not affect the liability of any other entity on, or the property of any other entity for, such debt", the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh and Eleventh Circuits have held that non-consensual third-party releases are permissible under the Bankruptcy Code under extraordinary circumstances.