

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JANUARY 2026

## EDITOR'S NOTE: CRYPTO AS COLLATERAL

Victoria Prussen Spears

## COLLATERAL DAMAGE OR COLLATERAL ADVANTAGE? CRYPTO'S ENTRY INTO THE FINANCIAL MAINSTREAM

Bepi Pezzulli

## OVER-TURNED CHEVRON DEFERENCE PROMISES A TURBULENT FUTURE FOR CREDITORS AND CONSUMERS

James Pannabecker

## DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT DISMISSES "DELAWARE TWO-STEP" FILING FOR LACK OF GOOD FAITH IN *IN RE BEDMAR, LLC*

Richard J. Cooper, David H. Botter, Thomas S. Kessler and Jack Massey

## HOUSTON WE HAVE (ANOTHER) PROBLEM: DISTRICT COURT REVERSES CONFIRMATION OVER UNEQUAL TREATMENT IN CONVERGEONE

Jeffrey D. Pawlitz

## CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

Steven A. Meyerowitz



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 22

NUMBER 1

January 2026

Editor's Note: Crypto as Collateral  
Victoria Prussen Spears

1

Collateral Damage or Collateral Advantage? Crypto's Entry into the Financial Mainstream  
Bepi Pezzulli

3

Over-Turned *Chevron* Deference Promises a Turbulent Future for Creditors and Consumers  
James Pannabecker

15

**Delaware Bankruptcy Court Dismisses "Delaware Two-Step" Filing for Lack of Good Faith in *In re Bedmar, LLC***  
Richard J. Cooper, David H. Botter, Thomas S. Kessler and Jack Massey

30

Houston We Have (Another) Problem: District Court Reverses Confirmation Over Unequal Treatment in *ConvergeOne*  
Jeffrey D. Pawlitz

34

Current Developments  
Steven A. Meyerowitz

40



## **QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

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

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at ..... 513.257.9021

Email: ..... [ryan.kearns@lexisnexis.com](mailto:ryan.kearns@lexisnexis.com)

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 (2026)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It 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 RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2026 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., 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.

Editorial Office  
521 Fifth Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10175 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://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*

**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*

*Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law* is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2026 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. 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 customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. 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, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

# Delaware Bankruptcy Court Dismisses “Delaware Two-Step” Filing for Lack of Good Faith in *In re Bedmar, LLC*

By **Richard J. Cooper, David H. Botter, Thomas S. Kessler and Jack Massey\***

*In this article, the authors review a bankruptcy court decision dismissing a Chapter 11 case for lack of good faith under Bankruptcy Code Section 1112(b).*

Judge J. Kate Stickles of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (the Court) has dismissed the Chapter 11 case of Bedmar, LLC (Bedmar) for lack of good faith under Bankruptcy Code Section 1112(b).<sup>1</sup>

Just six days prior to the Chapter 11 filing, Bedmar’s ultimate parent company, National Resilience Holdco, Inc., and other affiliated entities (collectively, National Resilience) effectuated a series of divisional mergers under Delaware law to effectively transfer underperforming leases (the Leases) to the newly-formed Bedmar, and to separate them from the revenue-generating entities within the National Resilience family. The purpose of Bedmar’s Chapter 11 filing was to reject the Leases and utilize a special feature of the Bankruptcy Code – Section 502(b)(6) – which allows debtors to cap long-term lease liabilities. The application of that provision would have reduced Bedmar’s total lease obligations from approximately \$372 million over approximately 15 years to just \$32 million. National Resilience capitalized Bedmar prefilings with \$41.4 million in cash and receivables, i.e., just enough to fund the bankruptcy case and the capped lease liabilities.

Certain Lease counterparties (the Landlords), as well as the U.S. Trustee, objected to the Chapter 11 filing on the ground that it was not filed in good faith. The Court agreed, holding that the case did not serve a valid bankruptcy purpose because Bedmar had more in assets than expected liabilities, and that its filing was instead intended to gain a tactical advantage vis-à-vis the Landlords. The Court’s ruling acknowledged precedent from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit holding that, under other circumstances, a debtor may file for the primary purpose of using Section 502(b)(6) to cap liabilities, highlighting the importance of the “valid bankruptcy purpose” holding.

---

\* The authors, attorneys with Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP, may be contacted at [rcooper@cgsh.com](mailto:rcooper@cgsh.com), [dbotter@cgsh.com](mailto:dbotter@cgsh.com), [tkessler@cgsh.com](mailto:tkessler@cgsh.com) and [jamassey@cgsh.com](mailto:jamassey@cgsh.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> Opinion, *In re Bedmar, LLC*, Case No. 25-11027 (JKS) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 29, 2025).

## **CASE BACKGROUND**

National Resilience was founded in 2020 as a biotech manufacturing venture and grew quickly, raising approximately \$2 billion in equity financing and acquiring and developing manufacturing sites in the United States. Certain sites performed well, but others failed to garner contracts, and by early 2025, the company was experiencing a liquidity crunch. Rather than restructure the entire enterprise’s debt under Chapter 11, which would have put all of its assets in play for creditors seeking recovery, National Resilience undertook a series of divisional mergers under 6 Del. C. § 18-217, allocating the underperforming Leases to the newly formed Bedmar entity, which had no business operations or employees.

Immediately upon entering bankruptcy, Bedmar filed a motion to reject the Leases as well as a Chapter 11 plan that proposed to pay the Landlords “in full,” with their claims capped pursuant to Section 502(b)(6). The Landlords, along with the U.S. Trustee, moved to dismiss the Chapter 11 case, arguing that it did not meet the good faith filing requirement of Section 1112(b).

## **DISMISSAL OF THE CHAPTER 11 CASE**

After a two-day trial, the Court granted the motions and dismissed the case for lack of good faith. The Court held that the Chapter 11 petition did not serve a valid bankruptcy purpose, because (i) the debtor was not in genuine financial distress, and (ii) the bankruptcy filing would neither preserve a going concern (given that Bedmar was never operational) nor maximize the value of the estate (as there was no benefit to the Landlords to counterbalance the harm associated with capping their claims).

Further, the Court held that the petition had been filed to gain a tactical advantage vis-à-vis the Landlords, which is not a permitted use of the Bankruptcy Code in the absence of a valid reorganization purpose.<sup>2</sup>

The Court focused in particular on the first prong – the debtor’s lack of genuine financial distress – finding that, on the contrary, its financial “obstacles” were “a fiction” that had been manufactured by National Resilience. In so finding, it rejected the debtor’s assertion that a showing of genuine financial distress requires merely a comparison of an entity’s assets (in this case, approximately \$50 million in cash) with its liabilities (here, approximately \$372

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court found that the evidence “establishe[d] that the Enterprise carefully orchestrated the Corporate Transactions that led to the Debtor’s bankruptcy filing” as shown in an email from the CEO of National Resilience stating that, “I used a legal tool to rid Resilience of the toxic sites. Now I’m down to a profitable core that will only grow from here. To me the best path to return value to shareholders.” Opinion at 35.

million in lease liabilities), looking instead to the quantum of the capped liabilities under the Leases (totaling approximately \$33 million) as compared to the entity's assets (which were, by design, greater than this liability).<sup>3</sup>

With respect to the second prong, the debtor argued that the filing was a necessity to prevent a race-to-the-courthouse by the Landlords, and for that reason, the Chapter 11 served a necessary function beyond gaining a tactical advantage in a two-party dispute. The Court rejected this argument, observing that Bedmar was current on its lease payments, and there was no indication of imminent enforcement actions on the part of the Landlords.

The Court's opinion specifically addressed Third Circuit precedent in *In re PPI Enters. (U.S.), Inc.*,<sup>4</sup> in which the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit held that "an insolvent debtor can file under Chapter 11 in order to maximize the value of its [] asset[s] to satisfy its creditors, while at the same time availing itself of the landlord cap under § 502(b)(6)."<sup>5</sup> The Court held that Bedmar's case was distinguishable, because in *PPI*, the debtor was insolvent and had filed in order to facilitate its corporate parent's winddown in a foreign jurisdiction and liquidate its sole asset. Bedmar, by contrast, was not in financial distress, had no other assets, and the benefits of the Section 502(b)(6) lease cap would accrue solely to its affiliates, none of whom were in insolvency proceedings, with no other bankruptcy purpose.<sup>6</sup>

## LESSONS FROM *BEDMAR*

The Court's decision in the *Bedmar* case is a cautionary tale with implications for entities that seek to isolate liabilities in a so-called "BadCo" and then liquidate or reorganize that entity through a Chapter 11 proceeding in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Notably, the Court's decision cites no precedent for the proposition that the relevant quantum of liabilities for purposes of comparing to assets is the total liability after application of the Section 502(b)(6) cap, rather than prepetition (and uncapped) total liabilities.

<sup>4</sup> *In re PPI Enters. (U.S.), Inc.*, 324 F.3d 197 (3d Cir. 2003).

<sup>5</sup> *In re Integrated Telecom Express, Inc.*, 384 F.3d 108 (3d Cir. 2004) (describing the holding in *In re PPI Enters.*).

<sup>6</sup> Notably, courts in the Third Circuit impose a significantly higher bar with respect to the good faith requirements of Section 1112(b) than do courts in other circuits, assigning to the debtor the burden of showing good faith. See *LTL Mgmt., LLC v. Those Parties Listed on Appendix A to Complaint (In re LTL Mgmt., LLC)*, 64 F.4th 84, 100 (3d Cir. 2023). Query whether Bedmar would have fared better in, for example, the Southern District of New York, where a party seeking to dismiss a bankruptcy case for lack of good faith bears the initial burden and must establish not only an objective lack of good faith, but also subjective bad faith by the debtor. See *In re General Growth Properties, Inc.*, No. 09-411977 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Aug. 11, 2009). In matters of good faith, as in many aspects of bankruptcy practice, venue can be paramount.

bankruptcy courts of the Third Circuit. Given the facts of this case, it is unlikely to precipitate a shift in existing caselaw holding that a debtor in genuine financial distress may avail itself of the Section 502(b)(6) lease liability cap. Instead, *Bedmar* adds to a growing body of caselaw holding that in order to take advantage of the protections of the Bankruptcy Code, a company must demonstrate genuine financial distress, and courts remain skeptical of tactical pre-filing reorganizations designed to surgically limit the assets available to creditors in a restructuring.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See generally LTL Mgmt., LLC, *supra* (dismissing Chapter 11 case of an entity created through divisional merger for purposes of isolating mass tort liabilities in a single entity, on grounds that the company was not in genuine financial distress); *In re Aearo Technologies, LLC.*, No. 22-02892-JJG-11 (Bankr. S.D. Ind. June 9, 2023) (dismissing Chapter 11 case of entity facing tort liability on grounds that no financial distress existed where parent company had agreed to fund litigation).