1	Robert J. Miller, Esq. (#013334)	
2	Bryce A. Suzuki, Esq. (#022721)	
3	BRYAN CAVE LLP Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4406 Telephone: (602) 364-7000 Facsimile: (602) 364-7070	
4		
5	Internet: rjmiller@bryancave.com	
6	<u>bryce.suzuki@bryancave.com</u>	
7 8	Counsel for Queen Creek XVIII, L.L.C. and Pueblo Sereno	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
10	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
11	In re:	In Proceedings Under Chapter 11
12	MORTGAGES LTD.,	Case No. 2:08-bk-07465-RJH
13	D.14	
14	Debtor.	RESPONSE TO ML MANAGER'S MOTION TO APPROVE SALE OF REAL PROPERTY (ZDCII LOAN)
15		
16		Hearing Date: 8/25/10 Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.
17 18	Queen Creek XVIII, L.L.C. ("Queen Creek") and Pueblo Sereno Mobile Home	
19	Park L.L.C. ("Pueblo Sereno") hereby file this Response to the ML Manager's Motion	
	To Sell Real Property Free And Clear Of Liens, Claims, Encumbrances, And Interests	
20	dated August 5, 2010 (the "Sale Motion"). In support of this Response, Queen Creek	
21	and Pueblo Sereno submit as follows:	
22	1. Pursuant to the Sale Motion, the ML Manager states that ZDCII Loan, LLC	
23	and certain pass-through investors co-own the property at issue in the Sale Motion (the	
24	"Property"). Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno are two of the pass-through investors	
25	referenced in the Sale Motion.	
26	2. Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno object to the Sale Motion on the basis that	
27	a "sale free and clear" mechanism is not provided for in the plan confirmed by the Court	
28	(the "Plan"). Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code and its "free and clear" mechanism	
(the 1 min). Section 303 of the Bankruptey code and its free and clear incentains		

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

have no application here. There is no longer a debtor in possession nor is there any property of the estate since a chapter 11 plan was confirmed by the Court in June 2009. Assuming, arguendo, section 363 was applicable here, the ML Manager has not made any effort to make a showing under subsections 363(f) or (h) of the Bankruptcy Code.

- 3. ML Manager claims the Plan provides for retained jurisdiction under section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code and/or under sections 9.1(e), (g), and (h) of the Plan. These sections of the Plan do not provide a basis for retained jurisdiction with respect to the ML Manager's requests for relief under the Sale Motion.
- 4. It is black-letter law that post-confirmation jurisdiction is necessarily more limited than pre-confirmation jurisdiction. In determining whether a bankruptcy court has retained post-confirmation jurisdiction, courts look to whether: (i) the matter has a close nexus to the bankruptcy plan or proceeding; and (ii) the bankruptcy plan provides for the retention of jurisdiction over the particular matter. In re Johns-Manville Corp., 7 F.3d 32, 34 (2d Cir. 1993); CCM Pathfinder Pompano Bay, LLC v. Compass Fin. Partners LLC, 396 B.R. 602, 605 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2008); see also In re Pegasus Gold Corp., 394 F.3d 1189, 1194 (9th Cir. 2005).
- 5. It is beyond dispute the Plan does not provide for retained jurisdiction with respect to the matters addressed in the Sale Motion. The ML Manager also does not even attempt to explain how it satisfies the "close nexus" requirement for post-confirmation retention of jurisdiction by the Court.
- 6. The ML Manager has not produced Queen Creek nor Pueblo Sereno with any master agency agreement that has been signed by a duly authorized representative of Queen Creek or Pueblo Sereno. Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno reserve all of their rights on authority issues including, without limitation, the right to terminate the asserted agency of ML Manager.
- On page 4 of the Sale Motion, the ML Manager makes a reference to perhaps seeking an order providing for the distribution of proceeds at a later date but then states the sale order, a proposed copy of which is not attached to the Sale Motion, "will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

seek" to provide for certain distributions. As the Court will recall, the ML Manager is under a court order to provide an accounting. See Minute Entry dated June 30, 2010. Under these circumstances, assuming the Court grants the Sale Motion, Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno believe it is inappropriate, and therefore object, to having any funds (other than direct closing costs) paid out of gross sale proceeds absent a proper accounting, including expense allocations, and an opportunity to be heard before additional amounts are disbursed by the ML Manager.1

- 8. The ML Manager's Sale Motion basically can be read to say it is going to distribute money to the investors who agreed to transfer their interests to a Loan LLC (ZDCII Loan LLC), but that it will withhold making any distributions to non-transferring investors. Having waited more than a year for any kind of recovery from these cases, in the event the Court grants the Sale Motion, equity should result in the Court entering an order that requires an accounting and distributions to be made within the same general timeframe to both kinds of investors.
- 9. ML Manager suggests the Sale Order will order the non-transferring investors to execute documents effectuating the Court's order and sale. The ML Manager cites no authority for this request for relief, which is obviously objectionable to Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno.
- ML Manager requests the waiver of the stay provided in Bankruptcy Rule 10. 6004(h). Queen Creek and Pueblo Sereno object to this request because it might have an adverse impact on their ability to seek appellate review of any relief that may be granted by the Court pursuant to the Sale Motion.

Page 3 of 5

wants to pay the exit financier funds after the closing. Neither Queen Creek nor Pueblo 26 Sereno are obligors on the debts to the exit financier and their interests have not been encumbered by the exit financier. 28

Main Document

This is particularly important since the ML Manager references the fact that it

28