

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
Citigroup Center  
153 East 53<sup>rd</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10022-4675  
Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900  
Matthew A. Cantor (MC-7727)  
Jonathan S. Henes (JH-1979)

Attorneys for Debtors and Debtors in Possession

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

_____	X	
In re	:	
	:	Chapter 11 Case No.
Allegiance Telecom, Inc., <u>et al.</u> ,	:	03-13057 (RDD)
	:	
Debtors.	:	Jointly Administered
_____	X	

**MOTION OF THE DEBTORS FOR AN ORDER, PURSUANT  
TO RULE 9019 OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF BANKRUPTCY  
PROCEDURE, APPROVING THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT,  
DATED OCTOBER 24, 2003, AMONG DRESDNER BANK AG,  
NEW YORK AND GRAND CAYMAN BRANCHES, AND THE DEBTORS**

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

Allegiance Telecom, Inc. and its direct and indirect subsidiaries, as debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, “Allegiance” or the “Debtors”), respectfully represent:

**Introduction**

1. On May 14, 2003 (the “Commencement Date”), the Debtors each commenced with this Court a voluntary case under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”). The Debtors are authorized to operate their business and manage their properties as debtors in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtors’ chapter 11 cases have been consolidated for procedural

purposes only and are being jointly administered pursuant to rule 1015(b) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”).

2. No trustee or examiner has been appointed in these chapter 11 cases. On May 28, 2003, pursuant to section 1102 of the Bankruptcy Code, the United States Trustee for the Southern District of New York (the “U.S. Trustee”) appointed a statutory committee of unsecured creditors (the “Creditors Committee”) in these chapter 11 cases.

### **Jurisdiction**

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction to consider and determine this Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

### **An Overview of Allegiance’s Business**

4. Allegiance is a facilities-based national local exchange carrier that provides integrated telecommunications products and services to small and medium-sized business customers, large businesses (*i.e.*, national customers with multiple locations), governmental entities, wholesale customers and other institutional users. Allegiance offers its customers a variety of services, including:

- local and long distance voice services, including basic telephone services and advanced calling features;
- broadband and other Internet and data services, including high-speed Internet access, wide area network interconnection, domain name registration, web hosting, email and collocation services;
- integrated local long distance/Internet access offerings, which provide customers with integrated voice and Internet access over a single broadband line;

- wholesale services to other regional and national service providers, including equipment collocation, managed modem ports and Internet protocol traffic aggregation; and
- customer premise equipment sales and maintenance services.

5. As of June 30, 2003, the Debtors served more than 100,000 business customers in major markets throughout the United States. As of June 30, 2003, the Debtors employed approximately 3,350 people, of which approximately 91 employees were covered by collective bargaining agreements.

6. As of June 30, 2003, the Debtors had approximately \$269.2 million of unrestricted cash on hand. As of June 30, 2003, the Debtors' consolidated books and records reflected assets totaling approximately \$1.292 billion and liabilities totaling approximately \$1.459 billion. For the six months ending June 30, 2003, the Debtors, on a consolidated basis, reported revenues of approximately \$401.2 million and net losses of approximately \$212.4 million.

#### **Funding Dispute Under the Prepetition Credit Agreement**

7. Prior to the Commencement Date, Allegiance Telecom Company Worldwide ("ATCW" or the "Borrower") entered into that certain Credit and Guaranty Agreement (the "Prepetition Credit Agreement"), dated as of February 15, 2000, as amended as of November 27, 2002, among ATCW, as borrower, the Debtors (other than ATCW), as guarantors, certain lender parties thereto (the "Prepetition Lenders") and General Electric Capital Corporation (as successor in interest to Toronto Dominion (Texas), Inc.), as administrative agent (the "Agent"). One of the Prepetition Lenders is Dresdner Bank AG, New York and Grand Cayman Branches (collectively, "Dresdner").

8. Pursuant to a Funding Notice (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement), dated June 20, 2002 (the “2002 Funding Notice”), the Borrower requested an advance by the Prepetition Lenders of the remaining portion of the then unfunded Revolving Loan Commitments (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement). Dresdner declined to fund its respective pro rata share of such unfunded Revolving Loan Commitments. Dresdner’s refusal to fund its respective pro rata share of the 2002 Funding Notice resulted in a dispute between Dresdner and the Debtors relating to Dresdner’s obligations under the Prepetition Credit Agreement to honor the 2002 Funding Notice (the “Funding Dispute”).

9. On November 27, 2002, the Prepetition Credit Agreement was amended pursuant to the First Amendment (the “First Amendment”), which was executed by the Debtors and the Requisite Lenders (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement), but not Dresdner. Pursuant to section 7(j) of the First Amendment, the Borrower delivered a written declaration to Dresdner (“Defaulting Lender Declaration”), dated January 16, 2003, stating that Dresdner constituted a Defaulting Lender under section 2.20 of the Credit Agreement. Pursuant to section 7(i) of the First Amendment, the Borrower made a voluntary principal prepayment of \$15,000,000 to the Agent and the Agent distributed the proceeds of the voluntary prepayment to those Prepetition Lenders who funded their respective pro rata shares of the Revolving Loan Commitments pursuant to the 2002 Funding Notice (the “Funding Lenders”). Thereafter, the Borrower made a further voluntary principal prepayment of \$5,000,000 to the Agent pursuant to the terms of that certain Forbearance Agreement, dated April 29, 2003, which was executed by the Debtors and the Requisite Lenders, but not Dresdner, and the Agent distributed the proceeds of the voluntary prepayment to the Funding Lenders.

10. The Debtors submit that it is in the best interests of their estates to resolve the Funding Dispute amicably, thereby enabling all parties to the Prepetition Credit Agreement to focus on completing the restructuring of the Debtors as effectively and expeditiously as possible.

### **Relief Requested**

11. By this Motion, the Debtors seek approval, pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a), of the terms of the Settlement Agreement and Release, dated as of October 24, 2003 (the “Settlement Agreement”). The salient terms of the Settlement Agreement are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

- Within two (2) business days following Court approval of the Settlement Agreement, Dresdner agrees to advance and deliver directly to the Borrower, which advance will be treated by the Agent for the benefit of the Borrower as provided in the Prepetition Credit Agreement as a Loan (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement), an amount equal to the Dresdner Net Funding Obligation (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) (*i.e.*, an amount equal to \$5,113,082.00), as full and complete satisfaction of all of its payment and funding obligations under the Settlement Agreement and under the Prepetition Credit Agreement.
- Subject only to receipt of Court approval of the Settlement Agreement and receipt by the Borrower of the Dresdner Net Funding Obligation from Dresdner,
  - (a) each of the Debtors declares that Dresdner is a Lender (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement) in good standing and in full compliance with all of the terms of the Prepetition Credit Agreement and all other Credit Documents (as defined in the Prepetition Credit Agreement) and that Dresdner and its successors and assigns are entitled to exercise all of the rights and privileges of a Lender in good standing under the Prepetition Credit Agreement and all other Credit Documents to which Dresdner is a party;

---

<sup>1</sup> The description of the Settlement Agreement is qualified in its entirety by the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement, annexed hereto as “Exhibit A.”

- (b) the Borrower rescinds in its entirety the Defaulting Lender Declaration as it may relate to Dresdner and, within two (2) business days of Court approval of the Settlement Agreement, shall deliver to the Agent, along with a copy to Dresdner, a notice substantially in the form set forth in Annex A to the Settlement Agreement, which notice will become effective upon receipt by the Borrower of the Dresdner Net Funding Obligation from Dresdner; and
- (c) each of the Debtors agrees immediately to cease and desist from, and to use its reasonable efforts to prohibit any other party to the Prepetition Credit Agreement from, referring to or treating Dresdner, or any subsequent assignee or transferee thereof, as a Defaulting Lender.
- Upon receipt by the Borrower from Dresdner of the amount equal to the Dresdner Net Funding Obligation, the Debtors shall retain the funds as Cash Collateral (as this term is defined in the Amended Final Order) and use such Cash Collateral only in accordance with the terms of the Amended Final Order (as defined in the Settlement Agreement).
  - The Debtors and Dresdner mutually release, acquit and forever discharge each other and their respective directors, officers, employees, shareholders, agents, representatives, attorneys, successors and assigns from any and all actions, causes of action, suits, claims for sums of money, contracts, controversies, agreements, costs, attorneys' fees, expenses, damages, judgments and demands whatsoever in law or in equity, known or unknown, which the Debtors and Dresdner have or may have against any of the released parties (a) with respect to the Debtors, arising out of, under or in connection with the Prepetition Credit Agreement through the date of entry of the Court order approving the Settlement Agreement, including Dresdner's prior refusal to advance the Dresdner Funding Amount (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) or any other matter relating to the Funding Dispute and (b) with respect to Dresdner, arising out of, under or in connection with the Defaulting Lender Declaration through the date of entry of the Court approving the Settlement Agreement.
  - The Debtors represent and warrant that the Debtors have not paid or distributed any amount to the Agent or the Funding Lenders between June 30, 2002 and the date of the Settlement Agreement, other than (a) the Funding Lender Prepayments (as defined in the Settlement Agreement), (b) interest due under the Prepetition Credit Agreement paid to the Agent for further distribution to all of the Lenders pro rata to their respective Loans then outstanding, (c) periodic adequate protection payments authorized under the Interim Order (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) and the Amended Final Order paid to the Agent for further distribution to all of the Lenders pro rata to their respective Loans then outstanding in amounts equal to the interest

payments due and owing under the Prepetition Credit Agreement and (d) other amounts authorized under the Interim Order and the Amended Final Order to be paid to the Agent.

- The Agent, in its capacity as Administrative Agent and for itself as a Lender, under the Prepetition Credit Agreement, acknowledges and agrees to the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement. Subject only to receipt of Court approval of the Settlement Agreement and receipt by the Borrower of the Dresdner Net Funding Obligation from Dresdner, the Agent agrees:
  - (a) that Dresdner is a Lender in good standing and in full compliance with all of the terms of the Prepetition Credit Agreement and all other Credit Documents and that Dresdner and its successors and assigns are entitled to exercise all of the rights and privileges of a Lender in good standing under the Prepetition Credit Agreement and all other Credit Documents to which Dresdner is a party;
  - (b) immediately to cease and desist from, and to use its reasonable efforts to prohibit any other party to the Prepetition Credit Agreement from, referring to or treating Dresdner, or any subsequent assignee or transferee thereof, as a Defaulting Lender; and
  - (c) to take all reasonable steps to help effect full and unconditional implementation of all of the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

12. The Debtors submit that the Settlement Agreement is beneficial to their estates and creditors. The Settlement Agreement resolves all of the outstanding claims between the Debtors and Dresdner without the need for protracted and costly negotiations and litigation. In addition, as a result of the Settlement Agreement, the Debtors will receive in excess of \$5 million in cash.

**The Settlement Agreement Should Be  
Approved Because It Falls Within the Range of Reasonableness**

13. Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a) provides, in relevant part, that: “[o]n motion by the trustee and after notice and a hearing, the court may approve a compromise and settlement.” Compromises and settlements are “a normal part of the process of reorganization.” Protective

Comm. for Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson, 390 U.S. 414, 424 (1968) (quoting Case v. Los Angeles Lumber Prods. Co., 308 U.S. 106, 130 (1939)).

14. To approve a compromise and settlement under Bankruptcy Rule 9019, a bankruptcy court should find that the compromise and settlement is fair and equitable, reasonable and in the best interests of the debtor's estate. See, e.g., In re Ionosphere Clubs, Inc., 156 B.R. 414, 426 (S.D.N.Y. 1993), aff'd, 17 F.3d 600 (2d Cir. 1994) (citations omitted); In re Enron Corp., Case No. 02 Civ. 8489, 2003 WL 230838, \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2003). The decision to approve a particular settlement lies within the sound discretion of the bankruptcy court. Nellis v. Shugrue, 165 B.R. 115, 122-123 (S.D.N.Y. 1994). In exercising its discretion, the bankruptcy court must make an independent determination that the settlement is fair and reasonable. Id. at 122. The court may consider the opinions of the debtor in possession and its counsel that the settlement is fair and reasonable. Id.; see In re Purofied Down Prods. Corp., 150 B.R. 519, 522 (S.D.N.Y. 1993). This discretion should be exercised by the bankruptcy court "in light of the general public policy favoring settlements." In re Hibbard Brown & Co., Inc., 217 B.R. 41, 46 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1998); Shugrue, 165 B.R. at 123 ("the general rule [is] that settlements are favored and, in fact, encouraged by the approval process outlined above").

15. In determining whether to approve a proposed settlement, a bankruptcy court need not decide the numerous issues of law and fact raised by the settlement, but rather should "canvass the issues and see whether the settlement 'fall[s] below the lowest point in the range of reasonableness.'" In re W.T. Grant Co., 699 F.2d 599, 608 (2d Cir. 1983); see also Purofied Down Prods., 150 B.R. at 522 ("the court need not conduct a 'mini-trial' to determine the merits of the underlying [dispute]").



16. In deciding whether a particular settlement falls within the “range of reasonableness,” courts consider the following factors:

- (a) the probability of success in the litigation;
- (b) the difficulties associated with collection;
- (c) the complexity of the litigation, and the attendant expense, inconvenience and delay; and
- (d) the paramount interests of creditors.

See Purofied Down Prods., 150 B.R. at 522 (citing Drexel v. Loomis, 35 F.2d 800, 806 (8th Cir. 1989)); Six West Retail Acquisition, Inc. v. Loews Cineplex Entm’t Corp., 286 B.R. 236, 248 n.13 (S.D.N.Y. 2002), see also In re Drexel Burnham Lambert Group, Inc., 960 F.2d 285, 292 (2d Cir. 1992).

17. “The ‘reasonableness’ of a settlement depends upon all factors, including probability of success, the length and cost of the litigation, and the extent to which the settlement is truly the product of ‘arms-length’ bargaining, and not of fraud or collusion.” Ionosphere Clubs, 156 B.R. at 428.

18. In the instant case, the Settlement Agreement is fair and equitable, falls well within the range of reasonableness and enables the parties to avoid the costs of negotiation and litigation. Absent authorization to enter into the Settlement Agreement, the Debtors and Dresdner may require judicial intervention to resolve the Funding Dispute. The undertaking of a risky litigation would be an unnecessary drain on the resources of the Debtors’ estates and would divert the attention of its management and legal personnel from the current efforts to maximize the value of the estates.

19. The value accruing from the Settlement Agreement, including the elimination of potential negotiation and litigation costs and the guarantee of immediate payment of a significant and definite amount, represent a benefit to the Debtors' creditors and all parties in interest. For these reasons, the Court should approve the Settlement Agreement pursuant Bankruptcy Rule 9019.

#### **Waiver of Memorandum of Law**

20. Because there are no novel issues of law presented herein, the Debtors respectfully request that the Court waive the requirement that the Debtors file a memorandum of law in support of this Motion pursuant to rule 9013-1(b) of the Local Bankruptcy Rules for the Southern District of New York.

#### **Notice**

21. This Notice has been provided to (a) the U.S. Trustee; (b) attorneys for Dresdner; (c) attorneys for the Prepetition Lenders; (d) attorneys for the Creditors Committee and (e) all other parties on the Master Service List maintained in these chapter 11 cases. In light of the nature of the relief requested herein, the Debtors submit that no other or further notice is required.

#### **No Prior Request**

22. No prior Motion for the relief requested herein has been made to this or any other court.

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully request that the Court enter an order (i) approving the Settlement Agreement and authorizing the Debtors to enter into the Settlement Agreement and (ii) granting such other relief as is just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York  
October 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jonathan S. Henes

Matthew A. Cantor (MC-7727)

Jonathan S. Henes (JH-1979)

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

Citigroup Center

153 East 53<sup>rd</sup> Street

New York, New York 10022-4675

Telephone: (212) 446-4800

Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Attorneys for Debtors and Debtors in Possession