1 2 3 4 5	WILLIAM W. HUCKINS (BAR NO. 201098) THOR D. MCLAUGHLIN (BAR NO. 257864) ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP Three Embarcadero Center, 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-4074 Phone: (415) 837-1515 Fax: (415) 837-1516 E-Mail: whuckins@allenmatkins.com tmclaughlin@allenmatkins.com	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DARRYL S. LADDIN FRANK N. WHITE ARNALL GOLDEN GREGORY LLP 171 17th Street N.W., Suite 2100 Atlanta, GA 30363 Phone: (404) 873-8500 Fax: (404) 873-8501 E-Mail: darryl.laddin@agg.com frank.white@agg.com (Pro Hac Vice Pending) Attorneys for American Express Travel Related	1 Services
13 14	Company UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	OAKLAND DIVISION	
17	In re Case No. 16-40050-WJL	
18	FOX ORTEGA ENTERPRISES, INC. d/b/a	Chapter 7
19	PREMIER CRU,	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER
20	Debtor.	SHORTENING TIME TO HEAR:
21		MOTION OF CREDITOR AMERICAN EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED SERVICES
22		COMPANY, INC., PURSUANT TO FED. R. BANKR. P. 2004, FOR AN ORDER
23		DIRECTING THE IMMEDIATE PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN
24		DOCUMENTS BY THE CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE
25		Judge: Hon. William J. Lafferty
26		
27		
28		
LAW OFFICES Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP Case	16-40050 — Doc# 112 Filed: 02/26/16 F 994256.01/SF EX PARTE APPLICATION F	Entered: 02/26/16 16:07:50 Page 1 of 9

I. INTRODUCTION

Creditor American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc. ("AmEx") hereby submits this *Ex Parte* Application ("Application") for an order shortening time to hear its concurrently-filed Motion, Pursuant To Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004, for An Order Directing the Immediate Production of Certain Documents By the Chapter 7 Trustee (the "Motion") on the Chapter 13 calendar on March 3, 2016 at 1:30 p.m., or such other date as soon thereafter as is possible.¹

AmEx has filed the Motion because it needs to obtain from the Trustee, on an urgent basis, information necessary to investigate and determine the validity of millions of dollars of credit card chargeback requests that have already been submitted to AmEx, and that are expected to be submitted in large numbers in the foreseeable future, by former customers who purchased goods from the Debtor using "American Express" credit cards, but now contend, among other things, that they never received the goods for which they paid.

Under the applicable regulations, AmEx generally has thirty (30) days from submission by cardholders to provide its initial response to a cardholder's chargeback request. In order to investigate such requests, however, and to dispute any requests that appear on the facts to be unfounded, AmEx is required, and is expressly entitled under applicable regulations and its contract with the Debtor, to obtain information concerning the specifics of each challenged credit card transaction, such as, for example, what goods the customer purchased, to what extent the purchased goods were delivered to the customer, whether any goods were ever returned, and whether any refunds have already been provided to the customer in some form.

Obtaining this information, and as quickly as possible, is also critical to AmEx's ability to mitigate the damages accruing to it from issuance of refunds to cardholders who made purchases from the Debtor, and in turn the magnitude of AmEx's eventual claim for losses against the Chapter 7 estate. While many chargeback requests submitted by the Debtor's customers may turn out to be legitimate and worthy of a refund, some portion of those requests likely will not be

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

AmEx's counsel, Darryl Laddin, will be traveling from Atlanta, GA for the hearing. Out of an abundance of caution, the Motion was self-calendared for March 30, 2016.

submitted in good faith, or supported by the facts, and can be refuted and ultimately disallowed by AmEx if challenged within the applicable timeframe. Each such unfounded chargeback request that is ultimately disallowed by AmEx will reduce, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, the size of AmEx's eventual claim against the estate, not only mitigating AmEx's aggregate loss, but reducing the aggregate volume of all claims against the estate to the benefit of all unsecured creditors.

Through counsel and other agents, the Trustee has informed AmEx that he possesses the critical information that AmEx requires in order to investigate and determine the validity of chargeback requests, and that it is already collected, prepared and in a format that can be provided to AmEx immediately.² Nonetheless, the Trustee has refused to provide the information to AmEx to date, citing unspecific concerns that production of the information to AmEx voluntarily may expose the estate, the Trustees or his agents and professionals to claims by third parties under applicable privacy or consumer protection laws. Moreover, while the Trustee's counsel at one time indicated that the information could be provided to AmEx immediately if the Trustee were compelled to do so pursuant to an Order of this Court and accompanying subpoena that shields the estate, the Trustee and his agents and professionals from any liability to third parties as a consequence, he has since altered his position and demanded that AmEx execute an indemnification agreement as a condition to receipt of the information, perhaps among other conditions, notwithstanding that AmEx is already entitled to the information as a matter of contract. AmEx was thus compelled to file the Motion on an emergency basis and without the Trustee's consent.

If heard on regular notice, based on the Court's open calendaring system, the Motion would be heard on March 30, 2016, by which time deadlines for investigating and responding to

In fact, the Trustee has already provided the bulk of the requested information to AmEx

chargeback requests submitted by many of the Debtor's customers will have expired, inhibiting AmEx from challenging any such requests that may not be supported by the facts, and possibly resulting in significant liability to AmEx that could have been prevented and, in turn, additional and unnecessary claims against the estate to the detriment of all unsecured creditors.

By this Application, AmEx requests to advance the hearing date on the Motion and have the matter heard on shortened notice.

II. RELEVANT FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The relevant facts are set forth fully in the Motion.

Under an Agreement For American Express Card Acceptance (the "Merchant Agreement"), and on the express terms and conditions provided for therein, the Debtor was authorized by AmEx to accept "American Express" credit cards, issued by AmEx and certain of its affiliates, as a form of payment for goods purchased by the Debtor's customers. After executing the Merchant Agreement, and continuously until the Debtor ceased operations and filed for bankruptcy protection in January of 2016, customers charged millions of dollars of wine and related purchases from the Debtor on their "American Express" credit cards.

With the cessation of the Debtor's business and its bankruptcy filing, however, multitudes of "American Express" cardholders are now submitting chargeback requests to AmEx, seeking millions of dollars in refunds for purchases of goods that they contend they paid for but never received.

The large volume of chargeback requests is no doubt attributable, in part, to the extensive press and Internet coverage of the Debtor's demise. For example, in an article posted on CSNBC's website on February 17, 2016, the following appeared:

But Mark Bostick, trustee for the bankruptcy, said the largest creditor may turn out to be American Express. Several customers who purchased wine at Premier Cru used their AmEx card to do so, and the company has been issuing them refunds.

See http://www.cnbc.com/2016/02/17/fbi-investigates-possible-wine-ponzi-scheme.html. In addition, on at least one popular online forum for wine enthusiasts, WineBerserkers.com, posts in

a "Premier Cru Chargeback Information" thread specifically instruct customers of the Debtor on how to submit chargeback requests to their credit card issuers. (See http://tinyurl.com/judxjme.)

Moreover, while some portion of these chargeback requests is likely legitimate, and the cardholders will ultimately be justified in having credits back to their accounts issued by AmEx, a material portion of the requests may not be submitted in good faith or otherwise justified by the facts. In some cases, it is likely that cardholders will submit chargeback requests to AmEx for the full amounts of their purchases even though they received all or a substantial portion of the goods that they charged and paid for. AmEx's only means of mitigating the damages that it ultimately will be required to pay out to the Debtor's former customers (and, therefore, also to mitigate damages for which the Estate would be liable) is to investigate each chargeback request in an attempt to weed out, challenge and ultimately deny any requests that do not appear to be justified on the facts.

For precisely this reason, and so as to allow American Express to obtain information regarding specific transactions that may be necessary to investigate and dispute chargeback requests by cardholders, the American Express Merchant Regulations (the "Merchant Regulations") that are incorporated by reference into the Debtor's Merchant Agreement with AmEx set forth the documentation that a merchant is required to provide to AmEx for purposes of contesting a chargeback against that merchant for the reasons that are likely asserted by the Debtor's customers – *i.e.*, either "goods/services cancelled" or "goods/services not received." Among the information that a merchant such as the Debtor is required to provide to permit investigation of a disputed charge are the transaction charge record, the merchant's cancellation policy, written documentation of the goods/services purchased by the cardholder, detailed documentation relating to any deliveries or returns of the goods purchased, and proof of any refunds or credits on the goods that have already been issued to the cardholder.³

In addition to being extremely voluminous, the Merchant Regulations are proprietary and confidential, and accordingly are not attached to this public filing. Excerpts from the document relating to chargeback requests have already been provided by AmEx to the Trustee's counsel, however, and can be provided to the Court upon request.

Accordingly, once it began receiving chargeback requests from cardholders *en masse* following the Debtor's bankruptcy filing, and pursuant to the Merchant Agreement and Merchant Regulations, AmEx requested, through contacts by AmEx business people and its in-house counsel with counsel for the Chapter 7 Trustee, that the Trustee provide certain transaction-related documents and information concerning customers who had made purchases from the Debtor using "American Express" credit cards. Specifically, and for each transaction by a customer with the Debtor made with an "American Express" credit or charge card issued from 2008 through the present, AmEx needs to obtain:

- (a) the transaction date, sales order number, customer name, customer address and customer AmEx card number;
- (b) evidence of the purchase and detail of what was purchased (*i.e.*, wine futures to be delivered, with date to be delivered, cases that were was immediately shipped or provided at the store, etc.);
- (c) evidence of any deliveries and delivery dates, addresses and records for goods delivered, itemized by shipment and/or tracking information; and
- (d) evidence of any credits or refunds issued, whether on an "American Express" charge or credit card or by other means, where the original purchase was on an "American Express" credit or charge card.

It is AmEx's intention to use the requested information solely for purposes of investigating chargeback requests submitted by the Debtor's customers and contesting any such requests that appear not to be supported by the facts surrounding the disputed purchase. Nonetheless, as of the date of this Application, the Trustee has refused to provide this critical information to AmEx unless AmEx accedes to certain additional conditions that it believes to be unreasonable and contrary to its existing rights.

While the permissible scope of an examination under Rule 2004 is "unfettered and broad," (9 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 2004.02[1], p. 2004-6 (16th ed. Revised 2015) (citations omitted)), the information that AmEx seeks to obtain from the Trustee here is narrow and intended solely for a specific purpose – the investigation and, where appropriate on the facts, reduction or

denial of chargeback requests submitted to AmEx by the Debtor's customers. Only with the benefit of this information, obtained on a timely basis, can AmEx seek to mitigate the damages accruing to it from issuance of refunds to cardholders who made purchases from the Debtor, and in turn the magnitude of AmEx's eventual claim for losses against the Chapter 7 Estate. Each unsupported chargeback request that is ultimately disallowed by AmEx will reduce, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, the size of AmEx's eventual claim against the estate, not only mitigating AmEx's aggregate loss, but reducing the aggregate volume of all claims against the estate to the benefit of all unsecured creditors slated to receive a *pro rata* distribution from available estate assets.

Finally, entry of a Rule 2004 Order by the Court in the form proposed by AmEx and service of a corresponding subpoena *duces tecum*, thus compelling the Trustee to provide the requested information to AmEx, will operate to shield the Trustee, his agents and the estate from the potential liabilities to third-parties with which the Trustee has purportedly been concerned to date, removing the Trustee's stated justification for withholding the information from AmEx to date. *See*, *e.g.*, *In re Williams*, 2009 WL 1609389, at *3 (Bankr. E.D.N.C. June 8, 2009) (attorney was immunized from duty to maintain confidentiality as to former client because he produced information to Trustee only pursuant to court-ordered subpoena, with which he was required to comply) (citing *Higginbotham v. KCS Intern., Inc.*, 202 F.R.D. 444, 455 (D. Md. 2001) ("Even though subpoenas are issued by attorneys, they are issued on behalf of the Court and should be treated as orders of the Court."). While AmEx submits that the Trustee's concerns in this regard are unfounded in any event, ⁴ the Order granting AmEx's Motion and subpoena compelling the

As noted above, the information at issue is already required, as a matter of contract, to be provided by the Debtor under its Merchant Agreement with AmEx and the governing Merchant Regulations. Moreover, and insofar as AmEx's legal research has indicated to date, none of the information that AmEx has requested the Debtor to provide here is the sort of private, confidential or personally identifiable information that might give rise to a claim against the Trustee or estate under privacy or consumer protection laws. Account numbers on "American Express" credit cards cannot be confidential as to AmEx, because AmEx and its affiliates are the entities that issued those accounts and established those numbers. That information is thus already in AmEx's possession, and the information from the Trustee will simply allow chargeback requests submitted to AmEx by cardholders to be matched with the challenged purchases that were made with the Debtor and related transaction details. In addition, the personal information disclosure provided to "American Express" cardholders with their Cardmember Agreements provides that, as a matter of Federal law, personal information relating to use of their accounts can be shared for purposes of "respond[ing] to court orders" and "legal

1 Trustee to provide AmEx with the information necessary to investigate and (in appropriate 2 instances) dispute customer chargeback requests will effectively moot the Trustee's stated 3 concern, allowing AmEx to obtain, without further delay, critical and time-sensitive information to the ultimate benefit of the estate and creditor body as a whole. 4 GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO HAVE THE MOTION HEARD ON SHORTENED 5 III. **NOTICE** 6 7 Ex parte relief may be granted when a party will be prejudiced by hearing a matter on full notice. Mission Power Engineering Co. v. Continental Cas. Co., 883 F.Supp. 488, 492 (C.D. Cal. 8 1985). Moreover, the Court has authority to enter an order shortening time to hear the Motion 10 pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9006(c)(1), which provides, 11 [W]hen an action is required or allowed to be done at or within a specified time by these rules or by a notice given thereunder or by 12 order of court, the court for cause shown may in its discretion with or without motion or notice order the period reduced. 13 Further, Local Bankruptcy Rule 9006-1 provides that parties may seek court approval to enlarge or 14 shorten time. 15 If heard on regular notice, the Motion here would be heard until March 30, 2016, by which 16 17 time deadlines for investigating and responding to chargeback requests submitted by many of the 18 Debtor's customers will have expired, inhibiting AmEx from challenging any such requests that may not be supported by the facts. The possible result will be significant liability to AmEx that 19 could have been prevented and, in turn, additional and unnecessary claims against the estate that 20 will diminish *pro rata* distributions to other unsecured creditors. 21 22 IV. **CONCLUSION** 23 For the above discussed reasons, AmEx respectfully requests that this Court enter the order, concurrently uploaded herewith, setting the hearing date on the Motion for March 3, 2016 at 24 25 1:30 p.m., and allowing the Motion to be heard on shortened notice.

investigations."

LAW OFFICES

Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP

26

27

1 2	Dated: February 26, 2016	ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE MALLORY & NATSIS LLP WILLIAM W. HUCKINS THOR D. MCLAUGHLIN
3		
4 5		By: /s/William W. Huckins WILLIAM W. HUCKINS Attorneys for American Express Travel
		Related Services Company
6		
7 8	Dated: February 26, 2016	ARNALL GOLDEN GREGORY LLP DARRYL S. LADDIN FRANK N. WHITE
9		
10		By: <u>/s/ Darryl S. Laddin</u> DARRYL S. LADDIN
11		Attorneys for American Express Travel Related Services Company
12		Related Services Company
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		