1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Alan A. Meda, 009213 STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP 1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Telephone: (602) 279-1600 Facsimile: (602) 240-6925 tashworth@stinson.com J. Gregory Milmoe (admitted pro hac vice) Shepard Goldfein (admitted pro hac vice) SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 4 Times Square New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 735-3000 Facsimile: (212) 735-2000 gregory.milmoe@skadden.com shepard.goldfein@skadden.com Anthony W. Clark (admitted pro hac vice) SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP One Rodney Square Wilmington, Delaware 19899 Telephone: (302) 651.3000 Facsimile: (302) 651.3001		
15	Attorneys for the National Hockey League		
16	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT		
17	FOR THE DISTRIC		
18	In re)	Case No. 2:09-bk-09488-RTBP	
19	DEWEY RANCH HOCKEY, LLC,	(Jointly Administered)	
20	COYOTES HOLDINGS, LLC,	Chapter 11	
21	COYOTES HOCKEY, LLC, and	Supplemental Submission of the National Hockey League in Support of Motion for	
22	ARENA MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC,	a Determination that Debtors' NHL Membership Rights May Not Be	
23	Debtors.	Transferred to PSE or an Affiliate Thereof	
24			
25		Date: September 2, 2009 Time: 9:00 am Leasting: U.S. Bankguntay Court	
26	This filing applies to:	Location: U.S. Bankruptcy Court 230 N. First Ave, Courtroom 703	
27 28	■ All Debtors) □ Specified Debtors)	Phoenix, AZ 85003	

5

The National Hockey League (the "NHL" or "League") hereby submits this supplemental filing in support of its Motion for a Determination that Debtors' NHL Membership Rights May Not Be Transferred to PSE or an Affiliate Thereof (August 7, 2009, Dkt. # 584) (the "Motion").

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

There is an old joke about the three biggest, one of which is, "the check is in the mail." In this case, the first two "big lies" have been: (i) "the NHL's reason for turning down Mr. Balsillie is pretextual – the League really wants to protect the super-secret territorial veto of the Toronto Maple Leafs;" and (ii) "this case was filed to protect the creditors." The third "big lie" has now been added to the litany: "the NHL's making of a non-contingent bid to try to keep the Phoenix Coyotes in Glendale means that it acted in bad faith in rejecting Mr. Balsillie as an owner." There is no bad faith by the NHL in making a firm bid that, to the extent possible, puts creditors in the same position as if the case had never been filed. There is something sad, however, about Mr. Balsillie's inability to grasp the plain fact that it is his conduct, insensitivity, perceived lack of trustworthiness and unwillingness to accept responsibility for his own actions over several years that has caused the NHL Board of Governors (the "Board") to wish to not be associated with him in the business of professional hockey.

The NHL's overwhelming preference in this case has been to find one or more satisfactory owners of the Club in Glendale. To that end, it worked to recruit and assist potential bidders to become qualified and to finalize their bids. As the Court is aware, although the Board conditionally approved the Reinsdorf Group at a specially convened meeting, it withdrew its proposal, believing it had been harassed and impeded in its efforts to acquire the Club including by the inappropriate disclosure of sensitive details regarding its negotiations. The Ice Edge Team, LLC and Ice Edge Arena, LLC (together, the "Ice Edge Group") continues their quest, but by the bidding deadline still had significant contingencies that the NHL reasonably believed could take months to resolve. Meanwhile, the Club is stuck in a limbo created by the uncertainty of this case, and its business continues to deteriorate at a dramatic rate. Against that background, the NHL's bid can hardly be considered to be in bad faith. Nor does its bid in any way undermine its good faith

with respect to its earlier actions in rejecting Mr. Balsillie or passing on the qualifications of the Ice Edge Group.

ARGUMENT

I. PSE MISCHARACTERIZES THE NHL AS AN "INSIDER."

Contrary to the PSE's assertions, the NHL is clearly not an insider of the Debtors. PSE asserts the NHL is an insider under its arrangement for sharing of management control and through its "control" over the bidder qualification process. Despite PSE's repeated use of the word "control," however, it is patently evident that the NHL does not have any control over the Debtors in these cases. First, if the NHL were in control of the Debtors, these cases would never have been filed, nor would the NHL have a need to seek control in its Renewed Authority Motion. It is also safe to assume that if the NHL was in control, the Debtors would not be suing the NHL under the antitrust laws. Second, any exercise of control that the NHL may have over its own internal policies and procedures does not translate into the NHL being "in control of the debtor[s]." 11 U.S.C. § 101(31)(B)(iii). Quite simply, PSE has not shown, and cannot show, that the NHL is an "insider" of the Debtors under the Bankruptcy Code.

Even if this Court were to grant the Renewed Authority Motion, and the NHL became an insider of the Debtors, the NHL has acted and will continue to act in good faith. It is not bad faith for an insider to have an interest in the purchase of the debtor. In re Andy Frain Servs., Inc., 798 F.2d 1113, 1125 (7th Cir. 1986). A sale to an insider, "without more would not suffice to show a lack of good faith." Id. (citing Sulmeyer v. Karbach Enters. (In re Exennium, Inc.), 715 F.2d 1401, 1404-05 (9th Cir. 1983)). To show lack of good faith, there must be "fraud or collusion between the purchaser and the seller or other bidders, or that the purchaser's actions constituted 'an attempt to take grossly unfair advantage of other bidders." 255 Park Plaza Assocs. Ltd. P'ship v. Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co. (In re 255 Park Plaza Assocs. Ltd. P'ship), 100 F.3d 1214, 1218 (6th Cir. 1996) (quoting Onouli-Kona Land Co. v. Estate of Richards (In re Onouli-Kona Land Co.), 846 F.2d

See Reply in Support of PSE's Motion for Determination that the Debtors' Interests May be Transferred to PSE Notwithstanding the NHL's Refusal to Consent (August 31, 2009, Dkt. # 852) ("PSE's Reply").

3

5 6

15

17

18 19

27

 $1 \parallel 1170, 1173$ (9th Cir. 1998). Insiders "do not forfeit their good faith status unless it is shown that $2 \parallel$ they colluded with the debtor or engaged in conduct that was intended to control the sale price or take unfair advantage of other bidders." Sugarloaf Indus. & Mktg. Co., LLC v. Quaker City Castings, Inc. (In re Quaker City Castings, Inc.), 2005 Bankr. LEXIS 2211, *20 (B.A.P. 6th Cir. 2005) (citing In re Bakalis, 220 B.R. 525, 538 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1998)).

The same is true when an insider becomes a potential purchaser. See Prichard v. Sherwood & Roberts, Inc. (In re Kings Inn, Ltd.), 37 B.R. 239, 243 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1984) (upholding sale despite argument that good faith was lacking where purchaser controlled various entities in bankruptcy case). "The requirement that a purchaser act in good faith, of course, speaks to the 10 integrity of his conduct in the course of the sale proceedings. Typically, the misconduct that would destroy a purchaser's good faith status at a judicial sale involves fraud, collusion between the purchaser and other bidders or the trustee, or an attempt to take grossly unfair advantage of other bidders." In re Rock Indus. Mach. Corp., 572 F.2d 1195, 1198 (7th Cir. 1978). Wearing multiple hats does not make a potential purchaser an insider, nor does it impose a presumption of bad faith. See SBA v. XACT Telesolutions, Inc. (In re XACT Telesolutions, Inc.), 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 621 (D. Md. 2006) (member of board of directors who was also DIP lender was good faith purchaser where board had rejected all outside offers and insider made a subsequent offer to purchase substantially all of assets of debtors).

Here, PSE asserts that the NHL should be stripped of its right to use its business judgment and act in accordance with its internal procedures and policies simply because it has now emerged as a potential purchaser. But PSE has not shown, and cannot show, that the NHL has acted in bad faith. The cases that PSE has cited are wholly inapplicable because (i) the NHL, a reluctant buyer, has not engaged in any self-dealing; (ii) the NHL has disclosed the information it is required to disclose; and (iii) the NHL has not illegally colluded with the Debtors or anyone else. Curiously, 25 | in one of the cases cited by PSE, the court found that, in another bankruptcy case, Mr. Moyes failed to disclose material information in the context of an asset sale and that he should not benefit from the lack of disclosure. See In re Simon Transp. Servs., Inc., 292 B.R. 207, 216 (Bankr. D. Utah 2003). Further, in each of the cases that PSE cited, the insider stood to benefit from its actions at

1 the expense of the estate. In this case, the exact opposite is true – the NHL's bid is in the best 2 | interests of creditors and any profit the NHL may see in the near future will be shared with the estates.

Finally, PSE asserts that the NHL is acting in bad faith in order "to acquire for itself the 5 Coyotes relocation opportunity right for a fraction of its value." (PSE's Reply at 2.) However, this Court already has acknowledged that the NHL owns the right to place a team in Hamilton, Ontario. (6/15/09 Order (Dkt. # 341) at 10-12.) While that is not why the NHL is bidding for the Club, it is 8 not bad faith to protect that which is already yours.

II. THE BOARD DID NOT AUTHORIZE A BID IN ORDER TO MAKE MONEY.

While it is difficult for Mr. Balsillie to accept that the NHL does not want to do business 11 with him given the entire fabric of his interactions with the League and its members over time, this 12 is a reasonable business judgment by 26 individual governors (3 abstentions) whose clubs will have 13 at most a 1/29 interest in a team that, according to the Debtors, has lost vast sums. The facts and opinions that were considered by the Board in rejecting Mr. Balsillie are set forth at length in the 15 National Hockey League's Reply in Support of Motion for Determination that Debtors' NHL 16 Membership Rights May Not Be Transferred to PSE or an Affiliate Thereof (August 31, 2009, Dkt. # 863, at 26-34).

In sum, the Board is not, and did not become, an insider with respect to the purchase of the Club by determining to have the League make a bid under these circumstances. Accordingly, the Board's reasonable business judgment in rejecting Mr. Balsillie as an owner should not be affected in any way by the subsequent decision of the NHL to make a bid.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, the NHL's Motion for a Determination that Debtors' NHL Membership Rights may not be Transferred to PSE or an Affiliate Thereof should be granted.

26

25

3

4

9

10

17

18

22

23

27

28

1	DATED: September 1, 2009	
2	STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP	
3	D //Al A M 1 (#000212)	
4	By: /s/ Alan A. Meda (#009213) C. Taylor Ashworth, 010143 Alan A. Meda, 009213	
5	Alan A. Meda, 009213	
6	and	
	SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, LLF)
7	J. Gregory Milmoe Shepard Goldfein Anthony W. Clark	
8	Anthony W. Clark	
9	Attorneys for the National Hockey League	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	5	

1	COPY of the foregoing sent this September 1, 2009, to:	
2	Thomas J. Salerno, Esq.	James E. Cross, Esq.
3	Jordan A. Kroop, Esq. Kelly Singer, Esq.	Brenda K. Martin, Esq. Warren J. Stapleton, Esq.
4	SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP 40 N Central Ave #2700	OSBORN MALEDON PA 2929 N Central Ave #2100
5	Phoenix AZ 85004-4498	Phoenix AZ 85012-2794
6	tsalerno@ssd.com jkroop@ssd.com	jcross@omlaw.com bmartin@omlaw.com
7	ksinger@ssd.com Attorneys for Debtors	wstapleton@omlaw.com Attorneys for National Hockey League Players'
8		Association
9	Larry L Watson, Esq. Connie S. Hoover OFFICE OF THE U.S. TRUSTEE	Carolyn J. Johnsen, Esq. Peter W. Sorensen, Esq. JENNINGS STROUSS & SALMON PLC
10	230 N First Ave #204 Phoenix AZ 85003-1706	201 E Washington St Phoenix AZ 85004-2385
12	larry.watson@usdoj.gov connie.s.hoover@usdoj.gov	cjjohnsen@jsslaw.com psorensen@jsslaw.com
13		Attorneys for Jerry Moyes
14	Susan M. Freeman, Esq. Stefan M. Palys, Esq.	Jeffrey Freund, Esq. BREDHOFF & KAISER PLLC
15	LEWIS AND ROCA LLP 40 N Central Ave	805 15th St NW Washington DC 20005
16	Phoenix AZ 85004-4429 SFreeman@lrlaw.com	jfreund@bredhoff.com Attorneys for National Hockey League Players'
17	spalys@lrlaw.com Attorneys for PSE Sports & Entertainment and for S&E Interim Facility Corporation	Association
18	Steven M. Abramowitz, Esq.	Sean P. O'Brien, Esq.
19	VINSON & ELKINS LLP	GUST ROSENFELD PLC
20	666 Fifth Ave 26th Fl New York NY 10103-0040	201 E Washington St #800 Phoenix AZ 85004-2327
21	sabramowitz@velaw.com Attorneys for SOF Investments LP, White Tip	spobriein@gustlaw.com Attorneys for Drawbridge Special opportunities
22	Investments, LLC, and Donatello Investments,	Fund LP
23	LLC Donald L. Gaffney, Esq.	Richard W. Havel, Esq.
24	SNELL & WILMER LLP	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
25	One Arizona Center Phoenix AZ 85004-2202	555 W Fifth St 40th Fl Los Angeles CA 90013-1010
26	dgaffney@swlaw.com Attorneys for SOF Investments LP, White Tip	rhavel@sidley.com Attorneys for Drawbridge Special opportunities
27	Investments, LLC, and Donatello Investments, LLC	Fund LP
28		
1	i	

1 2 3	Richard H. Herold, Esq. HINSHAW & CULBERTSON LLP 3200 N Central Ave #800 Phoenix AZ 85012 rherold@hinshawlaw.com Attorneys for Aramark	Lori Lapin Jones LORI LAPIN JONES PLLC 98 Cutter Mill Rd #201 N Great Neck NY 11021 ljones@jonespllc.com Attorneys for BWD Group
5	Ivan L. Kallick, Esq. Ileana M. Hernandez, Esq.	Thomas Allen, Esq. Paul Sala, Esq.
6	MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS 11355 W Olympic Blvd	ALLEN SALA & BAYNE PLC 1850 N Central Ave #1150
7	Los Angeles CA 90064 ikallick@manatt.com	Phoenix AZ 85004 psala@asbazlaw.com
8	ihernandez@manatt.com Attorneys for Ticketmaster	tallen@asbazlaw.com Attorneys for the Official Joint Committee of
9	Theories for Tienedinaster	Unsecured Creditors
10	Louis T.M. Conti, Esq. HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 100 N Tampa St #4100	William Novotny, Esq. MARISCAL WEEKS McINTYRE & FRIEDLANDER PA
12	Tampa FL 33602 louis.conti@hklaw.com	2901 N Central Ave #200 Phoenix AZ 85012-2705
13	Attorneys for Facility Merchandising Inc.	William.novotny@mwmf.com Attorneys for Coyote Center Development LLC
14	Cathy L. Reece, Esq. Nicolas B. Hoskins, Esq.	Jonathan K. Bernstein, Esq. Andrew J. Gallo, Esq.
15	Fennemore Craig PC	BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
16	3003 n Central Ave #2600 Phoenix AZ 85012-2913	One Federal St Boston MA 02110
17 18	creece@fclaw.com nhoskins@fclaw.com Attorneys for City of Glendale, Arizona	Jon.bernstein@binghma.com Andrew.gallo@bingham.com
19	William R. Baldiga, Esq.	Mark C. Dangerfield, Esq.
20	Andrew M. Sroka, Esq. BROWN RUDNICK LLP One Financial Center	Dean C. Short, Esq. GALLAGHER & KENNEDY PA 2575 E Camelback Rd
21	Boston MA 02111 wbaldiga@brownrudnick.com	Phoenix AZ 85016-9225 mcd@gknet.com
22	asroka@brownrudnick.com	dcs@gknet.com
23	Attorneys for City of Glendale, Arizona Jonathan P. Ibsen, Esq.	Attorneys for Arizona Cardinals Football Club Mark A. Nadeau, Esq.
24	Laura A. Rogal, Esq.	Shane D. Gosdis, Esq.
25	JABURG & WILK PC 3200 N Central Ave #2000	Allison L. Kierman, Esq. DLA PIPER LLP (US)
26	Phoenix AZ 85012-2400 jpi@jaburgwilk.com	2525 E Camelback Rd #1000 Phoenix AZ 85016-4245
27	lar@jaburgwilk.com Attorneys for Wayne Gretzky	mark.nadeau@dlapiper.com shane.gosdis@dlapiper.com
28		allison.kierman@dlapiper.com

Attorneys for Lease Group Resources, Inc. Scott B. Cohen, Esq. Arthur E Rosenberg Esq HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP ENGELMAN BERGER PC 3636 N Central Ave #700 195 Broadway New York NY 10007-3189 Phoenix AZ 85012 sbc@engelmanberger.com Attorneys for John Breslow arthur.rosenberg@hklaw.com Attorneys for Facility Merchandising Inc. /s/ Tracy Dunham