## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In the Matter of: : Case No.: 01-00056

TWA POST CONFIRMATION : Wilmington, DelawareSeptember 19, 2005

ESTATE,

Debtor.

TRANSCRIPT OF OMNIBUS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE PETER J. WALSH UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Debtors: JAMES E. O'NEILL, ESQ.

Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, Young,

Jones & Weintraub

919 North Market Street Wilmington, Delaware 19899

For Creditor:

United Technologies: BRETT D. FALLON, ESQ.

Morris, James, Hitchens & Williams

222 Delaware Avenue

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

Pro Se: HENRY SULLIVAN (Via Telephone)

34 West 74th Street

New York, New York 10023

Pro Se: HERBERT McMILLIAN

Audio Operator: Sherry Scaruzzi

Transcribed by: DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING

P.O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026-0129

(856) 435-7172

FAX: (856) 435-7124

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

MR. O'NEILL: Good morning, Your Honor. James o'Neill, Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl, Young, Jones & Weintraub, 4 here today on behalf of the TWA post confirmation estate.

Your Honor, looking at the agenda for today, there are a number of resolved and continued matters. And the first going forward matter appears at number 8 which is on page 5 of the agenda.

> THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

18

20

22

23

MR. O'NEILL: Which is the TWA post confirmation. It states thirty-first non-substantive objection.

Your Honor, there were no -- well, there was one 13 response filed by the Internal Revenue Service. And the Internal Revenue Service did file a response indicating that they agreed with the treatment as proposed as long as their remaining claim would in fact remain, and that is what we 17 sought to do.

So, Your Honor, this morning I filed a certification of counsel which reflects the relief requested in the thirtyfirst omnibus objection. I have a copy of the certification with me and also a proposed form of order on top which I can hand up.

> THE COURT: Okay.

24 (Pause)

25 THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you. Number 9 on the agenda, Your MR. O'NEILL: 2 Honor, is the TWA post confirmation estates thirty-second 3 substantive omnibus objection to claims.

There were a number of responses which we received and the agenda reflects the status of each one of the responses.

I will note for the record, in the thirty-second omnibus objection, the estate objected to the claim of Henry A. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan filed a response. It is the first item listed at number 9A on the agenda. And after review of that response, the estate has agreed to withdraw its objection to Mr. Sullivan's claim. And the order that I will be handing up shortly reflects the fact that the estate has withdrawn its objection to Mr. Sullivan's claim.

I believe that Mr. Sullivan is appearing by telephone today and I just wanted to confirm for him that we have withdrawn our objection.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

MR. O'NEILL: There are a number of other matters which are listed there, responses. A number of them are continued to our next hearing which is November 18th at 11 a.m.

And I would also note for the record, the estate filed an objection to Pratt & Whitney, the claim of Pratt & Whitney, and counsel for Pratt & Whitney is in the courtroom today. And the order which I have to hand up indicates that the

1 estate's objection to the claim of Pratt & Whitney has been 2 resolved through a settlement which does not require Court 3 approval. So that objection is resolved.

Other than that, Your Honor, if there are no comments from anyone, I do have a proposed form of order which reflects the resolution or continuances of the matters in the thirtysecond omnibus objection. We did file a certification of counsel this morning, and I have a proposed form of order I can 9 | hand up with that certification.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you have a resolution of Wells Fargo also?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes, Your Honor. Wells Fargo -- yes, 13 Your Honor. That is also resolved through a settlement which 14 does not require Court approval. And that is their claim number 998400. This has been resolved through a settlement which does 16∥not require Court approval. There were two other Wells Fargo 17 claims which are being expunged for insufficient documentation. But the one Wells Fargo matter is Wells Fargo Bank Northwest As indenture trustee has been resolved through an agreement which does not require Court approval.

> THE COURT: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: And I can hand that up.

THE COURT: Okay.

4

5

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 (Pause)

25 MR. FALLON: Good afternoon -- sorry, good morning,

1 Your Honor. Brett Fallon for Pratt & Whitney, a division of 2 United Technologies Corporation. Mr. O'Neill is correct. We have resolved the 3 4 objection in an amount certain. My understanding is that that 5 does not have to be reflected on this order, but it will be reflected on the claims register. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. FALLON: Thank you. 9 MR. O'NEILL: That's correct, Your Honor. We will 10 mark the register to reflect that resolution. Those are the only matters which are on the agenda 11 for today, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. O'NEILL: And so the hearing is concluded. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Hello, Judge Walsh. This is Henry 17 Sullivan. I'm appearing pro se. Could I speak up, please? 18 THE COURT: Did you hear what counsel said about your claim? 19 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I did, Your Honor. This was the 20 second time they had objected to my claim, and I had filed 22 responses earlier, and they withdrew their objection then. 23 What I wanted to ask you, Your Honor, is whether it

24∥ would be all right, whether I'd be in violation of any court

order or rule if I were to file a motion requesting a

1 declaratory order from the Court which would enable me to seek 2 appropriate redress from American Airlines, resulting from the 3 actions that I believe, concerted actions of American and TWA 4 in violation of my due process rights. I did not receive 5 actual notice that they intended to terminate the travel 6∥ benefits that I had as a former TWA employee under a voluntary termination program in 1986.

And as I say, I don't want to run afoul of any of  $9\parallel$  your orders, specifically the injunction in the sale order of 10∥March 12th, 2001 that American invoked when I made a claim against American.

THE COURT: I honestly don't know what you're 13 referring to, Mr. Sullivan.

8

11

12

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, this is all explained in my response to the thirty-second substantive objection. I could elaborate it, if you give me a minute, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, well, I didn't read your response 18 because the agenda letter indicated that the matter was resolved by the debtor withdrawing its objection.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, would you like me to briefly explain it to you?

THE COURT: Okay, go ahead.

MR. SULLIVAN: In my response to the objections, I explained that I'm a former TWA attorney who exchanged his continued employment for lifetime passes on TWA pursuant to

1 voluntary termination program in 1986. And that I did not 2 receive actual notice of any of the pleadings which resulted in 3 the Court's approval of American Airlines bid for TWA's assets, 4 and assumption of certain limited and defined liability.

I understand that individuals who retired from TWA 6 under standard retirement understandings also did not receive actual notice of the proposed sale, and that this was because 8 American had agreed to offer retirement benefits to TWA 9 retirees generally.

5

10

11

14

20

21

23

25

And it's my belief that American made a belated decision to reject TWA's obligations to me, even though I was receiving retirement benefits from TWA when it filed the 13 voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11.

Further, it appears that American then engaged in a 15 concerted effort with TWA to obtain Court approval of the asset 16 | sale on limited notice for the purpose of avoiding expected opposition from interested parties such as myself. And I 18 believe that such actions by American and TWA violated my due process rights by preventing me from making the singular argument before the Court that my agreement with TWA should not be rejected by American because the agreement provided TWA with 22 a profit, not a liability.

When using our passes, we occupy seats which 24∥ otherwise would have been empty, and we typically pay surcharges of 30 to \$50 per flight segment per person. We paid

1 even greater amounts for fair market value space available 2 tickers under TWA's extended eligibility program for employees 3 and retirees. For example, \$250 for a ticket to Europe in 4 October 2000.

And as I explained, American has taken the position that it has no liability for my claim for damages on the grounds that the Court's April 9, 2001 order specifically approved the rejection of contracts.

5

6

8

9

10

11

14

19

20

21

23

24

25

Further, American contends that under the asset purchase agreement, flight travel benefits or privileges are retained by the TWA estate, and that as a holder of a retained liability, I'm enjoined from filing suit against American by 13 $\parallel$  the injunction in the March 12th, 2001 sale order.

And that's why I'm asking Your Honor whether you 15 would permit me to file a motion, perhaps to be heard at the 16 next scheduled time on your calendar for this TWA case in 17∥November, in which I would seek a declaratory order from you which would enable me to try to obtain appropriate redress from American for the damages that I believe resulted from their actions in violation of my due process rights.

THE COURT: Does this have anything to do with the 22 claim that was objected to and now withdrawn?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor. This was explained in that. But actually as a result of a notice that I received when I got the thirty-second omnibus objection, I inquired whether

TWA estate was indeed trying, willing to settle the claim as 2 the notice indicated. And when I touched base with their 3 counsel, I found that American would not participate in any 4 settlement. So this caused me to think that maybe it would be appropriate to file such a motion as I outlined to you.

MR. O'NEILL: With regard to the estate, the claim against the estate, Your Honor, the claim was filed I believe in a monetary amount, and I think that it was just an economic decision on the estate's part, given what the anticipated distribution would be, not to continue to raise objections to the monetary amount asserted in the unsecured claim.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sullivan, I obviously can't 13 comment on the merits of your --

MR. SULLIVAN: Of course not.

THE COURT: -- assertion, but if you wish to file something and serve it on American and any other party that you think that ought to be served, why, it can be brought on for consideration at some future hearing.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Your Honor. And specifically, there is an enormous service list attached to the thirty-second omnibus objection. Do you think it would be sufficient if I just served such a motion on the TWA estate and American Airlines, since I am participating in this pro se?

> THE COURT: I assume -- is there still a Committee? MR. O'NEILL: I don't -- I don't think the Committee

25

1

5

б

11

12

14

15

18

19

20

22

23

24

is still functioning, Your Honor.

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

17

20

24

THE COURT: Okay. All right, I would think that 3 service on the estate and American would be sufficient.

MR. SULLIVAN: Fine, Your Honor. Okay, well, thank 5 you very much.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you very much, Your Honor. No, that's all for today.

THE COURT: Okay, we stand in recess.

MR. MC MILLIAN: excuse me, Your Honor, for the record, my name is Herbert McMillian, for the record.

12 THE COURT: Yes. Do you have a matter scheduled here 13 today?

MR. MC MILLIAN: I did submit papers to the law firm since April, and I came to both -- first, my name is Herbert 16 McMillian, and I'm pro se, in reference to the creditor.

I submitted a affidavit, I mean a request, for, to 18 enter a judgment by default of the creditor, and it supposed to 19 be on the agenda for April which I came and there was no hearing. I never got notice. Then I came in July and there also I never got notice, and I understand on the agenda. And I spoke to Mr. O'Neill just a few minutes ago, he said I'm not on the 23 agenda.

So I just want to be on the record that I did submit 25∥ papers timely in order to be on the agenda, and I was denied

1 the opportunity to express my views, or there was never any  $2 \parallel$  objections in reference to the request to enter a judgment by 3 default.

4

5

10

11

14

19

24

Also, I just like to bring two points, I'm not here to argue, I just want to be on the record. I also request, the third is I submitted a request which I just submitted today and filed in the Clerk's Office and the service was sent out 8 yesterday to the debtors and the insurance in reference to my ERIS - E.R.I.S.A. claims and benefits that I'm entitled to. And I have a application here, reads request for judicial notice, criminal investigation at grand jury procedures, and it is addressed to the Honorable Mary L. Walford, a Chief Judge of 13 the United States Bankruptcy Court, at this address.

So I submitted to the debtors a copy just a few minutes ago, Mr. O'Neill, but there was sent out by U.S. Mail to the debtors and copy went to the U.S. Attorney's Office and a copy went to U.S. Trustee's Office, and I just wanted to be on the record in reference to a particular papers.

Also, I would like according to the rules, a reference to the debtors or any party in the matter, do not inform the other party in writing in reference to a schedule date and whatnot, a violation of your court rules. And it's a very serious rule. I think I have a right to hear my motion.

So also I would like to, if it's possible, to 25 continue whatever, be on the agenda in the next hearing.

THE COURT: Do you know what motion he's talking 2 about, Mr. O'Neill?

1

3

5

10

11

14

18

20

21

22

24

MR. O'NEILL: I can respond. Mr. McMillian has 4 continued to put things on the docket that are very difficult for me to understand the meaning of. They don't request any particular thing, they're not in the form of a motion, they're similar to other things that have been filed by Mr. McMillian in the past. I have seen Mr. McMillian's request for entry of default judgment appear on the docket several times. There is no open matter for which a default could be entered.

So the estate has not been responding because the pleadings which have been filed don't really address any open 13 matter that's pending before this Court.

Your Honor will recall the last thing that happened with respect to Mr. McMillian was disallowance of his claim which happened some time ago. And at that time, basically it was the estate's view that the relationship with Mr. McMillian as far as the estate was over. That was after several hearings, several pleadings which were filed and disposition by this Court.

Since that time, there have been things which have been put on the docket. Again, there's no open matter. There's nothing for this Court to decide in our view. The things which are put on the docket aren't styled as a motion, and we have no way really to respond other than to file a pleading that says

1 we're not going to respond to this.

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

So, this Mr. O'Neill Mr. McMillian handed me the 3 | latest thing which got put on the docket which still it doesn't 4 really inform me of what he wants other than some kind of a 5 criminal investigation. There are claims which -- maybe there  $6\parallel$  are claims which he has against other people, but as far as the estate's concerned, he has no claim against the TWA post 8 confirmation estate, and there's no continuing role for him to 9 play in the bankruptcy.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. McMillian, look, if you want to say something, you must identify for Mr. O'Neill by docket number --

MR. MC MILLIAN: I have --

THE COURT: -- what item you want considered.

MR. MC MILLIAN: Docket number 5521.

THE COURT: Okay, that's --

MR. MC MILLIAN: If like he said, he didn't respond, even though even just two words, I'm not responding, you know, at least you know, there would be something on the court record.

THE COURT: Okay, so you want the Court to consider 22 that on --

MR. MC MILLIAN: Right, consider that and that is to put on the agenda and have --

25 THE COURT: All right, we'll put it on for the next

Colloguy 14

```
1 hearing. You can respond to it, Mr. O'Neill.
 2
             MR. O'NEILL: What was the docket number?
             MR. MC MILLIAN:
 3
                              5521.
             MR. O'NEILL: I'll do that.
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Do you know when the next omnibus hearing
 б
   is?
 7
             MR. O'NEILL: It's November 18th.
             THE COURT: Okay.
 8
 9
             MR. MC MILLIAN: And also too, Your Honor --
10
             THE COURT: We'll put it on for November 18th.
11
             MR. MC MILLIAN: Okay, thank you. Only other
   question, I don't --
13
             THE COURT: Mr. O'Neill, you'll respond to it.
14
             MR. O'NEILL: Yes, I will, Your Honor.
15
             MR. MC MILLIAN: Also, in reference to the criminal
   investigation by grand procedure, that is decided by, got to be
   proven by a grand jury, it can't be proven by me. The only
   thing I can do is put down the issues that be triable in
18
   reference to the charges. So I don't know what he's talking
   about. Only thing when you have a jury trial, only has to be
21 proven triable issues that's raised on the agenda.
22
             Only other question is that in reference to the
23∥ expunge, and I give you a copy of this if you want to see it
24 because your name is on here in reference to, disqualifying
25 yourself from the case.
```

THE COURT: I don't need to see it.

MR. MC MILLIAN: All right, Your Honor. But anyway, I

say, but anyway, so I'll be on the agenda for the next November

the Sth. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Okay. We stand in recess.

5

6

(Matter concluded at 11:52 a.m.)

\* \* \* \*

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

12 SANDRA CARBONARO

13

14 Doman Transcribing & Recording Svcs.

15 AGENCY

16

17

18

CERTIFICATION

I, Sandra Carbonaro, court approved transcriber, 6 certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 7 official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the 8 above-entitled matter.

DATE