

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JUNE 2021

## EDITOR'S NOTE: LITIGATION

Victoria Prussen Spears

## OFFICERS OF SELLING COMPANIES MAY ESCAPE FIDUCIARY DUTY LIABILITY BUT MAY BE REQUIRED TO RETURN CHANGE OF CONTROL PAYMENTS IF COMPANY IS INSOLVENT POST-CLOSING – PART II

Ronit J. Berkovich and Teddy Cohan

## U.S. SUPREME COURT'S "AUTODIALER" RULING UNDER TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT SHOULD SHIELD DEBT COLLECTORS FROM LIABILITY WHERE DEVICE DOES NOT RANDOMLY OR SEQUENTIALLY GENERATE NUMBERS

Wayne Streibich, Diana M. Eng, and Andrea M. Roberts

## SECOND CIRCUIT REAFFIRMS ITS PREFERENCE FOR EQUITABLE MOOTNESS

Lisa M. Schweitzer, Sean A. O'Neal, Luke A. Barefoot, Jane VanLare, and Kristin Corbett

## CREDITOR STRATEGIES TO COMBAT INSIDER TRANSACTIONS

John C. Kilgannon

## EMPLOYERS SHOULD TAKE NOTE OF A RECENT DISTRICT COURT DECISION HOLDING THAT THE U.S. BANKRUPTCY CODE'S AUTOMATIC STAY DOES NOT EXTEND TO FLSA ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

Daniel M. Pereira

## COVID-19 PANDEMIC DID NOT ELIMINATE RETAILER'S LEASE OBLIGATIONS, NEW YORK FEDERAL COURT RULES

Steven A. Meyerowitz

## THREE-C'S IN THE GROUP INSOLVENCY: AN INDIAN OUTLOOK

Gaurav Chaliya



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 17

NUMBER 4

June 2021

---

**Editor's Note: Litigation**

Victoria Prussen Spears 171

**Officers of Selling Companies May Escape Fiduciary Duty Liability But May Be Required to Return Change of Control Payments If Company Is Insolvent Post-Closing—Part II**

Ronit J. Berkovich and Teddy Cohan 174

**U.S. Supreme Court's "Autodialer" Ruling Under Telephone Consumer Protection Act Should Shield Debt Collectors from Liability Where Device Does Not Randomly or Sequentially Generate Numbers**

Wayne Streibich, Diana M. Eng, and Andrea M. Roberts 182

**Second Circuit Reaffirms Its Preference for Equitable Mootness**

Lisa M. Schweitzer, Sean A. O'Neal, Luke A. Barefoot, Jane VanLare, and Kristin Corbett 185

**Creditor Strategies to Combat Insider Transactions**

John C. Kilgannon 191

**Employers Should Take Note of a Recent District Court Decision Holding that the U.S. Bankruptcy Code's Automatic Stay Does Not Extend to FLSA Enforcement Actions**

Daniel M. Pereira 197

<b>COVID-19 Pandemic Did Not Eliminate Retailer's Lease Obligations, New York Federal Court Rules</b> Steven A. Meyerowitz	200
<b>Three-C's in the Group Insolvency: An Indian Outlook</b> Gaurav Chaliya	208

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Kent K. B. Hanson, J.D., at ..... 415-908-3207  
Email: ..... kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

---

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

**Example:** Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2021 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**SCOTT L. BAENA**

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP*

**ANDREW P. BROZMAN**

*Clifford Chance US LLP*

**MICHAEL L. COOK**

*Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP*

**MARK G. DOUGLAS**

*Jones Day*

**MARK J. FRIEDMAN**

*DLA Piper*

**STUART I. GORDON**

*Rivkin Radler LLP*

**PATRICK E. MEARS**

*Barnes & Thornburg LLP*

*Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law* is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2021 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

# Employers Should Take Note of a Recent District Court Decision Holding that the U.S. Bankruptcy Code’s Automatic Stay Does Not Extend to FLSA Enforcement Actions

*By Daniel M. Pereira\**

*Filing for federal bankruptcy protection automatically stays the commencement or continuation of judicial, administrative or other actions or proceedings against a debtor. The Bankruptcy Code, however, carves out limited exceptions to the reach of the automatic stay. The author of this article discusses a recent district court decision, which held that the automatic stay does not extend to enforcement actions brought by the U.S. Department of Labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act.*

In a recent decision from the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, the court held that the U.S. Bankruptcy Code’s automatic stay does not extend to enforcement actions brought by the U.S. Department of Labor (“DOL”) under the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”). The decision, applying Section 362(b)(4) of the Bankruptcy Code, rejects a contrary holding by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and provides persuasive authority within the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit that an employer cannot shield itself from FLSA enforcement actions by seeking protection under the Bankruptcy Code.

## **BACKGROUND**

Generally speaking, filing for federal bankruptcy protection automatically stays the commencement or continuation of judicial, administrative or other actions or proceedings against a debtor. The Bankruptcy Code, however, carves out limited exceptions to the reach of the automatic stay, including an exception for certain police and regulatory actions under Section 362(b)(4).

Section 362(b)(4) provides that:

The filing of a petition . . . does not operate as a stay . . . of the commencement or continuation of an action or proceeding by a governmental unit . . . to enforce such governmental unit’s . . . police and regulatory power, including the enforcement of a judgment other than a money judgment, obtained in an action or proceeding by

---

\* Daniel M. Pereira is an associate at Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP, concentrating his practice on litigation and transactional matters with a focus on advising clients on commercial litigation, bankruptcy-related and creditors’ rights issues. He may be reached at [dpereira@stradley.com](mailto:dpereira@stradley.com).

the governmental unit's . . . police or regulatory power[.]

In *Stewart v. Holland Acquisitions, Inc.*, the DOL filed a civil complaint against Holland Acquisitions, Inc. (“Holland”) and its principal, alleging willful and repeated failures to pay its employees overtime and maintain adequate employment records both in violation of the FLSA. Holland subsequently filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy and asserted that the bankruptcy filing stayed the FLSA suit.

## THE DECISION

The court first noted that there was no dispute that the DOL is a “governmental unit” as defined by Section 101(27) of the Bankruptcy Code, which includes departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the United States. Nor was there any dispute that the DOL is not seeking to enforce a pre-existing money judgment. Instead, the DOL is seeking to enjoin further violations of the FLSA and obtain a monetary judgment in the form of back wages and liquidated damages.

The court explained that that “[t]he Third Circuit applies two ‘overlapping’ and ‘complementary’ tests to determine whether a governmental unit’s action advances the unit’s ‘police or regulatory power’ such that the exception to the automatic stay would be triggered.”<sup>1</sup>

First, the “pecuniary purpose” test considers whether the action seeks to protect a pecuniary governmental interest in a debtor’s property as opposed to protecting the public safety and health.

Second, the “public policy” test considers whether the action is in furtherance of public policy rather than adjudicating private rights.

Holland, relying primarily on the Sixth Circuit’s decision in *Chao v. Hospital Staffing Services, Inc.*,<sup>2</sup> argued that the FLSA action failed the public policy test because the DOL, in seeking a judgment for back pay, was seeking primarily to protect the private rights of Holland’s employees. The court rejected that argument, concluding that the Sixth Circuit’s reasoning contrasts with principles applied by courts within the Third Circuit and would “substantially impair the core remedial purposes of the FLSA.”

In sum, the court concluded that the DOL’s remedial authority under the FLSA—even when used, in part, to vindicate the personal rights of specific employees—has the overall purpose of advancing the public welfare. Further,

<sup>1</sup> Quoting *In re Nortel*, 669 F.3d 128, 139 (3d Cir. 2011).

<sup>2</sup> 270 F.3d 374 (6th Cir. 2001).



the DOL's enforcement authority serves to "bring a culpable employer into compliance with the FLSA" and "serves to deter others from failing to fulfill their wage-payment duties under the FLSA."

Thus, despite the fact that a judgment in favor of the DOL would result in an award of backpay for specific individuals, the purpose of such action is to protect the welfare of employees and foster employer compliance with the FLSA. Accordingly, the court held that the DOL could proceed with its action against Holland notwithstanding the automatic stay. The court did note, however, that although the automatic stay would not prevent the court from entering judgment against Holland, enforcement of any such judgment would have to be adjudicated by the bankruptcy court.

## CONCLUSION

It is not uncommon for entities facing costly litigation and a potentially significant civil judgment to file for bankruptcy protection in order to afford themselves the benefits of the automatic stay. Among other things, filing a bankruptcy petition provides such debtors an opportunity to hit the pause button on the litigation, create some breathing room, and hopefully limit the damage of any potential judgment.

In the absence of any controlling precedent, an employer operating within the Third Circuit and facing down a significant FLSA enforcement action might look to the Sixth Circuit's *Chao* decision and consider filing for bankruptcy protection in order to stay the litigation. The court's decision in *Holland* should give room for pause to any employer considering such a strategy. Although not binding precedent, the decision provides persuasive authority within the Third Circuit that the police and regulatory exception under Section 362(b)(4) extends to FLSA enforcement actions such that the automatic stay will not protect a wayward employer from the FLSA's reach.