Capital Markets Alert

Skadden

October 5, 2016

District Court Ruling May Broaden Noteholders' Ability to Receive Redemption Premiums Following Indenture Defaults

In a decision issued on September 19, 2016, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York ruled that bondholders were entitled to a "make-whole" redemption premium, as opposed to a repayment at par, following a default by the issuer under the related bond indenture. The decision raises important considerations for issuers of debt securities that contain similar provisions.

If you have any questions regarding the matters discussed in this memorandum, please contact the attorneys listed on the last page or call your regular Skadden contact.

This memorandum is provided by Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP and its affiliates for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed as legal advice. This memorandum is considered advertising under applicable state laws.

Four Times Square
New York, NY 10036
212.735.3000

On September 19, 2016, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York granted summary judgment to Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB, with respect to claims brought against Cash America International, Inc. in Wilmington Savings' capacity as trustee under the indenture governing $300 million of Cash America's outstanding notes. Wilmington Savings claimed that Cash America violated a covenant in the indenture when it disposed of 80 percent of a wholly owned subsidiary to its shareholders in the form of a dividend of the subsidiary's stock. Wilmington Savings also claimed that the proper remedy for Cash America's breach would be an award requiring Cash America to redeem the notes, including payment of the specified "make-whole" redemption premium under the indenture, as opposed to accelerating the maturity date and a repayment at the par value of the notes.

While the court's decision with respect to the breach of contract claim involved a relatively straightforward analysis, the claim that the holders had a right to require Cash America to pay the premium was more complex and a question that required examination of the interplay between two provisions that are customary in indentures. The first is the provision allowing an issuer to optionally redeem notes prior to maturity by paying a redemption premium, generally designed to compensate holders for the lost value from future interest payments. The second is the provision allowing holders to accelerate the maturity of notes upon an event of default, which upon acceleration requires immediate payment of the full principal amount of the notes at par. The court noted the well-established provisions of New York law that preclude the payment of a redemption premium following an automatic acceleration of notes, most commonly seen in the bankruptcy context, but further noted that in the more atypical nonbankruptcy context, the interplay between the two provisions is less clear. Specifically, the question arises as to whether the acceleration provisions in an indenture are intended to be the exclusive remedies for such a default.

In making its determination in favor of Wilmington Savings, the court referred to the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit in *Sharon Steel v. Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.*, 691 F.2d 1039 (2d Cir. 1982), in which the court found that the acceleration provisions in the applicable debt instrument did not bar security holders from seeking specific performance of the redemption provisions where the default resulted from "voluntary actions" by the issuer. The district court rejected Cash America's arguments that the only remedy for an event of default under a plain reading of the indenture is acceleration, specifically referencing the customary provision allowing the trustee to enforce the performance of any provision under the indenture. The court also

disagreed with Cash America's interpretation of *Sharon Steel* as requiring some element of bad faith conduct, such as intentionally defaulting under the indenture to evade the payment of the redemption premium. Instead, the court stated that the analysis by the 2nd Circuit in *Sharon Steel* turned on the distinction between defaults arising from "voluntary actions" (such as the Cash America disposition) versus involuntary actions (such as bankruptcies), not subjective intent. The court also noted that the parties could have specifically included acceleration provisions that were self-operative and that Cash America could not "attempt to reap the benefit of something it did not bargain for."

The court's holding in this case raises important considerations for the many issuers of debt securities that contain similar provisions. By electing not to consider the subjective intent of the parties, the court's interpretation of *Sharon Steel* seems to broaden the requirement for payment of a redemption premium to any voluntary action taken by an issuer that results in a default under an indenture, even if the issuer may have possessed a good faith belief that such action complied with the indenture. Such actions could include transfers of assets, affiliate transactions, the incurrence of debt or liens or the making of restricted payments, which often involve calculations and judgment. As a result, issuers may face increased litigation risk from noteholders seeking to challenge actions that could arguably result in defaults as well as increased costs associated with negotiating consents or waivers under existing instruments if, under either scenario, the expected return upon a default would include the value of a redemption premium. In addition, while the voluntary actions of the issuers in this case and in *Sharon Steel* related to significant transactions that appeared to be material to the noteholders, the court imported no such standard of materiality or significance to the applicability of the requirement. This could result in unintended and potentially inequitable repercussions in future decisions.

As the case law in this area continues to develop, it is important for issuers, underwriters and their respective counsel to consider the implications of this case law when drafting the related indenture provisions. Issuers also should consider such implications when interpreting the provisions of existing indentures, particularly when doing so in connection with proposed transactions. In light of this case law, issuers, underwriters and investors may want to focus closely on the language used in both existing bond indentures and indentures for new bond offerings.

Capital Markets Alert
Contacts

New York

Ryan J. Dzierniejko
Partner
212.735.3712
ryan.dzierniejko@skadden.com

Gregory A. Fernicola
Partner
212.735.2918
gregory.fernicola@skadden.com

David J. Goldschmidt
Partner
212.735.3574
david.goldschmidt@skadden.com

Laura A. Kaufmann Belkhayat
Partner
212.735.2439
laura.kaufmann@skadden.com

Andrea L. Nicolas
Partner
212.735.3416
andrea.nicolas@skadden.com

Michael J. Schwartz
Partner
212.735.3694
michael.schwartz@skadden.com

Yossi Vebman
Partner
212.735.3719
yossi.vebman@skadden.com

Dwight S. Yoo
Partner
212.735.2573
dwight.yoo@skadden.com

Michael J. Zeidel
Partner
212.735.3259
michael.zeidel@skadden.com

Los Angeles

Michelle Gasaway
Partner
213.687.5122
michelle.gasaway@skadden.com

Palo Alto

Thomas J. Ivey
Partner
650.470.4522
thomas.ivey@skadden.com

Gregg A. Noel
Partner
650.470.4540
gregg.noel@skadden.com

Washington, D.C.

Brian V. Breheny
Partner
202.371.7180
brian.breheny@skadden.com

Andrew J. Brady
Of Counsel
202.371.7513
andrew.brady@skadden.com

Frankfurt

Stephan Hutter
Partner
49.69.74220.170
stephan.hutter@skadden.com

Hong Kong

Z. Julie Gao
Partner
852.3740.4863
julie.gao@skadden.com

Jonathan B. Stone
Partner
852.3740.4703
jonathan.stone@skadden.com

London

James A. McDonald
Partner
44.20.7519.7183
james.mcdonald@skadden.com

Danny Tricot
Partner
44.20.7519.7071
danny.tricot@skadden.com

Pranav L. Trivedi
Partner
44.20.7519.7026
pranav.trivedi@skadden.com

Singapore

Rajeev P. Duggal
Partner
65.6434.2980
rajeev.duggal@skadden.com

Sydney

Adrian J. S. Deitz
Partner
61.4294.44311
adrian.deitz@skadden.com

Tokyo

Kenji Taneda
Partner
81.3.3568.2640
kenji.taneda@skadden.com

Toronto

Riccardo A. Leofanti
Partner
416.777.4703
riccardo.leofanti@skadden.com

Counsel **Michael Hong** assisted in the preparation of this alert.