1	THE CAVANAGH LAW FIRM A Professional Association	
2	1850 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE	
3	SUITE 2400 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004-4527 (602) 322-4000	
4	edocket@cavanaghlaw.com	
5	_	
6	Philip G. Mitchell, SBN 10374 pmitchell@cavanaghlaw.com Julie A. Pace, SBN 14585	
7	jpace@cavanaghlaw.com	
8	Attorneys for Debtors	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
10	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
11	TOK THE DISTRI	ICT OF ANIZONA
12	In re	In Proceedings Under Chapter 11
13	FRONTIER STAR, LLC, a Delaware	1
14	limited liability company, and	No. 2:15-bk-09383-EPB 2:15-bk-09385-EPB
15		(Joint Administration Pending)
16	FRONTIER STAR CJ, LLC, A Delaware limited liability company,	MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING
17	Debtors.	STIPULATION REGARDING POSTPETITION CREDIT, PREPETITION DEBT, ADEQUATE PROTECTION, AND SETTLEMENT
18	·	PROTECTION, AND SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE AGREEMENT
19		WITH MEADOWBROOK MEAT COMPANY, INC. D/B/A/ MBM
20		CORPORATION PURSUANT TO FED.R.BANKR.P. 9019
21		
22	Frontier Star, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Star") and Frontier Star	
23	CJ, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("CJ") (Star and CJ are collectively	
24	referred to hereinafter as the "Debtors"), and Meadowbrook Meat Company, Inc., d/b/a	
25	MBM Corporation ("MBM"), herewith move this Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of	

Bankruptcy procedure 9019, to approve the attached Stipulation Regarding Post-Petition

Credit, Pre-Petition Debt, Adequate Protection and Settlement and Release Agreement (the "Stipulation") for the purpose of allowing favorable terms on continuing credit and providing temporary cash debt relief. It is the Debtor's business judgment that approval of this Stipulation is in the best interest of creditors and the Estates. Under the applicable franchise agreements, the Debtors are obligated to obtain its food supplies from MBM. Notwithstanding the bankruptcy petitions, MBM has agreed to continue, uninterrupted vendor services on ordinary and customary business terms. In support of their Stipulation, the Debtors state as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This matter relates to the administration of the Debtors' bankruptcy estates and is accordingly a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(A), (B), (D), (F), (H), (K), (M) and (O). Venue of this case is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409. The statutory predicates for the relief requested herein are sections 105(a), 363(b), 364(c) and (d), 503(b)(9), 544, 547, and 548 of title 11 of the United States Code (the "Bankruptcy Code"), and Rules 4001 and 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") and Local Bankruptcy Rule 4001-4.

II.

RELEVANT FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On July 27, 2015 (the "Petition Date"), the Debtors commenced voluntary cases under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtors are authorized to continue to operate their business and manage their properties as debtors in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. The United States Trustee has not yet appointed an official committee of unsecured creditors under section 1102 of the

Bankruptcy Code. On July 28, 2015, the Debtors moved the Court to jointly administer the above-captioned cases. *See* Case No. 15-09383, D.E. 5.

Non-debtor Frontier Star I, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, ("Frontier Star I," together with Debtors, the "Frontier Entities") is the sole member of the Debtors, and Jason LaVecke is the Manager of Frontier Star I, who has submitted his Declaration in support of this Motion (the "LaVecke Declaration").

The Frontier Entities are franchisees operating approximately eight-one (81) Hardee's® and approximately eighty-four (84) Carl's Jr.® restaurants located throughout the states of Arizona, Texas, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee under franchise agreements with CKE Hardee's Restaurants, LLC and CKE Carl's Jr. Restaurants, LLC (together, the "Franchisor").

As Hardee's® or Carl's Jr.® franchisees, the Frontier Entities are required to comply with certain recipe and ingredient specifications dictated by their respective Franchisor. Per its distribution agreements with Franchisor (or Franchisor's affiliates), MBM is the sole-source and exclusive national supplier to the Frontier Entities, and thus, MBM purchases, warehouses, and distributes substantially all the food items and related restaurant items, including, among other things, meat products, produce, paper products, and cleaning supplies (the "Goods") for the Frontier Entities' restaurants.

The Frontier Entities' primary source of revenue comes from restaurant sales, specifically, the sale of food and beverages, and thus, the Frontier Entities are largely dependent on MBM's Goods to derive revenue and are required to purchase such Goods from MBM per their franchise agreements with their respective Franchisor; indeed, as the sole-source and exclusive national supplier to the Frontier Entities, MBM is uniquely equipped to distribute the fresh ingredients required in the Frontier Entities' businesses, and the Frontier Entities' businesses would collapse or be materially harmed (both financially and operationally) if MBM refused to ship the Goods to the Frontier Entities.

MBM is not required to deliver any Goods to the Frontier Entities on credit by virtue of any executory contract with the Frontier Entities or otherwise; instead, the award of any credit terms is determined by MBM in MBM's sole and absolute discretion, and MBM may freely revoke any award of credit terms entirely by forcing wire in advance of delivery of Goods, which would severely and negatively affect the Frontier Entities' liquidity.

In the ordinary course of their businesses before the Petition Date, the Debtors, non-debtor Frontier Star, and MIH Admin Services, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company acting solely in its capacity as the management company for the Frontier Entities (the "Management Company"), together utilized a consolidated cash management system, whereby revenues generated from store sales are deposited into a centralized account (or accounts) held in the name of Frontier Star I at Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, and through which the Frontier Entities (or the Frontier Entities through their Management Company) processed and managed cash receipts, credit card payments, electronic funds transfers, and other transfers and disbursements for the Frontier Entities, including payment of MBM's invoices for the sale of Goods to the Frontier Entities (the "Consolidated Cash Management Account").

Before the Petition Date, MBM had (consistent with its internal credit policies, which are established, administered, and changed in MBM's sole and absolute discretion) awarded the Debtors net 21-day terms, and upon learning of the Debtors' bankruptcy filings, MBM, through counsel, notified the Debtors and their counsel that MBM was seriously considering converting the Debtors' credit terms to bank wire in advance of delivery. Due to the cash flow, liquidity, and logistical issues that would be caused by the conversion of the Debtors' credit terms from net 21-day terms to bank wire (approximately \$3.6 million of liquidity), the Debtors requested that MBM continue to award to them net 21-day terms after the Petition Date.

On January 26, 2011, to secure all indebtedness of the Frontier Entities to MBM, each Frontier Entity executed a Purchase Money Security Agreement (the "PMSAs"), granting MBM purchase money security interests (the "PMSIs"), securing the debt the Frontier Entities owe to MBM by the Goods MBM delivers to the Frontier Entities and the proceeds thereof, including cash proceeds, which MBM perfected by filing UCC-1 financing statements and sending authenticated notices to other secured creditors of record; MBM is thus a secured creditor of the Debtors with a properly perfected security interest in and lien on the Goods purchased by the Debtors and proceeds thereof.

As of the Petition Date, Frontier Star CJ owed MBM \$1,664,576.26 (the "Frontier Star CJ Prepetition Amount"), and Frontier Star owed MBM \$1,926,484.06 (the "Frontier Star Prepetition Amount") for a total sum of \$3,591,060.32 (together, the "Prepetition Amount"). Of the Frontier Star CJ Prepetition Amount, \$1,452,913.95 falls within the 20-day window under section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code (the "Frontier Star CJ Admin Claim"), and of the Frontier Star Prepetition Amount, \$1,425,611.73 falls within the 20-day window under section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code (the "Frontier Star Admin Claim," together with the Frontier Star CJ Admin Claim, the "Admin Claim").

In addition to the fact that MBM has (i) properly perfected PMSIs and (ii) an Admin Claim allowable under section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, MBM also holds a claim equal to \$231,712.07 against Frontier Star CJ and a claim equal to \$182,439.53 against Frontier Star (together, the "PACA Claim") under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 7 U.S.C. § 499, et seq., as amended ("PACA"), which allows the imposition of a trust over Goods subject to PACA and over the proceeds received by the Frontier Entities for such Goods.

¹ Copies of the PMSAs are attached as Exhibit "A-1" to the LaVecke Declaration.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Subject to the terms and conditions of the Stipulation Regarding Postpetition Credit, Prepetition Debt, Adequate Protection, and Settlement and Release Agreement (the "Agreement"), MBM has agreed, in its sole and absolute discretion, to continue shipping to the Frontier Entities and to accommodate their request for net 21-day terms, if. and only if, the Court approves each of the conditions precedent and subsequent as set forth in the Agreement. Moreover, based on the LaVecke Declaration, the Frontier Entities submit that, to encourage MBM to continue providing the Goods to the Frontier Entities, the Frontier Entities have reached an Agreement with MBM, which, if approved by Court order, will govern the treatment of MBM's prepetition claims and the Frontier Entities' and MBM's post-petition relationship.

III.

THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH MBM

Because MBM is extremely critical to the Frontier Entities' operations, it is in the best interests of the Debtors' estates to (1) ensure that MBM continues to deliver Goods to the Debtors during these cases, and (2) obtain deliveries from MBM on credit as opposed to payment in advance. MBM is willing to deliver Goods to the Debtors on credit, provided that the Debtors satisfy certain requirements, including, among other requirements set forth in the Agreement, resolving the Prepetition Amount and granting MBM a replacement lien in any Goods delivered, including the proceeds thereof, to the extent as set forth in the PMSAs.

Subject to approval of the Bankruptcy Court, the Debtors and MBM have entered into the Agreement. The material terms of the Agreement are as follows:

Payment of Prepetition Debt. Immediately upon the Effective Date (as 1. defined in the Agreement), MBM shall be entitled to apply all amounts received (or to be

² A copy of the Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

received) from the Frontier Entities or the Management Company to its oldest outstanding invoices until the Prepetition Amount is unavoidably paid in full. To provide some liquidity relief to the Frontier Entities, however, MBM has agreed that payment of \$100,000.00 of the Prepetition Amount may be deferred and paid in full within sixty (60) days of the effective date of the Debtors' plans of reorganization or liquidation.

- 2. Upon the Effective Date (as defined in the Post-petition Credit. Agreement), MBM will continue to ship Goods to the Debtors on net 21-day terms. If the Frontier Entities commit a default in payment to MBM of the Prepetition Amount and/or any outstanding post petition invoice according to such invoice's terms, MBM shall have no obligation to ship the Goods on net 21-day terms, and the net 21-day terms may be revoked in MBM's sole and absolute discretion, including by reducing the Debtors' terms to bank wire in advance of load; provided, for the sake of clarity, that it shall be a default under this Agreement if the Debtors exceed or stretch the terms beyond net-21 days postpetition, and MBM shall provide Debtors notice of such default with a three calendar day cure period; provided further, that if the Frontier Entities default in payment to MBM more than twice during a six month period, the net-21 day terms may be revoked in MBM's sole and absolute discretion.
- 3. Stipulation to Liens/Claims. Subject to the Challenge Period (defined below), the Frontier Entities have stipulated and agreed that as of the Petition Date, (A) all of MBM's claims (i) constitute legal, valid, binding, and non-avoidable obligations of the Frontier Entities and (ii) are not, and shall not be, subject to any avoidance, disallowance, disgorgement, reductions, setoff, offset, re-characterization, subordination (whether equitable, contractual or otherwise), counterclaims, cross-claims, defenses or any other challenges of any kind or nature under the Bankruptcy Code or any other applicable law or regulation and (B)(i) MBM's PMSIs and liens constitute valid, binding, enforceable, non-avoidable, and properly perfected liens on the Goods MBM delivers to the Frontier

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Entities and the cash proceeds thereof, that, prior to the entry of this Agreement, were senior in priority over any and all other liens on the Goods and cash proceeds thereof, subject only to those liens that were valid, enforceable, properly perfected, non-avoidable, and senior in priority to the PMSIs as of the Petition Date, if any (the "Permitted Liens"); (ii) shall not be subject to avoidance, reductions, recharacterization, subordination (whether equitable, contractual, or otherwise), counterclaims, cross-claims, defenses or any other challenges under the Bankruptcy Code or any other applicable law or regulation; and (iii) are subject and subordinate only to the Permitted Liens, if any. The Frontier Entities irrevocably waive any right to challenge or contest in any way the perfection, validity, or enforceability of the PMSIs or the allowance, validity or enforceability of MBMs claims and security interest or the perfection thereof. Frontier Entities believe that the MBM's claims and liens constitute allowable, fully secured claims against the Debtors' estates. To avoid any doubt, the Frontier Entities stipulate that, based the allocation of claims to each Debtor's estate (as set forth above): (1) the Prepetition Amount is a valid and outstanding obligation of the Debtors and shall be fully allowed as a secured claim; (ii) MBM shall also have an allowed claim under section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code equal to the Admin Claim; and (iii) MBM shall also have a secured claim equal to \$414,151.60 under PACA. Despite the foregoing, MBM shall only be entitled to a single satisfaction of the Prepetition Amount.

Adequate Protection. As adequate protection for MBM's PMSIs in Collateral (as defined in the PMSAs), MBM is hereby granted, pursuant to Section

³ Collateral means "all of the Debtor's right, title and interest in and to each of the following, at the restaurant locations wherever located and whether now or hereafter existing, or now owned or hereafter acquired or arising: (a) all Inventory; and (b) any and all products and proceeds of any of the foregoing (including, but not limited to, any claims to any items referred to in this definition, and any claims of the Debtor against third parties for loss of, damage to or destruction of, any or all of the Collateral or for proceeds payable under, or unearned premiums with respect to, policies of insurance) in whatever form, including, but not limited to, cash, instruments, general intangibles, accounts receivable, goods, documents and chattel paper.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

361(1), 363(e), and 552(b) post-petition liens (the "Replacement Liens") in such Collateral, including any cash collateral, to the same validity, extent, and priority of MBM's prepetition PMSIs equal to the aggregate diminution in the value of such Collateral (whether such diminution is a result of, arises from, or is attributable to, the imposition of the automatic stay, use or disposition of cash collateral, or physical deterioration, consumption, use, shrinkage, disposition, or decline in market value or otherwise). The Replacement Liens granted to MBM shall be perfected by operation of law upon execution and entry of the Court order approving this Agreement. MBM shall not be required to take any action to validate or perfect such Replacement Liens.

- 5. The stipulations contained in Paragraph B of the Challenge Period. Agreement (Paragraph 3 above) shall be without prejudice to the right of any non-debtor party in interest, including any unsecured creditors' committee, to challenge MBM's PMSIs. Parties in interest, including any unsecured creditors' committee, shall have until the later of: (A) October 10, 2015 (75 days from the Petition Date); or (B) thirty calendar days after MBM files its proof of claim attaching the PMSAs (the "Challenge Period"), to commence the appropriate action challenging MBM's PMSIs. If no such action is timely filed, the Debtors' stipulations in Paragraph B of the Agreement shall become final and binding on the Debtors, their estates (excluding any subsequently appointed chapter 7 trustee), and all parties in interest, including any unsecured creditors' committee.
- 6. Waiver of Chapter 5 Claims Against MBM. In the Debtors' business judgment and given the fact that MBM has (i) properly perfected PMSIs and (ii) PACA claims (secured claims) against the Debtors, which would bar any preference claim, and after reviewing MBM's statutory defenses under sections 547(c)(2) and 547(4)(c)(5) of the Bankruptcy Code, among others, the consideration being extended by MBM in this Agreement, including the provision of significant post-petition credit, warrants the accommodation of the waiver of all claims against MBM under sections 544, 547, 548,

PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004-4527

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

549 and 550 of the Bankruptcy Code.

IV.

THE AGREEMENT SHOULD BE APPROVED

It is a well-established maxim that "[t]he law favors compromise and not litigation for its own sake." Martin v. Kane (In re A & C Properties), 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom., Martin v. Robinson, 479 U.S. 854, 107 S. Ct. 189 (1986); see also In re Blair, 538 F.2d 849, 851 (9th Cir. 1976). The standard for approval of a compromise or settlement is set forth in Rule 9019 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. Rule 9019(a) provides:

> On motion by the trustee and after notice and a hearing, the court may approve a compromise or settlement. Notice shall be given to creditors, the United States trustee, the debtor, and indenture trustees as provided in Rule 2002 and to any other entity as the court may direct.

Pursuant to Rule 9019(a), a Bankruptcy Court may approve a proposed compromise so long as it is fair and equitable. Woodson v. Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. (In re Woodson), 839 F.2d 610, 620 (9th Cir. 1987). The Ninth Circuit has held that the Bankruptcy Court has "great latitude in approving compromise agreements" proposed by a debtor in possession. *Id.*

In A&C Properties, the Ninth Circuit set forth certain factors relevant to approving a settlement in a bankruptcy case:

> In determining the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of a proposed settlement agreement, the court must consider: (a) The probability of success in the litigation; (b) the difficulties, if any, to be encountered in the matter of collection; (c) the complexity of the litigation involved, and the expense, inconvenience and delay necessarily attending it; (d) the paramount interest of creditors and a proper deference to their reasonable views in the premises.

784 F.2d. at 1381 (citation omitted).

The factors set forth in A&C Properties are easily satisfied in this case, and other

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

bankruptcy courts have approved similar requests from debtors in possession who are franchisees required to purchase Goods from MBM as the sole and exclusive national supplier. See, e.g., In re Pollo West Corp. & In re Mi Pollo, Inc., Jointly Administered Case No. 11-11433-VK at D.E. 92, 114 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. May 11, 2011) (approving similar agreement, including chapter 5 claims); In re Duke and King Acquisition Corp., Jointly Administered Case No. 10-38652, D.E. 153, 200, 201 (Bankr. D. Minn. April 5, 2011) (approving similar agreement, including chapter 5 claims); In re Fast American Restaurants, Inc., Case No. 10-37391-hdh11, D.E. 89, 100 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. Jan. 1, 2011) (approving similar agreement, including chapter 5 claims).

- 1. Probability of Success. Pursuant to the Agreement, the Debtors propose to, among other things, satisfy the Prepetition Amount (except for \$100,000.00) and grant MBM a release from potential avoidance action claims. The Debtors have reviewed MBM's prepetition claim and PMSA and do not dispute that (1) MBM is the holder of a valid, perfected purchase money security interest in the Goods that it delivered (and the proceeds thereof), and (2) substantially all of the Prepetition Amount is an administrative expense claim under section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code. Thus, the Debtors are not aware of any colorable argument that the Prepetition Amount could be treated as a general unsecured claim. Further, with respect to the avoidability of prepetition transfers, MBM has always held a perfected security interest in the delivered Goods and the Debtors always timely paid all amounts owed in the ordinary course of business pursuant to the credit terms. As such, the Debtors are not aware of any colorable argument that any payments made to MBM in any applicable reach back period are avoidable as preferential or fraudulent transfers.
 - 2. Difficulty of Collection. This factor does not apply to the settlement.
- 3. Complexity of Litigation. This factor does not apply to the settlement.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

5. Furthermore, while MBM has been willing to continue to deliver Goods to the Debtors on credit post-petition, MBM has indicated that it is unwilling to do so absent this Court's approval of the Agreement. Indeed, the Agreement ensures that MBM will deliver on 21-day terms for the remainder of the cases (provided the Debtors do not default). As consideration, the Debtors will be required to satisfy the Prepetition Amount and release avoidance action claims, but, as set forth above, the Debtors believe there is no colorable argument that the Prepetition Amount could be treated as a general unsecured claim or that the avoidance action claims have any value. Under these circumstances, the Agreement is in the best interests of the estates and should be approved.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004-4527

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

V.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, the Debtors request the Court enter an order, approving and authorizing the Debtors to enter into the Stipulation attached hereto as Exhibit "B".

DATED this // day of August, 2015

THE CAVANAGH LAW FIRM, P.A.

By:

Philip G. Mitchell Attorneys for Debtors

COPY of the foregoing mailed this _//4_day of August, 2015, to:

Jonathan T. Edwards, Esq. Alston & Bird LLP 1201 W. Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Attorneys for Meadowbrook Meet Company d/b/a MBM Corp.

John R. Worth, Esq. Forrester & Worth, PLC 3636 N. Central Avenue, Suite 700 Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Attorneys for Meadowbrook Meet Company d/b/a MBM Corp.

W. Scott Jenkins, Jr., Esq. Alissa A. Brice, Esq. Quarles & Brady LLP 1 Renaissance Square 2 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004-2391 Attorneys for Western Alliance Bank

1	John A. Nasr, Esq. Gust Rosenfeld PLC
2	1 E. Washington St., Ste. 1600 Phoenix AZ 85004-2553
3	Attorneys for Hardee's Restaurants, LLC
4	Jordan A. Kroop, Esq. Bradley A. Cosman, Esq.
5	Perkins Coie LLP 2901 N. Central Ave., Suite 2000
6	Phoenix, Arizona 85012 Attorneys for Cheeseburger, LLC
7	Valerie P. Morrison, Esq.
8	Dylan G. Trache, Esq. Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP
9	101 Constitution Avenue NW, Ste. 900 Washington, DC 20001
10	
11	Ryan J. Bird, Esq. Gilbert Bird Law Firm, PC 10575 N. 114 th St., Ste. 115
12	Scottsdale, Arizona 85259 Attorneys for Eital Properties, LLC
13	•
14	Matthew H. Sloan, Esq. Jennings Haug & Cunningham, LLP 2800 N. Central Ave., Suite 1800
15	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1049 Attorneys for Hendrick Commercial, LLC
16	
17	Larry Watson Office of the U.S. Trustee 230 N. 1 st Avenue, Ste. 204
18	Phoenix, AZ 85003-1706 Trustee
19	Senia Kantin
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	