1	Steven M. Olson, Esq.	
2	State Bar No. 146120 LAW OFFICE OF STEVEN M. OLSON	
3	100 E Street, Suite 104 Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Telephone: (707) 575-1800	
4	Facsimile: (707) 575-1867 Email: smo@smolsonlaw.com	
5	Attorney for Sullivan Vineyards Corporation	
6	Michael C. Fallon, Esq. State Bar No. 88313	
7	FALLON & FALLON 100 E Street, Suite 219	
8	Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Telephone: (707) 546-6770	
9	Facsimile: (707) 546-5775 Email: mcfallon@fallonlaw.net	
10	Attorney for Sullivan Vineyards Partnership	
11	John H. MacConaghy, Esq. State Bar No. 83684	
12	MacCONAGHY & BARNIER, LLP 645 First Street West, Suite D Sonoma, CA 95476 Attorney for Ross Sullivan and Kelleen Sullivan	
13 14		
15	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17	SANTA ROSA DIVISION	
18	In Re Case No. 17-10065-RLE-11	
19	(Jointly Administered) SULLIVAN VINEYARDS	
20	CORPORATION, Debtor.	
21	/	
22	SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP,	
23	Debtor.	
2425	/	
26	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN	
27	VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017	
28	TO ALL CREDITORS AND OTHER PARTIES IN INTEREST:	

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 1 of

1	1 THIS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT HAS BEEN AP	PROVED BY THE UNITED STATES	
2	2 BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE NORTHERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AS CONTAINING	
3	3 ADEQUATE INFORMATION AS REQUIRED BY T	THE BANKRUPTCY CODE FOR	
4	4 SOLICITATION OF ACCEPTANCES OF THE JOIN	NT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN	
5	5 VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINE	VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN	
6	6 AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 2	20, 2017, AND FILED IN THESE JOINTLY	
7	7 ADMINISTERED PROCEEDINGS. HOWEVER, A	PPROVAL OF THE DISCLOSURE	
8	8 STATEMENT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ENDO	ORSEMENT OF THE PLAN BY THE COURT.	
9	9 THE COURT HAS MADE NO INDEPENDENT INV	VESTIGATION OR DETERMINATION OF ANY	
10	0 FACTUAL STATEMENTS OR DOLLAR VALUES	SET FORTH IN THE PLAN OR THE	
11	1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.		
12	2 DATED: October 20, 2017	s/ Michael C. Fallon	
13		Michael C. Fallon	
14		Attorney for SVP	
15	5		
16	6 DATED: October 20, 2017	s/ Steven M. Olson	
17		Steven M. Olson Attorney for SVC	
18			
19		/s/ John H. MacConaghy	
20	0 J	ohn H. MacConaghy Attorney for Ross Sullivan and Kelleen	
21		Sullivan	
22	2		
23	3		
24	4		
25	5		
26			
27			
28	8 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY .	IOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF	
2000	SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULI SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED	IVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS	

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 2 of 26

I. INTRODUCTION

Sullivan Vineyards Corporation ("SVC"), Sullivan Vineyards Partnership ("SVP"), the Debtors in the above-captioned jointly administered cases (sometimes hereafter collectively the "Debtors"), and Ross Sullivan and Kelleen Sullivan, equity interest holders in the Debtors (hereinafter collectively the "Proponents"), submit this Disclosure Statement (the "Disclosure Statement") in support of the Joint Reorganization Plan of Sullivan Vineyards Corporation, Sullivan Vineyards Partnership, Ross Sullivan and Kelleen Sullivan Dated October 20, 2017 (the "Plan"). The Proponents seek to reorganize the Debtors' debts. This Disclosure Statement is being provided to creditors to provide adequate information of a kind, and in sufficient detail, to enable creditors to make informed judgments about the Plan before deciding whether to support confirmation of the Plan or object to confirmation of the Plan. Capitalized terms in this Disclosure Statement are defined in the Plan.

The Plan does not impair any classes of creditors or interests. Thus, there will be no voting on the Plan.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE DEBTORS

A. Formation.

The Sullivan family purchased its first vineyard in Napa Valley in 1972. In 1978, it purchased the vineyard property located at 1090 Galleron Road, Rutherford, California (the "Winery Property") and began a small winery thereon.

In 1987, SVP was formed to own the Winery Property. The initial partners were JoAnna Sullivan, her husband, James O'Neil Sullivan, and their five children, Philomena Gildea, Sean Sullivan, Kelleen Sullivan, Caireen Sullivan and Ross Sullivan.

Also in 1987, SVC was formed to own and operate the winery on SVP's Winery Property. The initial shareholders in SVC were JoAnna Sullivan, her husband, James O'Neil Sullivan, and their five children, Philomena Gildea, Sean Sullivan, Kelleen Sullivan, Caireen Sullivan and Ross Sullivan.

James Sullivan passed in 2004, and JoAnna retained his shares in SVC and his interest in SVP.

B. Mr. Finn Acquires Control in 2011.

In August of 2011, JoAnna Sullivan wished to retire. She sold her interests in SVC and SVP to Stephen Finn, who had recently married Kelleen Sullivan. Mr. Finn thus became the majority shareholder in SVC and the majority partner in SVP.

As of August of 2011, the assets of SVP and SVC included the following:

Asset	Book Value
Winery Property	\$2,050,963
Bottled Wine	\$1,942,959
Bulk Wine	\$919,327
TOTAL	\$4,913,249

As of August of 2011, the liabilities of SVP and SVC included the following:

Liability Type	Apx. Amt.
DOTs Against Winery Property	\$7,059,971
SVC other third-party debts	\$449,622
SVP other debts	\$198,693
TOTAL	\$7,708,286

C. Kelleen Sullivan Divorces Mr. Finn and Acquires His Interests in SVC and SVP.

When Kelleen Sullivan became engaged to marry Mr. Finn, she and Mr. Finn entered into a prenuptial agreement. One of the terms of this agreement was that upon the entry of a divorce decree, any ownership interests of Mr. Finn would become the assets of Kelleen Sullivan.

In the spring of 2015, the marriage was deteriorating. Mr. Finn attempted to amend the prenuptial agreement so that his interests in SVC and SVP would not be transferred to Kelleen upon entry of the divorce decree. Mr. Finn threatened to "bankrupt the winery" and "run it into the ground" if Kelleen refused his demand to modify the

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 4

Case

17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 4 of

prenuptial agreement.

Case

In May of 2015, Kelleen Sullivan commenced a divorce proceeding in Colorado, where she and Mr. Finn were then residing. Mr. Finn, on May 22, 2015, listed the Winery Property and the related assets for sale for \$20 million.

In June of 2015, the Colorado divorce court issued an injunction barring Mr. Finn from "transferring, encumbering or disposing of the Winery, or listing the Winery for sale."

On October 7, 2015, the Colorado Court issued orders entering a divorce decree and enforcing a portion of the parties' prenuptial agreement that dealt with SVC and SVP. The Order provides, in pertinent part:

The marriage is dissolved and a Decree of Dissolution of Marriage is entered.

12 |

[T]he Court does order the immediate transfer to Petitioner of Respondent's entire ownership interest in Sullivan Vineyards, including but not limited to Respondent's shares of Sullivan Vineyards Corporation and his partnership interest in Sullivan Vineyards Partners.

Following this Order, SVC installed new directors and officers.

On October 23, the Colorado Court issued a more complete, detailed order addressing the interest in SVC and SVP. In that order, the Colorado Court reiterated its prior orders of October 7 and October 9, and specifically ordered that Mr. Finn's interest in SVC and SVP had been transferred to Kelleen Sullivan. Mr. Finn has appealed the Colorado Court orders, but he has not requested or obtained a stay of the transfers of his interests in SVC and SVP pending appeal.

D. Financial Condition of SVC and SVP at Time of Transfer to Kelleen.

As of September 30, 2015, the assets of SVP and SVC included the following:

Asset	Book Value
Winery Property	\$4,903,128
Bottled Wine	\$2,409,212
Bulk Wine	\$2,014,294

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 5

17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 5 of

TOTAL	\$9,326,634
IOIAL	Ψ/•3∠U•U3⊤

As of September 30, 2015, the liabilities of SVP and SVC included the following:

Liability Type	Apx. Amt.
First DOT Against Winery Property	\$9,538,889
Disputed Second DOT of Mr. Finn Against Winery Property	\$4,144,122
SVC other third-party debts	\$408,333
SVP other debts	\$38,264
TOTAL	\$14,129,608

Thus, during the time when Mr. Finn had controlling ownership interests in SVC and SVP, the combined debts of the two entities grew by approximately \$6,421,322, and the combined book values of their assets grew by \$4,413,385.

The third-party debts, excluding the debts secured by deed of trust against the Winery Property, aggregated approximately \$446,597 when Kelleen Sullivan acquired majority ownership from Mr. Finn. In the 15 months since then, the Debtors reduced the aggregate balance of their third-party debts by approximately \$129,000. During the same time period, the Debtors paid down the principal balance of the debt secured by the first deed of trust against the Winery Property by approximately \$194,994, until WR, the assignee of the claim, refused to accept any further periodic payments.

E. Mr. Finn's Pre-Divorce Efforts to Force Sale of Assets.

Notwithstanding the Colorado court's June 2015 injunction, Mr. Finn proceeded with extensive efforts to cause the sale of the assets of SVC and SVP. Mr. Finn orchestrated a meeting of shareholders of SVC in July of 2015 on very short notice to change the board of directors of SVC. The minority shareholders hurriedly obtained counsel to assist them in banding together to elect one of the three board members, Ross Sullivan.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 6

17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 6 o

Case

On or about August 3, 2015, Mr. Finn caused SVC and SVP to file a Complaint in Napa County Superior Court, seeking a declaratory judgment regarding the sale of assets.

Mr. Finn gave very short notice of a special board meeting. He sought a resolution authorizing the sale of the assets of SVC before the October trial in his divorce proceeding.

Mr. Finn then filed another suit in Napa County Superior Court. He sought an *ex* parte order to appoint his selected director to force the sale of assets. The Court denied Mr. Finn's request.

F. Mr. Finn's 2016 Litigation Actions.

In February of 2016, JoAnna Sullivan filed suit against Mr. Finn in Napa County Superior Court to enforce Mr. Finn's obligations to JoAnna Sullivan in the agreement by which Mr. Finn acquired JoAnna's Sullivan's interests in SVP and SVC, including his obligations to pay \$9,000 per month for the rest of JoAnna Sullivan's life and his obligation to pay \$500,000 towards a life interest of a personal residence for JoAnna Sullivan. Mr. Finn responded by removing the action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California and then filing a cross-complaint against SVC, SVP and individual members of the Sullivan family. Judge Orrick granted motions to strike the cross-complaint.

On September 15, 2016, Mr. Finn filed a new action against SVC, SVP, and Sullivan family members, asserting the same claims as he had asserted in the cross-complaint. By order entered on January 13, 2017, Judge Orrick granted the defendants' motion to dismiss Mr. Finn's complaint on the ground it is barred by the doctrine of judicial estoppel. In so doing, Judge Orrick found that Mr. Finn was "playing fast and loose with the courts," that his assertion in the complaint of ownership interests in SVC and SVP was contrary to Mr. Finn's representations in the Colorado divorce court, and that the decision would "protect the integrity and dignity of the Colorado proceedings."

G. Mr. Finn's Disputed Secured Claim.

In May of 2012, SVC and SVP jointly and severally gave Mr. Finn their Subordinated Secured Grid Promissory Note (the "Grid Note"), secured by a deed of trust against SVP's real property and by a security interest in much of the personal property of SVC and SVP. The Grid Note contemplated future advances from Mr. Finn pursuant to written requests from the authorized officers of SVC and SVP. The Grid Note was signed by Ross Sullivan on behalf of SVP in his stated capacity as partner, and it was signed by David B. Runberg on behalf of SVC in his stated capacity as CFO.

In May of 2012, when the Grid Note was created, Mr. Finn and senior lienor Silicon Valley Bank entered into an agreement by which Mr. Finn agreed to subordinate his liens and security interests to Silicon Valley Bank and Mr. Finn agreed to subordinate his right to receive payments to Silicon Valley Bank, such that no payments were due and payable to Mr. Finn until SVC and SVP had repaid their debt to Silicon Valley Bank. SVC and SVP contend that neither Silicon Valley Bank nor its successor ever informed SVC or SVP of the termination of the payment subordination of Mr. Finn's claims.

After May of 2012, Mr. Finn purportedly made advances on the Grid Note aggregating over \$4 million. SVC and SVP dispute whether most of the advances from Mr. Finn on the Grid Note were properly authorized. As of May of 2012, Mr. Finn was majority shareholder in SVC and he was majority partner in SVP. If the advances on the Grid Note were not properly authorized, SVC and SVP contend that the law prevents Mr. Finn from asserting claims arising from the advances unless he can establish that the advances were just and reasonable, evaluated from the perspective of SVC and SVP. SVC and SVP contend that the advances from Mr. Finn are properly characterized as equity infusions into the entities, for which Mr. Finn has no right of repayment and the rights to which are now held by Kelleen Sullivan pursuant to the terms of her prenuptial agreement with Mr. Finn.

Case

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS

SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 8

H. Cause of Bankruptcy Petitions - Foreclosure by Secured Creditors.

In mid 2016, the debt secured by a senior security interest in the assets of SVC and SVP matured by its terms. SVP and SVC sought to refinance to pay this debt. They were unable to do so, however, because of (1) the cloud created by Mr. Finn's assertion of a continued ownership interest in SVC and SVP, and (2) the cloud created by Mr. Finn's assertion of a debt of over \$4 million secured by a junior security interest in the assets of SVC and SVP.

Mr. Finn, through a limited liability company formed by him called Winery Rehabilitation, LLC ("WR") acquired the secured claim of Silicon Valley Bank.

Thereafter, WR and Mr. Finn commenced nonjudicial foreclosure.

SVC and SVP seek to reorganize to forestall foreclosure, restructure the debt now owing to WR, and determine the allowed amount of the claim of Mr. Finn (if any) and, to the extent the claim is allowed, to pay the claim.

I. Post-Petition Events.

Following the filing of the Chapter 11 case, SVC and SVP have filed all required Schedules, Statements of Affairs, and other initial papers. SVP was authorized to retain Fallon & Fallon as its counsel in the proceedings, and SVC was authorized to retain the Law Office of Steven M. Olson as its counsel in the proceedings. Prior to the Chapter 11 filing, Michael C. Fallon was paid a \$15,000 retainer on account of services to be rendered in this case, and Steven M. Olson was paid a \$35,000 retainer.

No official committee of unsecured creditors has been appointed in this case.

The Bankruptcy Court has ordered the cases of SVP and SVC to be jointly administered.

SVC and SVP attempted a mediated settlement with WR and Mr. Finn, but the efforts did not succeed.

Twice during the course of the cases to date, once in April and once in July, WR and Mr. Finn have wrongly served all creditors with documents in opposition to prior

Case

versions of the Debtors' disclosure statements. The Court has not yet adjudicated any remedies against WR and Mr. Finn for this violation of bankruptcy procedures.

In late August, the Court approved the appointment of Timothy W. Hoffman as Chapter 11 Trustee (the "Chapter 11 Trustee") for the Debtors' estates.

III. SUMMARY OF THE PLAN

The Plan does not impair any classes of creditors. The Plan will not forestall secured creditors from exercising their non-bankruptcy law remedies regarding their collateral. Kelleen Sullivan will lend the Debtors sufficient funds to pay in full all allowed unsecured claims, excluding only the claims of the Chapter 11 Trustee and his professionals, which are to be paid by Winery Rehabilitation, LLC, and Mr. Finn, pursuant to the order of the Bankruptcy Court for the appointment of a Chapter 11 Trustee.

The treatment of each particular type of Creditor is described below.

<u>a.</u> <u>Unclassified Claims</u>

Section 1123(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that certain claims, including claims for post-petition administrative expenses (including professional fees) and certain claims by governmental units for taxes, are not classified under the Plan. Entities holding unclassified claims are not entitled to vote on the Plan.

Except to the extent that the holder of a particular Administrative Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, each holder of an Allowed Administrative Claim shall be paid in cash, in full upon the later of (a) the Effective Date (projected to be December 31, 2017), (b) if such Claim is initially a Disputed Claim, when it becomes an Allowed Administrative Claim, and (c) if such Claim is incurred after the Petition Date in the ordinary course of a Debtor's business by a person other than an insider, within such time as payment is due pursuant to the terms giving rise to such Claim. Any request for allowance of an Administrative Claim pursuant to Section 503(a) of the Bankruptcy Code (including an estimation of expenses to be incurred after the Effective

Case

1	Date), other than by the Debtors' Professionals, must be filed on or before the 30 days
2	after the date of entry of the Court's order confirming the Plan or the holder of such
3	Claim shall be forever barred from asserting such Claim or receiving any payment on
4	account of such Claim. The Debtors estimate that the Allowed Administrative Claims
5	will aggregate approximately \$244,845.
6	Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Allowed Administrative Claims of the
7	Chapter 11 Trustee and his professionals will be paid by Winery Rehabilitation, LLC,
8	and/or Mr. Finn, pursuant to the provisions of the Bankruptcy Court's August 24, 2017,
9	Order Vacating Prior Order to Convert and Directing the Appointment of a Chapter 11
10	Trustee Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1104. Winery Rehabilitation, LLC, and Mr. Finn may
11	seek, in Case No. 3:17-cv-05799 filed by Kelleen Sullivan and Ross Sullivan against Mr.

Northern District of California (the "District Court Action"), an order authorizing them to add the amounts so remitted to the Chapter 11 Trustee and his professionals to their secured claims against the Debtors, and the Proponents may oppose any such request in the District Court Action.

Finn and Trust Company of America, Inc., in the United States District Court for the

The holders of Allowed Tax Claims will be paid in full on the Effective Date. Allowed Tax Claims will bear interest at the rate specified in Section 6621 of the Internal Revenue Code or the similar provision in the California statutes regarding Tax Claims owing to the State of California. Unclassified Tax Claims do not include local real estate taxes. SVP believes that it owes no unclassified Tax Claims, and SVC believes that its unclassified Tax Claims aggregate \$5,356.86.

<u>b.</u> Classified Claims And Interests

The Plan divides claims and interests into twelve classes. A description of each class and its treatment under the Plan is as follows:

Class 1: Secured Claim of The County of Napa

The County of Napa holds a Secured Claim in an unknown amount, which claim,

28

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

if any, is collateralized by a lien on the real property and improvements located at 1090 Galleron Road, Rutherford, CA (the "Winery Property"), as provided by non-bankruptcy law. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 1 Claim entitles the holder of such Claim. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of the Class 1 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holder of the Allowed Class 1 Claim shall be paid in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code. The holder of the Allowed Class 1 Secured Claim shall retain its lien on the Winery Property to the extent enforceable under non-bankruptcy law.

Class 2: Winery Rehabilitation, LLC

WR holds a disputed Secured Claim in the amount of approximately \$11,000,000 collateralized by a first deed of trust on the Winery Property and a senior security interest in many of the personal property assets of SVC and SVP. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 2 Claim entitles the holder of such Claim. On the Effective Date, the automatic stay of acts against the Debtors or the collateral for payment of the Class 2 Claim will terminate, without prejudice to the rights of some or all of the Plan Proponents to seek, in the District Court Action or other non-bankruptcy court action, injunctive relief against the Class 2 Claimant. The holder of the Allowed Class 2 Claim shall retain its liens under non-bankruptcy law. The Plan does not require any payments on the Class 2 Claim.

Class 3: Stephen A. Finn

Mr. Finn holds a disputed Secured Claim in the amount of approximately \$5,000,000 collateralized by a second deed of trust on the Winery Property and a junior security interest in many of the personal property assets of SVC and SVP. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 3 Claim entitles the holder of such Claim. On the Effective Date, the automatic stay of acts against the Debtors or the collateral for payment of the Class 3 Claim will terminate,

without prejudice to the rights of some or all of the Plan Proponents to seek, in the District Court Action or other non-bankruptcy court action, injunctive relief against the Class 3 Claimant. The holder of the Allowed Class 3 Claim shall retain its liens under non-bankruptcy law. The Plan does not require any payments on the Class 3 Claim.

Class 4: Claims of General Unsecured Creditors of SVP

The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 4 Claims entitle the holders of such Claims. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of a Class 4 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holder of the Allowed Class 4 Claim shall be paid in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, on the later of the Effective Date or the date on which the Class 4 Claim becomes Allowed.

Class 5: Claims of General Unsecured Creditors of SVC

The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 5 Claims entitle the holders of such Claims. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of a Class 5 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holder of the Allowed Class 5 Claim shall be paid in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, on the later of the Effective Date or the date on which the Class 5 Claim becomes Allowed.

Class 6: Ford Credit

Ford Credit holds a claim in the approximate amount of \$15,500 secured by a lien on SVC's 2016 Ford F250 vehicle. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 6 Claim entitles the holder of such Claim. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of the Class 6 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holder of the Allowed Class 6 Claim shall be paid in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code. The holder of the Allowed Class 6 Secured Claim shall retain its lien on the 2106 Ford F250 vehicle to the extent enforceable under non-bankruptcy law.

28

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

27

Class 7: <u>Growers</u>

Two entities hold claims against SVC for the purchase price for grapes sold to SVC in 2016. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 7 Claims entitle the holders of such Claims. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of a Class 7 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holder of an Allowed Class 7 Claim shall be paid in full on the Effective Date in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code. The holders of the Allowed Class 7 Secured Claims shall retain their liens on SVC's wine made with the subject grapes to the extent enforceable under non-bankruptcy law.

Class 8: SVC Priority Employee Benefit Claim

SVC has a small amount of indebtedness for employee benefits, an amount SVC believes is\$579.37. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 8 Claims entitle the holders of such Claims. Thus, except to the extent that the holder of a Class 8 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holders of the Allowed Class 8 Claims shall be paid in full on the Effective Date.

Class 9: <u>Warehouse Secured Claims</u>

Two warehouses at which SVC stores bottled wine hold claims that aggregate \$37,101.570. These claimants have statutory warehouse liens on the items being stored at their respective facilities. The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 9 Claims entitle the holders of such Claim. Thus, Except to the extent that a holder of a Class 9 Claim has agreed to a different treatment of such Claim, the holders of the Allowed Class 9 Claims shall be paid in full on the Effective Date in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law, except as provided in Section 1124(2) of the Bankruptcy Code. The holders of the Allowed Class 9 Secured Claims shall retain their liens on SVC's bottled wine being stored with the Claimant to the extent enforceable under non-bankruptcy law.

Class 10: <u>SVP's Claims Against SVC</u>

The Plan leaves unaltered the legal, equitable, and contractual rights to which the Class 10 Claim entitles the holder of such Claim. On the Effective Date, the automatic stay of acts against the Debtors or the collateral for payment of the Class 10 Claim will terminate. The holder of the Allowed Class 10 Claim shall retain its liens under non-bankruptcy law. The Plan does not require any payments on the Class 10 Claim. SVP will elect not to pursue collection until all Allowed Claims against SVC have been paid in full.

Class 11: Equity Interests in SVP

The Class 11 interests of the general partners in SVP shall remain unaltered by this Plan. This Class is unimpaired and therefore is not entitled to vote on the Plan.

Class 12: <u>Equity Interests in SVC</u>

The Class 12 interests of the shareholders in SVC shall remain unaltered by this Plan. This Class is unimpaired and therefore is not entitled to vote on the Plan.

c. Other Provisions of the Plan

The Plan contains a number of other provisions concerning its implementation.

The following is a summary. Consult the Plan itself for details.

1. Post-Confirmation Disbursing Agent.

Following Confirmation, the Reorganized Debtors will act as the Disbursing Agents under the Plan. The Debtors reserve the right to appoint any other Person as the Disbursing Agent under the Plan, if it so chooses. Current management of the Debtors will continue to manage the Debtors' businesses and will manage the implementation of this Plan. The compensation for management will be consistent with the compensation received by management prior to the appointment of the Chapter 11 Trustee.

2. Post-Confirmation Compensation and Reimbursement of Professionals.

All professionals employed by the Reorganized Debtor or the Disbursing Agent (if a third party Disbursing Agent is appointed), including the Debtors' Professionals,

shall be entitled to payment of their post-Confirmation Date fees and reimbursement of expenses on a monthly basis, based on the service of a detailed statement of the requested fees and expenses on the Notice Parties as discussed more fully in the Plan. Pre-Confirmation compensation remains subject to the noticed motion requirements of Bankruptcy Code Section 330.

3. Distributions and Claims.

Subject to the deadlines in the Plan, Distributions will be made to Creditors when their Claims are Allowed Claims, as defined in the Plan. Proofs of Claim, when required, must be filed with the Bankruptcy Court no later than the applicable Claims Bar Date, or the applicable Governmental Unit Claims Bar Date for prepetiton tax and similar Claims. However, Bankruptcy Rule 3001(b) provides that it is not necessary for a Creditor to file a proof of Claim if its Claim has been listed on the Debtors' Schedules filed with the Bankruptcy Court pursuant to Section 521(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code and Rule 1007(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy Rules, and is not listed as disputed, contingent, unliquidated or unknown as to amount. Except as provided by the Plan or as otherwise permitted by the Bankruptcy Court, the Bankruptcy Rules or applicable law, upon expiration of the applicable bar date, proofs of Claim may not be filed or amended unless the amendment is solely to decrease the amount or priority. Distributions to Creditors under the Plan will be made to the Persons shown on the Debtors' or the Bankruptcy Court's records on the Effective Date.

Any party who acquires a claim against the Reorganized Debtor after the Effective Date must arrange with the holder on that date to receive Distributions to which the transferee may be entitled. Neither the Reorganized Debtors nor the Disbursing Agent will be required to track changes in ownership of claims after the Effective Date.

Objections to any Claim may be filed by any party in interest and shall be filed no later than the Claims Objection Date, which is defined in the Plan as 75 days after the Effective Date.

//

4. <u>Retained Claims</u>.

Under the Plan, the Debtors retain any claims held by the Debtors against Angelica de Vere, Teresa Sullivan, Mr. Finn or Winery Rehabilitation, LLC. The Retained Claims against Winery Rehabilitation, LLC, and Mr.. Finn include, without limitation, claims arising from the improper distribution to all creditors of papers in opposition to disclosure statements of the Debtors. The Retained Claims against Mr. Finn and Angelica de Vere include, without limitation, claims asserted in Adversary Proceeding No. 17-1023 filed by SVC and SVP against Stephen A. Finn and Angelica de Vere in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of California (the "AP"). The Retained Claims against Teresa Sullivan include, without limitation, the claims described in SVC's October 18, 2017, filed amendment to Schedule B. The Debtors furthers reserve the right to object to any filed or scheduled Claim. SVC's objections to the claims of Sonyia Grabski, Teresa Sullivan, Trinity Scott and Elizabeth Matulich will be adjudicated in Napa County Superior Court.

5. Retention of Jurisdiction.

Article X of the Plan provides that the Bankruptcy Court shall retain broad jurisdiction under the Bankruptcy Code to adjudicate any disputes arising out of the Plan, the administration of the case, and claims for relief held by the Debtors or Reorganized Debtors.

6. Persons Bound/Discharge of Debts.

Confirmation of the Plan binds the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors, any entity acquiring property under or otherwise accepting the benefits of the Plan, and every Creditor, whether or not such Creditor has filed a proof of Claim in the bankruptcy case, whether or not the Claim of such Creditor is impaired under the Plan, and whether or not such has accepted or rejected the Plan. The Confirmation Order shall operate as an injunction against the commencement or continuation of any action to collect, recover or offset any debt in this case from the Debtors, the Reorganized Debtors, or their Estates,

except as otherwise permitted by this Plan, the Bankruptcy Code, or order of the Court. **Executory Contracts.** All insurance contracts to which SVC or SVP is an insured will be assumed on the Effective Date. SVC's contracts to purchase grapes with Castellucci Napa Valley and Rutherford River Ranch will be assumed on the Effective Date. SVP's executory contract with Garvey Brothers Vineyard Management Company will be assumed on the Effective Date. All other executory contracts of SVP or SVC will be deemed rejected on the Effective Date unless, prior to Confirmation, SVP or SVC gives the other party to any such executory contract notice of the intent to assume the contract upon Confirmation. Proofs of Claim arising from rejection of executory contracts must be filed within sixty (60) days after the Effective Date. Post-Confirmation Management and Insider Employees. 8. After Confirmation, the officers of SVC will continue to be Ross Sullivan - CEO, and Kelleen Sullivan - VP and Secretary. After Confirmation, the directors of SVC will continue to be Ross Sullivan, Kelleen Sullivan, and Dan Zepponi. After Confirmation, the managing general partner in SVP will continue to be Ross Sullivan. The post-Confirmation salaries of insiders will be: Ross Sullivan \$120,000 per year Kelleen Sullivan \$35,000 per year Sean Sullivan \$25 per hour (full-time employment) IV. FEASIBILITY OF THE PLAN A. Estimated Claims to Be Paid By Funds Advanced by Kelleen Sullivan. **Estimated Dollar Amount Claim Category Administrative Claims** \$244,845.00 **Tax Claims** \$5,356.86 **SVC General Unsecured Claims** \$188,492.75

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

27

28

Case:

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS <u>SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017</u> - Page 18

|17-10065 | Doc# 222 | Filed: 10/20/17 | Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 | Page 18 of

26

1	SVP General Unsecured Claims	\$41,977.40
2	Growers	\$49,774.02
3	SVC Benefits Claims	\$579.37
4	Warehouse Claims	\$37,101.57
5	Garvey Assumed Contract	\$79,074.78
6	TOTAL	\$647,201.75
7	B. Disputed Claims of Former Empl	loyees to Be Paid By Funds Advanced by
8	Kelleen Sullivan if Proponents Do	Not Prevail in Litigation.
9		
10	Claimant Name	Claim Amount
11	Teresa Sullivan	\$185,769.00
12	Elizabeth Matulich	\$305,000.00
13	Sonyia Grabski	\$429,134.00
14	Angelica de Vere	\$1,046,826.00
15	Trinity Scott	\$55,000.00
16	TOTAL	\$2,021,729.00
	C. Assets of Kelleen Sullivan Availal	ble to Fulfill Duty to Advance Funds.
17 18	Kelleen Sullivan's present assets in	clude, without limitation, the following:
19	Asset Description	Estimated Value
	Interest in Colorado residence	\$1,600,000
20	Funds in bank accounts	\$670,000
21	Monthly Alimony (18 months times	\$360,000
22	\$20,000)	
23	Misc. other assets	\$500,000
24	TOTAL	\$3,130,000
25	D. Feasibility Comments.	
26	Kelleen Sullivan has sufficient asse	ts to pay all claims for which payment under
27	the Plan is due on the Effective Date. With	respect to the former employees, there is
28		
ase:	SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DAT	JLLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 19 of

insurance coverage for the cost of defense. There is also insurance coverage for claims arising from Kelleen Sullivan's operation of motor vehicles.

Of the aggregate claim amounts, sums aggregating \$855,000 are for asserted severance obligations of SVC. No employment contracts containing post-termination severance rights were ever presented to the SVC Board of Directors or approved by the Board of Directors. Moreover, none of the former employees were terminated by SVC. Rather, they all voluntarily abandoned their positions when the Colorado divorce court ordered that Kelleen Sullivan, and not Mr. Finn, was the holder of the majority interest in SVC.

In light of the insurance coverage and the defenses to payment of the claims, the assets of Kelleen Sullivan are sufficient to make the Plan proposal regarding payment of these claims (*i.e.*, payment in full if and when the claimants prevail in litigation over the Proponents' dispute over allowance of the claims) feasible.

In addition to financial matters, the Debtors believe that they can comply with all technical requirements of the Bankruptcy Code necessary to confirm and substantially consummate the Plan.

V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PLAN

A. Liquidation.

In Chapter 7 liquidation proceeding, or in liquidation by the Chapter 11 Trustee, the trustee would attempt to sell the Debtors' assets to third parties and distribute any proceeds Pro Rata to all Creditors of the estate under the priorities established by Bankruptcy Code Section 507. The Trustee would also have the statutory power to assert "avoidance claims" and other litigation claims held by the Estates against third parties pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Sections 510, 541, 544, 545, 547, 548, and 549, which can generate funds to pay unsecured Creditors.

The Proponents believe that the Plan is significantly more beneficial to Creditors than Chapter 7 because Creditors will be paid in full on the Effective Date. Full payment

Case

in liquidation is questionable, and in any event, payment would not occur until, at the very earliest, the late summer of 2018.

B. No Other Plans

The Bankruptcy Code permits parties in interest other than the Proponents to propose a plan of reorganization under certain circumstances. The Plan submitted by the Proponents is the only plan of reorganization that has been proposed at this time.

VI. CERTAIN FEDERAL INCOME TAX CONSEQUENCES OF THE PLAN

A. In General

The following is a summary of certain United States federal income tax consequences of the Plan that may be material to Creditors (each a "Holder"). This discussion is included for general information purposes only and is not intended to be, and is not, legal or tax advice to any particular Holder. This summary is based on the current provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code"), the Income Tax Regulations (the "Regulations") and other legal authorities, all of which are subject to change, possibly with retroactive effect. No rulings from the Internal Revenue Service (the "IRS") or opinions of counsel have been or will be requested concerning the matters discussed below. The tax consequences set forth in the following discussion are not binding on the IRS or the courts, and no assurance can be given that contrary positions will not be successfully asserted by the IRS or adopted by a court.

This summary does not address the taxation of the Debtors or the Holders under state, local law or foreign law.

TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH TREASURY DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 230, HOLDERS ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT: (A) ANY DISCUSSION OF FEDERAL TAX ISSUES IN THIS DISCLOSURE STATEMENT IS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE RELIED UPON, AND CANNOT BE RELIED UPON BY HOLDERS FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING PENALTIES THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON HOLDERS UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE; (B) SUCH DISCUSSION IS INCLUDED HEREIN BY DEBTOR IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROMOTION OR MARKETING (WITHIN THE MEANING OF CIRCULAR 230) BY DEBTORS OF THE TRANSACTIONS OR MATTERS

1	ADDRESSED HEREIN; AND (C) HOLDERS SHOULD SEEK ADVICE BASED ON ITS PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES FROM AN	
2	INDEPENDENT TAX ADVISOR.	
3	EACH HOLDER SHOULD CONSULT THE HOLDER'S OWN TAX	
4	ADVISOR TO DETERMINE THE HOLDER'S PARTICULAR U.S. FEDERAL INCOME TAX CONSEQUENCES AND OTHER TAX	
5 6	CONSEQUENCES TO THE HOLDER OF THE PLAN, INCLUDING ANY STATE, LOCAL AND FOREIGN TAX LAWS AND THE EFFECT OF ANY CHANGES IN SUCH LAWS.	
7	B. Consequences to Creditors.	
8	Creditors should consult their own tax advisors concerning any income tax	
9	consequences of their respective treatment under the Plan.	
10	C. Wage Withholding.	
11	If any Allowed Claim under the Plan constitutes "wages" for U.S. federal income	
12	tax purposes, the U.S. federal income tax rules applicable to wage withholding will apply	
13	to the payment of the Allowed Claim.	
14	D. Backup Withholding.	
15	U.S. federal income tax laws require that, to avoid backup withholding with	
16	respect to "reportable payments" (in an amount equal to 28%), a Creditor or Holder must	
17	(a) provide the Debtors with its correct taxpayer identification number (" <u>TIN</u> ") on IRS	
18	Form W-9 and certify as to its eligibility for exemption from backup withholding, or (b)	
19	establish a basis for exemption from backup withholding on an appropriate IRS Form W-	
20	8 (including a Form W-8BEN, W-8ECI, W-8EXP and W-8IMY) or IRS Form W-9, as	
21	applicable. Exempt Creditors and Holders (including, among others, all corporations and	
22	certain foreign individuals) are not subject to backup withholding and reporting	
23	requirements. If withholding is made and results in an overpayment of taxes, a refund	
24	may be obtained.	
25	VII. CONFIRMATION	
26	A. In General.	
27	The United States Bankruptcy Court has set a date for the hearing on the	
28		
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS	

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 22 of 26

Confirmation of the Plan. The hearing is to be held at the United States Bankruptcy Court, 99 South E Street, Santa Rosa, CA 95404. The Plan can be implemented only if confirmed by the Bankruptcy Judge.

B. No Voting.

There are no impaired classes. Thus, there is no voting on the Plan. All classes are deemed to have accepted the Plan.

C. Confirmation.

The Court will hold a Confirmation Hearing. At the Confirmation hearing, the Bankruptcy Judge has the duty to determine whether the Plan meets the requirements of Section 1129 of the Bankruptcy Code. The principal requirements of Section 1129 include the following: (1) that the proponents of the Plan have complied with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code on all matters connected with the case; (2) that the Plan has been proposed in good faith, and not by any means forbidden by law; (3) that Confirmation of the Plan is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization of the debtor; and (4) that the Proponents and the Plan in all other respects comply with applicable law. Only if such determinations are made will the Judge confirm the Plan.

D. Modification of the Plan.

The Proponents may propose amendments to or modifications of the Plan under Section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3019 at any time prior to the conclusion of the hearing on Confirmation of the Plan. After the Confirmation Date, the Proponents may modify the Plan in accordance with Section 1127(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3019.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The Proponents believe that their Plan of Reorganization realistically affords to Creditors their best opportunity for receiving a prompt, full payment. The Proponents therefore respectfully request that Creditors support the Plan.

1	Dated: October 20, 2017	/s/ Michael C. Fallon
2		Michael C. Fallon Attorney for SVP
3	Datadi Oatahan 20, 2017	SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP
4	Dated: October 20, 2017	SULLIVAIN VINETARDS PARTNERSHIP
5		<u>/s/ Ross Sullivan</u> Its Responsible Individual
6		Tesponsione marviadar
7	Dated: October 20, 2017	/s/ Steven M. Olson Steven M. Olson
8		Steven M. Olson Attorney for SVC
9		
10 11	Dated: October 20, 2017	SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION
12		CORTORATION
13		_/s/ Ross Sullivan Its Responsible Individual
14		
15	Dated: October 20, 2017	<u>/s/ Ross Sullivan</u> An Individual
16		An individual
17	Dated: October 20, 2017	/s/ Kelleen Sullivan
18	2	An Individual
19	Dated: October 20, 2017	/s/ John H. MacConaghy
20 21		John H. MacConaghy Attorney for Ross Sullivan and Kelleen Sullivan
22		Sumvan
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		W JONES PRODUCTIVE CONTRACTOR CON
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SUI	LLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS
ase	SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATE 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17	Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 24 of

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 24 of

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I reside in the County of Sonoma, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Law Office of Steven M. Olson, 100 É Street, Suite 104, Santa Rosa, CA 95404. 3 On October 20, 2017, I served the 4 5 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN 6 **DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017** 7 on the parties listed on the attached Service List. I served such parties in the manner 8 described as follows: 9 /X/ (BY MAIL) I placed a copy of the document in sealed envelopes, with postage thereon fully prepaid for First Class Mail, addressed to such parties as have mailing 10 addresses set forth on the attached Service List, for collection and mailing at Santa Rosa, California. 11 /_/ (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I caused the document to be delivered by hand to the address(es) noted on the attached Service List. 12 13 / / (BY FACSIMILE) I caused the document to be transmitted by facsimile machine to such parties as have facsimile numbers set forth on the attached Service List. 14 /_/ (BY EMAIL) I caused the document to be transmitted by Email to such parties as 15 have Email addresses set forth on the attached Service List. I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States and of the 16 State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Santa Rosa, California, on October 20, 2017. 17 18 /S/ Steven M. Olson 19 Steven M. Olson 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF

SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 25 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 25 of

SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS

1	
2	SERVICE LIST Special Notice
2	Philip S. Warden, Esq.
3	Cecily A. Dumas, Esq.
4	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP 4 Embarcadero Center, 22 Fl
5	San Francisco, CA 94111-5998
6	Austin Nagel, Esq. 111 Deerwood Rd. #305
	San Ramon, CA 94583
7	Reno F.R. Fernandez III, Esq.
8	221 Sansome Street, Third Floor
9	San Francisco, CA 94104
	<u>United States Trustee</u>
10	Lynette C. Kelly, Esq. Office of the U.S. Trustee
11	450 Golden Gate Avenue, 5 th Fl., #05-0153
12	San Francisco, CA 94102
	Securities and Exchange Commission
13	Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, NE
14	Washington, DC 20549
15	Chapter 11 Trustee
16	Timothy W. Hoffman P.O. Box 1761
17	Sebastopol, CA 95473
	Ron Oliner, Esq.
18	Duane Morris LLP Spear Tower One Market Plaza, Ste. 2200
19	San Francisco, CA 94105-1127
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY JOINT REORGANIZATION PLAN OF SULLIVAN VINEYARDS CORPORATION, SULLIVAN VINEYARDS PARTNERSHIP, ROSS
_aco.	SULLIVAN AND KELLEEN SULLIVAN DATED OCTOBER 20, 2017 - Page 26 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 26 of
~aot:	1

Case: 17-10065 Doc# 222 Filed: 10/20/17 Entered: 10/20/17 15:24:36 Page 26 of