

MEALEY'S®

Asbestos Bankruptcy Report

Where Are They Now, Part Eight: An Update On Developments In Asbestos-Related Bankruptcy Cases

by
Mark D. Plevin,
Tacie H. Yoon,
and
Leslie A. Davis
Crowell & Moring LLP
Washington, D.C.

and

Brendan V. Mullan,
Belinda Y. Liu,
and
Galen P. Sallomi
Crowell & Moring LLP
San Francisco, CA

**A commentary article
reprinted from the
September 2016 issue of
Mealey's Asbestos
Bankruptcy Report**



Commentary

Where Are They Now, Part Eight: An Update On Developments In Asbestos-Related Bankruptcy Cases

By

Mark D. Plevin,
Tacie H. Yoon,
Leslie A. Davis,
Brendan V. Mullan,
Belinda Y. Liu,
and
Galen P. Sallomi

[Editor's Note: The authors are attorneys at Crowell & Moring LLP, practicing in the bankruptcy, litigation, and insurance coverage areas. They have represented insurers in asbestos, silica, products liability, sexual abuse, and other mass tort bankruptcy cases, including many of the cases mentioned below, and in coverage cases involving asbestos defendants. The views expressed herein are the authors' own, not necessarily those of their firm or their clients. Any commentary or opinions do not reflect the opinions of Crowell & Moring LLP or LexisNexis, Mealey's. Copyright © 2016 by Mark D. Plevin, Tacie H. Yoon, Leslie A. Davis, Brendan V. Mullan, Belinda Y. Liu, and Galen P. Sallomi. Responses are welcome.]

Since 2001, we have been reporting in these pages on the status of asbestos-related bankruptcy cases.¹ In our last report, published in July 2014, we observed that the pace of asbestos-related bankruptcy filings had slowed. This trend has continued, as only seven new cases were filed in the past two years. And most of those cases have involved liquidating debtors who do not seek to utilize the trust-injunction mechanism set forth in Section 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code.

This article updates our last seven by noting the asbestos bankruptcies filed since July 2014, summarizing key developments in asbestos bankruptcies that were pending when we last wrote, and discussing some of the significant themes we have observed in these cases

over the past two years. We also present updated versions of three charts: one listing asbestos bankruptcies in chronological order; one providing the same information, with the debtors listed in alphabetical order; and a third listing the case numbers of asbestos bankruptcies, the status of the plans in those cases, and the published decisions that have arisen from those cases. We keep these charts updated in real time on our web site, accessible at www.crowell.com/asbestosbankruptcy, and will continue to do so as a resource available to those interested in this field.²

1. Who Filed the Most Recent Asbestos Bankruptcies?

Eagle, Inc. On September 22, 2015, Eagle filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.³ Eagle sold gaskets and installed insulation and insulation-related products, which contained asbestos, until the late 1970s.⁴ It ceased all operations in 2006, and since then has been managing its asbestos litigation and insurance rights.⁵ Eagle was first sued for asbestos-related injuries in 1985 and faces approximately 20,000 pending lawsuits for asbestos-related injuries.⁶ Eagle filed for bankruptcy to seek relief under § 524(g).⁷

Before filing its bankruptcy petition, Eagle was in coverage litigation with several of its insurers.⁸ As a result of pre-petition settlements between Eagle and

two of its insurers, Eagle established a Qualified Settlement Fund to hold settlement payments made by the insurers, which would be used in part to fund a § 524(g) trust.⁹

On October 7, 2015, Eagle filed a motion under § 105(a) to enjoin asbestos claimants from pursuing direct actions against the insurers with whom Eagle had settled.¹⁰ The court denied the motion on October 28, 2015.¹¹

In May 2016, the Unsecured Creditors' Committee moved to retain Caplin & Drysdale as bankruptcy counsel and Gilbert LLP as special insurance counsel.¹² The court denied the motions to retain Caplin & Drysdale and Gilbert, but allowed the committee to retain local counsel.¹³ On July 5, 2016, the committee filed a motion seeking to substitute Caplin & Drysdale for local counsel.¹⁴ The U.S. Trustee and several non-settled insurers objected to the retention motions, arguing that there was little reason to hire a national firm like Caplin & Drysdale at much higher rates than local counsel.¹⁵ Eagle supported the committee's motion, asserting that Caplin & Drysdale's "exceptional expertise in asbestos-mass tort bankruptcies" would enable the debtor to quickly be in a position to file a proposed plan.¹⁶ On August 1, 2016, the court granted the motion to employ Caplin & Drysdale in place of local counsel effective July 27, 2016, at a capped hourly rate of \$475, although both the hourly rates and a request to employ Caplin & Drysdale *nunc pro tunc* may be revisited at a later date.¹⁷

On August 31, 2016, USF&G filed a motion to appoint a Chapter 11 trustee in place of Eagle's management.¹⁸ USF&G argued that Eagle's management had engaged in "repeated acts of dishonesty" in the administration of the case and had "irreconcilable conflicts of interest with the estate and its creditors."¹⁹ On September 12, 2016, Pacific Employers Insurance Co. filed a motion to dismiss the bankruptcy on the grounds that (1) it was filed in bad faith, (2) there is a substantial or continuing loss to the estate and no reasonable likelihood of rehabilitation, and (3) Eagle will not be able to confirm a plan.²⁰ A hearing on both motions is scheduled for September 22, 2016.²¹

On September 13, 2016, Eagle filed a plan of reorganization seeking relief under § 524(g).²²

Energy Future Holdings. On April 29, 2014, Energy Future Holdings Company ("EFHC") and 70 affiliates filed Chapter 11 petitions in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware.²³ EFHC's businesses include the largest generator, distributor, and retail supplier of electricity in Texas.²⁴ Although some of the debtors were defendants in asbestos bankruptcy cases, the bankruptcy filing was not driven by asbestos liabilities, and the debtors did not seek relief under § 524(g). Rather, the bankruptcy filing was intended to enable EFHC and its affiliates to reorganize and restructure their \$42 billion in outstanding debt.²⁵

On August 8, 2014, attorneys representing asbestos claimants appeared in the bankruptcy to oppose debtors' motion to set a claims bar date.²⁶ The claimants' counsel asserted that setting a bar date would be unfair to future asbestos claimants because unless such future claimants received adequate notice, their claims could be cut off without constitutionally appropriate due process.²⁷ On August 18, 2014, the court set a claims bar date, but excluded asbestos bodily injury claims from the bar date.²⁸ On October 27, 2014, an official creditors committee was appointed, which included representatives of two asbestos claimants.²⁹

On January 7, 2015, the court entered an order authorizing the establishment of an asbestos claim bar date, applicable to both manifested and unmanifested asbestos claims.³⁰ The court held that attorneys representing current asbestos claimants lacked standing to object to the setting of a bar date for unmanifested asbestos claims.³¹ The court then concluded that unmanifested asbestos claims, which were pre-petition claims due to the claimants' pre-petition exposure to asbestos, could be discharged, as long as constitutionally sufficient notice were provided to such unmanifested claimants.³² The court also found that it was premature to determine whether an injunction under § 524(g) would be appropriate, whether the debtors' asbestos liabilities should be estimated, or whether a future claimants' representative ("FCR") should be appointed.³³

Thereafter, on July 15, 2015, the court ordered a bar date for asbestos claims and approved proposed claim forms for manifested and unmanifested asbestos claimants.³⁴ Shortly thereafter, the court denied a motion filed by two alleged unmanifested asbestos claimants seeking appointment of an FCR.³⁵

On April 14, 2015, the debtors filed a plan of reorganization, which did not include any provisions seeking relief under § 524(g).³⁶ On December 7, 2015, debtors' Sixth Amended Joint Plan was confirmed.³⁷ The confirmation order overruled an objection filed by unmanifested asbestos claimants which asserted that the plan could not be confirmed because it did not comply with § 524(g).³⁸

The confirmed plan included a proposed sale of an EFHC subsidiary that is the largest electric utility in Texas. However, certain conditions necessary for the transaction to proceed did not occur before an April 30, 2016 deadline, which rendered the confirmed plan null and void.³⁹

The debtors filed a new proposed plan on May 1, 2016 and an amended plan on May 10, 2016.⁴⁰ The plan contemplates a spin off or sale of the assets of debtor Texas Competitive Electric Holdings Company LLC and its direct and indirect subsidiaries (the "TCEH Debtors").⁴¹ It also provides that confirmation proceedings for the TCEH Debtors may occur separately from the confirmation proceedings for other EFHC debtors.⁴² Under the proposed plan, asbestos claims against the EFH Debtors that were timely filed on or before the bar date shall be reinstated on the effective date of the confirmed plan.⁴³

On August 5, 2016, debtors filed their Third Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization.⁴⁴ That plan reflected the proposed restructuring of the EFH Debtors through a merger with NextEra Energy, a publicly traded company.⁴⁵ On August 29, 2016, the court confirmed the Third Amended Plan (as amended on August 23, 2016) with respect to the TCEH Debtors.⁴⁶ On September 12, 2016, unmanifested asbestos claimants who had objected at virtually all stages of the plan formulation and confirmation process filed a notice of appeal from the confirmation order.⁴⁷

The confirmation hearing with respect to the EFHC Debtors is scheduled to begin on December 1, 2016.⁴⁸

Geo. V. Hamilton. On October 8, 2015, Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc. filed a Chapter 11 petition in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.⁴⁹ For the last 70 years, Hamilton has been engaged in the business of distributing, fabricating,

and installing insulation products, some of which contained asbestos. At the time of its bankruptcy filing, approximately 2,000 asbestos cases were pending against Hamilton, mainly in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio.⁵⁰ Hamilton had previously negotiated settlements with several of its insurers, but only approximately \$8 million in settlement funds remained.⁵¹ Hamilton plans to seek relief under § 524(g) to resolve its asbestos liabilities and protect the company's continued viability.⁵²

On October 23, 2015, an official committee of asbestos claimants ("Asbestos Claimants Committee" or "ACC") was appointed,⁵³ and on December 23, 2015, the bankruptcy court approved the appointment of Gary Philip Nelson as FCR.⁵⁴ On July 21, 2016, the court granted Hamilton's motion to extend its exclusive periods to file a proposed plan of reorganization and to solicit acceptances until December 16, 2016 and February 28, 2017, respectively.⁵⁵

Henry Vogt. On September 14, 2012, Henry Vogt Machine Co. ("Vogt") filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Kentucky.⁵⁶ In 1989, Vogt was first named as a defendant in litigation arising from asbestos that Vogt used in products that it manufactured.⁵⁷ Since then, Vogt paid approximately \$8 million in settlements and \$14 million in defense costs for asbestos claims.⁵⁸ Through its bankruptcy filing, Vogt intended to wind down its operations and liquidate its assets for the benefit of its creditors.⁵⁹

Vogt filed a proposed plan of liquidation on October 8, 2014.⁶⁰ A law firm that represented asbestos claimants objected to the accompanying disclosure statement because it allegedly provided inadequate information about the proposed treatment of asbestos claims and debtor's efforts to recover insurance proceeds to pay such claims.⁶¹ On November 19, 2014, the court approved an amended disclosure statement, and a confirmation hearing was scheduled for December 31, 2014.⁶²

On December 22, 2014, Vogt filed an amended plan of liquidation which, unlike the earlier version of the plan, included a class of General Unsecured Tort Claims and provided for the establishment of a Creditors' Trust, to which Vogt's insurance policies and coverage rights would be assigned.⁶³ The Creditors'

Trust would pay holders of allowed General Unsecured Tort Claims a pro rata share of net cash proceeds generated by the liquidation of Vogt's insurance policies, after the payment of an allowed administrative claim in the amount of \$75,000 held by the law firm that had objected to the disclosure statement.⁶⁴

Certain insurers objected to confirmation of the amended plan because the debtor provided inadequate notice of that plan, the amended plan was not "insurance neutral," and the amended plan purported to provide relief under § 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code without meeting the statutory requirements.⁶⁵ On December 31, 2014, the bankruptcy court confirmed the amended plan of liquidation.⁶⁶

On January 14, 2015, the objecting insurers appealed from the confirmation order.⁶⁷ On February 24, 2015, the bankruptcy court denied the insurers' motion for a stay pending appeal.⁶⁸ On March 3, 2015, the bankruptcy court entered an order closing the case.⁶⁹ On March 6, 2015, the district court entered an order granting a joint motion to dismiss the insurers' appeal.⁷⁰

Oakfabco. On August 7, 2015, Oakfabco, Inc. filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Illinois.⁷¹ Oakfabco is the reorganized debtor that emerged in 1988 from a prior bankruptcy case filed by Kewanee Boiler Corp.⁷² The earlier bankruptcy case resolved all then-existing asbestos claims against Kewanee Boiler, but did not resolve future asbestos claims.⁷³ Specifically, in 1996, the Kewanee Boiler bankruptcy court ordered that post-confirmation asbestos claims could be litigated against Oakfabco and would not be paid under the Kewanee Boiler plan.⁷⁴

Oakfabco's operations consist solely of defending and settling asbestos claims.⁷⁵ It has no assets other than its insurance coverage, and no known liabilities other than asbestos liabilities.⁷⁶ Oakfabco asserts that its insurance coverage for asbestos claims has exhausted or will exhaust soon.⁷⁷

Oakfabco intends to file a plan of liquidation, which will provide for a liquidating trust, funded by insurance settlement proceeds, to resolve and pay current asbestos claims.⁷⁸ After its asbestos liabilities and

insurance assets are transferred to the liquidating trust, Oakfabco intends to seek approval to dissolve.⁷⁹

On August 27, 2015, the U.S. Trustee appointed an ACC.⁸⁰ On September 11, 2015, Oakfabco filed motions seeking approval of settlement agreements with three insurers, approval of the sale of its insurance policies back to those insurers, and issuance of an injunction in favor of those insurers.⁸¹ On June 27, 2016, the bankruptcy court approved the debtor's settlement with one of the three insurers, Affiliated FM; no objections were filed to this settlement.⁸² However, the ACC objected to Oakfabco's motions to approve the CNA and Hartford settlements.⁸³ First, the ACC claimed that the settlement did not include any value with respect to two CNA policies with total aggregate limits of \$8 million.⁸⁴ Second, the ACC claimed that a renewal certificate and related binder for the Hartford policy at issue provided additional limits of up to \$20 million.⁸⁵ Both insurance companies and the debtor responded to these two points, disputing the ACC's factual allegations and arguing that the settlement amount was reasonable in any event. No hearing date has been set on the CNA and Hartford settlement approval motions.

Oakfabco's exclusive period to file a plan has been extended to September 30, 2016.⁸⁶

Reichhold Holdings. On September 30, 2014, Reichhold Holdings US, Inc. and three direct and indirect subsidiaries filed Chapter 11 petitions in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware. Reichhold had engaged in the production of coatings and composites used primarily in manufacturing.⁸⁷ Reichhold filed for bankruptcy due to decreases in revenue caused by factors such as the decline in housing construction in the early 2000s, the 2008 financial crisis, destruction of one of its plants by Superstorm Sandy, large obligations to fund pensions and provide post-retirement benefits, environmental liabilities, and significant secured and unsecured debt.⁸⁸ Reichhold anticipated using its bankruptcy filing to sell substantially all of its assets for the benefit of its stakeholders.⁸⁹

On January 12, 2015, the court approved the sale of substantially all of the debtors' assets.⁹⁰ On May 3, 2015, debtor Reichhold, Inc. changed its name to Reichhold Liquidation, Inc.⁹¹

On September 15, 2015, the debtors filed a plan of liquidation.⁹² According to the disclosure statement, as of the petition date, about 125 asbestos claims were pending against Reichhold.⁹³ Only 107 proofs of claims were filed by asbestos claimants.⁹⁴ On January 13, 2016, the court entered an order confirming Reichhold's plan of liquidation.⁹⁵

Under the plan, asbestos claims will be resolved by a liquidating trust.⁹⁶ As a condition to the occurrence of the effective date of the plan, Reichhold, the Reichhold Liquidating Trust, and certain of Reichhold's liability insurers were to enter into a Products Insurance Cooperation Agreement pursuant to which the parties established procedures regarding the defense and resolution of asbestos claims against Reichhold.⁹⁷ The final agreement was filed on January 14, 2016 and the plan became effective on March 1, 2016.⁹⁸

Sepco Corporation. On January 14, 2016, Sepco Corporation filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Ohio.⁹⁹ Sepco's business had included the sale of asbestos-containing packing and gasket products through approximately 1984, and the sale of certain asbestos-containing spiral-wound or semi-metallic gaskets until approximately 1992.¹⁰⁰ From the late 1970s through the present, Sepco has been sued in over 195,000 asbestos personal injury and wrongful death cases.¹⁰¹ Sepco ceased active operations in 1995, and since then has been managing its asbestos litigation and its financial and insurance assets.¹⁰² Sepco filed for bankruptcy because its insurance coverage for asbestos claims is nearly exhausted.¹⁰³ It intends to liquidate its remaining assets through its bankruptcy case.¹⁰⁴

On February 1, 2016, an ACC was appointed.¹⁰⁵

Sepco's exclusive period to file a plan has been extended to November 9, 2016.¹⁰⁶

2. Significant Developments In Pending Bankruptcy Cases

Budd Company. On July 30, 2014, the U.S. Trustee appointed an ACC.¹⁰⁷ On October 23, 2014, over the ACC's objection, the court approved a claims bar date of March 31, 2015 and a proof of claim form for asbestos claims that had been diagnosed on or before the petition date.¹⁰⁸ The asbestos claim form required

each claimant to provide information about alleged exposure to asbestos for which Budd was responsible, including the work site where such exposure occurred, the claimant's employer, occupation, and industry while working at the site, the asbestos-containing product to which the claimant was exposed, dates of alleged exposure, and the activity which resulted in such exposure.¹⁰⁹

On August 13, 2015, Budd objected to asbestos proofs of claim that were allegedly barred by *res judicata* (*i.e.*, claims that were previously settled or dismissed with prejudice in the tort system).¹¹⁰ Budd thereafter sought an order establishing procedures for omnibus objections to asbestos claims, because it intended to file additional objections to asbestos claims that were barred by the applicable statutes of limitation, preempted under federal statutes, or defective for other reasons.¹¹¹ Certain of Budd's insurers also sought approval to file objections to asbestos claims, or to join Budd's objections, on the grounds that the insurers' policies gave them the right to control or participate in the defense of asbestos claims against Budd and the insurers would likely be called upon to defend and indemnify such claims post-confirmation.¹¹²

In September, 2015, Budd and its insurers completed a mediation which resulted in a cost-sharing agreement that addressed issues relating to post-confirmation treatment of asbestos claims against Budd.¹¹³ On September 30, 2015, Budd filed a plan which provided that asbestos claims would pass through the bankruptcy case to be liquidated in state or federal court, and then paid from one of two Asbestos Funds to be established by the debtor.¹¹⁴ Costs of defending and settling asbestos claims for which insurance coverage was available would be allocated to participating insurance policies and to the Insured Asbestos Claim Fund, while asbestos claims that were not covered by insurance would be paid from the Uninsured Asbestos Claim Fund.¹¹⁵

On October 9, 2015, the ACC moved to withdraw the reference with respect to the debtor's objection to asbestos claims.¹¹⁶ On November 6, 2016, the ACC moved to lift the automatic stay to allow asbestos claims to be litigated against Budd in the tort system.¹¹⁷ On January 6, 2016, the district court withdrew the reference with respect to the debtor's

objection.¹¹⁸ That court subsequently granted the ACC's motion to withdraw the reference with respect to Budd's other objections to asbestos claims.¹¹⁹

On February 10, 2016, the bankruptcy court granted the ACC's motion for relief from the automatic stay, finding that the prejudice to the asbestos claimants, who had been unable to litigate their claims against the debtor during the bankruptcy case, outweighed any potential harm to Budd, which appeared to have sufficient insurance with respect to the asbestos claims.¹²⁰ The court, however, stayed the effect of the order for 30 days to allow Budd to make arrangements with its insurers to defend the cases once the stay was lifted.¹²¹ The stay of the lift-stay order was extended several times in light of ongoing discussions between Budd and its insurers.¹²²

Budd continued to negotiate the terms of a final cost-sharing agreement with its insurers and the amount of funding for the Insured Asbestos Claim Fund and the Uninsured Asbestos Claim Fund, and negotiated other plan-related issues with its retiree creditors. On May 4, 2016, Budd filed its Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan, which the retirees and the ACC both supported.¹²³ On May 31, 2016, the court entered an order approving Budd's entry into the final cost sharing agreement with certain insurers.¹²⁴

On June 27, 2016, the bankruptcy court entered an order confirming Budd's plan. As noted, the plan allows asbestos claims to pass through to the tort system, where they will be defended pursuant to the terms of the plan, including the final cost-sharing agreement between Budd and its insurers.¹²⁵ The confirmed plan became effective on August 2, 2016.¹²⁶

Christy Refractories. Following the entry of a final decree in this case on December 29, 2011, the bankruptcy court has reopened the case and immediately closed it on three occasions in 2013, 2014, and 2016, in order to grant insurers who settled with the Christy Trust post-confirmation § 524(g) protection under the confirmed plan.¹²⁷

Consolidated Aluminum (Conalco). The U.S. Trustee's appeal from the June 5, 2014 order confirming the debtor's plan of liquidation, discussed in our previous article, was short-lived. On July 28, 2014,

the bankruptcy court entered a consent order resolving the appeal, based on an agreement between the U.S. Trustee and the debtor that the debtor would file a modified confirmation order and plan.¹²⁸ That same day, the bankruptcy court entered an amended confirmation order.¹²⁹ On April 22, 2015, the court entered an order stating that the estate had been fully administered and closing the case.¹³⁰

Flintkote. As we reported previously, following confirmation of Flintkote's original plan by the bankruptcy court in December, 2012,¹³¹ Flintkote's former parent, Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. ("ITCAN"), appealed the confirmation ruling to the district court, which affirmed the confirmation order in July, 2014.¹³² ITCAN then appealed the district court's decision to the Third Circuit. On February 9, 2015, Flintkote filed an amended plan and disclosure statement, reflecting that Flintkote and ITCAN had settled their dispute and that in exchange for ITCAN's contribution of \$575 million to Flintkote's reorganization, ITCAN and related parties would be protected by the § 524(g) channeling injunction from future asbestos claims.¹³³ On August 10, 2015, the bankruptcy court entered an order confirming the amended plan and approving the ITCAN settlement.¹³⁴ The district court affirmed the confirmation order on August 13, 2015.¹³⁵ On October 8, 2015, the Third Circuit dismissed ITCAN's appeal on joint stipulation by the parties.¹³⁶

During the pendency of the Third Circuit appeal, Flintkote entered into a \$1.7 million settlement agreement with one of its insurers, Travelers, which provided for a policy buyback by Travelers, mutual releases of claims arising out of the subject policies or asbestos claims arising under the policies, and protection for Travelers under § 524(g).¹³⁷

On April 4, 2016, a federal district court in California, applying California law, awarded partial summary judgment to insurers in a coverage dispute with Flintkote.¹³⁸ The court found that the subject policies only obligate the insurers to pay Flintkote for the amount that Flintkote actually pays to asbestos claimants out of the trust, rejecting Flintkote's argument that recovering the full liquidated value from the insurer would ultimately lead to a greater recovery for asbestos claimants.¹³⁹ The California district court also granted Flintkote's and the trust's motion for a bond pursuant

to California Ins. Code § 1616, and ordered the parties to meet and confer regarding the bond amount.¹⁴⁰ On May 9, 2016, the district court set the bond amount at \$1.5 million plus prejudgment interest, finding that “the only currently ascertainable and reasonably certain monetary damage amount sought is \$1.5 million (USD) – the amount for which defendants are alleged to be in arrears for billings owed.”¹⁴¹

Garlock. Our previous article reported on the bankruptcy court’s January 10, 2014 estimation decision and the resulting flurry of litigation seeking access to sealed evidence. But in addition to that activity, the bankruptcy court also dealt with confirmation-related activity, including granting Garlock’s motion to set a claims bar date for asbestos claims against Garlock and/or its affiliate, Garrison, that were settled on or before June 5, 2010, but were unpaid.¹⁴²

On January 14, 2015, Garlock filed its Second Amended Plan.¹⁴³ The accompanying disclosure statement stated that the debtors had obtained the FCR’s support for the Second Amended Plan.¹⁴⁴

On April 10, 2015, the court approved the disclosure statement for debtors’ Second Amended Plan, established solicitation and confirmation procedures, and set an asbestos claims bar date.¹⁴⁵ The order provided that the debtors would solicit votes from holders of four classes of asbestos claims – settled asbestos claims, current asbestos claims, future asbestos claims, and asbestos claims backed by judgments – even though the debtors contended that these classes were unimpaired under the plan.¹⁴⁶ The order stated that the court would determine at the confirmation hearing whether these classes were impaired or unimpaired.¹⁴⁷ The order required holders of current asbestos claims who submitted ballots to certify that (a) the claim had not been dismissed with prejudice or settled and paid, and was not known to be time barred, (b) the person whose asbestos-related injury formed the basis of the claim (the “Injured Party”) had been diagnosed with pleural or peritoneal mesothelioma, lung cancer, laryngeal cancer, or asbestosis, (c) the Injured Party was exposed to asbestos released from asbestos-containing gaskets or packing manufactured, produced, fabricated, distributed, supplied, marketed or sold by Garlock, and (d) if an attorney completed the certifications, that the attorney was authorized by the claim holder to vote on the plan

on the claim holder’s behalf.¹⁴⁸ With respect to holders of future asbestos claims, the order provided that ballots would be treated as proofs of claim, and that the ballots would be served on the FCR, although the court would defer until the confirmation hearing any ruling regarding whether the FCR had the legal authority and capacity to cast votes for future claimants.¹⁴⁹ The court scheduled the confirmation hearing to begin on June 20, 2016.¹⁵⁰

Thereafter, the parties engaged in extensive discovery concerning plan confirmation. On July 24, 2015, the court authorized the debtors to serve a subpoena on the Manville Trust, seeking information about persons asserting claims against the debtors who had also filed claims with the Manville Trust, in order to estimate non-mesothelioma claims against Garlock.¹⁵¹ Garlock also served interrogatories and document requests on 111 law firms representing asbestos claimants against Garlock, seeking production of claimant-specific information, which Garlock asserted was necessary to estimate non-mesothelioma claims against it, refute the ACC’s claim that an overwhelming number of asbestos claims made the plan infeasible, and show that the vast majority of ballots submitted by holders of current asbestos claims were invalid.¹⁵²

On January 5, 2016, the day before the court was scheduled to hear arguments on cross-motions for summary judgment on plan confirmation issues, the court continued all hearing dates, based on a joint request by the debtors, the ACC, and the FCR.¹⁵³

On May 20, 2016, the debtors, along with the FCR and the ACC, filed a joint plan of reorganization (the “Joint Plan”).¹⁵⁴ Unlike Garlock’s earlier proposed plans, the Joint Plan proposed to seek relief under § 524(g) to resolve all current and future asbestos claims against Garlock, Garrison, and their affiliate Coltec, a non-debtor. The Joint Plan proposes that Coltec will undergo a restructuring, which will culminate in its merger with OldCo LLC, provided that at least 75% of the voting Asbestos Claimants holding at least two-thirds of the claim amounts vote in favor of the Joint Plan.¹⁵⁵ If it receives sufficient votes to approve the Joint Plan, Coltec would then merge with Old Co, which would file a pre-packaged Chapter 11 bankruptcy and seek to have its case jointly administered with the existing Garlock bankruptcy case.¹⁵⁶

On July 29, 2016, the court entered an order establishing confirmation-related deadlines and procedures.¹⁵⁷ Among other things, the order states that after OldCo (Coltec) commences its bankruptcy case, it will seek a bar date for asbestos claims against Coltec that are based on asbestos-related disease diagnosed on or before August 1, 2014, for which a lawsuit against any defendant or a claim against any asbestos trust was filed on or before August 1, 2014.¹⁵⁸ The order also provides that the confirmation hearing will commence on May 15, 2017.¹⁵⁹

Lloyd E. Mitchell. As we previously reported, one plaintiffs' law firm – the Nicholl firm – which had vigorously opposed efforts to lift the automatic stay so that claimants represented by the Angelos firm could receive payments on their asbestos claims from the debtor's insurers, had appealed the district court's ruling affirming the bankruptcy court's lift-stay ruling. On September 19, 2014, the Fourth Circuit granted a stipulated motion for voluntary dismissal of the appeal.¹⁶⁰ On November 5, 2014, the bankruptcy court entered an order dismissing the bankruptcy case.¹⁶¹

Metex. On August 1, 2014, the district court affirmed the bankruptcy court's order confirming Metex's plan of reorganization and issuing an injunction under § 524(g).¹⁶² The effective date of the plan occurred on September 3, 2014.¹⁶³

Pittsburgh Corning. As we previously reported, the bankruptcy court's May 24, 2014 confirmation order was appealed by two of Pittsburgh Corning's insurers and Garlock, although Garlock voluntarily dismissed its appeal on March 14, 2014.¹⁶⁴ On September 30, 2014, the district court affirmed the bankruptcy court's confirmation order, overruling plan objections by the insurers.¹⁶⁵

The insurers appealed to the Third Circuit.¹⁶⁶ On March 26, 2015, the insurers moved for relief from the district court's judgment based on alleged new evidence that law firms representing asbestos claimants had engaged in fraud by concealing evidence regarding their clients' exposure to asbestos products, pursuing invalid or fraudulent claims, and casting fraudulent ballots on bankruptcy plans.¹⁶⁷ The insurers asserted that if such new evidence had been available before the district court entered its affirmation order, the insurers could have supplemented the record there, which "would have altered the outcome."¹⁶⁸

On August 12, 2015, the district court denied the insurers' motion for relief from judgment, and the insurers appealed that ruling to the Third Circuit.¹⁶⁹ That appeal was consolidated with the insurers' confirmation appeal. On January 6, 2016, the parties filed a stipulation to dismiss the Third Circuit appeals. The next day, the court entered an order dismissing the appeals.¹⁷⁰

Upon returning to the bankruptcy court, the plan proponents requested approval of technical amendments to the Modified Third Amended Plan, which were necessitated by, *inter alia*, the passage of seven years since the plan was filed on January 29, 2009.¹⁷¹ On March 24, 2016, the court granted the plan proponents' motion.¹⁷² On March 29, 2016, the debtor filed a complete set of the plan documents, as modified by the recently approved technical amendments and including other conforming corrections.¹⁷³ The effective date of the plan occurred on April 27, 2016.¹⁷⁴

On August 29, 2016, Reorganized PCC filed a motion for entry of a final decree closing the case, stating that the plan has been substantially consummated.¹⁷⁵ A hearing has been scheduled for October 6, 2016.¹⁷⁶

Plant Insulation. After hearing oral argument on the non-settled insurers' appeal from the bankruptcy court's post-remand confirmation order, the district court on August 18, 2014 affirmed the confirmation order, including the issuance of a channeling injunction under § 524(g).¹⁷⁷ The effective date of the plan occurred on September 22, 2014.¹⁷⁸

Rapid-American. As we previously reported, Rapid-American filed its Chapter 11 case in order to formulate a plan under § 524(g) that would distribute its remaining insurance assets to satisfy asbestos claims. On March 31, 2015, Rapid-American, the ACC, and the FCR commenced an adversary action seeking declaratory relief and damages for breach of contract and bad faith against Rapid-American's remaining solvent excess insurers.¹⁷⁹ An amended complaint alleged that Rapid-American had incurred losses in excess of \$700 million and/or paid defense and indemnity costs for asbestos claims in an amount sufficient to trigger the defendant insurers' excess policies.¹⁸⁰

Rapid-American, the ACC, and the FCR filed two motions for partial summary judgment on January 22,

2016. One motion sought a declaration that a three-year excess policy issued by St. Paul provided three annual aggregate limits, totaling \$30 million.¹⁸¹ The other motion sought a declaration that St. Paul was required to pay for asbestos-related damages once the debtor's asbestos liabilities exceeded the limits of the underlying policies, rather than after the insured had exhausted the limits of underlying insurance by actual payment.¹⁸²

National Union filed two cross-motions for summary judgment, arguing that (a) one of its excess policies, issued for a 14-month period, provided a single aggregate limit of \$7 million, rather than two separate aggregate limits totaling \$14 million, and (b) its excess policies are triggered only when the underlying insurance is exhausted by actual payment of claims or losses.¹⁸³ St. Paul and Travelers also filed cross-motions for partial summary judgment that were mirror images of the plaintiffs' motions.¹⁸⁴

On June 7, 2016, the bankruptcy court granted the insurers' cross-motions for summary judgment in part, holding that all but one of the excess policies required the underlying policies to be exhausted by actual payment before their liability attaches.¹⁸⁵ The court noted that the motions and cross-motions for summary judgment regarding the aggregate limits of the 3-year St. Paul policy and the 14-month National Union policy were likely rendered moot by this decision, but invited the parties to contact the court to discuss that issue.¹⁸⁶

To date, Rapid-American has not yet filed a plan.

Resillo Press Pad. On September 9, 2014, the bankruptcy court granted a motion filed by Resillo's Chapter 7 trustee to approve an agreement with two of Resillo's liability insurers regarding post-bankruptcy service of new asbestos claims, insurer access to the debtor's books and records, and related matters. The order also lifted the automatic stay to allow asbestos claimants to pursue their claims against Resillo, provided that any judgments would be satisfied by available insurance coverage.¹⁸⁷ On February 4, 2015, the bankruptcy court closed the bankruptcy case.¹⁸⁸

Specialty Products/Bondex. This case was resolved in late 2014 by the filing of a consensual plan of reorganization involving Specialty Products and

Bondex (the "Initial Debtors") and two affiliates, NMBFiL, Inc. and Republic Powdered Metals, Inc. ("Republic"), who were also defendants in numerous asbestos cases. NMBFiL and Republic filed their own Chapter 11 cases in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware on August 15, 2014 and August 31, 2014, respectively.¹⁸⁹

Pursuant to term sheets agreed among NMBFiL, Republic, the Initial Debtors, their non-debtor parent RPM International, the FCR, the ACC, and ad hoc committees of asbestos claimants asserting claims against Republic and NMBFiL, the parties agreed to the filing of a consensual plan of reorganization that would establish a § 524(g) trust for the benefit of all asbestos claimants against the Initial Debtors, NMBFiL, and Republic.

On September 26, 2014, the bankruptcy court granted a motion filed by the Debtors to set bar dates for claims other than asbestos claims.¹⁹⁰ This mooted hotly-litigated disputes among the parties relating to the proposed form of order setting an asbestos claims bar date and the proof of claim forms for asbestos claims.

The debtors filed a joint plan of reorganization on October 23, 2014 with the support of the ACC and FCR, superseding the competing plans filed in 2013 by the Initial Debtors, on the one hand, and the ACC and FCR, on the other hand.¹⁹¹ The joint plan proposed to employ the trust-injunction mechanism of § 524(g).¹⁹² The Trust would be segregated into an "SPHC Trust Account" and an "NMBFiL Trust Account," each available only to the applicable reorganized debtor and each tied to its own permanent channeling injunction.¹⁹³ On December 10, 2014, the bankruptcy court confirmed the Debtors' joint plan of reorganization in its entirety and issued the two channeling injunctions.¹⁹⁴ The district court entered an order affirming the confirmation orders the same day, and the plan became effective on December 23, 2014.¹⁹⁵

On September 24, 2015, the district court dismissed appeals filed from the bankruptcy court's estimation decision.¹⁹⁶

THAN. We previously reported that certain AIG insurers had filed an action in the Delaware Court

of Chancery against PENAC, THAN, and the 524(g) Trust claiming that the Trust was paying many more asbestos claims than expected and that the defendants were in breach of contract for failing to allow AIG to exercise its audit rights.¹⁹⁷

On June 4, 2015, the court granted AIG's request for declaratory relief, ruling that AIG can audit the THAN Trust once a year pursuant to its "broad right to audit the Trust's payments and distributions" under its settlement agreement with THAN.¹⁹⁸ The order stated that "AIG still cannot use the information for any purpose other than to confirm the Trust's payments, and it cannot challenge or question its obligations to make payments except for when it discovers accounting errors or fraud."¹⁹⁹ Arguing that THAN continued to deny it access to audit information under the guise of confidentiality, AIG later moved to compel THAN to produce information about cancer claims that had been paid by the Trust. The Trust objected on the basis that AIG could not have unfettered access to the requested data unless AIG agreed to preserve the confidentiality of the information and to limit its use. The court granted AIG's motion to compel on February 8, 2016,²⁰⁰ and simultaneously entered a protective order instructing AIG to maintain the audit information as confidential and requiring third parties to sign a nondisclosure agreement in order to access the disclosed information.²⁰¹

United Gilsonite. On September 30, 2014, the debtor filed a modified first amended plan of reorganization which provided for the establishment of a § 524(g) trust and the issuance of a channeling injunction.²⁰² Settling insurers were to be protected by the channeling injunction.²⁰³

On December 8, 2014, the bankruptcy court confirmed the plan and the district court affirmed the confirmation order and the issuance of a channeling injunction.²⁰⁴ Also on the same day, the bankruptcy court entered orders approving the debtor's insurance settlements and entering injunctions under § 105(a) barring suits against the settled insurers relating to or arising out of UGL's conduct or the settled policies.²⁰⁵

The effective date of the plan occurred on December 31, 2014.²⁰⁶

Yarway. On December 12, 2014, Yarway informed the bankruptcy court that Yarway and its non-debtor parent, Tyco International, had reached a settlement with the ACC and FCR pursuant to which the parties had agreed in principle to the filing of a plan of reorganization providing for an asbestos trust under § 524(g) and a channeling injunction protecting Tyco, its current and former affiliates, and other related entities, from asbestos claims arising from Yarway product lines.²⁰⁷ Tyco and Yarway agreed to contribute \$325 million to the Trust.²⁰⁸

On December 22, 2014, Yarway filed its proposed plan of reorganization.²⁰⁹ The channeling injunction established under the plan protects Yarway, Reorganized Yarway, settling insurers, Tyco, all current and former affiliates of Tyco other than Yarway, and any of their successors or assigns.²¹⁰ The bankruptcy court confirmed the plan on April 8, 2015,²¹¹ and the district court affirmed the confirmation order on July 14, 2015.²¹² The effective date of the plan was August 19, 2015.²¹³

3. Overview Of Recent Asbestos Bankruptcy Developments

Asbestos proofs of claim and bar dates. Following the example set by the court in Garlock, which ordered asbestos claimants to provide personal health-related information, alleged asbestos exposure information, and claim-related information in response to the debtor's personal injury questionnaire, and that court's condemnation of the asbestos plaintiffs' bar's "pattern of non-disclosure" and "startling pattern of misrepresentation,"²¹⁴ several other bankruptcy courts have also set bar dates for asbestos claims and have required asbestos proofs of claim to provide information about, *inter alia*, exposure to the debtor's asbestos-containing products.

As discussed above, in Specialty Products, the bankruptcy court found that setting a bar date for asbestos claims would be appropriate, but the parties reached a consensus on a plan before a proposed asbestos claim form was finalized. Nevertheless, several asbestos claimants filed proofs of claim in the Specialty Products case. The reorganized debtor's first omnibus objection to claims was directed to thirteen claims filed by six asbestos claimants, asserting that they should be disallowed because the claims were channeled to the

asbestos personal injury trust established by the confirmed plan.²¹⁵ On August 18, 2016, the court sustained the omnibus objection, and disallowed the asbestos proofs of claim, without prejudice to the claimants seeking payment from the trust.²¹⁶

In Budd, the court *sua sponte* entered an order scheduling a hearing to set a bar date for all non-administrative claims.²¹⁷ The debtor urged the court to require asbestos claimants to file proofs of claim identifying, among other things, the Budd asbestos-containing product to which they allegedly were exposed, the circumstances of exposure, and the resulting disease, and providing information about the claimants' medical history, litigation relating to the claim, and claims submitted to asbestos trusts, in order to ferret out illegitimate claims and to identify claimants who had already been paid by other defendants or by asbestos trusts.²¹⁸ The ACC opposed the setting of a claims bar date for asbestos claims, arguing that most courts handling asbestos bankruptcy cases had not required asbestos claimants to file proofs of claim.²¹⁹ The ACC asserted that requiring the filing of claim forms was unnecessary because the bankruptcy court would not have jurisdiction in any event to resolve such bodily injury and wrongful death claims, and requiring asbestos proofs of claim to be filed would cause the asbestos victims undue anxiety and would burden the bankruptcy estate with excessive claim processing costs.²²⁰ The claim form that was ultimately approved by the Budd court required each asbestos claimant to provide exposure information, but did not require information about claims submitted to asbestos trusts or recoveries from other defendants.²²¹ Only claimants whose asbestos-related disease had been diagnosed on or before the petition date were required to file proofs of claim.²²²

Budd later objected to a large number of asbestos proofs of claim, alleging that they were barred by *res judicata*. Thereafter, several of Budd's insurers sought to join Budd's objections or to file their own objections, and litigation ensued with the ACC, culminating several months later in the entry of orders withdrawing the reference with respect to the asbestos claims and granting relief from the automatic stay to litigate the asbestos claims in the tort system.²²³ Before any such litigation commenced, however, the parties reached agreement on a consensual plan pursuant to which asbestos claims would pass through the bankruptcy and be paid from one of two funds established under the plan.

Subsequently, in EFHC, the bankruptcy court went even farther than the courts in Budd, Specialty Products, and Garlock, and authorized an asbestos claim bar date, applicable to both manifested and unmanifested asbestos claims.²²⁴ The court found that as long as constitutionally sufficient notice was provided to asbestos claimants, then both present and future asbestos claims could be discharged. As a result, the debtors retained experts to develop a comprehensive notice plan and negotiated the scope and terms of claim forms for manifested and unmanifested asbestos claimants, which the court approved.²²⁵ The Third Amended Plan filed by EFHC provides that allowed legacy asbestos claims will be reinstated, and that all other prepetition asbestos claims are discharged.²²⁶

Coupled with extensive notice programs, the setting of bar dates in non-524(g) cases could lead to asbestos claims being discharged, even if no asbestos-related disease has manifested by the time of confirmation. It remains to be seen whether the lengthy litigation in these cases over the setting of asbestos bar dates, the form of notice and the claim form to be used, as well as the cost of hiring media and publication experts to ensure comprehensive notice to all potential claimants, will be worthwhile to the debtors by strengthening their arguments in favor of discharge.

While not addressing asbestos claims, a recent decision by the Second Circuit in the Motors Liquidation bankruptcy regarding enforcement of the "free and clear" sale provisions under § 363 to bar mass tort claims, and highlighting the importance of providing adequate notice to claimants, could be instructive in the asbestos context.²²⁷ In that case, the Second Circuit reviewed several decisions by the bankruptcy court enforcing the "free and clear" language in the sale order conveying Old GM's assets to New GM. Certain owners of prepetition GM cars with defective ignition switches sought to pursue class action successor liability litigation against New GM despite the § 363 sale order. The court undertook a two-step analysis, deciding first which claims were subject to the bar imposed by the free and clear sale order, and second, whether the affected claimants had received notice of the sale motion consistent with the requirements of due process, in order for their claims to be barred.

The court held that successor liability claims were barred to the extent the claims arose from a right to

payment that arose pre-petition or resulted from pre-petition conduct, even if the claims were only contingent, and the claimant had “some contact or relationship” with the debtor “such that the claimant is identifiable.”²²⁸ Thus, claimants who had owned GM cars with defective ignitions pre-petition had sufficient contact with Old GM for their claims to be affected by the sale order, but claimants who bought cars from New GM post-confirmation or from third parties in the used car market post-confirmation did not have a sufficient relationship with Old GM.²²⁹

With respect to due process, the court found that Old GM's issuance of publication notice was inadequate with respect to claimants who had purchased their cars from Old GM. Since Old GM knew or should have known of the ignition switch defect and was required by federal law to keep records of all initial purchasers of its cars, it should have been required to provide actual notice by mail or by an equivalent method to those purchasers.²³⁰ Accordingly, the court reversed the bankruptcy court's decision enforcing the sale order with respect to ignition defect claims.²³¹ On September 14, 2016, the court denied New GM's motion for rehearing or for rehearing en banc.²³²

Resolving asbestos claims through the establishment of non-524(g) trusts. Several recent debtors have chosen not to seek relief under § 524(g), but rather to try to establish non-524(g) trusts to marshal insurance proceeds to pay present and future asbestos claimants. In Budd, for example, the debtor stated that it had insurance policies that would provide \$100 million in coverage for asbestos claims.²³³ Budd's confirmed plan of reorganization provided for claims to return to the tort system and for settlements and judgments to be paid by either an insured asbestos claims fund or an uninsured asbestos claims fund, as appropriate. The Budd plan also created an administrative fund to pay asbestos claims and related expenses, and provided that unspent amounts in the various funds would flow into an asbestos springing trust, in the event the reorganized debtor dissolved.²³⁴ The asbestos springing trust is to dissolve when all lawsuits arising from asbestos claims brought as of January 1, 2045 have been resolved.²³⁵

Some liquidating debtors established trusts funded by insurance assets to pay asbestos claims. Reichhold, for example, which asserted that it had insurance with

limits in excess of \$843 million to pay asbestos claims,²³⁶ confirmed a plan of liquidation which provided that a liquidating trust would pay asbestos claims, only to the extent the asbestos claim was not satisfied by insurance.²³⁷ Henry Vogt, on the other hand, asserted that it had exhausted its ability to recover from its insurers, who had consistently denied coverage.²³⁸ Nevertheless, in its plan of liquidation, Henry Vogt established a creditors' trust, to which it transferred its insurance policies and causes of action against insurers, for the payment of unsecured tort claims.²³⁹

Even though none of these debtors used the § 524(g) trust/injunction mechanism to resolve their asbestos liabilities, the bankruptcy courts confirmed plans which purported to channel asbestos claims to a trust and bar asbestos claimants from taking action to recover on their claims from any property of the debtors or their estates. The confirmation order in the Budd bankruptcy, for example, stated that “all Persons who have, held or may hold Asbestos Claims against the Debtor or the Estate, whether manifested or filed before or after the Petition Date, are limited to recovery on account thereof to the Asbestos Funds and/or the proceeds of Asbestos Insurance Policies” and are “prohibited from collecting, recovering, or receiving payment or recovery with respect to any such Asbestos Claims from any other asset of the Debtor or its Estate.”²⁴⁰ The confirmation orders in the Reichhold and Henry Vogt bankruptcies also preclude asbestos claimants from taking any action to recover on their claims except as provided in the confirmed plans of liquidation.

The use of trusts in non-524(g) cases may gain traction, since the process does not require payment of fees for ACCs or FCRs and, as the EFHC court has held, § 524(g) is not the exclusive means to deal with asbestos liabilities in bankruptcy cases.²⁴¹ However, all such efforts must confront the Third Circuit's admonition in *Combustion Engineering* that “we do not believe that § 105(a) can be employed to extend a channeling injunction to non-debtors in an asbestos case where the requirements of § 524(g) are not otherwise met.”²⁴²

Attempts to obtain access to asbestos claimant information. Following the Garlock estimation decision, various entities have sought access to records relating to asbestos claimants and payments made to

asbestos claimants, based on suspicions of fraud. As discussed above, insurers succeeded in obtaining access to claims and payment information from the THAN asbestos trust in order to exercise their audit rights under a settlement agreement with THAN.

On June 30, 2016, Honeywell International filed motions to access Rule 2019 statements in nine separate bankruptcy cases.²⁴³ Honeywell asserted that it is entitled to obtain the Rule 2019 statements because it is a frequent defendant in asbestos cases and because it has an obligation in perpetuity to fund all distributions made by the NARCO Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust.²⁴⁴ Citing the Garlock estimation decision and its finding of a “startling pattern of misrepresentation’ by asbestos claimants,” Honeywell asserted that it needs access to the Rule 2019 statements in order to determine whether the NARCO Trust was the victim of invalid or fraudulent claims, for which Honeywell is financially responsible.²⁴⁵ Honeywell asserts that it has standing to seek the documents as a member of the public, and that it has a statutory and common law right to access documents filed in these bankruptcy cases because such documents are public records.²⁴⁶ Ford Motor Company, also a frequent defendant in asbestos litigation, joined Honeywell’s motions.²⁴⁷ The trusts established in all nine cases have opposed Honeywell’s motion.²⁴⁸ On August 4, 2016, the asbestos trusts filed an emergency motion seeking to appoint retired judge Judith Fitzgerald to serve as a Rule 2019 expert and

referee.²⁴⁹ Honeywell has opposed the emergency motion on the grounds that Judge Fitzgerald is conflicted due to her past involvement in the asbestos cases.²⁵⁰ On August 24, 2016, Judge Kevin Gross, to whom the Honeywell motions have been assigned, wrote to Judge Fitzgerald, asking her view as to the existence of any conflict.²⁵¹ On September 7, 2016, Judge Fitzgerald responded that she felt she could serve the court as a “neutral” without conflict, but that due to her current role as a mediator in a matter involving Honeywell, the NARCO Trust, the NARCO Trust Advisory Committees and the FCR, she asked the court to give due consideration to any objection that might be asserted by any of the mediation parties to her serving in that capacity.²⁵² Honeywell’s motion and the trusts’ emergency motion are scheduled to be heard on October 14, 2016.²⁵³

It is interesting to note that since 2008, the API Asbestos Trust, which was established in 2007, has published on its website the names, diseases, and amounts of payments made to asbestos claimants.²⁵⁴

4. Conclusion

After 15 years of reporting on asbestos bankruptcy developments in this publication, new issues and arguments continue to be raised in these cases. Further, parties’ creativity in resolving present and future asbestos claims under § 524(g) or otherwise continues to impress. We look forward to providing further commentary on these issues.



**CHART 1:
COMPANY NAME AND YEAR OF BANKRUPTCY FILING
(CHRONOLOGICALLY)**

Company	Year
UNR Industries	1982
Johns-Manville Corp.	1982
Amatex Corp.	1982
Unarco	1982
Waterman Steamship Corp.	1983
Wallace & Gale Co.	1984

Company	Year
Forty-Eight Insulations	1985
Philadelphia Asbestos Corp. (Pacor)	1986
Standard Insulations, Inc.	1986
Prudential Lines, Inc.	1986
McLean Industries	1986
United States Lines	1986
Gatke Corp.	1987
Todd Shipyards	1987
Nicolet, Inc.	1987
Raymark Corp./Raytech Corp.	1989
Delaware Insulations	1989
Hillsborough Holding Co.	1989
Celotex Corp.	1990
Carey Canada, Inc.	1990
National Gypsum	1990
Eagle-Picher Industries	1991
H.K. Porter Co.	1991
Kentile Floors	1992
American Shipbuilding, Inc.	1993
Keene Corp.	1993
Lykes Bros. Steamship	1995
Rock Wool Manufacturing	1996
M.H. Detrick	1998
Fuller-Austin	1998
Brunswick Fabricators	1998
Harnischfeger Corp.	1999
Rutland Fire Clay	1999
Babcock & Wilcox Co.	2000
Pittsburgh Corning	2000
Owens Corning Corp./Fibreboard	2000
Armstrong World Industries	2000
Burns & Roe, Inc.	2001
G-I Holdings	2001
Skinner Engine Co.	2001
W.R. Grace	2001

Company	Year
USG Corp.	2001
E.J. Bartells	2001
United States Mineral Products	2001
Federal Mogul	2001
Murphy Marine Services	2001
Chicago Fire Brick	2001
Insul Co.	2001
Swan Transportation Co.	2001
North American Refractories Corp. (NARCO)	2002
Kaiser Aluminum	2002
GIT/Harbison-Walker/AP Green Industries	2002
Plibrico Co.	2002
Shook & Fletcher	2002
Porter-Hayden Co.	2002
Artra Group, Inc.	2002
Special Metals Corp.	2002
Asbestos Claims Management Corp.	2002
ACandS	2002
JT Thorpe Co. (S.D. Tex.)	2002
A-Best Products	2002
Western MacArthur/Western Asbestos	2002
C.E. Thurston	2003
Combustion Engineering	2003
Congoleum Corp.	2003
J. Graves Insulation Co.	2003
Mid-Valley (Halliburton subsidiaries)	2003
Muralo Co.	2003
Flintkote Co./Flintkote Mines	2004
Oglebay Norton Co. (ONCO)	2004
Special Electric	2004
Quigley Co.	2004
Utex Industries	2004
JT Thorpe, Inc. (C.D. Cal.)	2004
API, Inc.	2005
Lake Asbestos of Quebec, Ltd.	2005

Company	Year
Asarco ¹	2005
Brauer Supply Co.	2005
Dana Corporation	2006
ABB Lummus Global	2006
Lloyd E. Mitchell Co.	2006
Thorpe Insulation Co.	2007
Pacific Insulation Co. ²	2007
Schutte & Koerting, Inc.	2007
Hercules Chemical Co.	2008
Christy Refractories Co. LLC	2008
T H Agriculture & Nutrition, LLC	2008
Plant Insulation Co.	2009
General Motors Corp.	2009
Durabla Manufacturing Co. ³	2009
Bondex International, Inc. and Specialty Products Holding Corp. ⁴	2010
Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC, The Anchor Packing Company; Garrison Litigation Management Group Ltd.	2010
Leslie Controls, Inc.	2010
Triple A Machine Shop, Inc.	2010
Pulmosan Safety Equipment Corp.	2010
State Insulation Corp.	2011
United Gilsonite Laboratories	2011
C.P. Hall Company	2011
National Service Industries	2012
Henry Vogt Machine Co.	2012
Metex Mfg. Corp.	2012
Overseas Shipholding Group, Inc.	2012
Dowman Products, Inc.	2013
Resillo Press Pad Co.	2013
Rapid-American Corp.	2013
A.L. Burbank & Co., Ltd.	2013

¹ Three subsidiaries of Asarco – AR Sacaton LLC; Southern Peru Holdings, LLC; and Asarco Exploration Company – filed for Chapter 11 on December 12, 2006, citing asbestos exposure.

² Pacific Insulation Co. is related to Thorpe Insulation Co., which filed two weeks earlier in the same court.

³ An affiliate of Durabla – Durabla Canada Ltd. – filed for Chapter 11 on November 8, 2010, citing asbestos exposure.

⁴ Two affiliates of Bondex and SPHC – NMBFIL, Inc., formerly known as Bondo Corporation, and Republic Powdered Metals, Inc. – filed for Chapter 11 on August 15, 2014 and August 31, 2014, respectively.

Company	Year
Saberhagen Holdings	2013
Yarway Corporation	2013
Consolidated Aluminum Corp.	2013
Budd Company	2014
Energy Future Holdings Corp.	2014
Reichhold Holdings US, Inc.; Reichhold, Inc.; Canadyne Corp.; Canadyne-Georgia Corp.	2014
Oakfabco, Inc.	2015
Eagle, Inc.	2015
Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc.	2015
Sepco Corporation	2016



CHART 2:
COMPANY NAME AND YEAR OF BANKRUPTCY FILING
(ALPHABETIZED)

Company	Year
ABB Lummus Global	2006
A-Best Products	2002
ACandS, Inc.	2002
A.L. Burbank & Co., Ltd.	2013
Amatex Corp.	1982
American Shipbuilding Co.	1993
Anchor Packing Company	2010
Ancor Holdings Inc./National Gypsum	1990
API, Inc.	2005
Armstrong World Industries	2000
Artra Group, Inc.	2002
Asarco, Inc. ¹	2005
Asbestos Claims Management Corp.	2002

¹ Three subsidiaries of Asarco – AR Sacaton LLC; Southern Peru Holdings, LLC; and Asarco Exploration Company – filed for Chapter 11 on December 12, 2006, citing asbestos exposure.

Company	Year
Babcock & Wilcox Co.	2000
Bondex International, Inc. and Specialty Products Holding Corp. ²	2010
Brauer Supply Co.	2005
Brunswick Fabricators	1998
Budd Company	2014
Burns & Roe	2001
Carey Canada, Inc.	1990
Celotex Corp.	1990
C.E. Thurston	2003
Chicago Fire Brick	2001
Christy Refractories Co. LLC	2008
Combustion Engineering	2003
Congoleum Corp.	2003
Consolidated Aluminum Corp.	2013
C.P. Hall Company	2011
Dana Corporation	2006
Delaware Insulations Distributors	1989
Dowman Products, Inc.	2013
Durabla Manufacturing Co. ³	2009
Eagle, Inc.	2015
Eagle Picher Industries	1991
EJ Bartells Co., Inc.	2001
Energy Future Holdings Corp.	2014
Federal Mogul Corp.	2001
Flintkote Co.	2004
Flintkote Mines Ltd.	2004
Forty-Eight Insulations	1985
Fuller-Austin Insulation Co.	1998
Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC ⁴	2010
Gatke Corp.	1987
General Motors Corp.	2009
Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc.	2015

² Two affiliates of Bondex and SPHC – NMBFIL, Inc., formerly known as Bondo Corporation, and Republic Powdered Metals, Inc. – filed for Chapter 11 on August 15, 2014 and August 31, 2014, respectively.

³ An affiliate of Durabla – Durabla Canada Ltd. – filed for Chapter 11 on November 8, 2010, citing asbestos exposure.

⁴ Garlock filed along with its affiliates The Anchor Packing Company and Garrison Litigation Management Group Ltd.

Company	Year
G-I Holdings	2001
GIT/Harbison-Walker/AP Green	2002
Harnischfeger Corp.	1999
Henry Vogt Machine Co.	2012
Hercules Chemical Co.	2008
Hillsborough Holdings	1989
H.K. Porter Co., Inc.	1991
Insul Co.	2001
J. Graves Insulation Co.	2003
Johns-Manville Corp.	1982
JT Thorpe (S.D. Tex.)	2002
JT Thorpe (C.D. Cal.)	2004
Kaiser Aluminum Corp.	2002
Keene Corp.	1993
Kentile Floors, Inc.	1992
Lake Asbestos of Quebec, Ltd.	2005
Leslie Controls, Inc.	2010
Lloyd E. Mitchell Co.	2006
McLean Industries	1986
Metex Mfg. Corp.	2012
M.H. Detrick	1998
Mid-Valley (Halliburton subsidiaries)	2003
The Muralo Co., Inc.	2003
Murphy Marine Services, Inc.	2001
National Gypsum Co.	1990
National Service Industries	2012
North American Refractories Co. (NARCO)	2002
Nicolet, Inc.	1987
Oakfabco, Inc.	2015
Oglebay Norton (ONCO)	2004
Overseas Shipholding Group, Inc.	2012
Owens Corning/Fibreboard	2000
Pacific Insulation Co. ⁵	2007

⁵ Pacific Insulation Co. is related to Thorpe Insulation Co., which filed two weeks earlier in the same court.

Company	Year
Philadelphia Asbestos Corp. (Pacor)	1986
Pittsburgh Corning	2000
Plant Insulation Co.	2009
Plibrico Co.	2002
Porter-Hayden Co.	2002
Prudential Lines, Inc.	1986
Pulmosan Safety Equipment Corp.	2010
Quigley Co.	2004
Rapid-American Corp.	2013
Raymark Corp./Raytech Corp.	1989
Reichhold Holdings US, Inc.; Reichhold, Inc.; Canadyne Corp.; Canadyne-Georgia Corp.	2014
Resillo Press Pad Co.	2013
Rock Wool Manufacturing	1996
Rutland Fire Clay Co.	1999
Saberhagen Holdings	2013
Schutte & Koerting, Inc.	2007
Sepco Corporation	2016
Shook & Fletcher Insulation Co.	2002
Skinner Engine Co.	2001
Special Electric Co.	2004
Special Metals Corp.	2002
Standard Insulations, Inc.	1986
State Insulation Corp.	2011
Swan Transportation Co.	2001
T H Agriculture & Nutrition, LLC	2008
Thorpe Insulation Co.	2007
Todd Shipyards	1987
Triple A Machine Shop, Inc.	2010
Unarco Industries, Inc.	1982
United Gilsonite Laboratories	2011
United States Lines	1986
United States Mineral Products	2001
UNR Industries, Inc.	1982
USG Corp.	2001

Company	Year
Utex Industries	2004
Wallace & Gale	1984
Waterman Steamship Corp.	1983
Western Macarthur	2002
W.R. Grace Co.	2001
Yarway Corporation	2013



**CHART 3:
COMPANY NAME, CASE NO., COURT,
PLAN STATUS & PUBLISHED DECISIONS**

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
ABB Lummus Global, Inc.	No. 06-10401-JKF (Bankr. D. Del.)	Prepackaged plan of reorganization confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 29, 2006 and by the district court on July 21, 2006.	
A-Best Products	No. 02-12734-JKF (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 25, 2004 and by the district court on June 7, 2004.	
ACandS, Inc.	No. 02-12687 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan denied confirmation by the bankruptcy court on January 26, 2004. Debtor's revised second plan of reorganization approved by the bankruptcy court on May 6, 2008; district court affirmation order entered on June 27, 2008.	<i>ACandS, Inc. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> , 435 F.3d 252 (3d Cir. 2006); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 311 B.R. 36 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 297 B.R. 36 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 297 B.R. 395 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003). See also <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, USG, United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases).
A.L. Burbank & Co., Ltd.	No. 13-11147 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Chapter 7 petition filed April 12, 2013.	
Amatex Corp.	No. 82-05220 (Bankr. E.D. Pa.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on April 25, 1990.	<i>In re Amatex Corp.</i> , 755 F.2d 1034 (3d Cir. 1985); <i>Amatex Corp. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> (<i>In re Amatex Corp.</i>), 107 B.R. 856 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1989), <i>aff'd</i> , 908 F.2d 961 (3d Cir. 1990); <i>Amatex Corp. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> (<i>In re Amatex Corp.</i>), 97 B.R. 220 (Bankr. E.D. Pa.), <i>aff'd sub nom. Amatex Corp. v. Stonewall Ins. Co.</i> , 102 B.R. 411 (E.D. Pa. 1989); <i>In re Amatex Corp.</i> , 37 B.R. 613 (E.D. Pa. 1983).

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
American Shipbuilding Co.	No. 93-11552 (Bankr. M.D. Fla.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on October 11, 1994.	
A.P.I., Inc.	No. 05-30073 (Bankr. D. Minn.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 6, 2005; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on May 25, 2006; appeal to the Eighth Circuit (No. 06-2421) dismissed.	<i>Faricy Law Firm v. A.P.I., Inc. Asbestos Settlement Trust (In re A.P.I., Inc.)</i> , 537 B.R. 902 (Bankr. D. Minn. 2015); <i>In re A.P.I., Inc.</i> , 331 B.R. 828 (Bankr. D. Minn. 2005), <i>aff'd sub nom. OneBeacon American Ins. Co. v. A.P.I., Inc.</i> , 2006 WL 1473004 (D. Minn. May 25, 2006); <i>In re A.P.I., Inc.</i> , 324 B.R. 761 (Bankr. D. Minn. 2005).
Armstrong World Industries	No. 00-4471 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan recommended for confirmation by bankruptcy court on December 19, 2003; confirmation denied by district court on February 23, 2005; district court's order denying confirmation affirmed by the Third Circuit on December 29, 2005. Amended post-remand plan filed February 21, 2006. District court entered an opinion and order confirming the plan on August 15, 2006.	<i>In re Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 432 F.3d 507 (3d Cir. 2005), <i>aff'g In re Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 320 B.R. 523 (D. Del. 2005); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 368 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2004) (also applicable to the <i>Federal-Mogul, Owens Corning, USG Corp.</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 353 F.3d 211 (3d Cir. 2003) (also applicable to the <i>Federal-Mogul, Owens Corning, USG Corp.</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 348 B.R. 136 (D. Del. 2006); <i>In re Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 348 B.R. 111 (D. Del. 2006); <i>In re Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 320 B.R. 523 (D. Del. 2005); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). See also <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, USG, United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>Maertin v. Armstrong World Indus., Inc.</i> , 241 F. Supp.2d 434 (D.N.J. 2002); <i>Wise v. Travelers Indem. Co.</i> , 192 F. Supp.2d 506 (N.D. W.Va. 2002).
Artra Group, Inc.	No. 02-21522 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on January 25, 2007 and by the district court on February 16, 2007.	<i>In re Artra Group, Inc.</i> , 308 B.R. 858 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2003); <i>Official Comm. Of Unsecured Creditors of Artra Group, Inc. v. Artra Group, Inc. (In re Artra Group, Inc.)</i> , 300 B.R. 699 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2003).
Asarco, LLC	No. 05-21207 (Bankr. S.D. Tex.)	Two competing plans were presented to the bankruptcy court during the confirmation hearing: (i) the seventh amended plan of reorganization of Debtors' estranged parent, Asarco, Inc., as modified on August 27, 2009; and (ii) Debtors' sixth amended plan of reorganization, as modified August 27, 2009. Consideration of a third competing plan, filed by Harbinger Capital, a bondholder of Asarco LLC, was abated on Harbinger's motion. The bankruptcy court confirmation hearing concluded on August 28, 2009. On August 31, 2009, the bankruptcy judge issued a report and recommendation recommending confirmation of the Parent's plan. Debtors appealed the report and recommendation to the District Court. On September 10, 2009, Debtors filed further modifications to their sixth plan of	<i>Baker Botts LLP v. ASARCO LLC</i> , 135 S.Ct. 2158 (2015); <i>In re ASARCO, LLC</i> , 751 F.3d 291 (5th Cir. 2014), <i>aff'd, Baker Botts LLP v. ASARCO LLC</i> , 2135 S.Ct. 2158 (2015); <i>ASARCO, LLC v. Barclays Capital, Inc. (In re ASARCO, LLC)</i> , 702 F.3d 250 (5th Cir. 2012); <i>ASARCO, Inc. v. Elliot Management (In re ASARCO, LLC)</i> , 650 F.3d 593 (5th Cir. 2011); <i>United Steel, Paper and Forestry, etc. Service Workers Int'l Union AFL-CIO v. Asarco Incorporated (In re ASARCO LLC)</i> , 401 Fed. Appx. 914 (5th Cir. 2010); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Baker Botts L.L.P. (In re ASARCO LLC)</i> , 477 B.R. 661 (S.D. Tex. 2012); <i>In re ASARCO LLC</i> , 441 B.R. 813 (S.D. Tex. 2010), <i>aff'd, ASARCO, Inc. v. Elliot Management (In re ASARCO, LLC)</i> , 650 F.3d 593 (5th Cir. 2011); <i>In re ASARCO LLC</i> , 513 B.R. 499 (S.D. Tex. 2012); <i>ASARCO, LLC v. Barclays Capital Inc. (In re ASARCO LLC)</i> , 457 B.R. 575 (S.D. Tex.

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
		reorganization. On September 24, 2009, the bankruptcy judge issued a report and recommendation reiterating, in the face of Debtors' September 10 supplemental filing, that the Parent's plan should be confirmed. On November 13, 2009, the district court entered an order confirming the Parent's plan. Appeals to the Fifth Circuit were dismissed by that court as equitably moot on November 12, 2010.	2011); <i>In re ASARCO LLC</i> , 420 B.R. 314 (S.D. Tex. 2009); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Americas Mining Corp.</i> , 419 B.R. 737 (S.D. Tex. 2009); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Americas Mining Corp.</i> , 404 B.R. 150 (S.D. Tex. 2009); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Americas Mining Corp.</i> , 396 B.R. 278 (S.D. Tex. 2008); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Americas Mining Corp.</i> , 382 B.R. 49 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2007). <i>See also ASARCO LLC v. Celanese Chemical Co.</i> , 792 F.3d 1203 (9th Cir. 2015); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Union Pac. R. Co.</i> , 765 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2014); <i>ASARCO LLC v. Union Pac. R. Co.</i> , 755 F.3d 1183 (10th Cir. 2014); <i>Center for Biological Diversity v. Dept. of the Interior</i> , 623 F.3d 633 (9th Cir. 2010).
Asbestos Claims Management Corp.	No. 02-37124 (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 6, 2003 and by the district court on June 5, 2003.	<i>In re Asbestos Claims Mgt. Corp.</i> , 294 B.R. 663 (N.D. Tex. 2003).
Babcock & Wilcox Co.	No. 00-10992 (Bankr. E.D. La.)	Plan recommended for confirmation by the bankruptcy court December 28, 2005, confirmed by the district court January 17, 2006.	<i>Caplin & Drysdale Chtd. v. Babcock & Wilcox Co. (In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.)</i> , 526 F.3d 824 (5th Cir. 2008); <i>Amer. Nuclear Insurers v. The Babcock & Wilcox Co. (In re The Babcock & Wilcox Co.)</i> , 69 Fed. Appx. 659 (5th Cir. 2003); <i>Clyde Bergemann, Inc. v. The Babcock & Wilcox Co. (In re The Babcock & Wilcox Co.)</i> , 250 F.3d 955 (5th Cir. 2001); <i>In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i> , 425 B.R. 266 (E.D. La. 2010), <i>vacating and remanding In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i> , 413 B.R. 337 (Bankr. E.D. La. 2009), <i>vacated</i> , 425 B.R. 266 (E.D. La. 2010); <i>The Babcock & Wilcox Co. v. Southern Indiana Gas & Elec. Co. (In re The Babcock & Wilcox Co.)</i> , 316 B.R. 62 (Bankr. E.D. La. 2003); <i>In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i> , 274 B.R. 230 (Bankr. E.D. La. 2002); <i>Wilcox Constr. Co. v. Babcock & Wilcox Co. (In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.)</i> , 250 F.3d 955 (5th Cir. 2001). <i>See also Babcock & Wilcox Co. v. McGriff, Seibels & Williams, Inc.</i> , 235 F.R.D. 632 (E.D. La. 2006).
Brauer Supply Co.	No. 05-51754 (Bankr. E.D. Mo.)	Plan confirmed by bankruptcy court on December 8, 2006 and confirmed by the district court on January 5, 2007.	
Budd Company	No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Chapter 11 petition filed March 31, 2014. Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 27, 2016.	<i>In re The Budd Co., Inc.</i> , 550 B.R. 407 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2016); <i>In re The Budd Co., Inc.</i> , 540 B.R. 353 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2015); <i>In re The Budd Co., Inc.</i> , 512 B.R. 910 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2014).
Burns & Roe	No. 00-41610 (Bankr. D.N.J.)	Plan confirmed by the district court on February 23, 2009.	
Carey Canada, Inc.	Nos. 90-10016-8B1, 90-10017-8B1 (Bankr. M.D. Fla.)	Joint plan of reorganization with Celotex Corp. confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 6, 1996 and by the district court on March 4, 1997.	<i>See Celotex-related decisions.</i>
Celotex Corp.	Nos. 90-10016-8B1, 90-10017-8B1 (Bankr. M.D. Fla.)	Joint plan of reorganization with Carey Canada confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 6, 1996 and by the district court on March 4, 1997.	<i>Michigan State Univ. v. Asbestos Settlement Trust (In re Celotex Corp.)</i> , 700 F.3d 1262 (11th Cir. 2012); <i>Property Damage Advisory Comm. v. Celotex Asbestos Settlement Trust (In re Celotex Corp.)</i> , 497 Fed. Appx. 896 (11th Cir. 2012); <i>Southern Wesleyan Univ. v. Asbestos Settlement Trust (In re Celotex Corp.)</i> , 496 Fed. Appx. 3 (11th Cir. 2012); <i>Claremont McKenna College v. Asbestos Settlement Trust (In re Celotex Corp.)</i> , 613 F.3d 1318 (11th

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<p>Cir. 2010); <i>Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Continental Ins. Co. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 299 Fed. Appx. 850 (11th Cir. 2008); <i>Asbestos Settlement Trust v. City of New York (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 487 F.3d 1320 (11th Cir. 2007); <i>Fibreboard Corp. v. Celotex Corp. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 472 F.3d 1318 (11th Cir. 2006); <i>Dana Corp. v. Celotex Asbestos Settlement Trust</i>, 251 F.3d 1107 (6th Cir. 2001); <i>Owens-Illinois, Inc. v. Rapid Am. Corp. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 124 F.3d 619 (4th Cir. 1997); <i>Hillsborough Holdings Corp. v. Celotex Corp.</i>, 123 B.R. 1018 (M.D. Fla. 1990); <i>Southern Wesleyan Univ. v. Andrews (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 427 B.R. 909 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2010), <i>aff'd</i>, 496 Fed. Appx. 3 (11th Cir. 2012); <i>Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Anderson Mem. Hosp. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 380 B.R. 895 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2008); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 380 B.R. 623 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2007); <i>Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Port Auth. Of NY & NJ (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 377 B.R. 345 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2006); <i>Celotex Corp. v. Allstate Ins. Co. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 336 B.R. 833 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2005); <i>Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Utah (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 330 B.R. 815 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2005); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 289 B.R. 460 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2003); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 245 B.R. 174 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2000); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 224 B.R. 853 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1998); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 204 B.R. 586 (M.D. Fla. 1996); <i>Celotex Corp. v. AUI Ins. Co. (In re Celotex Corp.)</i>, 187 B.R. 746 (M.D. Fla. 1995); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 152 B.R. 667 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1993); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 152 B.R. 661 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1993); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 149 B.R. 997 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1993); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 140 B.R. 912 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1992); <i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>, 123 B.R. 917 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1991); <i>Hillsborough Holdings Corp. v. Celotex Corp. (In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.)</i>, 123 B.R. 1004 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1990).</p>
C.E. Thurston	No. 03-75932-SCS (Bankr. E.D. Va.)	Plan confirmed by the district court March 30, 2006.	
Chicago Fire Brick	No. 01-45483 (Bankr. N.D. Cal.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court September 7, 2012.	
Christy Refractories Co. LLC	No. 08-48541 (Bankr. E.D. Mo.)	On July 13, 2011, the bankruptcy court issued an order confirming the First Amended Plan and recommending that the district court issue the 524(g) injunctions. On August 19, 2011, the district court entered an order issuing the 524(g) injunctions.	
Combustion Engineering	No. 03-10495 (Bankr. D. Del.)	<p>Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 23, 2003 and by the district court on August 13, 2003; confirmation order vacated by the Third Circuit on December 2, 2004.</p> <p>Modified post-remand plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 19, 2005; district court order affirming the bankruptcy court's confirmation order entered on March 1, 2006.</p>	<p><i>In re Combustion Eng'g, Inc.</i>, 391 F.3d 190 (3d Cir. 2004); <i>Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's, London v. ABB Lummus Global, Inc.</i>, 337 B.R. 22 (S.D.N.Y. 2005); <i>TIG Ins. Co. v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc. (In re Combustion Eng'g, Inc.)</i>, 366 F. Supp.2d 224 (D. Del. 2005); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i>, 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO, and Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>In re Combustion Eng'g, Inc.</i>, 295 B.R. 459 (Bankr. D. Del.</p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			2003), <i>rev'd</i> , <i>In re Combustion Eng'g, Inc.</i> , 391 F.3d 190 (3d Cir. 2004); <i>Pre-Petition Comm. of Select Asbestos Claimants v. Combustion Eng'g, Inc. (In re Combustion Eng'g, Inc.)</i> , 292 B.R. 515 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003). See also <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Armstrong, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, USG, United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases).
Congoleum Corp.	No. 03-51524 (Bankr. D.N.J.)	<p>On February 1, 2007, the bankruptcy court docketed opinions and orders finding debtors' tenth plan and the CNA insurers' second plan unconfirmable as a matter of law. On June 5, 2008, the bankruptcy court issued an opinion finding an amended proposed plan of reorganization filed on February 5, 2008 by debtors, future claimants' representative, and the official bondholder's committee the plan unconfirmable as a matter of law. On February 26, 2009, the bankruptcy court issued an opinion finding an amended joint plan filed on November 14, 2008 by debtors, the official bondholder's committee, and the official committee of asbestos claimants unconfirmable as a matter of law, and stating that the Chapter 11 case would be dismissed as of March 18, 2009. The bankruptcy court stayed its dismissal order pending appeal on March 3, 2009.</p> <p>On August 17, 2009, the district court entered an order reversing in part and affirming in part the bankruptcy court's order denying confirmation of the plan, reversing and vacating the bankruptcy court's order dismissing the Chapter 11 case, and withdrawing the reference as to all future proceedings in the bankruptcy case. On September 24, 2009, certain insurers filed an appeal of the district court's order. On October 5, 2009, the district court issued an opinion and order refusing to certify the appeal for interlocutory review.</p> <p>On June 7, 2010, the District Court confirmed the Fourth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization filed by Debtors, the ACC, the FCR, and the official committee of bondholders on March 11, 2010. An appeal to the Third Circuit by certain claimants (No. 10-3011) was dismissed as "equitably moot" on October 7, 2010.</p>	<p><i>Century Indem. Co. v. Congoleum Corp. (In re Congoleum Corp.)</i>, 426 F.3d 675 (3d Cir. 2005); <i>In re Congoleum Corp.</i>, 414 B.R. 44 (D.N.J. 2009); <i>Baron & Budd, P.C. v. Unsecured Asbestos Claimants Comm. (In re Congoleum Corp.)</i>, 321 B.R. 147 (D.N.J. 2005); <i>In re Congoleum Corp.</i>, 362 B.R. 198 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2007); <i>In re Congoleum Corp.</i>, 362 B.R. 167 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2007).</p>
Consolidated Aluminum Corp.	No. 13-37149 (Bankr. D.N.J.)	Chapter 11 plan of liquidation confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 5, 2014. Appeal by U.S. Trustee resolved by consent, and amended confirmation order entered July 28, 2014.	
C.P. Hall Company	No. 11-26443 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Petition filed June 24, 2011. Converted to Chapter 7 on October 22, 2012.	<p><i>In re C.P. Hall Co. (Appeal of Columbia Cas. Co.)</i>, 750 F.3d 659 (7th Cir. 2014); <i>Shipley v. Cooney & Conway Creditors (In re C.P. Hall Co.)</i>, 506 B.R. 751 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2014).</p>
Dana Corporation	No. 06-10354 (BRL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by bankruptcy court December 26, 2007; appeals by certain asbestos claimants dismissed by the district court on September 30, 2008; remaining	<p><i>Jasco Tools, Inc. v. Dana Corp. (In re Dana Corp.)</i>, 574 F.3d 129 (2d Cir. 2009); <i>Ad Hoc Comm. Of Personal Injury Asbestos Claimants v. Dana Corp. (In re Dana Corp.)</i>, 412 B.R. 53</p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
		appeal by one asbestos claimant dismissed by the Second Circuit on December 23, 2008.	(S.D.N.Y. 2008); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 379 B.R. 449 (S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 390 B.R. 100 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2008); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 367 B.R. 409 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 358 B.R. 567 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 351 B.R. 96 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 350 B.R. 144 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006); <i>In re Dana Corp.</i> , 344 B.R. 35 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006).
Delaware Insulations Distributors	No. 89-00295 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on September 9, 1992.	
Dowman Products, Inc.	No. 8:13-bk-19741-ES (Bankr. C.D. Cal.)	Chapter 7 petition filed January 25, 2013.	
Durabla Manufacturing Co.	No. 09-14415-MFW (Bankr. D. Del.)	On June 27, 2012, the bankruptcy court issued an order confirming the plan and recommending that the district court issue the 524(g) injunction. On August 2, 2012, the district court issued an order affirming the bankruptcy court's confirmation order and issuing the 524(g) injunction.	
Eagle, Inc.	No. 15-12437	Chapter 11 petition filed September 22, 2015. Plan of reorganization filed September 13, 2016.	
Eagle-Picher Industries	No. 91-10100 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio) No. 05-12601 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy and district courts on November 18, 1996. Company filed a new bankruptcy petition on April 11, 2005. Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 28, 2006.	<i>Caradon Doors & Windows, Inc. v. Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i> (<i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i>), 447 F.3d 461 (3d Cir. 2006); <i>American Imaging Services, Inc. v. Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i> (<i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i>), 963 F.2d 855 (6th Cir. 1992); <i>In re Eagle-Picher Holdings, Inc.</i> , 345 B.R. 860 (S.D. Ohio 2006); <i>Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors v. Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i> (<i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus., Inc.</i>), 169 B.R. 130 (S.D. Ohio 1994); <i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus.</i> , 203 B.R. 256 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1996), <i>aff'd</i> , 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17160 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 18, 1996), <i>aff'd without op.</i> , 172 F.3d 48 (6th Cir. 1998); <i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus.</i> , 189 B.R. 681 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1995), <i>aff'd</i> , 1996 U.S. Dist. Lexis 22742 (S.D. Ohio 1996); <i>In re Eagle-Picher Indus.</i> , 144 B.R. 69 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1992).
E.J. Bartells Co., Inc.	No. 00-10390 (Bankr. W.D. Wash.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on February 14, 2001.	
Energy Future Holdings Corp.	No. 14-10979 (CSS)	Petition filed April 29, 2014. Plan filed April 14, 2015. Amended plans filed July 23, August 3, August 10, September 18, September 21, and December 1, 2015. Disclosure statement approved September 21, 2015. Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 7, 2015.	<i>Marathon Asset Mgt., LP v. Wilmington Trust, N.A.</i> (<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>), 548 B.R. 790 (D. Del. 2016); <i>Delaware Trust Co. v. Energy Future Intermediate Holding Co. LLC</i> (<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>), 527 B.R. 160 (D. Del. 2015); <i>Delaware Trust Co. v. Computershare Trust Co.</i> (<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>), 551 B.R. 550 (Bankr. D. Del. 2016); <i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i> , 540 B.R. 109 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i> , 540 B.R. 96 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>Computershare Trust Co. v. Energy Future Intermediate Holding Co. LLC</i> (<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>), 539 B.R. 723 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>Delaware Trust Co. v. Energy Future Intermediate Holding Co. LLC</i> (<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>), 533 B.R. 106 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>Energy Future Intermediate Holding Co. LLC v. UMB Banker, N.A.</i> (<i>In re</i>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<p><i>Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>, 531 B.R. 499 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>Delaware Trust Co. v. Energy Future Intermediate Holding Co. LLC (In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.)</i>, 527 B.R. 178 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015); <i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.</i>, 522 B.R. 520 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015).</p>
Federal-Mogul	No. 01-10578 (Bankr. D. Del.)	<p>Plan confirmed by bankruptcy court on November 8, 2007; confirmation order affirmed by district court on November 15, 2007.</p> <p>Opinion and order declining confirmation of alternative "Plan B" entered by the bankruptcy court on September 30, 2008.</p>	<p><i>Barraford v. T&N Ltd.</i>, 778 F.3d 258 (1st Cir. 2015); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global Inc.</i>, 684 F.3d 355 (3d Cir. 2012); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i>, 368 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2004) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Owens Corning, USG Corp.</i>, and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i>, 353 F.3d 211 (3d Cir. 2003) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Owens Corning, USG Corp.</i>, and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 300 F.3d 368 (3d Cir. 2002); <i>PepsiAmericas, Inc. v. Federal-Mogul Global, Inc. (In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.)</i>, 526 B.R. 567 (D. Del. 2015), <i>aff'd In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 438 B.R. 767 (Bankr. D. Del. 2010); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 402 B.R. 625 (D. Del. 2009), <i>aff'd In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 385 B.R. 560 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 330 B.R. 133 (D. Del. 2005); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 438 B.R. 787 (Bankr. D. Del. 2010), <i>aff'd, PepsiAmericas, Inc. v. Federal-Mogul Global, Inc. (In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.)</i>, 526 B.R. 567 (D. Del. 2015); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 411 B.R. 148 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 385 B.R. 560 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>In re Federal-Mogul Global, Inc.</i>, 282 B.R. 301 (Bankr. D. Del.), <i>mandamus denied</i>, 300 F.3d 368 (3d Cir. 2002), <i>cert. denied</i>, 537 U.S. 1148 (2003). <i>See also Federal-Mogul U.S. Asbestos Personal Injury Trust v. Continental Cas. Co.</i>, 666 F.3d 384 (6th Cir. 2011); <i>Arnold v. Garlock</i>, 278 F.3d 426 (5th Cir. 2001).</p>
Flintkote Co.	No. 04-11300 (JKF) (Bankr. D. Del.)	<p>Plan confirmed by bankruptcy court on December 21, 2012 and by the district court on July 10, 2014. The district court's affirmation order was been appealed to the Third Circuit by Imperial Tobacco. On February 9, 2015, Plan Proponents submitted a modified plan that incorporates a settlement with Imperial Tobacco. The bankruptcy court confirmed that modified plan on August 10, 2015. The district court adopted and affirmed the bankruptcy court's confirmation order on August 13, 2015.</p>	<p><i>Flintkote Co. v. Aviva PLC</i>, 769 F.3d 215 (3d Cir. 2014); <i>8 E. Frederick Place, LLC v. The Flintkote Co. (In re The Flintkote Co.)</i>, 533 B.R. 887 (D. Del. 2015); <i>Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. v. The Flintkote Co. (In re The Flintkote Co.)</i>, 526 B.R. 515 (D. Del. 2014), <i>aff'd In re Flintkote Co.</i>, 486 B.R. 99 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012); <i>Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. v. The Flintkote Co. (In re The Flintkote Co.)</i>, 471 B.R. 95 (D. Del. 2012); <i>Hopkins v. Plant Insulation Co.</i>, 342 B.R. 703 (D. Del. 2006); <i>Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's, London v. Future Asbestos Claims Representative (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 327 B.R. 554 (D. Del. 2005) (consolidated with <i>London Mkt. Ins. Cos. v. Baron & Budd PC (In re The Flintkote Co.)</i>; <i>In re Flintkote Co.</i>, 486 B.R. 99 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012), <i>aff'd, Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd. v. The Flintkote Co. (In re The Flintkote Co.)</i>, 526 B.R. 515 (D. Del. 2014); <i>In re Flintkote Co.</i>, 475 B.R. 400 (Bankr. D. Del. 2012), <i>aff'd</i>, 533 B.R. 887 (D. Del. 2015); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i>, 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S.</i></p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<i>Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO, and Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). See also <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, USG, United States Mineral Products, and W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>Flintkote Co. v. Gen'l Acc. Assur. Co.</i> , 480 F. Supp.2d 1167 (N.D. Cal. 2007); <i>Flintkote Co. v. Gen'l Acc. Assur. Co.</i> , 410 F. Supp.2d 875 (N.D. Cal. 2006); <i>Hopkins v. Plant Insulation Co.</i> , 349 B.R. 805 (N.D. Cal. 2006); <i>Hopkins v. Plant Insulation Co.</i> , 342 B.R. 703 (D. Del. 2006).
Forty-Eight Insulations	No. 85-B-05061 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Plan of liquidation confirmed by bankruptcy court on May 16, 1995.	<i>In re Forty-Eight Insulations</i> , 115 F.3d 1294 (7th Cir. 1997); <i>In re Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc.</i> , 133 B.R. 973 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1991), <i>aff'd</i> , 149 B.R. 860 (N.D. Ill. 1992); <i>In re Forty-Eight Insulations, Inc.</i> , 109 B.R. 315 (N.D. Ill. 1989).
Fuller-Austin Insulation Co.	No. 98-02038 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the district court, sitting in bankruptcy, on November 13, 1998.	See <i>Fuller-Austin Insulation Co. v. Highlands Ins. Co.</i> , 135 Cal. App.4th 958, 38 Cal. Rptr.3d 716 (2006), <i>cert. denied</i> , 127 S. Ct. 248 (2006).
Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC	No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C.)	Petition filed June 5, 2010. Co-debtors are The Anchor Packing Company and Garrison Litigation Management Group Ltd. Debtors filed First Amended Plan of Reorganization on May 29, 2014. On May 20, 2016, the debtors filed a plan of reorganization for themselves and "Oldco, LLC," a company that will be a successor by merger to Coltec Industries LLC and that is expected to soon commence its own Chapter 11 case. On June 21, 2016 and then again on July 29, 2016, the debtors and "Oldco" filed a modified joint plan.	<i>In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, Inc.</i> , 504 B.R. 71 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. 2014). See <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013).
Gatke Corp.	No. 87-30308 (Bankr. N.D. Ind.)	Second amended plan of liquidation filed August 17, 1989; case converted to Chapter 7 on August 9, 1991.	
General Motors Corp. (n/k/a Motors Liquidation Co.)	No. 09-50026 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Petition filed June 1, 2009. Asbestos Claimants' Committee appointed March 2, 2010. Debtors' motion for appointment of an FCR granted April 8, 2010. Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan filed December 7, 2010. Motion to estimate Debtors' asbestos liabilities filed November 15, 2010. Stipulation estimating Debtors' asbestos liability at \$625 million filed January 21, 2011. Bankruptcy court confirmed the plan on March 29, 2011.	<i>In re Motors Liquidation Corp.</i> , ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3766237 (2d Cir. 2016); <i>Castillo v. General Motors Corp. (In re Motors Liquidation Co.)</i> , 500 B.R. 333 (S.D.N.Y. 2013); <i>U.S. Dep't of the Treasury v. Official Comm. Of Unsecured Creditors of Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 475 B.R. 347 (S.D.N.Y. 2012); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 439 B.R. 339 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 436 B.R. 752 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>In re General Motors Corp.</i> , 430 B.R. 65 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>In re General Motors Corp.</i> , 428 B.R. 43 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>Motors Liquidation Company Avoidance Action Trust v. JPMorgan Case Bank, N.A. (In re Motors Liquidation Co.)</i> , 552 B.R. 253 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 549 B.R. 607 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 541 B.R. 104 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 539 B.R. 676 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 536 B.R. 54 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 534 B.R. 538 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i> , 533 B.R. 46 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<p>2015); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 531 B.R. 354 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part, vacated in part, and remanded</i>, <i>In re Motors Liquidation Corp.</i>, ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3766237 (2d Cir. 2016); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 529 B.R. 510 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part, vacated in part, and remanded</i>, <i>In re Motors Liquidation Corp.</i>, ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3766237 (2d Cir. 2016); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 522 B.R. 13 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2014); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 514 B.R. 377 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2014), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part, vacated in part, and remanded</i>, <i>In re Motors Liquidation Corp.</i>, ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3766237 (2d Cir. 2016); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 513 B.R. 467 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2014); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 460 B.R. 603 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011), <i>vacated</i>, 475 B.R. 347 (S.D.N.Y. 2012); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 447 B.R. 150 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011); <i>In re Motors Liquidation Co.</i>, 438 B.R. 365 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>In re General Motors Corp.</i>, 409 B.R. 24 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2009); <i>In re General Motors Corp.</i>, 407 B.R. 463 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2009), <i>aff'd</i>, 428 B.R. 43 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) and 430 B.R. 65 (S.D.N.Y. 2010).</p>
Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc.	No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Chapter 11 petition filed October 8, 2015.	
G-I Holdings	Nos. 01-30135 [RG] and 01-38790 [RG] (Bankr. D.N.J.)	Order confirming the plan jointly issued by the bankruptcy court and district court on November 12, 2009. On December 17, 2009, after Debtor claimed that it substantially consummated its plan, the Third Circuit issued a stay pending appeal (No. 09-4296). The appeal was dismissed on December 28, 2011 pursuant to a stipulation between the Debtor and the IRS.	<p><i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 755 F.3d 195 (3d Cir. 2014); <i>G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Reliance Ins. Co.</i>, 586 F.3d 247 (3d Cir. 2009); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants v. G-I Holdings, Inc. (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i>, 385 F.3d 313 (3d Cir. 2004); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 420 B.R. 216 (D.N.J. 2009); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants of G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Heyman</i>, 359 B.R. 452 (S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants of G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Heyman</i>, 342 B.R. 416 (S.D.N.Y. 2006); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 380 F. Supp.2d 469 (D.N.J. 2005); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants v. Bank of N.Y. (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i>, 318 B.R. 66 (D.N.J. 2004), <i>aff'd</i>, 122 Fed. Appx. 554 (3d Cir. 2004); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants of G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Heyman</i>, 306 B.R. 746 (S.D.N.Y. 2004); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 295 B.R. 502 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants v. G-I Holdings, Inc. (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i>, 295 B.R. 211 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 295 B.R. 222 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 295 B.R. 502 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 218 F.R.D. 428 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants of G-I Holdings v. Heyman</i>, 277 B.R. 20 (S.D.N.Y. 2002); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 477 B.R. 542 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2012); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 472 B.R. 263 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2012); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 443 B.R. 645 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2010); <i>Official Comm. of Asbestos Claimants v. Bldg. Mat'l's Corp. of America (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i>, 338 B.R. 232 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2006); <i>G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Bennet (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i>, 328 B.R. 691 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2005); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i>, 327 B.R. 730 (Bankr.</p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			D.N.J. 2005); <i>In re G-I Holdings</i> , 323 B.R. 583 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2005); <i>G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Those Parties Listed On Exhibit A (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i> , 313 B.R. 612 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2004); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i> , 308 B.R. 196 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2004); <i>In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i> , 292 B.R. 804 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2003); <i>G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Reliance Ins. Co. (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i> , 278 B.R. 725 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2002); <i>G-I Holdings, Inc. v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. (In re G-I Holdings, Inc.)</i> , 278 B.R. 376 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2002).
GIT/Harbison-Walker/AP Green	No. 02-21626 (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Plan approved by the bankruptcy court on November 13, 2007; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on July 25, 2008; confirmation order vacated by the Third Circuit and remanded on May 4, 2011. Following another confirmation hearing, the bankruptcy court confirmed the plan again on February 13, 2013. That order was affirmed by the district court on March 11, 2013.	<i>Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Fitzpatrick (In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.)</i> , 645 F.3d 201 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 551 (2011); <i>Global Indus. Techs., Inc. v. Ash Trucking Co. (In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.)</i> , 375 B.R. 155 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2007); <i>In re Global Indus. Techs.</i> , 344 B.R. 382 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2006); <i>Global Indus. Techs., Inc. v. Ash Trucking Co. (In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.)</i> , 333 B.R. 251 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2005); <i>Harbison-Walker Refractories Co. v. ACE Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. (In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.)</i> , 303 B.R. 753 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2004), vacated in part, modified in part by <i>In re Global Indus. Techs., Inc.</i> , 2004 WL 555418 (W.D. Pa. Feb 3, 2004). See also <i>York Linings Int'l, Inc. v. Harbison-Walker Refractories Co.</i> , 839 N.E.2d 766 (Ind. App. 2005).
Harnischfeger Corp.	No. 99-02171 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 18, 2001.	<i>In re Joy Global, Inc.</i> , 423 B.R. 445 (D. Del. 2010); <i>In re Joy Global, Inc.</i> , 381 B.R. 603 (D. Del. 2007); <i>In re Joy Global, Inc.</i> , 346 B.R. 659 (D. Del. 2006) appeal dismissed, 257 Fed. Appx. 539 (3d Cir. 2007); <i>In re Harnischfeger Indus., Inc.</i> , 270 B.R. 188 (D. Del. 2001), vacated in part and remanded, 80 Fed. Appx. 286 (3d Cir. Jul. 2, 2003); <i>In re Harnischfeger Indus., Inc.</i> , 246 B.R. 421 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 2000).
Henry Vogt Machine Co.	No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky.)	Amended plan of liquidation confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 31, 2014.	
Hercules Chemical Co.	No. 08-27822-MS (Bankr. D.N.J.)	Petition filed August 22, 2008 in the Western District of Pennsylvania. Transferred to the District of New Jersey on September 18, 2008. On December 22, 2009, the bankruptcy court recommended confirmation of Hercules' plan of reorganization. On January 6, 2010, the district court entered an order confirming the plan.	
Hillsborough Holdings	No. 89-09715 (Bankr. M.D. Fla.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on March 2, 1995.	<i>In re Hillsborough Holding Corp.</i> , 127 F.3d 1398 (11th Cir. 1997); <i>In re Hillsborough Holding Corp.</i> , 116 F.3d 1391 (11th Cir. 1997); <i>Walter Industries, Inc. v. Solutia, Inc. (In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.)</i> , 325 B.R. 334 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2005); <i>Cavazos v. Mid-State Trust II (In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.)</i> , 267 B.R. 882 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2001); <i>Walter v. Celotex Corp. (In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.)</i> , 197 B.R. 372 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1996); <i>In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.</i> , 197 B.R. 366 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1996); <i>Hillsborough Holdings Corp. v. Celotex Corp.</i> , 123 B.R. 1018 (M.D. Fla. 1990); <i>Hillsborough Holdings Corp. v. Celotex Corp. (In re Hillsborough Holdings Corp.)</i> , 123 B.R. 1004 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1990).

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
H.K. Porter Co.	No. 91-468 WWB (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Plan confirmed by the district court on June 25, 1998.	<i>Travelers Ins. Co. v. H.K. Porter Co.</i> , 45 F.3d 737 (3d Cir. 1995); <i>Continental Cas. Co. v. H.K. Porter Co. (In re H.K. Porter Co.)</i> , 379 B.R. 272 (W.D. Pa. 2007), <i>aff'g In re H.K. Porter Co.</i> , 358 B.R. 231 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2006); <i>Locks v. U.S. Trustee</i> , 157 B.R. 89 (W.D. Pa. 1993); <i>In re H.K. Porter Co.</i> , 183 B.R. 96 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1995); <i>In re H.K. Porter Co.</i> , 156 B.R. 16 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1993).
Insul Co.	No. 02-43909 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio)	Chapter 7 case; petition filed September 4, 2002; no-asset report filed May 18, 2005; case closed June 7, 2005.	
J. Graves Insulation Co.	No. 03-13475 (Bankr. W.D. La.)	Chapter 11 voluntary petition filed September 19, 2003. On motion of one of debtor's insurers, case dismissed on June 19, 2006.	
Johns-Manville Corp.	Nos. 82 B 11656 [BLR] through 82 B 11676 [BLR] (S.D.N.Y., E.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 22, 1986 and affirmed by the district court on July 15, 1987.	<i>Travelers Indem. Co. v. Bailey</i> , 557 U.S. 137 (2009); <i>Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Chubb Indem. Ins. Co. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 600 F.3d 135 (2d Cir. 2010), <i>cert. denied</i> , 131 S.Ct. 644 (U.S. 2010); <i>Johns-Manville Corp. v. Chubb Indem. Ins. Co. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 517 F.3d 52 (2d Cir. 2008), <i>rev'd</i> , 557 U.S. 137 (2009); <i>The Asbestos Personal Injury Plaintiffs v. Travelers Indem. Co. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 476 F.3d 118 (2d Cir. 2007); <i>State Gov't Creditors' Comm. for Prop. Damage Claims v. McKay (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 920 F.2d 121 (2d Cir. 1990); <i>Kane v. Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 843 F.2d 636 (2d Cir. 1988); <i>MacArthur Co. v. Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 837 F.2d 89 (2d Cir. 1988), <i>cert. denied</i> , 488 U.S. 868 (1988); <i>In re Comm. of Asbestos-Related Litigants</i> , 749 F.2d 3 (2d Cir. 1984); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 845 F. Supp.2d 584 (S.D.N.Y. 2012), <i>rev'd</i> , No. 12-1094 (2d Cir., July 22, 2014); <i>The Bogdan Law Firm v. Marsh, SUA (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 551 B.R. 104 (S.D.N.Y. 2016); <i>Travelers Indem. Co. v. Common Law Settlement Counsel (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 449 B.R. 31 (S.D.N.Y. 2011); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 340 B.R. 49 (S.D.N.Y. 2006), <i>rev'd</i> , 517 F.2d 52 (2d Cir. 2008), <i>rev'd</i> , 557 U.S. 137 (2009), <i>on remand</i> , 600 F.3d 135 (2d Cir. 2010); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 68 B.R. 618 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986), <i>aff'd</i> , 78 B.R. 407 (S.D.N.Y. 1987), <i>aff'd sub nom. Kane v. Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 843 F.2d 636 (2d Cir. 1988); <i>Albero v. Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 68 B.R. 155, (S.D.N.Y. 1986); <i>United States v. Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 63 B.R. 600 (S.D.N.Y. 1986); <i>Manville Corp. v. Equity Sec. Holders' Comm. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 60 B.R. 842, 845 (S.D.N.Y. 1986), <i>rev'd</i> , 801 F.2d 60 (2d Cir. 1986); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 52 B.R. 940 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 45 B.R. 827 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); <i>Roberts v. Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 45 B.R. 823 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 42 B.R. 651 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i> , 40 B.R. 219 (S.D.N.Y. 1984), <i>aff'g Johns-Manville Corp. v. Asbestos Litig. Group (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i> , 26 B.R. 420 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1983), and <i>GAF Corp. v.</i>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<p><i>Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i>, 26 B.R. 405 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1983); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 39 B.R. 998 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); <i>Commercial Union Ins. Co. v. Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i>, 31 B.R. 965 (S.D.N.Y. 1983); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 552 B.R. 221 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2016); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 534 B.R. 553 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2015), <i>aff'd in part and rev'd in part</i>, 551 B.R. 104 (S.D.N.Y. 2016); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 440 B.R. 604 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2010), <i>rev'd</i>, 845 F. Supp.2d 584 (S.D.N.Y. 2012), <i>rev'd</i>, No. 12-1094 (2d Cir., July 22, 2014); <i>Johns-Manville Corp. v. Colorado Ins. Guar. Ass'n</i>, 91 B.R. 225 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1988); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 68 B.R. 618 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986); <i>Committee of Asbestos-Related Litigants v. Johns-Manville Corp. (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i>, 60 B.R. 612 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986); <i>In re Johns-Manville Corp.</i>, 36 B.R. 743 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1984); <i>Johns-Manville Corp. v. Asbestos Litig. Group (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i>, 33 B.R. 254 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1983); <i>Findley v. Falise (In re Joint Eastern & Southern Districts Asbestos Litig.)</i>, 878 F. Supp. 473 (E. & S.D.N.Y. 1995), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part</i>, 78 F.3d 764 (2d Cir. 1996); <i>Findley v. Falise (In re Johns-Manville Corp.)</i>, 982 F.2d 721 (2d Cir. 1992). <i>See also Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. Superior Court</i>, 139 Cal. App.4th 1481 (2006); <i>Findley v. Trustees of the Manville Personal Injury Settlement Trust (In re Joint E. & S. Dist. Asbestos Litig.)</i>, 237 F. Supp.2d 297 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002); <i>In re Davis</i>, 730 F.2d 176 (5th Cir. 1984) (per curiam).</p>
JT Thorpe Co.	No. 02-41487-H5-11 (Bankr. S.D. Tex.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on January 17, 2003 and by the district court on January 30, 2003; following appeal to the Fifth Circuit and remand by the Fifth Circuit after oral argument but before any ruling, plan re-confirmed by the bankruptcy court on March 3, 2004 and by the district court on March 3, 2004.	<i>In re JT Thorpe Co.</i> , 308 B.R. 782 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2003).
JT Thorpe, Inc.	No. LA02-14216-BB (Bankr. C.D. Cal.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on September 6, 2005 and by the district court on January 17, 2006.	
Kaiser Aluminum Corp.	No. 02-10429 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on February 6, 2006 and by the district court on May 11, 2006.	<p><i>In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.</i>, 456 F.3d 328 (3d Cir. 2006); <i>In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.</i>, 386 Fed. Appx. 201 (3d Cir. 2010), vacating and remanding <i>Moss Landing Commercial Park, LLC v. Kaiser Aluminum Corp. (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 399 B.R. 596 (D. Del. 2009); <i>Law Debenture Trust Co. of New York v. Kaiser Aluminum Corp. (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 380 B.R. 344 (D. Del. 2008); <i>Public Utility Dist. No. 1 of Clark Cty. v. Kaiser Aluminum Corp. (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 365 B.R. 447 (D. Del. 2007); <i>In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.</i>, 343 B.R. 88 (D. Del. 2006); <i>Law Debenture Trust Co. v. Kaiser Aluminum Corp. (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 339 B.R. 91 (D. Del. 2006); <i>Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's, London v. Future Asbestos Claims Representative (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i>, 327 B.R. 554 (D. Del. 2005); <i>Safety Nat'l Cas. Corp. v. Kaiser</i></p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<i>Aluminum & Chem. Corp. (In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp.)</i> , 303 B.R. 299 (D. Del. 2003); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). See also <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Owens Corning, USG, United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 139 Cal. App.4th 1481 (2006).
Keene Corp.	No. 93 B 46090, 96 CV 3492 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 13, 1996 and by the district court on June 13, 1996.	<i>In re Keene Corp.</i> , 171 B.R. 180 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1994); <i>Keene Corp. v. Coleman (In re Keene Corp.)</i> , 166 B.R. 31 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1994); <i>In re Keene Corp.</i> , 164 B.R. 844 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1994); <i>Keene Corp. v. Acstar Ins. Co. (In re Keene Corp.)</i> , 162 B.R. 935 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1994).
Kentile Floors, Inc.	No. 92 B 46466 BRL (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 10, 1998. Kentile's successor, Metex Mfg. Corp., filed a Chapter 11 voluntary petition on November 9, 2012 (No. 12-14554, Bankr. S.D.N.Y.).	
Leslie Controls, Inc.	No. 10-12199-CSS (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on October 28, 2010. An appeal was filed on October 29, 2010 (No. 10-924 (D. Del.)) but remanded to the bankruptcy court, prior to argument, on January 14, 2011. Order confirming a revised plan entered by the bankruptcy court January 18, 2011. Order affirming the bankruptcy court's confirmation order entered by the district court February 7, 2011; district court issued additional findings in support of confirmation on March 28, 2011.	<i>In re Leslie Controls, Inc.</i> , 437 B.R. 493 (Bankr. D. Del. 2010).
Lloyd E. Mitchell Co.	No. 06-13250 (Bankr. D. Md.)	First amended joint plan of liquidation filed by Debtor and ACC on July 8, 2008. On May 6, 2009, Debtor and the ACC filed a joint motion to dismiss the Chapter 11 case. On May 29, 2009, insurers Maryland Casualty and Travelers filed a plan of liquidation. On November 5, 2014, the court dismissed the bankruptcy case.	<i>In re Lloyd E. Mitchell Co.</i> , 373 B.R. 416 (Bankr. D. Md. 2007).
Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.	No. 95-10453 (M.D. Fla.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on April 15, 1997 and by the district court on April 15, 1997.	<i>In re Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.</i> , 399 B.R. 555 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 2009).
Metex Mfg. Corp.	No. 12-14554 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 23, 2014 and by the district court on August 1, 2014.	<i>In re Metex Mfg. Corp.</i> , 510 B.R. 735 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2014).
M.H. Detrick	No. 98 B 01004 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Plan confirmed jointly by the bankruptcy court and the district court on Aug. 21, 2002.	
Mid-Valley, Inc. (Halliburton subsidiaries)	No. 03-35592-JKF (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on July 16, 2004 and by the district court on December 1, 2004.	<i>In re Mid-Valley, Inc.</i> , 288 Fed. Appx. 784 (3d Cir. 2008); <i>In re Mid-Valley, Inc.</i> , 305 B.R. 425 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2004); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). See also <i>Archdiocese of Milwaukee Supporting Fund, Inc. v. Halliburton Co.</i> , 597 F.3d 330 (5th Cir. 2010), vacated and remanded, 131 S. Ct. 2179 (2011), on remand, 647 F.3d 533 (5th Cir. 2011).
The Muralo Co.	No. 03-26723-MS (Bankr. D.N.J.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 21, 2007.	<i>In re Muralo Co.</i> , 301 B.R. 690 (D.N.J. 2003); <i>In re Muralo Co.</i> , 295 B.R. 512 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2003).
Murphy Marine Services, Inc.	No. 01-00926 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan filed on January 23, 2002; case converted to Chapter 7 on July 25, 2002.	
National Gypsum Co./Ancor Holdings Inc.	No. 90-37213 (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on March 9, 1993.	<i>New Nat'l Gypsum Co. v. National Gypsum Co. Settlement Trust (In re Nat'l Gypsum)</i> , 219 F.3d 478 (5th Cir. 2000); <i>Century Indem. Co. v. Nat'l Gypsum Co. (In re Nat'l Gypsum Co.)</i> , 208 F.3d 498 (5th Cir. 2000); <i>Donaldson Luftkin Jenrette Securities Corp. v. National Gypsum Co. (In re National Gypsum Co.)</i> , 123 F.3d 861 (5th Cir. 1997); <i>Ins. Co. of North America v. NGC Settlement Trust (In re National Gypsum Co.)</i> , 118 F.3d 1056 (5th Cir. 1997); <i>In re National Gypsum Co.</i> , 139 B.R. 397 (N.D. Tex. 1992); <i>In re National Gypsum Co.</i> , 134 B.R. 188 (N.D. Tex. 1991); <i>In re National Gypsum Co.</i> , 257 B.R. 184 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2000); <i>In re National Gypsum Co.</i> , 243 B.R. 676 (Bankr. D. Tex. 1999). See also <i>United States Fire Ins. Co. v. National Gypsum Co.</i> , 101 F.3d 813 (2d Cir. 1996); <i>Browning v. Prostok</i> , 165 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2005).
National Service Industries	No. 12-12057 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Chapter 7 petition filed July 12, 2012.	
North American Refractories Corp. (NARCO)	No. 02-20198 (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Plan approved by the bankruptcy court on November 13, 2007; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on July 25, 2008; confirmation order vacated by the Third Circuit and remanded on May 4, 2011. New plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court and affirmed by the district court. Channeling injunction became effective on April 30, 2013.	<i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. North American Refractories Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust (In re North American Refractories Co.)</i> , 543 B.R. 536 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2015); <i>Honeywell Int'l, Inc. v. North American Refractories Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust (In re North American Refractories Co.)</i> , 542 B.R. 350 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2015); <i>In re North American Refractories Co.</i> , 280 B.R. 356 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2002); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO, and Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). See also <i>Continental Ins. Co. v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> , 406 N.J. Super. 156, 967 A.2d 315 (N.J. App. Div. 2009); <i>Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Honeywell Int'l Inc.</i> , 851 N.Y.S.2d 426 (N.Y. App. Div. 2008).
Nicolet, Inc.	No. 87-03574S (Bankr. E.D. Pa.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on September 21, 1989.	
Oakfabco, Inc. (fka Kewanee Boiler Corp.)	No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Petition filed August 7, 2015.	See <i>In re Kewanee Boiler Corp.</i> , 297 B.R. 720 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2003); <i>Kewanee Boiler Corp. v. Smith (In re Kewanee Boiler Corp.)</i> , 198 B.R. 519 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1996).
Oglebay Norton Co.	No. 04-10558-JBR (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on November 7, 2004. Company emerged from bankruptcy on Jan. 31, 2005.	
Overseas Shipholding Group, Inc.	No. 12-20000 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court July 18, 2014.	

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
Owens Corning/ Fibreboard	No. 00-03837 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on September 26, 2006; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on September 28, 2006.	<i>In re Owens Corning</i> , 419 F.3d 195 (3d Cir. 2005), <i>rev'g In re Owens Corning</i> , 316 B.R. 168 (D. Del. 2004); <i>Owens Corning v. Credit Suisse First Boston</i> , 322 B.R. 719 (D. Del. 2005); <i>In re Owens Corning</i> , 305 B.R. 175 (D. Del. 2004); <i>In re Owens Corning</i> , 291 B.R. 329 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 368 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2004), <i>rev'g In re Owens Corning</i> , 316 B.R. 168 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Federal-Mogul, USG Corp.</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 353 F.3d 211 (3d Cir. 2003) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Federal-Mogul, USG Corp.</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). <i>See also Wright v. Owens Corning</i> , 679 F.3d 101 (3d Cir. 2012); <i>Fibreboard Corp. v. Celotex Corp.</i> (<i>In re Celotex Corp.</i>), 472 F.3d 1318 (11th Cir. 2006); <i>Rogers v. McCulloch</i> , 173 Fed. Appx. 371 (6th Cir. 2006); <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, USG, United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>Wright v. Owens Corning</i> , 450 B.R. 541 (W.D. Pa. 2011), <i>aff'd in part and rev'd in part</i> , 679 F.3d 101 (3d Cir. 2012).
Philadelphia Asbestos Corp. (Pacor, Inc.)	No. 86-03252G (Bankr. E.D. Pa.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on November 30, 1989.	
Pittsburgh Corning Corporation	No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	Second amended plan filed on November 20, 2003; order entered by the bankruptcy court on December 21, 2006 denying confirmation. Third amended plan filed January 29, 2009. Confirmation hearing conducted for three days during June, 2010; closing arguments held October 29, 2010. Order entered by the bankruptcy court on June 16, 2011 denying confirmation. Debtor filed plan modifications on September 23, 2011, April 20, 2012, and August 17, 2012. A confirmation hearing was held on October 10, 2012. Confirmation order entered by the bankruptcy court May 16, 2013 and affirmed by the district court on September 30, 2014. Appeals to the Third Circuit dismissed January 7, 2016. The bankruptcy court approved technical amendments to the plan on March 24, 2016.	<i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 260 Fed. Appx. 463 (3d Cir. 2008); <i>Mt. McKinley Ins. Co. v. Corning, Inc.</i> , 399 F.3d 436 (2d Cir. 2005); <i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 453 B.R. 570 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2011); <i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 417 B.R. 289 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2006); <i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 308 B.R. 716 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2004), <i>aff'd</i> , Dkt. No. 17, No. 2:04-cv-01199-DSC (W.D. Pa. Dec. 7, 2005); <i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 277 B.R. 74 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2002), <i>aff'd</i> , 260 Fed. Appx. 463 (3d Cir. 2008); <i>In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp.</i> , 255 B.R. 162 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2000); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). <i>See also Mt. McKinley Ins. Co. v. Corning, Inc.</i> , 918 N.Y.S.2d 22 (N.Y. App. Div. 2011).
Plant Insulation Company	No. 09-31347 (Bankr. N.D. Cal.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on April 4, 2012; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on October 9, 2012. Stay pending appeal denied by the district court on November 1, 2012 and by both the Ninth Circuit and Justice Kennedy, as circuit justice, on November 8, 2012. Plan went effective November 16, 2012.	<i>In re Plant Insulation Co.</i> , 734 F.3d 900 (9th Cir. 2013), <i>cert. denied</i> , 134 S.Ct. 1901 (2014); <i>Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Plant Insulation Co.</i> (<i>In re Plant Insulation Co.</i>), 485 B.R. 203 (N.D. Cal. 2012), <i>rev'd</i> , 734 F.3d 900 (9th Cir. 2013), <i>cert. denied</i> , 134 S.Ct. 1901 (2014); <i>In re Plant Insulation Co.</i> , 469 B.R. 843 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2012), <i>aff'd</i> , 485 B.R. 203 (N.D. Cal. 2012), <i>rev'd</i> , 734 F.3d

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
		Plan confirmation reversed by the Ninth Circuit October 28, 2013. On March 3, 2014, the bankruptcy court issued an order confirming the revised post-confirmation plan for the reasons stated in a February 25, 2014, memorandum opinion. On August 18, 2014, the district court issued an order affirming the confirmation order.	900 (9th Cir. 2013), <i>cert. denied</i> , 134 S.Ct. 1901 (2014); <i>In re Plant Insulation Co.</i> , 414 B.R. 646 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2009).
Plibrico Co.	No. 02 B 09952 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court and the district court on January 30, 2006.	
Porter-Hayden Co.	No. 02-54152 (Bankr. D. Md.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on July 5, 2006 and by the district court on July 7, 2006.	<i>National Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Porter Hayden Co.</i> , 408 B.R. 66 (D. Md. 2009); <i>National Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Porter Hayden Co.</i> , 331 B.R. 652 (D. Md. 2005); <i>Porter-Hayden Co. v. First State Mgt. Group, Inc. (In re Porter-Hayden Co.)</i> , 304 B.R. 725 (Bankr. D. Md. 2004).
Prudential Lines, Inc.	No. 86-11773 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 15, 1989 and by the district court on October 4, 1990.	<i>Asbestosis Claimants v. American Steamship Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n (In re Prudential Lines)</i> , 533 F.3d 151 (2d Cir. June 19, 2008); <i>Dicola v. American S.S. Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n (In re Prudential Lines, Inc.)</i> , 158 F.3d 65 (2d Cir. 1998); <i>Dicola v. American S.S. Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n (In re Prudential Lines, Inc.)</i> , 170 B.R. 222 (S.D.N.Y. 1994); <i>In re Prudential Lines, Inc.</i> , 202 B.R. 13 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1996); <i>In re Prudential Lines, Inc.</i> , 148 B.R. 730 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992).
Pulmosan Safety Equipment Corp.	No. 10-16098 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Voluntary Chapter 7 petition filed November 15, 2010. Case closed November 25, 2013.	
Quigley Co.	No. 04-15739-SMB (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Fourth amended and restated plan modified on August 6, 2009. The confirmation hearing, which consumed 15 days of trial, began September 23, 2009. On September 8, 2010, the bankruptcy court issued findings of fact and conclusions of law denying confirmation and ordered the parties "to schedule a conference to discuss the dismissal or other disposition of this case." On September 21, 2010, the bankruptcy court issued its order denying confirmation. Quigley filed a revised fifth amended and restated plan and a disclosure statement related thereto on August 13, 2012. On July 2, 2013, the bankruptcy court issued an order confirming the plan and recommending that the district court issue an injunction under § 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code. On July 31, 2013, the district court entered an order adopting, approving, and affirming the plan and the bankruptcy court's confirmation order.	<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Law Offices of Peter G. Angelos (In re Quigley Co.)</i> , 676 F.3d 45 (2d Cir. 2012), <i>aff'd In re Quigley Co.</i> , 449 B.R. 196 (S.D.N.Y. 2011); <i>In re Ad Hoc Comm. Of Tort Victims (In re Quigley Co.)</i> , 327 B.R. 138 (S.D.N.Y. 2005); <i>Quigley Co. v. Coleman (In re Quigley Co.)</i> , 323 B.R. 70 (S.D.N.Y. 2005); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 500 B.R. 347 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2013); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 437 B.R. 102 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2010); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 391 B.R. 695 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2008); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 383 B.R. 19 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2008); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 377 B.R. 110 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>Continental Cas. Co. v. Pfizer, Inc. (In re Quigley Co.)</i> , 361 B.R. 723 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>Quigley Co. v. Coleman (In re Quigley Co.)</i> , 361 B.R. 670 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2007); <i>In re Quigley Co.</i> , 346 B.R. 647 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006). <i>See also In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 195 (3d Cir. 2014); <i>I.U. North America Inc. v. A.I.U. Ins. Co.</i> , 896 A.2d 880 (Del. Super. 2006).
Rapid-American Corp.	No. 13-10687-smb (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Chapter 11 petition filed March 8, 2013.	
Raymark Corp./Raytech Corp.	No. 89-00293 (Bankr. D. Conn.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on August 31, 2000.	
Reichhold Holdings US, Inc.; Reichhold, Inc.; Canadyne Corp.; Canadyne-Georgia Corp.	No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Chapter 11 petition filed September 30, 2014. Second amended plan of liquidation filed November 19, 2015. Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on January 13, 2016.	
Resillo Press Pad Co.	No. 13-02916 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Chapter 7 petition filed January 25, 2013. Case closed on February 4, 2015.	

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
Rock Wool Manufacturing	Nos. CV-99-J-1589-S, BK-96-08295-TBB-11 (Bankr. N.D. Ala.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 3, 1999 and by the district court on December 6, 1999.	
Rutland Fire Clay Co.	No. 99-11390 (Bankr. D. Vt.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court and by the district court on November 17, 2000.	
Saberhagen Holdings, Inc. (f/k/a The Brower Company)	No. 13-13531-MLB (Bankr. W.D. Wash.)	Chapter 11 petition filed April 18, 2013. Debtor's motion to dismiss the Chapter 11 case granted July 2, 2013.	
Schutte & Koerting, Inc.	No. 07-16075 (Bankr. D. Colo.)	Chapter 7 petition filed June 10, 2007.	
Sepco Corporation	No. 16-50058 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio)	Chapter 11 petition filed January 14, 2016.	
Shook & Fletcher Insulation Co.	No. 02-02771-BGC-11 (Bankr. N.D. Ala.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on October 29, 2002 and by the district court on November 8, 2002.	<i>See Shook & Fletcher Asbestos Settlement Trust v. Safety National Cas. Co.</i> , 909 A.2d 125 (Del. 2006).
Skinner Engine Co.	No. 01-23987-MBM (Bankr. W.D. Pa.)	On May 27, 2009, the bankruptcy court issued an order converting this case from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7 on the ground, <i>inter alia</i> , that debtor's fifth plan of liquidation is unconfirmable and that debtor and its co-proponents have been, and are, unable to effectuate a confirmable plan. On May 29, 2010, the district court issued an order affirming the bankruptcy court's order converting the case to Chapter 7 (Case No. 09-0886). The Third Circuit affirmed the lower courts' decisions on July 25, 2012. On September 11, 2013, the bankruptcy court issued an order granting the Chapter 7 trustee's motion to dismiss the bankruptcy case.	<i>In re American Capital Equipment, LLC</i> , 688 F.3d 145 (3d Cir. 2012); <i>In re American Capital Equipment, LLC</i> , 296 Fed. Appx. 270 (3d Cir. 2008); <i>In re American Capital Equipment, LLC</i> , 405 B.R. 415 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2009), <i>aff'd</i> , 2010 WL 1337222 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 29, 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 688 F.3d 145 (3d Cir. 2012); <i>In re American Capital Equipment, LLC</i> , 325 B.R. 372 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2005); <i>In re American Capital Equipment, LLC</i> , 324 B.R. 570 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 2005).
Special Electric Co.	No. 04-25471-11-MDM (E.D. Wis.)	Plan confirmed December 21, 2006.	
Special Metals Corp.	Nos. 02-10335 to 02-10338 (Bankr. E.D. Ky.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on September 29, 2003; confirmation order affirmed by the district court on March 12, 2004.	<i>Century Indem. Co. v. Special Metals Corp. (In re Special Metals Corp.)</i> , 360 B.R. 244 (E.D. Ky. 2006); <i>Century Indem. Co. v. Special Metals Corp. (In re Special Metals Corp.)</i> , 317 B.R. 326 (Bankr. E.D. Ky. 2004).
Specialty Products Holding Corp.; Bondex International, Inc.; Republic Powdered Metals, Inc.; NMBFiL, Inc. (fka Bondo Corp.)	No. 10-11780-PJW (Bankr. D. Del.)	SPHC and Bondex filed voluntary petitions filed May 31, 2010. On May 14, 2012, the ACC and FCR filed a joint plan of reorganization for Debtors. They filed amended plans on August 23, 2012, August 2, 2013, October 15, 2013, and December 17, 2013. On July 12, 2012, Debtors filed a competing plan of reorganization, but no disclosure statement. Debtors filed an amended first joint plan of reorganization on December 16, 2013. On August 15, 2014, NMBFiL filed a voluntary petition. On August 31, 2014, Republic filed a voluntary petition. On September 26, 2014, the Debtors (SPHC, Bondex, Republic, and NMBFiL) filed a joint plan of reorganization. They filed a 'solicitation version' of the joint plan on October 23, 2014 and a revised plan on December 9, 2014. The bankruptcy court and the district court each confirmed the plan on December 10, 2014.	<i>See Bondex Int'l v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co.</i> , 667 F.3d 669 (3d Cir. 2011).
Standard Insulations, Inc.	No. 86-03413-1-11 (Bankr. W.D. Mo.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court and by the district court on October 26, 1992.	<i>In re Standard Insulations, Inc.</i> , 138 B.R. 947 (Bankr. W.D. Mo. 1992).

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
State Insulation Corp.	No. 11-15110-MBK (D.N.J.)	On February 10, 2012, the bankruptcy court recommended that the district court enter an order confirming the plan. On March 14, 2012, the district court accepted and approved the bankruptcy court's findings of fact and conclusions of law and issued a channeling injunction under § 524(g) of the Bankruptcy Code.	
Swan Transportation Co.	No. 01-11690-JKF (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 30, 2003 and by the district court on July 21, 2003.	
T H Agriculture & Nutrition, LLC	No. 08-14692-reg (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 28, 2009 and affirmed by the district court on October 26, 2009.	
Thorpe Insulation Co.	No. 07-19271-BB (Bankr. C.D. Cal.)	<p>Jointly administered with the bankruptcy case of Pacific Insulation Co., which filed a Chapter 11 petition on October 31, 2007. Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on February 1, 2010 and by the district court on September 21, 2010. Stay pending appeal denied by the district court on October 20, 2010, by the Ninth Circuit on October 21, 2010, and by Justice Kennedy, as circuit justice, on October 22, 2010. Plan went effective October 22, 2010.</p> <p>On January 24, 2012, the Ninth Circuit reversed confirmation and remanded for a new confirmation hearing in bankruptcy court.</p> <p>On May 8, 2013, the bankruptcy court issued an order confirming the Sixth Amended Plan. On June 6, 2013, the district court issued an order affirming the bankruptcy court's confirmation order.</p>	<p><i>Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 677 F.3d 869 (9th Cir. 2012); <i>Continental Ins. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 671 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2012); <i>Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 671 F.3d 980 (9th Cir. 2012), <i>amended and superseded by Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 677 F.3d 869 (9th Cir. 2012); <i>National Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 393 Fed. Appx. 467 (9th Cir. 2010); <i>Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 392 Fed. Appx. 549 (9th Cir. 2010). <i>See Employers Reins. Co. v. Superior Ct. (Thorpe Insulation Co.)</i>, 161 Cal. App.4th 906, 74 Cal. Rptr.3d 733 (2008).</p>
Triple A Machine Shop, Inc.	No. 10-49354 (Bankr. N.D. Cal.)	Voluntary Chapter 7 petition filed August 16, 2010. Final decree entered August 21, 2015.	
United Gilsonite Laboratories	No. 5:11-bk-02032 (Bankr. M.D. Pa.)	Petition filed March 23, 2011. Plan of reorganization confirmed by the bankruptcy court on December 8, 2014. Plan confirmation affirmed by the district court later that same day.	
United States Lines	No. 86-12240 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.) (jointly administered with McLean Industries, No. 86-12238)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on May 16, 1989.	<p><i>Asbestosis Claimants v. U.S. Lines Reorganization Trust (In re United States Lines)</i>, 318 F.3d 432 (2d Cir. 2003), <i>aff'g U.S. Lines, Inc. v. U.S. Lines Reorganization Trust</i>, 262 B.R. 223 (S.D.N.Y. 2001); <i>Maritime Asbestos Legal Clinic v. United States Lines, Inc. (In re United States Lines)</i>, 216 F.3d 228 (2d Cir. 2000); <i>In re United States Lines</i>, 197 F.3d 631 (2d Cir. 1999), <i>rev'g United States Lines, Inc. v. American S.S. Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n</i>, 220 B.R. 5 (S.D.N.Y. 1997), <i>rev'g United States Lines, Inc. v. American S.S. Owners Mut. Protection & Indem. Ass'n</i>, 169 B.R. 804 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1994); <i>U.S. Lines, Inc. v. U.S. Lines Reorganization Trust</i>, 262 B.R. 223 (S.D.N.Y. 2001), <i>aff'd</i>, 318 F.3d 432 (2d Cir. 2003).</p>
United States Mineral Products	No. 01-02471 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on November 30, 2005; channeling injunction issued by the district court December 14, 2005.	<p><i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i>, 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO, and Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases). <i>See also In re Motions</i></p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
			<i>for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS</i> , <i>Armstrong</i> , <i>Combustion Engineering</i> , <i>Flintkote</i> , <i>Kaiser Aluminum</i> , <i>Owens Corning</i> , <i>USG</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases).
UNR Industries, Inc.	Nos. 82 B 9841-9845, 82 B 9847, 82 B 9849 (Bankr. N.D. Ill.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 1, 1989.	<i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 20 F.3d 766 (7th Cir. 1994); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 986 F.2d 207 (7th Cir. 1993); <i>UNR Indus., Inc. v. Continental Cas. Co.</i> , 942 F.2d 1101 (7th Cir. 1991); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 736 F.2d 1136 (7th Cir. 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 725 F.2d 1111 (7th Cir., 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 224 B.R. 664 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1998); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 212 B.R. 295 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1997); <i>UNR Indus., Inc. v. Bloomington Factory Workers</i> , 173 B.R. 149 (N.D. Ill. 1994); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 143 B.R. 506 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1992), <i>rev'd</i> , 173 B.R. 149 (N.D. Ill. 1994); <i>UNARCO Bloomington Factory Workers v. UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 124 B.R. 268 (N.D. Ill. 1990); <i>UNR Indus., Inc. v. American Mut. Liability Ins. Co.</i> , 92 B.R. 319 (N.D. Ill. 1988); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 74 B.R. 146 (N.D. Ill. 1987); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 72 B.R. 796 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1987); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 72 B.R. 789 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1987); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 71 B.R. 467 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1987); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 54 B.R. 270 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1985); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 54 B.R. 266 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1985); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 54 B.R. 263 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1985); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 46 B.R. 671 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1985); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 46 B.R. 25 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 42 B.R. 99 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 42 B.R. 94 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 39 B.R. 190 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1984); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 30 B.R. 609 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1983); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 30 B.R. 613 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1983); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 29 B.R. 741 (N.D. Ill. 1983); <i>In re UNR Indus., Inc.</i> , 23 B.R. 144 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1982). <i>See also Robm Indus., Inc. v. Platinum Equity LLC</i> , 887 A.2d 983 (Del. Super. 2005).
USG Corp.	No. 01-2094 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Plan confirmed by both the bankruptcy court and the district court on June 15, 2006.	<i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 368 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2004) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong</i> , <i>Federal-Mogul</i> , <i>Owens Corning</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i> , 353 F.3d 211 (3d Cir. 2003) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong</i> , <i>Federal-Mogul</i> , <i>Owens Corning</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i> , 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong</i> , <i>Combustion Engineering</i> , <i>Flintkote</i> , <i>Kaiser Aluminum</i> , <i>Owens Corning</i> , <i>U.S. Mineral Products</i> , <i>W.R. Grace</i> , <i>Pittsburgh Corning</i> , <i>NARCO</i> , and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>In re USG Corp.</i> , 290 B.R. 223 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003). <i>See also In re G-I Holdings, Inc.</i> , 755 F.3d 195 (3d Cir. 2014); <i>In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i> , 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS</i> , <i>Armstrong</i> , <i>Combustion Engineering</i> , <i>Flintkote</i> , <i>Kaiser Aluminum</i> , <i>Owens Corning</i> , <i>United States Mineral Products</i> , and <i>W.R. Grace</i> bankruptcy cases).

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
Utex Industries	No. 04-34427 (Bankr. S.D. Tex.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court and the district court on June 16, 2004.	
Wallace & Gale	No. 85-40092 (Bankr. D. Md.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on July 27, 1998 and affirmed by the district court on May 30, 2002.	<i>Jones v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. (In re Wallace & Gale Co.)</i> , 385 F.3d 820 (4th Cir. 2004), <i>aff'g</i> , <i>Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Wallace & Gale Co. (In re Wallace & Gale Co.)</i> , 284 B.R. 557 (D. Md. 2002), <i>reconsidering Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Wallace & Gale Co. (In re Wallace & Gale Co.)</i> , 275 B.R. 223 (D. Md. 2002); <i>Legal Representative for Future Claimants v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Wallace & Gale Co.)</i> , 72 F.3d 21 (4th Cir. 1995); <i>Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Wallace & Gale Co. (In re Wallace & Gale Co.)</i> , 284 B.R. 560 (D. Md. 2002). <i>See also Scapa Dryer Fabrics, Inc. v. Saville</i> , 988 A.2d 1059 (Md. App. 2010).
Waterman Steamship Corp.	No. 83-11732 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on June 19, 1986.	<i>In re Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Aguiar</i> , 141 B.R. 552 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1992).
Western Macarthur/ Western Asbestos	No. 02-46284-86 (Bankr. N.D. Cal.)	Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on January 27, 2004 and affirmed by the district court on April 16, 2004.	<i>Renfrew v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. (In re Western Asbestos Co.)</i> , 406 Fed. Appx. 227 (9th Cir. 2010); <i>Renfrew v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. (In re Western Asbestos Co.)</i> , 416 B.R. 670 (N.D. Cal. 2009), <i>aff'd</i> , 406 Fed. Appx. 227 (9th Cir. 2010); <i>In re Western Asbestos Co.</i> , 313 B.R. 859 (N.D. Cal. 2004); <i>In re Western Asbestos Co.</i> , 318 B.R. 527 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2004); <i>In re Western Asbestos Co.</i> , 313 B.R. 832 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2003); <i>In re Western Asbestos Co.</i> , 313 B.R. 456 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2004). <i>See also Snyder v. Calif. Ins. Guar. Ass'n</i> , 229 Cal. App.4th 1196, 177 Cal. Rptr.3d 853 (2014); <i>United States Fidelity & Guar. Co. v. American Re-Insurance Co.</i> , 939 N.Y.S.2d 307 (N.Y. App. Div. 2012); <i>Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 139 Cal. App.4th 1481 (2006).
W.R. Grace Co.	Nos. 01-1139, 01-1140 (Bankr. D. Del.)	<p>On January 31, 2011, the bankruptcy court issued findings of fact, conclusions of law, a memorandum opinion, and a recommendation that the district court confirm the plan and issue the various injunctions called for by the plan. On February 15, 2011, the bankruptcy court issued an order clarifying its January 31 order, findings, and conclusions. On March 4, 2011, the bankruptcy court issued an order that granted in part and denied in part a motion for reconsideration of the January 31, 2011 order and opinion.</p> <p>On January 30, 2012, the district court issued an order confirming the plan. Following motions for reconsideration, on June 11, 2012 the district court issued a revised order confirming the plan. Appeals were filed in the Third Circuit (Nos. 12-1402, <i>et al.</i>, consolidated). The district court on June 27, 2012 denied a motion to stay the confirmation order pending appeal; the movant renewed its motion in the Third Circuit, where it is pending.</p> <p>The Third Circuit issued three opinions affirming aspects of the district court's order confirming the plan (one non-precedential opinion on July 24, 2013, and two precedential</p>	<p><i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 729 F.3d 332 (3d Cir. 2013); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 729 F.3d 311 (3d Cir. 2013); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 532 Fed. Appx. 264 (3d Cir. 2013); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Chakarian (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 591 F.3d 164 (3d Cir. 2009); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 316 Fed. Appx. 134 (3d Cir. 2009); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i>, 368 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2004) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Federal-Mogul, Owens Corning</i>, and <i>USG Corp.</i> bankruptcies); <i>Gerard v. W.R. Grace & Co. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 115 Fed. Appx. 565 (3d Cir. 2004); <i>In re Kensington Int'l Ltd.</i>, 353 F.3d 211 (3d Cir. 2003) (also applicable to the <i>Armstrong, Federal-Mogul, Owens Corning</i>, and <i>USG</i> bankruptcies); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 476 B.R. 114 (D. Del. 2012); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 475 B.R. 34 (D. Del. 2012), <i>aff'd</i>, 532 Fed. Appx. 264 (3d Cir. 2013); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 729 F.3d 332 (3d Cir. 2013), and <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 729 F.3d 311 (3d Cir. 2013); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 468 B.R. 81 (D. Del. 2012), <i>amended and superseded</i>, 475 B.R. 34 (D. Del. 2012); <i>State of California Dep't of Gen'l Svcs. v. W.R. Grace & Co. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 418 B.R. 511 (D. Del. 2009); <i>State of New Jersey v. W.R.</i></p>

Company	Case No. & Court	Plan Status	Published Decisions
		<p>opinions on September 4, 2013). The last set of objections settled, and the plan went into effect on February 3, 2014.</p>	<p><i>Grace & Co. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 412 B.R. 657 (D. Del. 2009); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 398 B.R. 368 (D. Del. 2008); <i>In re ACandS, Inc.</i>, 462 B.R. 88 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011) (also entered in the <i>Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, U.S. Mineral Products, USG, W.R. Grace, Pittsburgh Corning, NARCO</i>, and <i>Mid-Valley</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 446 B.R. 96 (Bankr. D. Del. 2011), <i>aff'd</i>, 475 B.R. 34 (D. Del. 2012); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 403 B.R. 317 (Bankr. D. Del. 2009); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 397 B.R. 701 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008), <i>rev'd</i>, <i>State of California Dep't of Gen'l Svcs. v. W.R. Grace & Co. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 418 B.R. 511 (D. Del. 2009); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 389 B.R. 373 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Chakarian (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 386 B.R. 17 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Campbell (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 384 B.R. 678 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008), <i>aff'd sub nom. State of New Jersey v. W.R. Grace & Co. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 412 B.R. 657 (D. Del. 2009); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Chakarian (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 384 B.R. 670 (Bankr. D. Del. 2008); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 366 B.R. 302 (Bankr. D. Del. 2007), <i>aff'd</i>, 2007 WL 4333817 (D. Del. 2007), <i>aff'd</i>, 316 Fed. Appx. 134 (3d Cir. 2009); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Chakarian (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 366 B.R. 295 (Bankr. D. Del. 2007), <i>aff'd</i>, 2008 WL 3522453 (D. Del. Aug. 12, 2008), <i>aff'd</i>, 591 F.3d 164 (3d Cir. 2009); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 355 B.R. 462 (Bankr. D. Del. 2006); <i>In re W.R. Grace & Co.</i>, 346 B.R. 672 (Bankr. D. Del. 2006); <i>W.R. Grace & Co. v. Chakarian (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 315 B.R. 353 (Bankr. D. Del. 2004); <i>Official Comm. Of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants v. Sealed Air Corp. (In re W.R. Grace & Co.)</i>, 281 B.R. 852 (Bankr. D. Del. 2002). <i>See also In re Motions for Access of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC</i>, 488 B.R. 281 (D. Del. 2013) (also entered in the <i>ACandS, Armstrong, Combustion Engineering, Flintkote, Kaiser Aluminum, Owens Corning, United States Mineral Products</i>, and <i>USG</i> bankruptcy cases); <i>W.R. Grace & Co.-Conn. v. Zotos Int'l, Inc.</i>, 559 F.3d 85 (2d Cir. 2009); <i>U.S. v. W.R. Grace</i>, 526 F.3d 499 (9th Cir. 2008); <i>U.S. v. W.R. Grace</i>, 455 F. Supp.2d 1113 (D. Mont. 2006), <i>rev'd</i>, 504 F.3d 745, 755 (9th Cir. 2007); <i>U.S. v. W.R. Grace</i>, 280 F. Supp.2d 1149 (D. Mont. 2003), <i>aff'd</i>, 429 F.3d 1224 (9th Cir. 2005), <i>cert. denied</i>, 127 S.Ct. 379 (2006); <i>TIG Ins. Co. v. Smolker</i>, 264 B.R. 661 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2001).</p>
Yarway Corporation	No. 13-11025 (Bankr. D. Del.)	Chapter 11 petition filed April 22, 2013. Plan confirmed by the bankruptcy court on April 8, 2015. Plan confirmation affirmed by the district court on July 14, 2015.	

Endnotes

1. See Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now? A History Of The Companies That Have Sought Bankruptcy Protection Due To Asbestos Claims*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Aug. 2001); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now?, Part Two: A Continuing History Of The Companies That Have Sought Bankruptcy Protection Due To Asbestos Claims*, Mealey's Litigation Report: Asbestos, Vol. 17, No. 20 (Nov. 2002); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now?, Part Three: A Continuing History Of The Companies That Have Sought Bankruptcy Protection Due To Asbestos Claims*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Nov. 2005); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now?, Part Four: A Continuing History Of The Companies That Have Sought Bankruptcy Protection Due To Asbestos Claims*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 6, No. 7 (Feb. 2007); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now?, Part Five: An Update on Developments In Asbestos-Related Bankruptcy Cases*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 8, No. 8 (March 2009); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now, Part Six: An Update on Developments In Asbestos-Related Bankruptcy Cases*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 11, No. 7 (Feb. 2012); Plevin, *et al.*, *Where Are They Now, Part Seven: An Update on Developments In Asbestos-Related Bankruptcy Cases*, Mealey's Asbestos Bankruptcy Report, Vol. 13, No. 12 (July 2014).
2. Corrections are welcome. Please send any corrections or comments to mplevin@crowell.com or tyoon@crowell.com.
3. See Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 22, 2015).
4. See Declaration of Raymond Tellini, President of Eagle, Inc., in Support of Chapter 11 Petition and Initial Pleadings at ¶ 6, Dkt. No. 2, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 22, 2015).
5. *Id.*
6. *Id.* at ¶ 7.
7. *Id.* at ¶ 11.
8. *Id.* at ¶ 12.
9. *Id.* at ¶ 11.
10. See Motion of Debtor for Order Extending or Applying the Automatic Stay to Certain Settling Insurers, Dkt. No. 39, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Oct. 7, 2015).
11. See Order, Dkt. No. 76, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Oct. 28, 2015).
12. See Application to Retain and Employ Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee Nunc Pro Tunc to November 23, 2015, Dkt. No. 134, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. May 2, 2016); Application of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors for an Order Authorizing the Retention and Employment of Gilbert LLP, as Special Insurance Counsel, Nunc Pro Tunc as of November 23, 2015, Dkt. No. 147, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. May 10, 2016).
13. See Order, Dkt. No. 199, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. June 2, 2016); Order, Dkt. No. 200, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. June 2, 2016); Order, Dkt. No. 210, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. June 7, 2016).
14. See Ex Parte Motion to Substitute Counsel, Dkt. No. 225, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. July 5, 2016); Application to Retain and Employ Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee Nunc Pro Tunc to November 23, 2015, Dkt. No. 227, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. July 5, 2016).
15. See *e.g.*, Pacific Employers Insurance Company's Objection to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee's Ex Parte Motion to Substitute Counsel and Renewed Objection to Application to Employ Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee, Nunc Pro Tunc to November 23, 2015, Dkt. No. 235, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. July 20, 2016); U.S. Trustee's Objection to: (1) the Unsecured Creditors Committee's Ex Parte Motion to Substitute Counsel and

- (2) Objection to Application to Employ Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee, Nunc Pro Tunc, Dkt. No. 238, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. July 20, 2016).
16. See Statement of the Debtor in Support of (I) Ex Parte Motion to Substitute Counsel, and (II) Application to Retain and Employ Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee Nunc Pro Tunc to November 23, 2015, Dkt. No. 252, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. July 25, 2016).
17. See Order Granting the Unsecured Creditors' Committee's Motion to Substitute and Approving and Authorizing the Employment and Retention of Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered as Counsel to the Unsecured Creditors' Committee, Dkt. No. 262, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Aug. 1, 2016).
18. See Motion of United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company for Entry of an Order Appointing a Chapter 11 Trustee, Dkt. No. 268, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Aug. 31, 2016).
19. *Id.* at 1.
20. See Pacific Employers Insurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Bankruptcy Petition Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1112(b)(1), 1129(a)(9), and 524(g), Dkt. No. 278, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 12, 2016).
21. See Order Granting Ex Parte Motion to Continue and Reset Hearing on Motion for Order Appointing Chapter 11 Trustee, Dkt. No. 274, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 7, 2016); Notice of Hearing on Pacific Employers Insurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Bankruptcy Petition Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 1112(b)(1), 1129(a)(9), and 524(g), Dkt. No. 282, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 12, 2016).
22. See Plan of Reorganization of Eagle, Inc. under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 286, In re Eagle, Inc., No. 15-12437 (Bankr. E.D. La. Sept. 13, 2016).
23. See Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Apr. 29, 2014).
24. See Declaration of Paul Keglevic, Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, and Co-Chief Restructuring Officer of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., in Support of First Day Motions at ¶ 6, Dkt. No. 90, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Apr. 29, 2014).
25. *Id.* at ¶¶ 10, 11.
26. See Motion of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., for Entry of an Order (A) Setting Bar Dates for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, (B) Approving the Form and Manner for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, and (C) Approving Notice Thereof, Dkt. No. 1682, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. July 23, 2014).
27. See Objection of Certain Asbestos Claimants to the Motion of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., for Entry of an Order (A) Setting Bar Dates for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, (B) Approving the Form and Manner for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, and (C) Approving Notice Thereof, Dkt. No. 1791, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 8, 2014).
28. See Order (A) Setting Bar Dates for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, (B) Approving the Form and Manner for Filing Non-Customer Proofs of Claim and Requests for Payment under Section 503(b)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code, and (C) Approving Notice Thereof, Dkt. No. 1866, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 18, 2014).
29. See Notice of Appointment of Committee of Unsecured Creditors, Dkt. No. 2570, In re Energy Future

- Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 27, 2014).
30. See *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, 522 B.R. 520 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015).
31. *Id.* at 526.
32. *Id.* at 528.
33. *Id.* at 539.
34. See Order (A) Setting Bar Date for Filing Asbestos Proofs of Claim, (B) Approving the Form of and Manner for Filing Asbestos Proofs of Claim, and (C) Approving Notice Thereof, Dkt. No. 4997, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. July 15, 2015), as amended by Dkt. No. 5171, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. July 30, 2015).
35. See Order, Dkt. No. 5265, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 11, 2015).
36. See Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 4142, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Apr. 14, 2015).
37. See Order Confirming the Sixth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., Dkt. No. 7244, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 7, 2015).
38. See Trial Brief and Omnibus Objection of Fenicle and Fahy to (I) Motion of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., to Approve a Settlement of Litigation Claims and Authorize the Debtors to Enter into and Perform under the Settlement Agreement and (II) Confirmation of the Fifth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Dkt. No. 6610, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 23, 2015).
39. See Disclosure Statement for the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code at 7-8, Dkt. No. 8423, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. May 11, 2016).
40. See Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 8421, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. May 10, 2016).
41. See *id.* at Art. IV.B.2.
42. *Id.* at Art. IX.A and B.
43. *Id.* at Art. III.B.3.
44. See Third Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 9199-1, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 5, 2016).
45. *Id.* at Art. IV.B.9.
46. See Order Confirming the Third Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code as it Applies to the TCEH Debtors and EFH Shared Services Debtors, Dkt. No. 9421, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 29, 2016); Third Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 9375, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 23, 2016).
47. See Notice of Appeal, Dkt. No. 9521, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 12, 2016).
48. Order Scheduling Certain Hearing Dates and Deadlines and Establishing Certain Protocols in Connection with Confirmation of the Debtors' Joint Plan of Reorganization as it Relates to the EFH/EFIH Debtors, Dkt. No. 9381, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp.*, Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 24, 2016).

49. See Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc., Case No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Oct. 8, 2015).
50. See Declaration of Joseph E. Linehan in Support of Chapter 11 Petition and First Day Motions at ¶ 18, Dkt. No. 8, In re Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc., Case No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Oct. 8, 2015).
51. *Id.*
52. See *id.* at ¶¶ 19-20.
53. See Notice of Appointment of Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants, Dkt. No. 73, In re Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc., Case No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 2015).
54. See Default Order Appointing Gary Philip Nelson as the Legal Representative of Holders of Future Asbestos Demands Nunc Pro Tunc as of November 30, 2015, Dkt. No. 199, In re Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc., Case No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Dec. 23, 2015).
55. See Order Extending the Debtor's Exclusive Periods to File a Chapter 11 Plan and Solicit Acceptances Thereof, Dkt. No. 566, In re Geo. V. Hamilton, Inc., Case No. 15-23704 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. July 21, 2016).
56. See Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Sept. 14, 2012).
57. See Declaration of David F. Mack in Support of First Day Motions at ¶ II.B.1, Dkt. No. 3, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Sept. 17, 2012).
58. See *id.* at ¶¶ II.B.12-13.
59. See *id.* at ¶ II.B.16.
60. See Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co., Dkt. No. 397, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Oct. 8, 2014).
61. See Objection to Disclosure Statement for the Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co., Dkt. No. 412, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Nov. 11, 2014).
62. See Disclosure Statement for the Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co., Dkt. No. 416, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Nov. 14, 2014); Order, Dkt. No. 418, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Nov. 19, 2014).
63. See Amended Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co. at Arts. III.B.6, IV.E, and IV.L, Dkt. No. 424, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Dec. 22, 2014).
64. See *id.* at Art. III.B.6(b).
65. See Preliminary Objection of Republic Insurance Company, National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA, Granite State Insurance Company, and American International Specialty Lines Insurance Company to the Amended Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co., Dkt. No. 438, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Dec. 24, 2014).
66. See Order Confirming Amended Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co. Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 447, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Dec. 31, 2014).
67. See Republic Insurance Company's, National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA's, Granite State Insurance Company's, and American International Specialty Lines Insurance Company's Joint Notice of Appeal of Order Confirming Amended Plan of Liquidation, Dkt. No. 455, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Jan. 14, 2015).
68. See Order, Dkt. No. 486, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Feb. 24, 2015).
69. See Final Decree, Dkt. No. 494, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. March 3, 2015).

70. *See* Order Granting Joint Motion to Dismiss Appeal, Dkt. No. 7, Republic Insurance Company v. Henry Vogt Machine Co. (In re Henry Vogt Machine Co.), No. 3:15-cv-00069-JHM (W.D. Ky. March 6, 2015).
71. *See* Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 2015).
72. *See* Declaration of Frederick W. Stein in Support of Chapter 11 Petition and First Day Pleadings of Oakfabco, Inc. at ¶ 10, Dkt. No. 19, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 7, 2015).
73. *Id.* at ¶ 11.
74. *Id.* at ¶ 12. *See* Kewanee Boiler Corp. v. Smith (In re Kewanee Boiler Corp.), 198 B.R. 519 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1996).
75. *Id.* at ¶ 18.
76. *Id.* at ¶ 16.
77. *Id.* at ¶ 15.
78. *Id.* at ¶ 19.
79. *Id.* at ¶ 20.
80. *See* Notice of Appointment of the Asbestos Claimants' Committee, Dkt. No. 51, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 27, 2015).
81. *See* Debtor's Motion for an Order: (I) Approving the Assumption of a Settlement Agreement and Release between Oakfabco, Inc. and Affiliated FM Insurance Company; (II) Approving the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies to Affiliated FM Insurance Company; and (III) Issuing an Injunction in Favor of Affiliated FM Insurance Company Pursuant to the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies, Dkt. No. 65, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 11, 2015); Debtor's Motion for an Order: (I) Approving the Assumption of a Settlement Agreement and Release between Oakfabco, Inc. and the CNA Companies; (II) Approving the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies to the CNA Companies; and (III) Issuing an Injunction in Favor of the CNA Companies Pursuant to the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies, Dkt. No. 66, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 11, 2015); Debtor's Motion for an Order: (I) Approving the Assumption of a Settlement Agreement and Release between Oakfabco, Inc. and New England Reinsurance Company; (II) Approving the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies to New England Reinsurance Company; and (III) Issuing an Injunction in Favor of New England Reinsurance Company and Certain Others Pursuant to the Sale of Certain Insurance Policies, Dkt. No. 67, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 11, 2015).
82. *See* Order Approving Settlement With Affiliated FM Insurance Company, Including the Sale of Insurance Policies, Free and Clear of Liens, Claims, Interests, and Other Encumbrances, Dkt. No. 257, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. June 27, 2016).
83. *See* Asbestos Committee's Objection to Debtor's Proposed Settlements with CNA and Hartford, Dkt. No. 268, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 1, 2016).
84. *Id.* at 4-5.
85. *Id.* at 6.
86. *See* Order Further Extending the Debtor's (I) Exclusive Periods to File a Chapter 11 Plan and Solicit Acceptances Thereof and (II) Deadline to File a Chapter 11 Plan and Disclosure Statement, Dkt. No. 261, In re Oakfabco, Inc., No. 15-27062 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. June 27, 2016).
87. *See* Declaration of Roger L. Willis, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer of Reichhold, Inc. in Support of Chapter 11 Petitions and First Day Motions at ¶¶ 15-17, Dkt. No. 13, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 30, 2014).
88. *Id.* at ¶¶ 20-40.
89. *Id.* at ¶ 55.
90. *See* Order Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Sections 105(a), 363, 365, and Bankruptcy Rules 2002,

- 6004, 6006 (I) Approving the Sale of the Debtors' Assets Free and Clear of all Liens, Claims, Encumbrances and Interests; (II) Authorizing the Assumption and Assignment of Certain Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases; and (III) Granting Certain Related Relief, Dkt. No. 479, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Jan. 12, 2015).
91. See Order Authorizing the Debtors to Change the Name of Reichhold, Inc. and Changing the Caption for Filings in the Debtors' Cases, Dkt. No. 717, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. May 5, 2015).
92. See Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors, Dkt. No. 1043, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 15, 2015).
93. See Disclosure Statement with Respect to Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors at 30-31, Dkt. No. 1042, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 15, 2015).
94. *Id.* at 31.
95. See Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Confirming Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors, Dkt. No. 1385, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Jan. 13, 2016).
96. See Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors at Art. III.G.2, Dkt. No. 1247, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Nov. 19, 2015).
97. *Id.* at Art. VIII.B.6.
98. See Notice of Filing of Final Products Insurance Cooperation Agreement, Dkt. No. 1388, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Jan. 14, 2016); Notice of (A) Entry of Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Confirming Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors; (B) the Effective Date of the Plan; (C) Substantial Consummation of the Plan; and (D) Bar Dates for Certain Administrative, Professional Fee and Rejection Claims, Dkt. No. 1480, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. March 3, 2016).
99. See Voluntary Petition, Dkt. No. 1, In re Sepco Corp., No. 16-50058 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio Jan. 1, 2016).
100. See Declaration of Richard J. Szekelylin in Support of Chapter 11 Petition and First-Day Papers at ¶ 13, Dkt. No. 16, In re Sepco Corp., No. 16-50058 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio Jan. 14, 2016).
101. *Id.* at ¶ 14.
102. *Id.* at ¶ 11.
103. *Id.* at ¶ 3.
104. *Id.*
105. See Notice of Appointment of Committee of Asbestos Claimants, Dkt. No. 37, In re Sepco Corp., No. 16-50058 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio Feb. 1, 2016).
106. See Order Granting Debtor's Motion to Further Extend Exclusive Periods within which to File a Chapter 11 Plan and to Solicit Acceptance Thereof, Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1121(d), Dkt. No. 128, In re Sepco Corp., No. 16-50058 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio July 25, 2016).
107. See Notice of Appointment of the Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants, Dkt. No. 364, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. July 30, 2014).
108. See Order (I) Establishing Bar Dates for Filing Proofs of Claim, (II) Approving Form and Manner of Notice Thereof, and (III) Granting Related Relief, Dkt. No. 626, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Oct. 23, 2014).
109. *Id.* at Ex. 2.
110. See Sixth Omnibus Objection of the Debtor to Claims filed by Individuals Alleging Property,

- Personal or Bodily Injury arising from Exposure to Asbestos, Dkt. No. 1003, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 13, 2015).
111. *See* Debtor's Motion for an Order, Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 105(a) and Bankruptcy Rule 3007, Approving Claim Objection Procedures, Dkt. No. 1077, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 11, 2015).
112. *See* Insurers' Motion for an Order, Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 105(a) and Bankruptcy Rule 3007, Approving Claim Objection Procedures and Joinder in Debtor's Claim Objection Procedures Motion, Dkt. No. 1076, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 11, 2015).
113. *See* Disclosure Statement for Chapter 11 Plan dated September 30, 2015 at 19, Dkt. No. 1134, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 30, 2015).
114. *See* Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated September 30, 2015 at Art. II.B.5, Dkt. No. 1132, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 30, 2015).
115. *Id.*
116. *See* Motion of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants to Withdraw the Reference with Respect to the Sixth Omnibus Objection of the Debtor to Claims Filed by Individuals Alleging Property, Personal Injury or Bodily Injury Arising from Exposure to Asbestos [Dkt. No. 1003], Dkt. No. 1149, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Oct. 9, 2015); Emergency Motion of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants to Extend Time for Parties to Respond to the Sixth Omnibus Objection of the Debtor to Claims Filed by Individuals Alleging Property, Personal Injury or Bodily Injury Arising from Exposure to Asbestos [Dkt. No. 1003] and to Reduce Notice pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006(C) and 9007, Dkt. No. 1151, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Oct. 9, 2015).
117. Motion of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants to Modify the Automatic Stay, Dkt. No. 1204, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Nov. 6, 2015).
118. *See* Notification of Docket Entry, Dkt. No. 20, The Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants v. The Budd Co. (In re The Budd Co.), No. 15-cv-9492 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 6, 2016).
119. *See* Notification of Docket Entry, Dkt. No. 16, The Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants v. The Budd Co. (In re The Budd Co.), No. 16-cv-998 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 29, 2016).
120. *See* Memorandum Opinion on Motion of Asbestos Committee to Modify Stay as to Asbestos Claimants (Dkt. 1204), Dkt. No. 1569, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Feb. 10, 2016).
121. *Id.*
122. *See* Order Granting Joint Motion to Alter or Amend Order Modifying the Automatic Stay, Dkt. No. 1654, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. March 10, 2016); Order Granting Second Joint Motion to Alter or Amend Order Modifying the Automatic Stay, Dkt. No. 1740, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Apr. 1, 2016); Order Granting Second [sic] Joint Motion to Alter or Amend Order Modifying the Automatic Stay, Dkt. No. 1784, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Apr. 29, 2016).
123. *See* Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated May 4, 2016, Dkt. No. 1797, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. May 4, 2016); Disclosure Statement for the Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated May 4, 2016 at II-1 and II-17, Dkt. No. 1798, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. May 4, 2016).
124. *See* Order Authorizing Debtor to Enter into Cost Sharing Agreement with Participating Carriers for Defense and Indemnification of Budd Asbestos-Related Bodily Injury Claims, Dkt. No. 1864, In

- re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. May 31, 2016).
125. *See* Order Confirming Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated May 4, 2016, Dkt. No. 1913, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. June 27, 2016).
126. *See* Notice of Effective Date of Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated May 4, 2016, Dkt. No. 1984, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Aug. 2, 2016).
127. *See* Order Designating TIG Insurance Company a Settling Asbestos Insurance Company Entitled to the Benefits of the Asbestos Permanent Channeling Injunction Issued Pursuant to the Confirmed Chapter 11 Plan, Dkt. No. 324, In re Christy Refractories Co., No. 08-48541 (Bankr. E.D. Mo. Oct. 9, 2013); Order Designating National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as a Settling Asbestos Insurance Company Entitled to the Benefits of the Asbestos Permanent Channeling Injunction Pursuant to the Confirmed Plan, Dkt. No. 330, In re Christy Refractories Co., No. 08-48541 (Bankr. E.D. Mo. July 30, 2014); Order Designating United States Fire Insurance Company as a Settling Asbestos Insurance Company Entitled to the Benefits of the Asbestos Permanent Channeling Injunction Pursuant to the Confirmed Chapter 11 Plan, Dkt. No. 337, In re Christy Refractories Co., No. 08-48541 (Bankr. E.D. Mo. Apr. 6, 2016).
128. *See* Consent Order Resolving Appeal of Order Confirming Plan of Liquidation, Dkt. No. 105, In re Consolidated Aluminum Corp., No. 13-37149 (Bankr. D.N.J. July 28, 2014).
129. *See* Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Approving the Debtor's Disclosure Statement on a Final Basis and Confirming Debtor's Plan of Liquidation, Dkt. No. 104, In re Consolidated Aluminum Corp., No. 13-37149 (Bankr. D.N.J. July 28, 2014).
130. *See* Final Decree, Dkt. No. 122, In re Consolidated Aluminum Corp., No. 13-37149 (Bankr. D.N.J. Apr., 22, 2015).
131. *See* (1) Findings of Fact, (2) Conclusions of Law, (3) Order and Notice of Certain Bar Dates, and (4) Order Regarding Confirmation of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in Respect of The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited (As Modified November 16, 2011), Dkt. No. 7254, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 04-11300 (JKF) (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 21, 2012).
132. *See* Order Affirming Confirmation of Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in Respect of The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited (As Modified November 16, 2011), Issuing Channeling Injunction Under 11 U.S.C. § 524(g), Issuing the Mines Liquidating Injunction Under 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), and Adopting Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and the Memorandum Opinion Overruling Objections to the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization, Dkt. No. 48, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 13-cv-00227 (D. Del. July 10, 2014).
133. *See* Second Supplemental Disclosure Statement Regarding the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in Respect of The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited (As Modified February 9, 2015), Dkt. No. 8705, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 04-11300 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. Feb. 9, 2015); Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in Respect of The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited (As Modified February 9, 2015), Dkt. No. 8706, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 04-11300 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. Feb. 9, 2015).
134. *See* (1) Findings of Fact, (2) Conclusions of Law, (3) Order and Notice of Certain Bar Dates, and (4) Order Regarding Confirmation of the Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization in Respect of the Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited (As Modified February 9, 2015), Dkt. No. 9059, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 04-11300 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 10, 2015).
135. *See* Order, Dkt. No. 2, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 15-mc-00204 (D. Del. Aug. 13, 2015).

136. *See* Order, Doc. No. 003112096511, In re: Flintkote Company, No. 14-3367 (3rd Cir. Oct. 8, 2015).
137. *See* Order Approving Settlement Agreement, Policy Buyback, and Mutual Release between Debtors and Travelers, Dkt. No. 8898, In re The Flintkote Company and Flintkote Mines Limited, No. 04-11300 (MFW) (Bankr. D. Del. May 26, 2015).
138. *See* Order on Trust Payments, Applicability of a Bond, and Motions to Seal, Dkt. No. 156, Flintkote Co., et al., v. Aviva PLC, et al., No. 3:15-cv-01638-SI (N.D. Cal. April 4, 2016).
139. *See id.* at 4.
140. *See id.* at 24-25.
141. *See* Order on Bond Amount, Dkt. No. 161, Flintkote Co., et al., v. Aviva PLC, et al., No. 3:15-cv-01638-SI (N.D. Cal. May 9, 2016).
142. *See* Order on Debtor's Motion to Establish Bar Date for Settled Asbestos Claims, Dkt. No. 3854, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. July 9, 2014).
143. *See* Debtors' Second Amended Plan of Reorganization, Dkt. No. 4306, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Jan. 14, 2015).
144. *See* Disclosure Statement for Debtors' Second Amended Plan of Reorganization at 1, Dkt. No. 4316, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Jan. 16, 2015).
145. *See* Order Approving Disclosure Statement and Establishing Asbestos Claims Bar Date and Procedures for Solicitation, Dkt. No. 4542, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Apr. 10, 2015).
146. *Id.* at 4.
147. *Id.*
148. *Id.* at 5-6.
149. *Id.* at 8.
150. *Id.* at 13.
151. *See* Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Debtors' Motion for Leave to Serve Subpoena on Manville Trust, Dkt. No. 4721, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. July 24, 2015).
152. *See* Debtors' Response to Motion of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants for Protective Order Regarding Debtors' Discovery to One Hundred and Eleven Law Firms at 1-2, Dkt. No. 5042, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Nov. 13, 2015); Motion of the Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants for Protective Order Regarding Debtors' Discovery to One Hundred and Eleven Law Firms, Dkt. No. 4936, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Oct. 27, 2015).
153. *See* Amended Notice of Proposed Agenda of Matters Scheduled for Hearing on January 6, 2016 at 9:30 a.m., Dkt. No. 5201, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. Jan. 5, 2016). *See also* Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC, et al. and OldCo, LLC, Proposed Successor by Merger to Coltec Industries Inc. at 35, Dkt. No. 5332, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. May 20, 2016).
154. *See* Joint Plan of Reorganization of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC, et al. and OldCo, LLC, Proposed Successor by Merger to Coltec Industries Inc., Dkt. No. 5331, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. May 20, 2016).
155. *See* Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization of Garlock Sealing Technologies LLC, et al. and OldCo, LLC, Proposed Successor by Merger to Coltec Industries Inc. at 26-27, Dkt. No. 5332, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. May 20, 2016).
156. *Id.*

157. *See* Order Approving Disclosure Statement and Establishing Confirmation Procedures, Dkt. No. 5445, In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, No. 10-31607 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. July 29, 2016).
158. *Id.* at ¶ 12.
159. *Id.* at ¶ 22.
160. *See* Order, Dkt. No. 78, Nicholl Claimants v. Maryland Casualty Co., et al. (In re Lloyd E. Mitchell Inc.), No. 14-1327 (4th Cir. Sept. 19, 2014).
161. *See* Order Dismissing Debtor's Chapter 11 Case, Dkt. No. 1267, In re Lloyd E. Mitchell, Inc., No. 06-13250 (Bankr. D. Md. Nov. 5, 2014).
162. *See* Order Affirming the Bankruptcy Court's Order Confirming the Plan of Reorganization of Metex Mfg. Corporation Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 5, In re Metex Manufacturing Corp., Case No. 14-MISC-00213-P1 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 1, 2014).
163. *See* Notice of Effective Date of Plan of Reorganization of Metex Mfg. Corporation Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 600, In re Metex Manufacturing Corp., Case No. 12-14554 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Sept. 3, 2014).
164. *See* Dismissal Agreement Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8001(c)(2), Dkt. No. 52, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company, *et al.* v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. March 14, 2014); Order re Stipulation of Dismissal, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. March 17, 2014).
165. *See* Order, Dkt. No. 82, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. Sept. 30, 2014).
166. *See* Mt. McKinley Insurance Company's and Everest Reinsurance Company's Notice of Appeal to United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Dkt. No. 86, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. Oct. 29, 2014).
167. *See* Mt. McKinley Insurance Company's and Everest Reinsurance Company's Motion for Relief from Judgment, Dkt. No. 90, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. March 26, 2015).
168. *Id.* at 2.
169. *See* Order, Dkt. No. 113, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. Aug. 12, 2015); Mt. McKinley Insurance Company's and Everest Reinsurance Company's Notice of Appeal to United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Dkt. No. 114, Mt. McKinley Insurance Company v. Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 13-cv-01639-JFC (W.D. Pa. Aug. 13, 2015).
170. *See* Stipulation for Dismissal of Appeals, Doc. No. 003112172306, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Nos. 14-4329 and 15-2954 (3rd Cir. Jan. 6, 2016); Order, Doc. No. 003112172637, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Nos. 14-4329 and 15-2954 (3rd Cir. Jan. 7, 2016).
171. *See* Plan Proponents' Motion for Approval of Technical Amendments to the Modified Third Amended Plan of Reorganization dated January 29, 2009, Dkt. No. 10484, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Feb. 11, 2016).
172. *See* Order Approving Technical Amendments to the Modified Third Amended Plan of Reorganization dated January 29, 2009, Dkt. No. 10551, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. March 24, 2016).
173. *See* Notice of Filing of Composite Plan Documents, Dkt. No. 10572, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. March 29, 2016).
174. *See* Notice of Effective Date of Modified Third Amended Plan of Reorganization of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation dated January 29, 2009, as Amended, Dkt. No. 10616, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Apr. 26, 2016).
175. *See* Motion of Pittsburgh Corning Corporation for an Order Entering Final Decree Closing its Chapter

- 11 Case Pursuant to Section 350(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 10751, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Aug. 29, 2016).
176. See Order Scheduling Date for Response and Hearing on Motion, Dkt. No. 10752, In re Pittsburgh Corning Corp., No. 00-22876 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. Aug. 31, 2016).
177. See Order Denying Appeal from Confirmation of Revised Plan of Reorganization, Dkt. No. 76, OneBeacon Ins. Co. v. Plant Insulation Co., Case No. 14-01200 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2014); Order Affirming Confirmation of Revised Plan of Reorganization, Dkt. No. 77, OneBeacon Ins. Co. v. Plant Insulation Co., Case No. 14-01200 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2014).
178. See Notice of Occurrence of Modified Effective Date, Establishment of the Trust, Issuance of the Injunctions, Effectiveness of the Discharge and Effectiveness of Releases and Exculpations; and Notice of Administrative Claim Bar Date and Rejection Claims Bar Date, Dkt. No. 2860, In re Plant Insulation Company, Case No. 09-31347 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. Oct., 2, 2014).
179. See Complaint, Dkt. No. 447, In re Rapid-American Corp., No. 13-10687 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 31, 2015).
180. See Second Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 29, 30, Dkt. No. 26, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 24, 2015).
181. See Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Support of their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Dkt. No. 43, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Jan. 22, 2016).
182. See Plaintiffs' Motion for and Memorandum in Support of Summary Judgment that Travelers' Excess Policies are Triggered at such Time as Rapid has Incurred Sufficient Liability to Exhaust the Underlying Coverage, Dkt. No. 47, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Jan. 22, 2016).
183. See Memorandum of Law in Support of National Union's Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that National Union Policy No. 122-93-43 Has a Total Aggregate Limit of Liability of \$7 Million, Dkt. No. 56, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 10, 2016); Memorandum of Law in Support of National Union's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment that the Coverage Obligations of National Union's Excess Policies do not Attach until all Underlying Coverage is Exhausted by Actual Payment of Claims or Losses, Dkt. No. 62, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 10, 2016).
184. See Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion and in Support of Travelers' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment that the St. Paul Policy is not Attached until the Underlying Limits have been Paid by or on Behalf of Rapid-American Corporation, Dkt. No. 59, Rapid-American Corp., et al. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co., et al. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 10, 2016); Travelers' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion and in Support of Travelers' Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Limits, Dkt. No. 67, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-01095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. March 15, 2016).
185. See Memorandum Decision and Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiffs' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Granting Defendants' Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment, Dkt. No. 94, Rapid-American Corp. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. (In re Rapid-American Corp.), No. 15-1095 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. June 7, 2016).
186. See *id.* at 27 & n.2.
187. See Stipulated Order Approving Agreement between Chapter 7 Trustee and Certain Insurers and Lifting the Automatic Stay for Assertion of Asbestos Claims

- Subject to Certain Conditions, Dkt. No. 112, In re Resillo Press Pad Co., Case No. 13-02916 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 9, 2014).
188. *See* Bankruptcy Case Closed and Trustee Discharged, Dkt. No. 124, In re Resillo Press Pad Co., Case No. 13-02916 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Feb. 4, 2015).
189. *See* Motion of Republic Powdered Metals, Inc. and NMBFiL, Inc. for an Order (I) Directing the Joint Administration of their Chapter 11 Cases and (II) Extending to them Certain Relief Granted to Specialty Products Holding Corp. and Bondex International, Inc. at ¶ 1, Dkt. No. 4910, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp. No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 31, 2014).
190. *See* Order Establishing Bar Dates for Filing Proofs of Claim, Other Than Asbestos Personal Injury Claims, and Approving Related Relief, Dkt. No. 5021, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp. No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 26, 2014).
191. *See* Joint Plan of Reorganization of Specialty Products Holding Corp., Bondex International, Inc., Republic Powdered Metals, Inc., and NMBFiL, Inc. at 1, Dkt. No. 5117, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp. No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Oct. 23, 2014).
192. *See id.* at Arts. IV.E and IV.I.2.
193. *See id.* at Art. IX.B.2.
194. *See* Order Confirming the Joint Plan of Reorganization of Specialty Products Holding Corp., Bondex International, Inc., Republic Powdered Metals, Inc., and NMBFiL, Inc., as Modified, Dkt. No. 5261, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp., No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 10, 2014).
195. *See* Notice of (I) Entry of Order Confirming the Joint Plan of Reorganization of Specialty Products Holding Corp., Bondex International, Inc., Republic Powdered Metals, Inc., and NMBFiL, Inc.; (II) Effective Date and (III) Bar Date for Certain Administrative Claims, Professional Fee Claims and Rejection Damage Claims, Dkt. No. 5291, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp., No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 23, 2014).
196. *See* Joint Motion for Voluntary Dismissal of Appeals and Related Proceeding, Dkt. No. 5537, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp., No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 23, 2015); *So Ordered*, re 34 Joint Motion to Dismiss Based upon Rule 8023 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure for Civ. No. 13-1244 and Civ. No. 13-1245 and as Moot for Miscellaneous Action No. 13-0194, Dkt. No. 5538, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp., No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 24, 2015).
197. *See* Complaint, Transaction ID 55665855, AIU Insurance Co. v. Philips Electronics North America, No. 9852 (Del. Ch. July 2, 2014).
198. *See* Memorandum Opinion at 16, Transaction ID 57334780, AIU Insurance Co. v. Philips Electronics North America, No. 9852 (Del. Ch. June 4, 2015).
199. *See id.* at 19-20.
200. *See* Order Regarding Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Defendant, the T H Agriculture & Nutrition, L.L.C. Asbestos Personal Injury Trust, to Produce Preliminary Information in Support of Plaintiffs' Audit of the Trust's Payments and Distributions to Claimants, and to Enter a Confidentiality Order, Transaction ID 58541770, AIU Insurance Company v. Philips Electronics North America, No. 9852 (Del. Ch. Feb. 8, 2016).
201. *See* Order Regarding Confidentiality of Audit Information, Transaction ID 58541770, AIU Insurance Company v. Philips Electronics North America, No. 9852 (Del. Ch. Feb. 8, 2016).
202. *See* Modified First Amended Plan of Reorganization of United Gilsonite Laboratories Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 2013, In re United Gilsonite Laboratories, No. 11-2032 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. Sept. 30, 2014).
203. *Id.* at 27.
204. *See* Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Approving Exit Facility and Confirming the

- Modified First Amended Plan of Reorganization of United Gilsonite Laboratories Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, Dkt. No. 2190, In re United Gilsonite Laboratories, No. 11-02032 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2014); Order Under 11 U.S.C. § 524(g)(3)(A) Affirming Bankruptcy Court's Confirmation of Chapter 11 Reorganization Plan and Issuance of Channeling Injunction, Dkt. No. 12, In re United Gilsonite Laboratories, No. 3:14-cv-02045 (M.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2014).
205. See Orders Approving the Debtor's Entry into Settlement Agreements with Insurers, Dkt. Nos. 2192, 2194, 2196, 2198, 2201, and 2203, In re United Gilsonite Laboratories, No. 11-02032 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2014).
206. See Notice of (I) Entry of Order Confirming the Modified First Amended Plan of Reorganization of United Gilsonite Laboratories Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code; (II) Occurrence of the Effective Date; (III) Entry of Injunctions and Releases; and (IV) Plan Bar Dates, Dkt. No. 2383, In re United Gilsonite Laboratories, No. 11-02032 (Bankr. M.D. Pa. Dec. 8, 2014).
207. See Notice of Filing of Summary of Principal Terms for a Consensual Plan of Reorganization for Yarway Corporation, Dkt. No. 687, In re Yarway Corporation, No. 13-11025 (BLS) (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 12, 2014).
208. *Id.*
209. See Plan of Reorganization for Yarway Corporation Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by Yarway Corporation and Tyco International PLC, Dkt. No. 705, In re Yarway Corporation, No. 13-11025 (BLS) (Bankr. D. Del. Dec. 22, 2014).
210. See *id.*, at §§ 1.1.72, 1.1.84, 1.1.105, 10.3.
211. See Order Confirming the Plan of Reorganization for Yarway Corporation Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by Yarway Corporation and Tyco International PLC, Dkt. No. 859, In re Yarway Corporation, No. 13-11025 (BLS) (Bankr. D. Del. April 8, 2015).
212. See Order, Dkt. No. 3, In re Yarway Corporation, No. 15-mc-00085-LPS (D. Del. July 14, 2015).
213. See Notice of (A) Entry of Confirmation Order, (B) Effective Date of the Plan, (C) Substantial Consummation of the Plan, and (D) Bar Date for Administrative Expense Claims Including Professional Fee Claims, Dkt. No. 987, In re Yarway Corporation, No. 13-11025 (BLS) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 19, 2015).
214. See In re Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC, 504 B.R. 71, 85 (Bankr. W.D.N.C. 2014).
215. See Reorganized Debtors' First Omnibus Objection to Proofs of Claim Asserting Asbestos Personal Injury Claims, Dkt. No. 5636, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp. No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 8, 2016).
216. See Order Disallowing with Prejudice Proofs of Claim Asserting Asbestos Personal Injury Claims, Dkt. No. 5667, In re Specialty Products Holding Corp. No. 10-11780 (PJW) (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 18, 2016).
217. See Order, Dkt. No. 26, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Apr. 1, 2014).
218. See Response of Debtor to Motion of Court to Set Claims Bar Date, Dkt. No. 317, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. July 18, 2014).
219. See Objection of The Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants to Fixing of an Asbestos Claims Bar Date and to Debtor's Proposed Bar Date Procedures and Forms, Dkt. No. 511, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Sept. 26, 2014).
220. *Id.*
221. See Order (I) Establishing Bar Dates for Filing Proofs of Claim, (II) Approving Form and Manner of Notice Thereof, and (III) Granting Related Relief, Dkt. No. 626, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. Oct. 24, 2014).
222. *Id.*

223. See Notification of Docket Entry, Dkt. No. 20, The Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants v. The Budd Co. (In re The Budd Co.), No. 15-cv-9492 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 6, 2016); Notification of Docket Entry, Dkt. No. 16, The Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants v. The Budd Co. (In re The Budd Co.), No. 16-cv-998 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 29, 2016).
224. See In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., 522 B.R. 520 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015).
225. See Order (A) Setting Bar Date for Filing Asbestos Proofs of Claim, (B) Approving the Form of and Manner for Filing Asbestos Proofs of Claim, and (C) Approving Notice Thereof, Dkt. No. 4997, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. July 15, 2015), as amended by Dkt. No. 5171, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. July 30, 2015).
226. See Third Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Energy Future Holdings Corp., et al., Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code as it Applies to the EFH Debtors and EFIH Debtors at Arts. III.B.3 and VIII.A, Dkt. No. 9199-1, In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., Case No. 14-10979 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 5, 2016).
227. See In re Motors Liquidation Co., ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 3766237 (2d Cir. July 13, 2016).
228. *Id.* at *13.
229. *Id.* at *14.
230. *Id.* at *16.
231. *Id.* at *21.
232. See Order, Dkt. No. 443, In re Motors Liquidation Co., No. 15-2844 (2d Cir. Sept. 14, 2016).
233. See Disclosure Statement Redline at p. 17, Dkt. No. 1799-2, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. May 4, 2016).
234. See Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. Dated May 4, 2016 at Art. IV.J.3, Dkt. No. 1797, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. May 4, 2016).
235. *Id.*
236. See Second Amended Disclosure Statement with Respect to Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors at p. 34, Dkt. No. 1246, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Nov. 19, 2015).
237. See Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Proposed by the Debtors at Art. III.G.2, Dkt. No. 1247, In re Reichhold Holdings US, Inc., Case No. 14-12237 (Bankr. D. Del. Nov. 19, 2015).
238. Disclosure Statement for the Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co. at n.1, Dkt. No. 416, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Nov. 14, 2014).
239. See Amended Plan of Liquidation of Henry Vogt Machine Co. at Arts. IV.E, and IV.L, Dkt. No. 424, In re Henry Vogt Machine Co., Case No. 12-34186 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. Dec. 22, 2014).
240. See Order Confirming Ninth Amended Chapter 11 Plan for The Budd Company, Inc. dated May 4, 2016 at 22, Dkt. No. 1913, In re The Budd Company, Inc., No. 14-11873 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. June 27, 2016).
241. See In re Energy Future Holdings Corp., 522 B.R. 520, 539 (Bankr. D. Del. 2015).
242. See In re Combustion Engineering, Inc., 391 F.3d 190, 233-34 (3d Cir. 2004).
243. See Motions of Honeywell International, Inc. for Access to Rule 2019 Exhibits, Dkt. No. 21106, In re Owens Corning Corp., Nos. 00-3837, 00-3854 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 10813, In re Armstrong World Industries, Inc., No. 00-4471 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 32718, In re W.R. Grace & Co., No. 01-01139 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 12711, In re USG Corp., No. 01-2094 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 4094, In re U.S. Mineral Products

- Co., No. 01-2471 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 10351, In re Kaiser Aluminum Corp., No. 02-10429 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 3751, In re ACandS, Inc., No. 02-12687 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 3502, In re Combustion Engineering, Inc. No. 03-10495 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016); Dkt. No. 9338, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016).
244. *See e.g.*, Motion of Honeywell International, Inc. for Access to Rule 2019 Exhibits at 2-3, Dkt. No. 9338, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. June 30, 2016).
245. *Id.* at 4-5.
246. *Id.* at 8-12.
247. *See e.g.*, Joinder of Ford Motor Company to Motion of Honeywell International, Inc. for Access to Rule 2019 Exhibits, Dkt. No. 9339, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. July 6, 2016).
248. *See e.g.*, Objection of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to Honeywell's Motion for Access to Rule 2019 Exhibits, Dkt. No. 9346, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. July 26, 2016); Joinder of Certain Trust Advisory Committees to the Objection of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to Honeywell's Motion for Access to Rule 2019 Exhibits, Dkt. No. 9348, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. July 26, 2016).
249. *See e.g.*, Emergency Motion of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to (1) Consolidate and Continue Hearings and (2) Appoint Rule 2019 Expert and Referee, Dkt. No. 9360, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 4, 2016).
250. *See e.g.*, Omnibus Objection of Honeywell International Inc. to (I) Emergency Motion of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to (1) Consolidate and Continue Hearings and (2) Appoint Rule 2019 Expert and Referee and (II) Motion of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to Shorten Notice on its Emergency Motion of The North American Refractories Company Asbestos Personal Injury Settlement Trust Advisory Committee to (1) Consolidate and Continue Hearings and (2) Appoint Rule 2019 Expert and Referee, Dkt. No. 9364, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 5, 2016).
251. *See e.g.*, Letter from The Hon. Kevin Gross to Judith K. Fitzgerald, Esq., Dkt. No. 9376, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 24, 2016).
252. *See e.g.*, Letter from Judith K. Fitzgerald to The Hon. Kevin Gross, Dkt. No. 9382, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. Sept. 8, 2016).
253. *See e.g.*, Notice of Hearing, Dkt. No. 9379, In re The Flintkote Co., No. 04-11300 (Bankr. D. Del. Aug. 31, 2016).
254. *See* API, Inc. Asbestos Settlement Trust, Annual Report of the Trustee, 2015, <http://apiincasbestos-settlementtrust.com/documents/Annual%20Report%20of%20the%20Trustee%202015.pdf> (last visited Aug. 24, 2016). ■

MEALEY'S: ASBESTOS BANKRUPTCY REPORT
edited by Emerson Heffner

The Report is produced monthly by



1600 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 1655, Philadelphia, PA 19103, USA
Telephone: (215)564-1788 1-800-MEALEYS (1-800-632-5397)
Email: mealeyinfo@lexisnexis.com
Web site: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/mealeys>
ISSN 1537-2065