

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-10534

---

IN THE MATTER OF HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Debtor,*

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS,  
L.P., *now known as* NEXPOINT ASSET MANAGEMENT,  
L.P.; NEXPOINT ADVISORS, L.P.,

*Appellants,*

v.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

*Appellee.*

---

Argued: Feb. 28, 2024

Decided: Mar. 18, 2025

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
(No. 3:23-cv-573)

---

Before ELROD, *Chief Judge*, and WILLETT, and DUN-  
CAN, *Circuit Judges*.

JENNIFER WALKER ELROD, *Chief Judge*:

Appellants NexPoint Asset Management, L.P. and NexPoint Advisors, L.P. appeal the bankruptcy court’s approval of Appellee Highland Capital Management, L.P.’s revised Bankruptcy Confirmation Plan. Because the bankruptcy court partially failed to amend the Plan in accordance with our previous instructions, we REVERSE in part and REMAND.

## I

## A

Highland Capital Management, L.P., is a Dallas-based investment firm that was co-founded by James Dondero. *In re Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P. (Highland I)*, 48 F.4th 419, 424 (5th Cir. 2022).<sup>1</sup> For nearly three decades, Highland Capital has managed billion-dollar, publicly traded investment portfolios. *See id.* at 425. In 2019, however, “myriad unpaid judgments and liabilities forced Highland Capital to file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.” *Id.*

At the time Highland Capital filed for bankruptcy, Dondero served as a director and officer. *Id.* But at the start of the bankruptcy, the unsecured creditors’ committee negotiated an agreement with Dondero under which he would step down as a director and officer to serve as an “unpaid portfolio manager.” *Id.* The unsecured creditors’ committee then “selected a board of three independent directors to act as a quasi-trustee and to govern” Highland Capital. *Id.*

---

<sup>1</sup> We recount the facts as set out in *Highland I*.

During the bankruptcy, Dondero proposed several reorganization plans that the unsecured creditors' committee and the independent directors opposed. *Id.* at 426. When those plans failed, Dondero "began to frustrate the proceedings by objecting to settlements, appealing orders, seeking writs of mandamus, interfering with Highland Capital's management, threatening employees, and canceling trades between Highland Capital and its clients." *Id.* As a result, Highland Capital's independent directors insisted that Dondero resign from the company, which he did in October 2020. *Id.* In addition, the bankruptcy court held Dondero in civil contempt and sanctioned him for his behavior. See *Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P. v. Dondero (In re Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P.)*, Ch. 11 No. 19-34054-SGJ11, 2021 WL 2326350, at \*1, 26 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. June 7, 2021).

Meanwhile, the bankruptcy proceedings moved forward, and the unsecured creditors' committee and the independent directors agreed on a proposed reorganization plan. *Highland I*, 48 F.4th at 426–27. "Anticipating Dondero's continued litigiousness," the proposed plan included two provisions intended to shield Highland Capital and associated persons and entities from liability: the Exculpation Provision and the Injunction Provision. *Id.* at 427.

As proposed, the Plan's Exculpation Provision permanently extinguished "any claim, obligation, suit, judgment, damage, demand, debt, right, Cause of Action, remedy, loss, and liability" against a group of "Exculpated Parties" for any conduct related to:

(i) the filing and administration of the Chapter 11 Case; (ii) the negotiation and pursuit of the Disclosure Statement, the Plan, or the solicitation of votes for, or confirmation of, the Plan; (iii) the funding or consummation of the Plan (including the Plan Supplement) or any related agreements, instruments, or other documents, the solicitation of votes on the Plan, the offer, issuance, and Plan Distribution of any securities issued or to be issued pursuant to the Plan, including the Claimant Trust Interests, whether or not such Plan Distributions occur following the Effective Date; (iv) the implementation of the Plan; and (v) any negotiations, transactions, and documentation in connection with the foregoing clauses (i)-(iv).

The provision did not extend to actions by Highland Capital's general partner or its employees that predated the appointment of the independent directors, and it did not cover claims arising from "acts or omissions that constitute bad faith, fraud, gross negligence, criminal misconduct, or willful misconduct." *Id.* The Plan defined "Exculpated Parties" as:

collectively, (i) the Debtor and its successors and assigns, (ii) the Employees, (iii) Strand [Advisors, Inc., Highland Capital's general partner], (iv) the Independent Directors, (v) the [Unsecured Creditors'] Committee, (vi) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities), (vii) the Professionals retained by the Debtor and the Committee in the Chapter 11 Case, (viii) the CEO/CRO; and (ix) the Related Persons of each of the Parties listed in (iv) through (viii)[.]

The Plan's Injunction Provision, for its part, broadly enjoined certain persons and entities who

held claims against or equity interests in Highland Capital (the “Enjoined Parties”) from “taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan.” It also specifically prohibited the Enjoined Parties from suing, enforcing orders, or asserting rights of setoff so as to recover from Highland Capital or affect Highland Capital’s property. Then, in its Gatekeeper Clause, the provision implemented an injunction<sup>2</sup> prohibiting the Enjoined Parties from taking specific actions against the “Protected Parties,” stating:

[N]o Enjoined Party may commence or pursue a claim or cause of action of any kind against any Protected Party that arose or arises from or is related to the Chapter 11 Case, the negotiation of the Plan, the administration of the Plan or property to be distributed under the Plan, the wind down of the business of the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, the administration of the Claimant Trust or the Litigation Sub-Trust, or the transactions in furtherance of the foregoing without the Bankruptcy Court (i) first determining, after notice and a hearing, that such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim of any kind, including, but not limited to, negligence, bad faith, criminal misconduct, willful misconduct, fraud, or gross negligence against a Protected Party and (ii) specifically authorizing such

---

<sup>2</sup> Contrary to Highland Capital’s assertion, the Gatekeeper Clause *is* an injunction—a pre-filing injunction. See *IntegraNet Physician Res., Inc. v. Tex. Indep. Providers, LLC*, 945 F.3d 232, 237 (5th Cir. 2019) (“[T]he . . . court’s order prevents a party from filing future lawsuits without that judge’s permission—meaning it’s a pre-filing injunction.”).

Enjoined Party to bring such claim or cause of action against any such Protected Party[.]

The Plan defined the term “Protected Parties” as:

collectively, (i) the Debtor and its successors and assigns, direct and indirect majority-owned subsidiaries, and the Managed Funds, (ii) the Employees, (iii) Strand, (iv) the Reorganized Debtor, (v) the Independent Directors, (vi) the Committee, (vii) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities), (viii) the Claimant Trust, (ix) the Claimant Trustee, (x) the Litigation Sub-Trust, (xi) the Litigation Trustee, (xii) the members of the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee (in their official capacities), (xiii) New GP LLC, (xiv) the Professionals retained by the Debtor and the Committee in the Chapter 11 Case, (xv) the CEO/CRO; and (xvi) the Related Persons of each of the parties listed in (iv) through (xv)[.]

Dondero and several other interested parties objected to the Plan. *Id.* at 426. Among those parties were two entities that the bankruptcy court had found to be owned or controlled by Dondero: NexPoint Asset Management, L.P. (formerly known as Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.) and NexPoint Advisors, L.P. These two entities were Appellants in *Highland I* and are Appellants again in this appeal. The United States Trustee also objected to the Exculpation Provision, contending that these provisions constituted an impermissible nonconsensual release of non-debtors’ claims against other non-debtors. *Id.*; *see also* Bankr. Ct. Doc. 1671, at 4 (Jan. 5, 2021).

## B

The bankruptcy court confirmed the Plan over these objections. *Highland I*, 48 F.4th at 427. On direct appeal from the bankruptcy court under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2), we “reverse[d] only insofar as the plan exculpates certain non-debtors in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 524(e), str[uck] those few parties from the plan’s exculpation, and affirm[ed] on all remaining grounds.” *Id.* at 424.

The investment fund parties then requested panel rehearing, asking us to clarify whether our directive to strike certain persons and entities from the definition of the term “Exculpated Party” used in the Exculpation Provision also required striking the same persons and entities from the definition of the term “Protected Parties” used in the Injunction Provision’s Gatekeeper Clause. We granted panel rehearing and made one substantive change to the opinion: deleting the sentence, “The injunction and gatekeeper provisions are, on the other hand, perfectly lawful,” and replacing it with the sentence, “We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions.” *Id.* at 438.

Highland Capital then filed a Motion to Conform Plan, requesting that the bankruptcy court conform the Plan to our opinion in *Highland I* by, *inter alia*, narrowing the definition of the term “Exculpated Parties” to “(i) the Debtor, (ii) the Independent Directors, (iii) the Committee, and (iv) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities).” Because the motion did not propose any change to the definition of “Protected Parties” used in the Gatekeeper Clause, as Appellants believed that it should in light of *Highland*

*I*, Appellants filed a limited objection to the motion. In the objection, Appellants contended:

[A]mending the Plan only with respect to the definition of “Exculpated Parties” does not comport with the Fifth Circuit’s holding [in *Highland I*] because the Plan must also be changed with respect to its injunction and gatekeeper provisions in order to conform to the Final Opinion. As the Funds’ Response explains, the Plan’s permanent injunction provisions exculpate all included in the defined term “Protected Party.” To conform with the Final Opinion, this definition too must change.

The bankruptcy court held a hearing on the motion and Appellants’ objection. At the conclusion of the hearing, the bankruptcy court granted Highland’s motion as presented, without modifying the definition of “Protected Parties.” The bankruptcy court then issued a written opinion in support of its ruling, which confirmed its holding that *Highland I* required “that one change be made to the Plan to conform it to the mandate of the Fifth Circuit: revise the definition of ‘Exculpated Parties’ as proposed in the Motion and no more.”

Appellants petitioned for permission to appeal the Plan Conforming Order directly to this court, and we granted the petition. On appeal, Appellants ask us to consider two issues: (1) whether the bankruptcy court erred in failing to narrow the definition of “Protected Parties” used in the Gatekeeper Clause coextensively with its narrowing of the definition of “Exculpated Parties” used in the Exculpation Provision;



and (2) whether the Gatekeeper Clause, even if so narrowed, is lawful considering bankruptcy courts' limited jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup>

## II

We review a bankruptcy court's legal conclusions *de novo*. *Evolve Fed. Credit Union v. Barragan-Flores* (*In re Barragan-Flores*), 984 F.3d 471, 473 (5th Cir. 2021) (citation omitted).

## III

We conclude that the bankruptcy court failed to properly implement our instructions in *Highland I* when it declined to narrow the definition of "Protected Parties" used in the Gatekeeper Clause to include only "(i) the Debtor; (ii) the Independent Directors, for conduct within the scope of their duties; (iii) the Committee; and (iv) the members of the Committee in their official capacities, for conduct within the scope of their duties." In failing to make this change, the bankruptcy court exceeded its power under the Bankruptcy Code by allowing the Plan to improperly protect non-debtors from liability.

---

<sup>3</sup> Appellants raised the latter issue in their opening brief. But they walked this argument back at oral argument, averring that this appeal concerns only their first issue: whether *Highland I* should be read as narrowing the Gatekeeper Clause coextensively with the Exculpation Provision. Regardless, we decline to reach the second issue under our rule of orderliness. *See Mercado v. Lynch*, 823 F.3d 276, 279 (5th Cir. 2016). If Appellants wish to relitigate this issue, which was resolved in *Highland I*, they must do so via a petition for rehearing *en banc* or a petition for certiorari.

## A

Although bankruptcy courts have the power to “issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of” the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), this power is “not unlimited” and does not permit bankruptcy courts to “act as roving commission[s] to do equity.” *In re Mirant Corp.*, 378 F.3d 511, 523 (5th Cir. 2004) (alteration in original) (citing *In re Southmark Corp.*, 49 F.3d 1111, 1116 (5th Cir. 1995)). As relevant here, we have always recognized and enforced limitations on bankruptcy courts’ power to shield non-debtors from liability.

## 1

The Supreme Court and this court have definitively held that bankruptcy courts may not approve a confirmation plan that non-consensually releases non-debtors from liability related to a bankruptcy proceeding.<sup>4</sup> They have also recognized that bankruptcy injunctions, though not in themselves releases, similarly act to shield persons and entities from liability and therefore may not be entered to protect non-debtors not legally entitled to release.

“Although we interpret [11 U.S.C.] § 105 liberally” to allow bankruptcy courts a range of powers,

---

<sup>4</sup> We note that courts and bankruptcy confirmation plans often use the terms “release,” “exculpation,” and “discharge” loosely or interchangeably. Here, the Plan uses the term “exculpation” to refer to absolution from liability for both debts and conduct in the course of the bankruptcy. In this opinion, we mostly utilize the more generally used term “release,” but we discuss and apply cases that use other terminology when their usage is appropriate in the context of the discussion.

any action a bankruptcy court takes “must be consistent with the rest of the Bankruptcy Code.” *In re Zale Corp.*, 62 F.3d 746, 760 (5th Cir. 1995) (internal citations omitted). Notably, any bankruptcy court action must square with the Bankruptcy Code’s edict that “discharge of a debt of the debtor does not affect the liability of any other entity on . . . such debt.” 11 U.S.C. § 524(e); *see, e.g., In re Coho Res., Inc.*, 345 F.3d 338, 342–43 (5th Cir. 2003); *Hall v. Nat’l Gypsum Co.*, 105 F.3d 225, 229 (5th Cir. 1997); *In re Edgeworth*, 993 F.2d 51, 53–54 (5th Cir. 1993).

In accordance with this principle, the Supreme Court held recently in *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, 603 U.S. 204 (2024), that the Bankruptcy Code “does not authorize a release and injunction that, as part of a plan of reorganization under Chapter 11, effectively seeks to discharge claims against a non-debtor without the consent of the affected claimants.” *Id.* at 227. Even before *Purdue Pharma*, this court had held the same: that any provision that non-consensually releases non-debtors from liability for debts and/or conduct, and any injunction that acts to shield non-debtors from such liability, must be struck from a bankruptcy confirmation plan. *See, e.g., In re Pac. Lumber Co.*, 584 F.3d 229, 252 (5th Cir. 2009) (Fifth Circuit case law “seem[s] broadly to foreclose non-consensual non-debtor releases and permanent injunctions.”); *In re Vitro S.A.B. de C.V.*, 701 F.3d 1031, 1059, 1061–62 (5th Cir. 2012); *In re Zale Corp.*, 62

F.3d at 760 (“[W]e must overturn a § 105 injunction if it effectively discharges a nondebtor.”).<sup>5</sup>

As we explained in *Pacific Lumber*, “[t]he fresh start § 524(e) provides to debtors is not intended to serve th[e additional] purpose” of releasing non-debtors. 584 F.3d at 252–53. Thus, a bankruptcy court that approves a non-consensual release and/or injunction protecting non-debtors “exceed[s] its powers under § 105.” *In re Zale Corp.*, 62 F.3d at 761.

## 2

Relatedly, although we have recognized that bankruptcy courts have some power to perform gate-keeping functions, they nonetheless do not have unrestricted power to protect non-debtors from liability via a pre-filing injunction.

Under the *Barton* doctrine, we have acknowledged that an individual or entity may be required to obtain leave of the bankruptcy court before filing claims in another court “against the trustee or other bankruptcy-court-appointed officer, for acts done in the actor’s official capacity” in a bankruptcy proceeding, even if the bankruptcy court would not have jurisdiction to actually adjudicate those claims. *Villegas v. Schmidt*, 788 F.3d 156, 159 (5th Cir. 2015) (citation omitted); see *Carroll v. Abide*, 788 F.3d 502, 506–07 (5th Cir. 2015); accord *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S.

---

<sup>5</sup> The only situation in which permanent injunctions of third-party claims against non-debtors have been allowed is when the injunction “channel[s] those claims to allow recovery from separate assets and thereby avoid[s] discharging the nondebtor.” *In re Zale Corp.*, 62 F.3d at 760; see *In re Pac. Lumber Co.*, 584 F.3d at 252. The Bankruptcy Code explicitly authorizes this in mass tort asbestos cases. See 11 U.S.C. § 524(g).

126 (1881). The bankruptcy court may gatekeep such claims even after the bankruptcy proceeding has concluded. *See Villegas*, 788 F.3d at 157, 159.

We have articulated several rationales for allowing bankruptcy courts to perform this limited gatekeeping function. For one, it prevents “usurpation of the powers and duties which belong[] exclusively to [the appointing bankruptcy] court [that] . . . would [make] impossible of performance the duty of that court to distribute the trust assets to creditors equitably and according to their respective priorities.” *Barton*, 104 U.S. at 136; *see Carroll*, 788 F.3d at 506. In addition, “because a bankruptcy trustee is considered an officer of his appointing court, the bankruptcy court ‘has a strong interest in protecting him from unjustified personal liability for acts taken within the scope of his official duties.’” *Carroll*, 788 F.3d at 506 (footnotes omitted) (quoting *In re Lehal Realty Assocs.*, 101 F.3d 272, 276 (2d Cir. 1996)).

Beyond these few abovenamed non-debtor individuals, we have never extended the *Barton* doctrine to give bankruptcy courts gatekeeping power over claims against non-debtors. *See, e.g., Villegas*, 788 F.3d at 159; *Carroll*, 788 F.3d at 505; *In re Preferred Ready-Mix, LLC*, 2024 WL 5252498, at \*1 (5th Cir. Dec. 31, 2024); *In re Foster*, 2023 WL 20872, at \*5 (5th Cir. Jan. 3, 2023); *In re Grodsky*, 799 F. App’x 271, 273 n.2 (5th Cir. 2020); *Baron v. Vogel*, 678 F. App’x 202, 203 (5th Cir. 2017).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Other circuits have extended the *Barton* doctrine to protect a wider variety of court-appointed and court-approved fiduciaries and their agents. *See, e.g., Helmer v. Pogue*, 2012 WL 5231153, at \*2–12 (N.D. Ala. Oct. 22, 2012) (applying *Barton* to debtor-in-

## B

As it must, *Highland I* obeys these bedrock principles concerning bankruptcy courts' power to protect non-debtors. Consequently, the proper reading of *Highland I* is to require the bankruptcy court to narrow the definition of "Protected Parties" used in the Gatekeeper Clause coextensively with the definition of "Exculpated Parties" used in the Exculpation Provision, to read simply: "collectively, (i) the Debtor; (ii) the Independent Directors, for conduct within the scope of their duties; (iii) the Committee; and (iv) the members of the Committee in their official capacities, for conduct within the scope of their duties." Both (1) the opinion's plain language and (2) the change made to the opinion on rehearing elucidate this holding.

## 1

The plain language of two particular sections of *Highland I* indicates that the definition of "Protected Parties" must be narrowed.

---

possession); *In re Silver Oak Homes, Ltd.*, 167 B.R. 389, 394–95 (Bankr. D. Md. 1994) (applying *Barton* to debtor-in-possession's president); *Gordon v. Nick*, 1998 WL 559734, at \*2–3 (4th Cir. 1998) (applying *Barton* to debtor-in-possession's general partner); *Lawrence v. Goldberg*, 573 F.3d 1265, 1270 (11th Cir. 2009) (applying *Barton* to trustee's attorneys and creditors who "functioned as the equivalent of court appointed officers"); *In re Lowenbraun*, 453 F.3d 314, 321–22 (6th Cir. 2006) (applying *Barton* to trustee's attorney); *In re Ditech Holding Corp.*, 2021 WL 3716398, at \*10 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2021) (applying *Barton* to post-confirmation plan administrator, consumer claims representative, and their respective agents). But this circuit has never approved of broadening the *Barton* doctrine to cover such individuals.

First, in Part IV(E)(2), we stated that “Appellants’ primary contention—that the Plan’s injunction ‘is broad’ by releasing non-debtors in violation of § 524(e)—is resolved by our striking the impermissibly exculpated parties.” *Highland I*, 48 F.4th at 438. There is only one possible reading of this plain language: that we made a change to solve the Gatekeeper Clause’s broadness—namely, narrowing it to protect the same persons and entities as the narrowed Exculpation Provision lawfully protects. In this sentence, we agreed with Appellants that the Gatekeeper Clause, as written in the Plan, was too broad, but expressly stated that we were resolving this problem by narrowing the Gatekeeper Clause in coordination with our narrowing of the Exculpation Provision. Although we did not specify by name the persons and entities to be stricken from the Gatekeeper Clause’s definition of “Protected Parties,” it was implied that the same persons and entities stricken from the Exculpation Provision’s definition of “Exculpated Parties” were stricken also from the Gatekeeper Clause’s definition of “Protected Parties.” For clarity, we state now in explicit terms that *Highland I* struck all persons and entities from the definition of “Protected Parties” except Highland Capital; the Independent Directors, for conduct within the scope of their duties; the Committee; and the members of the Committee in their official capacities, for conduct within the scope of their duties.

In the next paragraph of *Highland I*, we considered the effect of the Injunction Provision on only “the legally exculpated parties.” *Id.* at 438. The use of this phrase further links our treatment of the Exculpation

Provision and the Injunction Provision and its Gatekeeper Clause. As just stated above, striking certain persons and entities from the Exculpation Provision had the effect of striking those same persons and entities from the Gatekeeper Clause, such that in the remainder of *Highland I* we needed to consider the effect of the Injunction Provision on only the “legally exculpated parties” in the remainder of the opinion. Consequently, our conclusion in Part IV(E)(2) that the injunction was “not unlawfully overbroad or vague” communicated our holding that the Injunction Provision was no longer overbroad in the sense that it protected persons and entities that it could not legally protect, because we had already stricken those persons and entities from the definition of “Protected Parties.”

Second, our summary of Part IV(E) of the *Highland I* opinion indicates that we narrowed both provisions coextensively. The summary states:

[T]he Plan violates § 524(e) but only insofar as it exculpates *and enjoins* certain non-debtors. The exculpatory order is therefore vacated as to all parties *except* Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors for conduct within the scope of their duties. We otherwise affirm the inclusion of the injunction and the gatekeeper provisions in the Plan.

*Id.* at 439 (first emphasis added). This is a crystal-clear statement of *Highland I*’s holding that the Plan was unlawful in that it both released *and* enjoined non-debtors that could not lawfully be protected. And the fact that *Highland I* states that we “*otherwise af-*



firm[ed] the inclusion of the injunction and gatekeeper provisions,” *id.*, shows that we made at least *some* alteration to the Injunction Provision and its Gatekeeper Clause. Given that no other changes to these provisions is evident from the face of *Highland I*, the only possible change was the non-debtors from the Gatekeeper Clause’s definition of “Protected Parties.”

## 2

The changes made to *Highland I* on rehearing only strengthen this reading of the opinion.

Preliminarily, the fact that the *Highland I* panel granted rehearing at all shows that it intended to make changes to the Gatekeeper Clause. The petition for limited panel rehearing asked the panel for one thing only: to “confirm that the scope of the injunction and gatekeeper provisions in the Plan are limited in accordance with the Court’s holding on the exculpation provision.” Although the panel did not explicitly state its reasoning for granting rehearing, this court generally only grants rehearing when parties “bring to [our] attention” specific issues in the original opinion. 5TH CIR. R. 40.1.2. Consequently, the *Highland I* panel would not have granted rehearing or made the change it did to the opinion for any purpose other than to address the issue raised by Appellants in their petition for panel rehearing.

Furthermore, on rehearing, the only change made to *Highland I* was to walk back the most conspicuous statement that could have been construed as saying that the Gatekeeper Clause should not be narrowed coextensively with the Exculpation Provision. At the beginning of Part IV(E)(2), the panel struck the

sentence, “The injunction and gatekeeper provisions are, on the other hand, perfectly lawful,” *In re Highland Cap. Mgmt., L.P.*, 2022 WL 3571094, at \*13 (5th Cir. Aug. 19, 2022) (withdrawn opinion), and replaced it with the sentence, “We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions,” *Highland I*, 48 F.4th at 438. In so doing, the panel took steps to rectify any erroneous message that the Injunction Provision and its Gatekeeper Clause, as written in the Plan, were fully lawful.<sup>7</sup>

#### IV

The clear weight of Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit precedent dictates our holding: that a proper reading of *Highland I* requires that the definition of “Protected Parties” used in the Plan’s Gatekeeper Clause be narrowed coextensively with the definition of “Exculpated Parties” used in the Exculpation Pro-

---

<sup>7</sup> Highland Capital’s argument that narrowing the Gatekeeper Clause in this way will “render it largely meaningless” does not undermine the conclusion that the definition of “Protected Parties” may not comprise more than the persons and entities to which we now clarify that it must be narrowed. It is indeed true, as Highland Capital points out, that “all the Exculpated Parties ceased to exist on the Effective Date of the Plan and have no role in any of the post-Effective Date activities,” such that limiting the Gatekeeper Clause in this way means that the clause will “not reach any conduct undertaken after the Effective Date.” But as explained above, *see supra* Part III(A), the bankruptcy court lacks the power to shield non-debtors from liability in this way. Furthermore, this will not gut the Gatekeeper Clause completely, as Highland Capital warns, because the clause will still allow the bankruptcy court to gatekeep claims raised against the remaining persons and entities related to their conduct during the bankruptcy proceedings.

vision. Any other reading of *Highland I* would improperly grant the bankruptcy court authority to enforce what is perhaps the broadest gatekeeper injunction ever written into a bankruptcy confirmation plan. Such authority is patently beyond the power of an Article I court under § 105.

Accordingly, we REVERSE in part and REMAND for the district court to revise the Plan's definitions of both "Exculpated Parties" and "Protected Parties" to read simply: "collectively, (i) the Debtor; (ii) the Independent Directors, for conduct within the scope of their duties; (iii) the Committee; and (iv) the members of the Committee in their official capacities, for conduct within the scope of their duties."

**APPENDIX B**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-10449

---

IN THE MATTER OF HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Debtor,*

NEXPOINT ADVISORS, L.P.; HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS, L.P.;  
HIGHLAND INCOME FUND; NEXPOINT STRATEGIC  
OPPORTUNITIES FUND; HIGHLAND GLOBAL  
ALLOCATION FUND; NEXPOINT CAPITAL,  
INCORPORATED; JAMES DONDERO; THE DUGABOY  
INVESTMENT TRUST; GET GOOD TRUST,

*Appellants,*

v.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

*Appellee.*

---

Argued: Mar. 8, 2022

Decided: Sept. 7, 2022

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas

(No. 3:21-cv-538)

(No. 19-34054)

---

Before WIENER, GRAVES, and DUNCAN, *Circuit Judges*.

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING

STUART KYLE DUNCAN, *Circuit Judge*:

The petition for panel rehearing is GRANTED. We withdraw our previous opinion, reported at 2022 WL 3571094, and substitute the following:

Highland Capital Management, L.P., a Dallas-based investment firm, managed billion-dollar, publicly traded investment portfolios for nearly three decades. By 2019, however, myriad unpaid judgments and liabilities forced Highland Capital to file for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. This provoked a nasty breakup between Highland Capital and its co-founder James Dondero. Under those trying circumstances, the bankruptcy court successfully mediated with the largest creditors and ultimately confirmed a reorganization plan amenable to most of the remaining creditors.

Dondero and other creditors unsuccessfully objected to the confirmation order and then sought review in this court. In turn, Highland Capital moved to dismiss their appeal as equitably moot. First, we hold that equitable mootness does not bar our review of any claim. Second, we affirm the confirmation order in large part. We reverse only insofar as the plan exculpates certain non-debtors in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 524(e), strike those few parties from the plan's exculpation, and affirm on all remaining grounds.

## I. BACKGROUND

### A. Parties

In 1993, Mark Okada and appellant James Dondero co-founded Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“Highland Capital”) in Dallas. Highland Capital managed portfolios and assets for other investment advisers and funds through a complex of entities under the Highland umbrella. Highland Capital’s ownership-interest holders included Hunter Mountain Investment Trust (99.5%); appellant The Dugaboy Investment Trust, Dondero’s family trust (0.1866%);<sup>1</sup> Okada, personally and through trusts (0.0627%); and Strand Advisors, Inc. (0.25%), the only general partner, which Dondero wholly owned.

Dondero also manages two of Highland Capital’s clients—appellants Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. and NexPoint Advisors, L.P. (the “Advisors”). Both the Advisors and Highland Capital serviced and advised billion-dollar, publicly traded investment funds for appellants Highland Income Fund, NexPoint Strategic Opportunities Fund, Highland Global Allocation Fund, and NexPoint Capital, Inc. (collectively, the “Funds”), among others. For example, on behalf of the Funds, Highland Capital managed certain investment vehicles known as collateral loan obligations (“CLOs”) under individualized servicing agreements.

### B. Bankruptcy Proceedings

Strapped with a series of unpaid judgments, Highland Capital filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Dugaboy Investment Trust appeals alongside Dondero’s other family trust Get Good Trust (collectively, the “Trusts”).

the District of Delaware in October 2019. The creditors included Highland Capital’s interest holders, business affiliates, contractors, former partners, employees, defrauded investors, and unpaid law firms. Among those creditors, the Office of the United States Trustee appointed a four-member Unsecured Creditors’ Committee (the “Committee”).<sup>2</sup> *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1102(a)(1), (b)(1). Throughout the bankruptcy proceedings, the Committee investigated Highland Capital’s past and current operations, oversaw its continuing operations, and negotiated the reorganization plan. *See id.* § 1103(c). Upon the Committee’s request, the court transferred the case to the Northern District of Texas in December 2019.

Highland Capital’s reorganization did not proceed under the governance of a traditional Chapter 11 trustee. Instead, the Committee reached a corporate governance settlement agreement to displace Dondero, which the bankruptcy court approved in January 2020. Under the agreed order, Dondero stepped down as director and officer of Highland Capital and Strand to be an unpaid portfolio manager and “agreed not to cause any Related Entity . . . to terminate any

---

<sup>2</sup> First, Redeemer Committee of the Highland Crusader Fund had obtained a \$191 million arbitration award after a decade of litigation against Highland Capital. Second, Acis Capital Management, L.P. and Acis Capital Management GP, LLC had sued Highland Capital after facing an adverse \$8 million arbitration award, arising in part from its now extinguished affiliation. Third, UBS Securities LLC and UBS AG London Branch had received a \$1 billion judgment against Highland Capital following a 2019 bench trial in New York. Fourth, discovery vendor Meta-E Discovery had \$779,000 in unpaid invoices. The Committee members are not parties on appeal.

agreements” with Highland Capital. The Committee selected a board of three independent directors to act as a quasitrustee and to govern Strand and Highland Capital: James Seery Jr., John Dubel, and retired Bankruptcy Judge Russell Nelms (collectively, the “Independent Directors”). The order also barred any claim against the Independent Directors in their official roles without the bankruptcy court’s authorizing the claim as a “colorable claim[] of willful misconduct or gross negligence.” Six months later, at the behest of the creditors, the bankruptcy court appointed Seery as Highland Capital’s Chief Executive Officer, Chief Restructuring Officer, and Foreign Representative. The order contained an identical bar on claims against Seery acting in these roles. Neither order was appealed.

Throughout summer 2020, Dondero proposed several reorganization plans, each opposed by the Committee and the Independent Directors. Unpersuaded by Dondero, the Committee and Independent Directors negotiated their own plan. When Dondero’s plans failed, he and other creditors began to frustrate the proceedings by objecting to settlements, appealing orders, seeking writs of mandamus, interfering with Highland Capital’s management, threatening employees, and canceling trades between Highland Capital and its clients. *See Highland Cap. Mgmt. L.P. v. Dondero (In re Highland Cap. Mgmt. L.P.)*, Ch. 11 Case No. 19-34054-SGJ11, Adv. No. 20-03190-SGJ11, 2021 WL 2326350, at \*1, \*26 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. June 7, 2021) (holding Dondero in civil contempt, sanctioning him \$100,000, and comparing this case to a “nasty divorce”). In Seery’s words, Dondero wanted to “burn



the place down” because he did not get his way. The Independent Directors insisted Dondero resign from Highland Capital, which he did in October 2020.

Highland Capital, meanwhile, proceeded toward confirmation of its reorganization plan—the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Plan”). In August 2020, the Independent Directors filed the Plan and an accompanying disclosure statement with the support of the Committee. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 1121, 1125. The bankruptcy court approved the statement as well as proposed notice and voting procedures for creditors, tee-ing up confirmation. Leading up to the confirmation hearing, the Advisors and the Funds asked the court to bar Highland Capital from trading or disposing of CLO assets pending confirmation. The bankruptcy court denied the request, and Highland Capital declined to voluntarily abstain and continued to manage the CLO assets.

Before confirmation, Dondero and other creditors (including several non-appellants) filed over a dozen objections to the Plan. Like Dondero, the United States Trustee primarily objected to the Plan’s exculpation of certain non-debtors as unlawful. Highland Capital voluntarily modified the Plan to resolve six such objections. The Plan proposed to create eleven classes of creditors and equity holders and three classes of administrative claimants. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1122. Of the voting-eligible classes, classes 2, 7, and 9 voted to accept the Plan while classes 8, 10, and 11 voted to reject it.

### C. Reorganization Plan

The Plan works like this: It dissolves the Committee, and creates four entities—the Claimant Trust, the Reorganized Debtor, HCMLP GP LLC,<sup>3</sup> and the Litigation Sub-Trust. Administered by its trustee Seery, the Claimant Trust “wind[s]-down” Highland Capital’s estate over approximately three years by liquidating its assets and issuing distributions to class-8 and -9 claimants as trust beneficiaries. Highland Capital vests its ongoing servicing agreements with the Reorganized Debtor, which “among other things” continues to manage the CLOs and other investment portfolios. The Reorganized Debtor’s only general partner is HCMLP GP LLC. And the Litigation Sub-Trust resolves pending claims against Highland Capital under the direction of its trustee Marc Kirschner.

The whole operation is overseen by a Claimant Trust Oversight Board (the “Oversight Board”) comprised of four creditor representatives and one restructuring advisor. The Claimant Trust wholly owns the limited partnership interests in the Reorganized Debtor, HCMLP GP LLC, and the Litigation Sub-Trust. The Claimant Trust (and its interests) will dissolve either at the soonest of three years after the effective date (August 2024) or (1) when it is unlikely to obtain additional proceeds to justify further action, (2)

---

<sup>3</sup> The Plan calls this entity “New GP LLC,” but according to the motion to dismiss as equitably moot, the new general partner was later named HCMLP GP LLC. For the sake of clarity, we use HCMLP GP LLC.

all claims and objections are resolved, (3) all distributions are made, and (4) the Reorganized Debtor is dissolved.

Anticipating Dondero's continued litigiousness, the Plan shields Highland Capital and bankruptcy participants from lawsuits through an exculpation provision, which is enforced by an injunction and a gatekeeper provision (collectively, "protection provisions"). The protection provisions extend to nearly all bankruptcy participants: Highland Capital and its employees and CEO; Strand; the Independent Directors; the Committee; the successor entities and Oversight Board; professionals retained in this case; and all "Related Persons"<sup>4</sup> (collectively, "protected parties").<sup>5</sup>

The Plan exculpates the protected parties from claims based on any conduct "in connection with or arising out of" (1) the filing and administration of the case, (2) the negotiation and solicitation of votes preceding the Plan, (3) the consummation, implementation, and funding of the Plan, (4) the offer, issuance, and distribution of securities under the Plan before or after the filing of the bankruptcy, and (5) any related

---

<sup>4</sup> The Plan generously defines "Related Persons" to include all former, present, and future officers, directors, employees, managers, members, financial advisors, attorneys, accountants, investment bankers, consultants, professionals, advisors, shareholders, principals, partners, heirs, agents, other representatives, subsidiaries, divisions, and managing companies.

<sup>5</sup> The Plan expressly excludes from the protections Dondero and Okada; NexPoint Advisors, L.P.; Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P; their subsidiaries, managed entities, managed entities, and members; and the Dugaboy Investment Trust and its trustees, among others.

negotiations, transactions, and documentation. But it excludes “acts or omissions that constitute bad faith, fraud, gross negligence, criminal misconduct, or willful misconduct” *and* actions by Strand and its employees predating the appointment of the Independent Directors.

Under the Plan, bankruptcy participants are enjoined “from taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan” or filing any claim related to the Plan or proceeding. Should a party seek to bring a claim against any of the protected parties, it must go to the bankruptcy court to “first determin[e], after notice and a hearing, that such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim of any kind.” Only then may the bankruptcy court “specifically authoriz[e]” the party to bring the claim. The Plan reserves for the bankruptcy court the “sole and exclusive jurisdiction to determine whether a claim or cause of action is colorable” and then to adjudicate the claim if the court has jurisdiction over the merits.

#### D. Confirmation Order

At a February 2021 hearing, the bankruptcy court confirmed the Plan from the bench over several remaining objections. *See* FED. R. BANKR. P. 3017-18; 11 U.S.C. §§ 1126, 1128, 1129. In its later-written decision, the bankruptcy court observed that Highland Capital’s bankruptcy was “not a garden variety chapter 11 case.” The type of debtor, the reason for the bankruptcy filing, the kinds of creditor claims, the corporate governance structure, the unusual success of the mediation efforts, and the small economic interests of the current objectors all make this case unique.

The confirmation order criticized Dondero's behavior before and during the bankruptcy proceedings. The court could not "help but wonder" if Highland Capital's deficit "was necessitated because of enormous litigation fees and expenses incurred" due to Highland Capital's "culture of litigation." Recounting Highland Capital's litigation history, it deduced that Dondero is a "serial litigator." It reasoned that, while "Dondero wants his company back," this "is not a good faith basis to lob objections to the Plan." It attributed Dondero's bad faith to the Advisors, the Trusts, and the Funds, given the "remoteness of their economic interests." For example, the bankruptcy court "was not convinced of the[] [Funds'] independence" from Dondero because the Funds' board members did not testify and had "engaged with the Highland complex for many years." And so the bankruptcy court "consider[ed] them all to be marching pursuant to the orders of Mr. Dondero." The court, meanwhile, applauded the members of the Committee for their "wills of steel" for fighting "hard before and during this Chapter 11 Case" and "represent[ing] their constituency . . . extremely well."

On the merits of the Plan, the bankruptcy court again approved the Plan's voting and confirmation procedures as well as the fairness of the Plan's classes. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 1122, 1125(a)–(c). The court held the Plan complied with the statutory requirements for confirmation. *See id.* §§ 1123(a)(1)–(7), 1129(a)(1)–(7), (9)–(13). Because classes 8, 10, and 11 had voted to

reject the Plan, it was confirmable only by cramdown.<sup>6</sup> *See id.* § 1129(b). The bankruptcy court found that the Plan treated the dissenting classes fairly and equitably and satisfied the absolute-priority rule, so the Plan was confirmable. *See id.* § 1129(b)(2)(B)–(C). The court also concluded that the protection provisions were fair, equitable, and reasonable, as well as “integral elements” of the Plan under the circumstances, and were within both the court’s jurisdiction and authority. The court confirmed the Plan as proposed and discharged Highland Capital’s debts. *Id.* § 1141(d)(1). After confirmation and satisfaction of several conditions precedent, the Plan took effect August 11, 2021.

#### E. The Appeal

Dondero, the Advisors, the Funds, and the Trusts (collectively, “Appellants”) timely appealed, objecting to the Plan’s legality and some of the bankruptcy court’s factual findings.<sup>7</sup> Together with Highland Capital, Appellants moved to directly appeal the confirmation order to this court, which the bankruptcy court

---

<sup>6</sup> The bankruptcy court must proceed by nonconsensual confirmation, or “cramdown,” 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b), when a class of unsecured creditors rejects a Chapter 11 reorganization plan, *id.* § 1129(a)(8), but at least one impaired class accepts it, *id.* § 1129(a)(10). A cramdown requires that the plan be “fair and equitable” to dissenting classes and satisfy the absolute priority rule—that is, dissenting classes are paid in full before any junior class can retain any property. *Id.* § 1129(b)(2)(B); *see Bank of Am. Nat’l Tr. & Sav. Ass’n v. 203 N. LaSalle St. P’ship*, 526 U.S. 434, 441–42 (1999).

<sup>7</sup> The Trusts adopt the Funds’ and the Advisors’ briefs in full, and Dondero adopts the Funds’ brief in full and the Advisors’ brief in part. FED. R. APP. P. 28(i).

granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). A motions panel certified and consolidated the direct appeals. *See ibid.* Both the bankruptcy court and the motions panel declined to stay the Plan’s confirmation pending appeal. Given the Plan’s substantial consummation since its confirmation, Highland Capital moved to dismiss the appeal as equitably moot, a motion the panel ordered carried with the case.

\* \* \*

We first consider equitable mootness and decline to invoke it here. We then turn to the merits, conclude the Plan exculpates certain non-debtors beyond the bankruptcy court’s authority, and affirm in all other respects.

## II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A confirmation order is an appealable final order, over which we have jurisdiction. *Bullard v. Blue Hills Bank*, 575 U.S. 496, 502 (2015); *see* 28 U.S.C. §§ 158(d), 1291. This court reviews a bankruptcy court’s factual findings for clear error and legal conclusions *de novo*. *Evolve Fed. Credit Union v. Barragan-Flores (In re Barragan-Flores)*, 984 F.3d 471, 473 (5th Cir. 2021) (citation omitted).

## III. EQUITABLE MOOTNESS

Highland Capital moved to dismiss this appeal as equitably moot. It argues we should abstain from appellate review because clawing back the implemented Plan “would generate untold chaos.” We disagree and deny the motion.

The judge-made doctrine of equitable mootness allows appellate courts to abstain from reviewing bankruptcy orders confirming “complex plans whose

implementation has substantial secondary effects.” *New Indus., Inc. v. Byman (In re Sneed Shipbuilding, Inc.)*, 916 F.3d 405, 409 (5th Cir. 2019) (citing *In re Trib. Media Co.*, 799 F.3d 272, 274, 281 (3d Cir. 2015)). It seeks to balance “the equitable considerations of finality and good faith reliance on a judgment” and “the right of a party to seek review of a bankruptcy order adversely affecting him.” *In re Manges*, 29 F.3d 1034, 1039 (5th Cir. 1994) (quoting *First Union Real Estate Equity & Mortg. Inv. v. Club Assocs. (In re Club Assocs.)*, 956 F.3d 1065, 1069 (11th Cir. 1992)); see *In re Hilal*, 534 F.3d 498, 500 (5th Cir. 2008); see also 7 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 1129.09 (16th ed.), LexisNexis (database updated June 2022) (observing “the equitable mootness doctrine is embraced in every circuit”).<sup>8</sup>

This court uses equitable mootness as a “scalpel rather than an axe,” applying it claim-by-claim, instead of appeal-by-appeal. *In re Pac. Lumber Co. (Pacific Lumber)*, 584 F.3d 229, 240–41 (5th Cir. 2009). For each claim, we analyze three factors: “(i) whether a stay has been obtained, (ii) whether the plan has

---

<sup>8</sup> The doctrine’s atextual balancing act has been criticized. See *In re Pac. Lumber Co.*, 584 F.3d 229, 240 (5th Cir. 2009) (“Despite its apparent virtues, equitable mootness is a judicial anomaly.”); *In re One2One Commc’ns, LLC*, 805 F.3d 428, 438–54 (3rd Cir. 2015) (Krause, J., concurring); *In re UNR Indus., Inc.*, 20 F.3d 766, 769 (7th Cir. 1994) (banishing the term “equitable mootness” as a misnomer); *In re Cont’l Airlines*, 91 F.3d 553, 569 (3d Cir. 1996) (en banc) (Alito, J., dissenting); see also Bruce A. Markell, *The Needs of the Many: Equitable Mootness’ Pernicious Effects*, 93 AM. BANKR. L.J. 377, 393–96 (2019) (addressing the varying applications between circuits). But see *In re Trib. Media*, 799 F.3d at 287–88 (Ambro, J., concurring) (highlighting some benefits of the equitable mootness doctrine).



been ‘substantially consummated,’ and (iii) whether the relief requested would affect either the rights of parties not before the court or the success of the plan.” *In re Manges*, 29 F.3d at 1039 (citing *In re Block Shim Dev. Co.*, 939 F.2d 289, 291 (5th Cir. 1991); and *Cleveland, Barrios, Kingsdorf & Casteix v. Thibaut*, 166 B.R. 281, 286 (E.D. La. 1994)); *see also, e.g., In re Blast Energy Servs.*, 593 F.3d 418, 424–25 (5th Cir. 2010); *In re Ultra Petroleum Corp.*, No. 21-20049, 2022 WL 989389, at \*5 (5th Cir. Apr. 1, 2022). No one factor is dispositive. *See In re Manges*, 29 F.3d at 1039.

Here, the bankruptcy court and this court declined to stay the Plan pending appeal, and it took effect August 11, 2021. Given the months of progress, no party meaningfully argues the Plan has not been substantially consummated.<sup>9</sup> *See Pacific Lumber*, 584

---

<sup>9</sup> Since the Plan’s effectuation, Highland Capital paid \$2.2 million in claims to a committee member and \$525,000 in “cure payments” to other counterparties. The independent directors resigned. The Reorganized Debtor, the Claimant Trust, HCMLP GP LLC, and the Litigation Sub-Trust were created and organized in accordance with the Plan. The bankruptcy court appointed the Oversight Board members, the Litigation Sub-Trust trustee, and the Claimant Trust trustee. Highland Capital assumed certain service contracts, including management of twenty CLOs with approximately \$700 million in assets, and transferred its assets and estate claims to the successor entities. Highland Capital’s pre-petition partnership interests were cancelled and cease to exist. A third party, Blue Torch Capital, infused \$45 million in exit financing, fully guaranteed by the Reorganized Debtor, its operating subsidiaries, the Claimant Trust, and most of their assets. From the exit financing, an Indemnity Trust was created to indemnify claims that arise against the Reorganized Debtor, Claimant Trust, Litigation Sub-Trust, Claimant Trustee, Litigation Trustee, or Oversight Board members. The

F.3d at 242 (observing “consummation includes transferring all or substantially all of the property covered by the plan, the assumption of business by the debtors’ successors, and the commencement of plan distributions” (citing 11 U.S.C. § 1141; and *In re Manges*, 29 F.3d at 1041 n.10)). But that alone does not trigger equitable mootness. See *In re SCOPAC*, 624 F.3d 274, 281–82 (5th Cir. 2010). Instead, for each claim, the inquiry turns on whether the court can craft relief for that claim that would not have significant adverse consequences to the reorganization. Highland Capital highlights four possible disruptions: (1) the unraveling of the Claimant Trust and its entities, (2) the expense of disgorging disbursements, (3) the threat of defaulting on exit-financing loans, and (4) the exposure to vexatious litigation.

Each party first suggests its own all-or-nothing equitable mootness applications. To Highland Capital, Appellants’ broad requested remedy with only a minor economic stake demands mooting the entire appeal. To Appellants, the type of reorganization plan categorially bars equitable mootness, or, alternatively, Highland Capital’s joining the motion to certify the appeal estops it from asserting equitable mootness. These arguments are unpersuasive and foreclosed by *Pacific Lumber*.

---

lone class-1 creditor withdrew its claim against Highland Capital. The lone class-2 creditor has been fully paid approximately \$500,000 and issued a note of \$5.2 million secured by \$23 million of the Reorganized Debtor’s assets. Classes 3 and 4 have been paid \$165,412. Class 7 has received \$5.1 million in distributions from the Claimant Trust, totaling 77% of class-7 claims filed.

First, Highland Capital contends the entire appeal is equitably moot because Appellants, with only a minor economic stake and questionable good faith, “seek[] nothing less than a complete unravelling of the confirmed Plan.” It claims the court cannot “surgically excise[]” certain provisions, as the Funds request, because the Bankruptcy Code prohibits “modifications to confirmed plans after substantial consummation.” See 11 U.S.C. § 1127(b). Not so.

“Although the Bankruptcy Code . . . restricts post-confirmation plan modifications, it does not expressly limit appellate review of plan confirmation orders.” *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 240 (footnote omitted) (citing 11 U.S.C. § 1127). This court may fashion “fractional relief” to minimize an appellate disturbance’s effect on the rights of third parties. *In re Tex. Grand Prairie Hotel Realty, L.L.C.*, 710 F.3d 324, 328 (5th Cir. 2013) (denying dismissal on equitable mootness grounds because the court “could grant partial relief . . . without disturbing the reorganization”); cf. *In re Cont’l Airlines*, 91 F.3d 553, 571–72 (3d Cir. 1996) (en banc) (Alito, J., dissenting) (observing “a remedy could be fashioned in the present case to ensure that the [debtor’s] reorganization is not undermined”). In short, Highland Capital’s speculations are farfetched, as the court may fashion the remedy it sees fit without upsetting the reorganization.

Second, Appellants contend that equitable mootness cannot apply—full-stop—because this appeal concerns a liquidation plan, not a reorganization plan. We reject that premise. See *infra* Part IV.A. Even if it were correct, however, this court has conducted the

equitable-mootness inquiry for a Chapter 11 liquidation plan in the past. *See In re Superior Offshore Int’l, Inc.*, 591 F.3d 350, 353–54 (5th Cir. 2009). And other circuits have squarely rejected the categorical bar proposed by Appellants. *See In re Abengoa Bioenergy Biomass of Kan., LLC*, 958 F.3d 949, 956–57 (10th Cir. 2020); *In re BGI, Inc.*, 772 F.3d 102, 107–09 (2d Cir. 2014). We do the same.

Finally, Appellants assert that because Highland Capital and NexPoint Advisors, L.P. jointly moved to certify the appeal, it should be estopped from arguing the appeal is equitably moot. They cite no legal support for that approach. We decline to adopt it.

Instead, we proceed with a claim-by-claim analysis, as our precedent requires. Highland Capital suggests only two claims are equitably moot: (1) the protection-provisions challenge and (2) the absolute-priority-rule challenge. Neither provides a basis for equitable mootness.

For the protection provisions, Highland Capital anticipates that, without the provisions, its officers, employees, trustees, and Oversight Board members would all resign rather than be exposed to Dondero-initiated litigation. Those resignations would disrupt the Reorganized Debtor’s operation, “significant[ly] deteriorat[ing] asset values due to uncertainty.” Appellants disagree, offering several instances when this court has reviewed release, exculpation, and injunction provisions over calls for equitable mootness. *See, e.g., In re Hilal*, 534 F.3d at 501; *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 252; *In re Thru Inc.*, 782 F. App’x 339, 341 (5th Cir. 2019) (per curiam). In response, Highland Capital

distinguishes this case because the provisions are “integral to the consummated plans.” *See In re Charter Commc’ns, Inc.*, 691 F.3d 476, 486 (2d Cir. 2012). We again reject that premise. *See infra* Part IV.E.1. In any event, Appellants have the better argument.

We have before explained that “equity strongly supports appellate review of issues consequential to the integrity and transparency of the Chapter 11 process.” *In re Hilal*, 534 F.3d 498, 500 (5th Cir. 2008). That is so because “the goal of finality sought in equitable mootness analysis does not outweigh a court’s duty to protect the integrity of the process.” *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 252. As in *Pacific Lumber*, the legality of a reorganization plan’s non-consensual non-debtor release is consequential to the Chapter 11 process and so should not escape appellate review in the name of equity. *Ibid.* The same is true here. Equitable mootness does not bar our review of the protection provisions.

For the absolute-priority-rule challenge,<sup>10</sup> Highland Capital contends our review requires us to “rejigger class recoveries.” *Pacific Lumber* is again instructive. There, the court declined to apply equitable mootness to a secured creditor’s absolute-priority-rule challenge, as no other panel had extended the doctrine so far. *Id.* at 243. Similarly, Highland Capital fails to identify a single case in which this court has declined review of the treatment of a class of creditor’s claims resulting from a cramdown. *See id.* at 252. Regardless,

---

<sup>10</sup> While the issue is nearly forfeited for inadequate briefing, it fails on the merits regardless. *See Roy v. City of Monroe*, 950 F.3d 245, 251 (5th Cir. 2020).

Appellants challenge the distributions to classes 8, 10, and 11. According to Highland Capital’s own declaration, “Class 8 General Unsecured Claims have received their Claimant Trust Interests.” But there is no evidence that classes 10 or 11 have received any distributions. *Contra Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 251 (holding certain claims equitably moot where “the smaller unsecured creditors” had already “received payment for their claims”). As a result, the relief requested would not affect third parties or the success of the Plan. *See In re Manges*, 29 F.3d at 1039. The doctrine of equitable mootness does not bar our review of the cramdown and treatment of class-8 creditors.

We DENY Highland Capital’s motion to dismiss the appeal as equitably moot.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

As to the merits, Appellants fire a bankruptcy-law blunderbuss. They contest the Plan’s classification as a reorganization plan, the Plan’s satisfaction of the absolute priority rule, the Plan’s confirmation despite Highland Capital’s noncompliance with Bankruptcy Rule 2015.3, and the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the court’s factual finding that the Funds are “owned/controlled” by Dondero. For each, we disagree and affirm. We do, however, agree with Appellants that the bankruptcy court exceeded its statutory authority under § 524(e) by exculpating certain non-debtors, and so we reverse and vacate the Plan only to that extent.

##### A. Discharge of Debt

We begin with the Plan’s classification as a reorganization plan, allowing for automatic discharge of

the debts. The confirmation of a Chapter 11 restructuring plan “discharges the debtor from any [pre-confirmation] debt” unless, under the plan, the debtor liquidates its assets, stops “engag[ing] in [its] business after consummation of the plan,” and would be denied discharge in a Chapter 7 case. 11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(1), (3); see *In re Sullivan*, No. 99-11107, 2000 WL 1597984, at \*2 (5th Cir. Sept. 26, 2000) (per curiam). The bankruptcy court concluded Highland Capital continued to engage in business after plan consummation, so its debts are automatically discharged. The Trusts call foul because, in their view, Highland Capital’s “wind down” of its portfolio management is not a continuation of its business. We disagree.

Whether a corporate debtor “engages in business” is “relatively straightforward.” *Um v. Spokane Rock I, LLC*, 904 F.3d 815, 819 (9th Cir. 2018) (contrasting the more complex question for individual debtors); see *Grausz v. Sampson (In re Grausz)*, 63 F. App’x 647, 650 (4th Cir. 2003) (per curiam) (same). That is, “a business entity will not engage in business postbankruptcy when its assets are liquidated and the entity is dissolved.” *Um*, 904 F.3d at 819 (collecting cases).<sup>11</sup> But even a temporary continuation of business after a plan’s confirmation is sufficient to discharge a Chapter 11 debtor’s debt. See *In re T-H New Orleans Ltd.*

---

<sup>11</sup> See e.g., *In re W. Asbestos Co.*, 313 B.R. 832, 853 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2003) (holding corporate debtor was not engaging in business by merely having directors and officers, rights under an insurance policy, and claims against it); *In re Wood Fam. Ints., Ltd.*, 135 B.R. 407, 410 (Bankr. D. Colo. 1989) (holding corporate debtor was not engaging in business when the plan called for liquidation and discontinuation of its business upon confirmation).

*P'ship*, 116 F.3d 790, 804 n.15 (5th Cir. 1997) (recognizing a debtor's "conducting business for two years following Plan confirmation satisfies § 1141(d)(3)(B)" (citation omitted)). That is the case here.

By the plain terms of the Plan, Highland Capital has and will continue its business as the Reorganized Debtor for several years. Indeed, much of this appeal concerns objections to Highland Capital's "continu[ing] to manage the assets of others." Because the Plan contemplates Highland Capital "engag[ing] in business after consummation," 11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(1), the bankruptcy court correctly held Highland Capital was eligible for automatic discharge of its debts.<sup>12</sup>

#### B. Absolute Priority Rule

Next, we consider the Plan's compliance with the absolute-priority rule. When assessing whether a plan is "fair and equitable" in a cramdown scenario, courts must invoke the absolute-priority rule. 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(1); *see* 7 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 1129.04. Under that rule, if a class of unsecured claimants rejects a plan, the plan must provide that those claimants be paid in full on the effective date *or* any junior interest "will not receive or retain under the plan . . . any property." 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2)(B).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> For the same reasons, we reject the Trusts' follow-on argument extending the same logic to the protection provisions.

<sup>13</sup> *See Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 244 (noting the rule "enforces a strict hierarchy of [creditor classes] rights defined by state and federal law" to protect dissenting creditor classes); *see also In re Geneva Steel Co.*, 281 F.3d 1173, 1180 n.4 (10th Cir. 2002) ("[U]nsecured creditors stand ahead of investors in the receiving line and their claims must be satisfied before any investment loss is compensated." (citations omitted)).



Because class-8 claimants voted against the Plan, the bankruptcy court proceeded by nonconsensual confirmation. The court concluded the Plan was fair and equitable to class 8 and its distributions were in line with the absolute-priority rule. 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2)(B). The Advisors claim the Plan violates the absolute priority rule by giving class-10 and -11 claimants a “Contingent Claimant Trust Interest” without fully satisfying class-8 claimants. We agree the absolute-priority rule applies, and the Plan plainly satisfies it.

The Plan proposed to pay 71% of class-8 creditors’ claims with *pro rata* distributions of interest generated by the Claimant Trust and then *pro rata* distributions from liquidated Claimant Trust assets. Classes 10 and 11 received a *pro rata* share of “Contingent Claimant Trust Interests,” defined as a Claimant Trust Interest vesting only when the Claimant Trustee certifies that all class-8 claimants have been paid indefeasibly in full and all disputed claims in class 8 have been resolved. Voilà: no interest junior to class 8 will receive any property until class-8 claimants are paid.

But the Advisors point to Highland Capital’s testimony and briefs to suggest the Contingent Claimant Trust Interests (received by classes 10 and 11) are property in some sense because they have value. That argument is specious. Of course, the Contingent Claimant Trust Interests have some small probability of vesting in the future and, thus, has some *de minimis* present value. See *Norwest Bank Worthington v. Ahlers*, 485 U.S. 197, 207–08 (1988) (holding a junior

creditor's receipt of a presently valueless equity interest is receipt of property). But the absolute-priority rule has never required us to bar junior creditors from ever receiving property. By the Plan's terms, no trust property vests with class-10 or -11 claimants "unless and until" class-8 claims "have been paid indefeasibly in full." *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)(2)(B)(ii). That plainly comports with the absolute-priority rule.

### C. Bankruptcy Rule 2015.3

We turn to whether the failure to comply with Bankruptcy Rule of Procedure 2015.3 bars the Plan's confirmation. The Independent Directors failed to file periodic financial reports per Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2015.3(a) about entities "in which the [Highland Capital] estate holds a substantial or controlling interest." The Advisors claim the failure dooms the Plan's confirmation because the Plan proponent failed to comply "with the applicable provisions of this title." 11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(2). We disagree.

Rule 2015.3 cannot be an applicable provision of Title 11 because the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure are not provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. *See Bonner v. Adams (In re Adams)*, 734 F.2d 1094, 1101 (5th Cir. 1984) ("The Bankruptcy Rules Enabling Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2075, provides that the Supreme Court may prescribe 'by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure' in bankruptcy courts."); *cf. In re Mandel*, No. 20-40026, 2021 WL 3642331, at \*6 n.7 (5th Cir. Aug. 17, 2021) (per curiam) (noting "Rule 2015.3 implements section 419 of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005," which amended 28 U.S.C. § 2073). The Advisors' attempt to

tether the rule to the bankruptcy trustee's general duties lacks any legal basis. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 704(a)(8), 1106(a)(1), 1107(a). The bankruptcy court, therefore, correctly overruled the Advisors' objection.

#### D. Factual Findings

One factual finding is in dispute, but we see no clear error. The bankruptcy court found that, despite their purported independence, the Funds are entities "owned and/or controlled by [Dondero]." The Funds ask the court to vacate the factual finding because it threatens the Funds' compliance with federal law and damages their reputations and values. According to the Funds, the characterization is unfair, as *they* are not litigious like Dondero and are completely independent from him. Highland Capital maintains Dondero has sole discretion over the Funds as their portfolio manager and through his control of the Advisors, so the finding is supported by the record.

"Clear error is a formidable standard: this court disturbs factual findings only if left with a firm and definite conviction that the bankruptcy court made a mistake." *In re Krueger*, 812 F.3d 365, 374 (5th Cir. 2016) (cleaned up). We defer to the bankruptcy court's credibility determinations. *See Randall & Blake Inc. v. Evans (In re Canion)*, 196 F.3d 579, 587–88 (5th Cir. 1999).

Here, the bankruptcy court drew its factual finding from the testimony of Jason Post, the Advisors' chief compliance officer, and Dustin Norris, an executive vice president for the Funds and the Advisors. Post testified that the Funds have independent board members that run them. But the bankruptcy court found Post not credible because "he abruptly resigned"

from Highland Capital at the same time as Dondero and is currently employed by Dondero. Norris testified that Dondero “owned and/or controlled” the Funds and Advisors. The bankruptcy court found Norris credible and relied on his testimony. The bankruptcy court also observed that none of the Funds’ board members testified in the bankruptcy case and all “engaged with the Highland complex for many years.” Because nothing in this record leaves us with a firm and definite conviction that the bankruptcy court made a mistake in finding that the Funds are “owned and/or controlled by [Dondero],” we leave the bankruptcy court’s factual finding undisturbed.

#### E. The Protection Provisions

Finally, we address the legality of the Plan’s protection provisions. As discussed, the Plan exculpates certain non-debtor third parties supporting the Plan from post-petition lawsuits not arising from gross negligence, bad faith, or willful or criminal misconduct. It also enjoins certain parties “from taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan.” The injunction requires that, before any lawsuit is filed, the plaintiff must seek the bankruptcy court’s approval of the claim as “colorable”—*i.e.*, the bankruptcy court acts as a gatekeeper. Together, the provisions screen and prevent bad-faith litigation against Highland Capital, its successors, and other bankruptcy participants that could disrupt the Plan’s effectiveness.

The bankruptcy court deemed the provisions legal, necessary under the circumstances, and in the best interest of all parties. We agree, but only in part. Though the injunction and gatekeeping provisions are

sound, the exculpation of certain non-debtors exceeds the bankruptcy court's authority. We reverse and vacate that limited portion of the Plan.

1. *Non-Debtor Exculpation*

We start with the scope of the non-debtor exculpation. In a Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceeding, "discharge of a debt of the debtor does not affect the liability of any other entity on, or the property of any other entity for, such debt." 11 U.S.C. § 524(e). Contrary to the bankruptcy court's holding, the exculpation here partly runs afoul of that statutory bar on non-debtor discharge by reaching beyond Highland Capital, the Committee, and the Independent Directors. *See Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d 251–53. We must reverse and strike the few unlawful parts of the Plan's exculpation provision.

The parties agree that *Pacific Lumber* controls and also that the bankruptcy court had the power to exculpate both Highland Capital and the Committee members. Appellants, however, submit the bankruptcy court improperly stretched *Pacific Lumber* to shield other non-debtors from breach-of-contract and negligence claims, in violation of § 524(e). Highland Capital counters that the exculpation provision is a commonplace Chapter 11 term, is appropriate given Dondero's litigious nature, does not implicate § 524(e), and merely provides a heightened standard of care.

To support that argument, Highland Capital highlights the distinction between a concededly unlawful release of all non-debtor liability and the Plain's limited exculpation of non-debtor post-petition liability. *See e.g., In re PWS Holding Corp.*, 228 F.3d 224, 246–47 (3d Cir. 2000) (describing releases as

“eliminating” a covered party’s liability “altogether” while exculpation provisions “set[] forth the applicable standard of liability” in future litigation). According to Highland Capital, the Third and Ninth Circuits have adopted that distinction when applying § 524(e). *See Blixseth v. Credit Suisse*, 961 F.3d 1074, 1084 (9th Cir. 2020), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct.1394 (2021); *In re PWS Holding*, 228 F.3d at 246–47. Under those cases, narrow exculpations of post-petition liability for certain critical third-party nondebtors are lawful “appropriate” or “necessary” actions for the bankruptcy court to carry out the proceeding through its statutory authority under § 1123(b)(6) and § 105(a). *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)(6) (“[A] plan may . . . include any other appropriate provision not inconsistent with the applicable provisions of this title.”); *id.* § 105(a) (“The court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.”).

Highland Capital reads *Pacific Lumber* as “in step with the law in [those] other circuits” by allowing a limited exculpation of post-petition liability. *Cf. Blixseth*, 961 F.3d at 1084. We disagree. As the Ninth Circuit acknowledged, our court in *Pacific Lumber* arrived at “a conclusion opposite [the Ninth Circuit’s].” 961 F.3d at 1085 n.7. Moreover, the Ninth Circuit expressly disavowed *Pacific Lumber*’s rationale—that an exculpation provision provides a “fresh start” to a nondebtor in violation of § 524(e)—because, in the Ninth Circuit’s view, the post-petition exculpation “affects only claims arising from the bankruptcy proceedings themselves.” *Ibid.* We are not persuaded, as Highland Capital contends, that the Ninth Circuit was “sloppy”

and simply “misread *Pacific Lumber*.” See O.A. Rec. 19:45–21:38.

The simple fact of the matter is that there is a circuit split concerning the effect and reach of § 524(e).<sup>14</sup> Our court along with the Tenth Circuit hold § 524(e) categorically bars third-party exculpations absent express authority in another provision of the Bankruptcy Code. *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 252–53; *Landsing Diversified Props. v. First Nat’l Bank & Tr. Co. of Tulsa (In re W. Real Estate Fund, Inc.)*, 922 F.2d 592, 600 (10th Cir. 1990) (per curiam). By contrast, the Ninth Circuit joins the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits in reading § 524(e) to allow varying degrees of limited third-party exculpations. *Blixseth*, 961 F.3d at 1084; accord *In re PWS Holding*, 228 F.3d at 246–47 (allowing third-party releases for “fairness, necessity to the reorganization, and specific factual findings to support these conclusions”); *In re Metromedia Fiber Network, Inc.*, 416 F.3d 136, 143 (2d Cir. 2005); *In re A.H. Robins Co.*, 880 F.2d 694, 702 (4th Cir. 1989); *In re Dow Corning Corp.*, 280 F.3d 648, 658 (6th Cir. 2002); *In re Airadigm Commc’ns., Inc.*, 519 F.3d 640, 657 (7th Cir. 2008); *In re Seaside Eng’g & Surveying, Inc.*, 780 F.3d 1070, 1078 (11th Cir. 2015).

---

<sup>14</sup> Amicus’s contention that failing to adopt the Ninth Circuit’s holding “would generate a clear circuit split” is wrong. There already is one. See Petition for Writ of Certiorari, *Blixseth v. Credit Suisse*, 141 S. Ct.1394 (No. 20-1028) (highlighting the circuits’ divergent approaches to the non-debtor discharge bar under § 524(e)).

Our *Pacific Lumber* decision was not blind to the countervailing view, as it twice cites the Third Circuit’s contrary holding in other contexts. See 584 F.3d at 241, 253 (citing *In re PWS Holding*, 228 F.3d at 236–37, 246). But we rejected the parsing between limited exculpations and full releases that Highland Capital now requests. We are obviously bound to apply our own precedent. See *Hidalgo Cnty. Emergency Serv. Found. v. Carranza (In re Hidalgo Cnty. Emergency Serv. Found.)*, 962 F.3d 838, 841 (5th Cir. 2020) (“Under our well-recognized rule of orderliness, . . . a panel of this court is bound by circuit precedent.” (citation omitted)).

Under *Pacific Lumber*, § 524(e) does not permit “absolv[ing] the [nondebtor] from any negligent conduct that occurred during the course of the bankruptcy” absent another source of authority. 584 F.3d at 252–53; see also *In re Zale Corp.*, 62 F.3d 746, 760 (5th Cir. 1995). At oral argument, Highland Capital pointed only to § 1123(b)(6) and § 105(a) as footholds. See O.A. Rec. 16:45–17:28. But in this circuit, § 105(a) provides no statutory basis for a nondebtor exculpation. *In re Zale*, 62 F.3d at 760 (noting “[a] § 105 injunction cannot alter another provision of the code” (citing *In re Oxford Mgmt., Inc.*, 4 F.3d 1329, 1334 (5th Cir.1993))). And the same logic extends to § 1123(b)(6), which allows a plan to “include any other appropriate provision *not inconsistent with the applicable provisions of this title.*” 11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)(6) (emphasis added).

*Pacific Lumber* identified two sources of authority to exculpate nondebtors. See 584 F.3d at 252–53. The first is to channel asbestos claims (not present



here). *Id.* at 252 (citing 11 U.S.C. § 524(g)). The second is to provide a limited qualified immunity to creditors' committee members for actions within the scope of their statutory duties. *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 253 (citing 11 U.S.C. § 1103(c)); see *In re Vitro S.A.B. de CV*, 701 F.3d 1031, 1069 (5th Cir. 2012). And, though not before the court in *Pacific Lumber*, we have also recognized a limited qualified immunity to bankruptcy trustees unless they act with gross negligence. *In re Hilal*, 534 F.3d at 501 (citing *In re Smyth*, 207 F.3d 758, 762 (5th Cir. 2000)); accord *Baron v. Sherman (In re Ondova Ltd.)*, 914 F.3d 990, 993 (5th Cir. 2019) (per curiam). If other sources exist, Highland Capital failed to identify them. So we see no statutory authority for the full extent of the exculpation here.

The bankruptcy court read *Pacific Lumber* differently. In its view, *Pacific Lumber* created an additional ground to exculpate non-debtors: when the record demonstrates that “costs [a party] might incur defending against suits alleging such negligence are likely to swamp either [it] or the consummated reorganization.” 584 F.3d at 252. We do not read the decision that way. The bankruptcy court’s underlying factual findings do not alter whether it has statutory authority to exculpate a non-debtor. That is the holding of *Pacific Lumber*.

That leaves one remaining question: whether the bankruptcy court can exculpate the Independent Directors under *Pacific Lumber*. We answer in the affirmative. As the bankruptcy court’s governance order clarified, nontraditional as it may be, the Independent

Directors were appointed to act together as the bankruptcy trustee for Highland Capital. Like a debtor-in-possession, the Independent Directors are entitled to all the rights and powers of a trustee. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1107(a); 7 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 1101.01. It follows that the Independent Directors are entitled to the limited qualified immunity for any actions short of gross negligence. *See In re Hilal*, 534 F.3d at 501. Under this unique governance structure, the bankruptcy court legally exculpated the Independent Directors.

In sum, our precedent and § 524(e) require any exculpation in a Chapter 11 reorganization plan be limited to the debtor, the creditors' committee and its members for conduct within the scope of their duties, 11 U.S.C. § 1103(c), and the trustees within the scope of their duties, *see Baron*, 914 F.3d at 993. And so, excepting the Independent Directors and the Committee members, the exculpation of non-debtors here was unlawful. Accordingly, the other non-debtor exculpations must be struck from the Plan. *See Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 253.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Highland Capital, like the bankruptcy court, claims the *res judicata* effect of the January and July 2020 orders appointing the independent directors and appointing Seery as CEO binds the court to include the protection provisions here. We lack jurisdiction to consider collateral attacks on final bankruptcy orders even when it concerns whether the court properly exercised jurisdiction or authority at the time. *See Travelers Indem. Co. v. Bailey*, 557 U.S. 137 (2009); *In re Linn Energy, L.L.C.*, 927 F.3d 862, 866–67 (5th Cir. 2019) (quoting *Bailey*, 557 U.S. at 152). To the extent Appellants seek to roll back the protections in the bankruptcy court's January 2020 and July 2020 orders (which is

As it stands, the Plan’s exculpation provision extends to Highland Capital and its employees and CEO; Strand; the Reorganized Debtor and HCMLP GP LLC; the Independent Directors; the Committee and its members; the Claimant Trust, its trustee, and the members of its Oversight Board; the Litigation Sub-Trust and its trustee; professionals retained by the Highland Capital and the Committee in this case; and all “Related Persons.” Consistent with § 524(e), we strike all exculpated parties from the Plan except Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors.

## 2. *Injunction & Gatekeeper Provisions*

We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions. Appellants object to the bankruptcy court’s injunction as vague and the gatekeeper provision as overbroad. We are unpersuaded.

First, Appellants’ primary contention—that the Plan’s injunction “is broad” by releasing non-debtors in violation of § 524(e)—is resolved by our striking the

---

not clear from their briefing), such a collateral attack is precluded.

As a result, the bankruptcy court was correct insofar as *those* orders have the effect of exculpating the Independent Directors and Seery in his executive capacities, but it was incorrect that *res judicata* mandates their inclusion in the Plan’s new exculpation provision. Despite removal from the exculpation provision in the confirmation order, the Independent Directors’ agents, advisors, and employees, as well as Seery in his official capacities are all exculpated to the extent provided in the January and July 2020 orders, given the orders’ ongoing *res judicata* effects and our lack of jurisdiction to review those orders. But that says nothing of the effect of the Plan’s exculpation provision.

impermissibly exculpated parties. *See supra* Part IV.E.1.

Second, Appellants dispute the permanency of the injunction for the legally exculpated parties by enjoining conduct “on and after the Effective Date.” Even assuming the issue was preserved,<sup>16</sup> permanency alone is no reason to alter a bankruptcy court’s otherwise-lawful injunction on appeal. *See In re Zale*, 62 F.3d at 759–60 (recognizing the bankruptcy court’s jurisdiction to issue an injunction in the first place allowed it to issue a permanent injunction).

Third, the Advisors argue that the injunction is “overbroad and vague” because it does not define what it means to “interfere” with the “implementation or consummation of the Plan.” That is unsupported by the record. As the bankruptcy court recognized, the Plan defined what constitutes interference: (i) filing a lawsuit, (ii) enforcing judgments, (iii) enforcing security interests, (iv) asserting setoff rights, or (v) acting “in any manner” not conforming with the Plan. The injunction is not unlawfully overbroad or vague.

Finally, Appellants maintain that the gatekeeper provision impermissibly extends to unrelated claims over which the bankruptcy court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. *See In re Craig’s Stores of Tex., Inc.*, 266 F.3d 388, 390 (5th Cir. 2001) (noting a bankruptcy court retains jurisdiction postconfirmation only over “matters pertaining to the implementation or execution of the plan” (citations omitted)). While that may

---

<sup>16</sup> *See Roy*, 950 F.3d at 251 (“Failure adequately to brief an issue on appeal constitutes waiver of that argument.” (citation omitted)).

be the case, our precedent requires we leave that determination to the bankruptcy court in the first instance.

Courts have long recognized bankruptcy courts can perform a gatekeeping function. Under the “*Barton* doctrine,” the bankruptcy court may require a party to “obtain leave of the bankruptcy court before initiating an action in district court when the action is against the trustee or other bankruptcy-court-appointed officer, for acts done in the actor’s official capacity.” *Villegas v. Schmidt*, 788 F.3d 156, 159 (5th Cir. 2015) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carter v. Rodgers*, 220 F.3d 1249, 1252 (11th Cir. 2000)); accord *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881).<sup>17</sup> In *Villegas*, we held “that a party must continue to file with the relevant bankruptcy court for permission to proceed with a claim against the trustee.” 788 F.3d at 158. Relevant here, we left to the bankruptcy court, faced with pre-approval of a claim, to determine whether it had subject matter jurisdiction over that claim in the first instance. *Id.* at 158–59; see, e.g., *Carroll v. Abide*, 788 F.3d 502, 506–07 (5th Cir. 2015) (noting *Villegas* “rejected an argument that the *Barton* doctrine does not apply when the bankruptcy court lacked jurisdiction”). In other words, we need not evaluate whether

---

<sup>17</sup> The Advisors also maintain that Highland Capital is neither a receiver nor a trustee, so *Barton* has no application here. We disagree. Highland Capital, for all practical purposes, was a debtor in possession entitled to the rights of a trustee. See 7 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 1101.01 (“The debtor in possession is generally vested with all of the rights and powers of a trustee as set forth in section 1106 . . . .”); see also *Carter*, 220 F.3d at 1252 n.4. (finding no distinction between bankruptcy court “approved” and bankruptcy court “appointed” officers).

the bankruptcy court would have jurisdiction under every conceivable claim falling under the widest interpretation of the gatekeeper provision. We leave that to the bankruptcy court in the first instance.<sup>18</sup>

\* \* \*

In sum, the Plan violates § 524(e) but only insofar as it exculpates and enjoins certain non-debtors. The exculpatory order is therefore vacated as to all parties *except* Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors for conduct within the scope of their duties. We otherwise affirm the inclusion of the injunction and the gatekeeper provisions in the Plan.<sup>19</sup>

## V. CONCLUSION

Highland Capital’s motion to dismiss the appeal as equitably moot is DENIED. The bankruptcy court’s judgment is AFFIRMED in part, REVERSED in part, and REMANDED for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

---

<sup>18</sup> For the same reasons, we also leave the applicability of *Barton*’s limited statutory exception to the bankruptcy and district courts in the first instance. See 28 U.S.C. § 959(a) (allowing suit, without leave of the appointing court, if the challenged acts relate to the trustee or debtor in possession “carrying on business connected with [their] property”).

<sup>19</sup> Nothing in this opinion should be construed to hinder the bankruptcy court’s power to enjoin and impose sanctions on Dondero and other entities by following the procedures to designate them vexatious litigants. See *In re Carroll*, 850 F.3d 811, 815 (5th Cir. 2017) (per curiam). But non-debtor exculpation within a reorganization plan is not a lawful means to impose vexatious litigant injunctions and sanctions.

**APPENDIX C**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-10534

---

IN THE MATTER OF HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Debtor,*

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS,  
L.P., *now known as* NEXPOINT ASSET MANAGEMENT,  
L.P.; NEXPOINT ADVISORS, L.P.,

*Appellants,*

v.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

*Appellee.*

---

Filed: May 29, 2025

---

ORDER RESPECTING DENIAL OF MOTION TO  
STAY ISSUANCE OF MANDATE PENDING  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Before ELROD, *Chief Judge*, and WILLETT and  
DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

It is not this court's usual practice to stay issuance of the mandate pending the filing and disposition

of a petition for writ of certiorari. We do so only when a party shows that “the petition would present a substantial question and that there is good cause for a stay.” Fed. R. App. P. 41(d)(1). Highland Capital has shown neither of these things.

Preliminarily, the questions that Highland Capital asserts it would include in its petition for certiorari do not appear to be reviewable because they were not the subject of this appeal. Highland Capital submits that it would ask the Supreme Court to consider: (1) whether this court correctly struck various non-debtors from the scope of the Gatekeeper Clause; and (2) whether the bankruptcy courts have authority to exculpate or release non-debtors from liability arising from the bankruptcy process. But in our opinion, we merely confirmed the instruction that we had previously given the bankruptcy court in *In re Highland Capital Management, L.P. (Highland I)*, 48 F.4th 419 (5th Cir. 2022): to narrow the definition of “Protected Parties” used in the Gatekeeper Clause. In doing so, we answered the question actually raised in the appeal: whether the bankruptcy court properly implemented *Highland I*. And that is hardly a substantial question.

Moreover, our opinion reiterated and followed principles that have been the law of this circuit for decades; it neither created nor deepened any circuit split. And denying Highland Capital’s motion does not likely lead to irreparable harm. While Highland Capital fears that our decision could lead to significant future litigation, Highland Capital certainly knows how to bring its concerns to this court and other courts,



given the voluminous litigation that has occurred between the parties thus far. In addition, even with the Gatekeeper Clause narrowed as required by both *Highland I* and our opinion in the current appeal, Highland Capital has tools to seek relief from burdensome litigation, such as sanctions.

Highland Capital stressed repeatedly in its briefing on appeal that it was not asking for the moon and stars, agreeing with Appellants that the appeal was a “simple” one that asked us merely to clarify whether the bankruptcy court had properly implemented our instructions in *Highland I*. And our resulting opinion did exactly that, interpreting our own jurisprudence and requiring the bankruptcy court to comply with it. Now, Highland Capital complains that we failed to grant them the moon and stars by reinterpreting our bankruptcy jurisprudence to vastly extend the power of the bankruptcy courts.

Accordingly, denial of Highland Capital’s motion to stay issuance of the mandate is appropriate here.

58a

**APPENDIX D**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-10534

---

IN THE MATTER OF HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Debtor,*

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS,  
L.P., *now known as* NEXPOINT ASSET MANAGEMENT,  
L.P.; NEXPOINT ADVISORS, L.P.,

*Appellants,*

v.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

*Appellee.*

---

Filed: May 22, 2025

---

**ORDER:**

Appellee's motion for stay of the mandate pending petition for writ of certiorari is DENIED.

/s/ Jennifer W. Elrod  
JENNIFER WALKER ELROD, Chief Judge  
*United States Circuit Judge*

59a

**APPENDIX E**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

---

No. 19-34054-sgj11

---

IN RE: HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Reorganized Debtor.*

---

Filed: Feb. 27, 2023

---

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER ON**  
**REORGANIZED DEBTOR'S MOTION**  
**TO CONFORM PLAN [DE # 3503]**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This Memorandum Opinion and Order addresses a *Motion to Conform Plan* [DE # 3503] (“*Motion*”) filed by Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“Highland” or the “Reorganized Debtor”).<sup>1</sup> The *Motion* was filed in response to a ruling of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit (“Fifth Circuit”) in connection with an appeal of the confirmation order on Highland’s Chapter 11 plan (“Plan”). As further explained herein, the Fifth Circuit affirmed the confirmation order in all respects except the following: it determined

---

<sup>1</sup> The court will sometimes use the term “Debtor” when referring to Highland during the post-petition/preconfirmation time period.

that certain *exculpations* in the Plan, as to certain parties, were impermissible pursuant to section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code and should be stricken as to those parties. More specifically, the Fifth Circuit held that the only parties properly entitled to Plan exculpations were: the Debtor, the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the “UCC”) and its members, and the “Independent Directors”<sup>2</sup> (collectively, the “Properly Exculpated Parties”). The Fifth Circuit then remanded “to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.”<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, the Reorganized Debtor filed the *Motion*, proposing that the bankruptcy court approve a scaled down defined term for “Exculpated Parties” in the Plan. This, says the Reorganized Debtor, is all that the Fifth Circuit’s mandate required—i.e., a narrowing of the defined universe of persons who received exculpations under the Plan.

Three sets of parties objected to the *Motion*: (a) Highland Income Fund, NexPoint Strategic Opportunities Fund, Highland Global Allocation Fund, and NexPoint Capital, Inc. (the “Funds”) [DE # 3539]; (b) the Dugaboy Investment Trust (“Dugaboy”)<sup>4</sup> [DE # 3540]; and (c) NexPoint Advisors, L.P. and Highland

---

<sup>2</sup> The Independent Directors—consisting of James P. Seery, Jr., John Dubel, and Retired Bankruptcy Judge Russell Nelms—were appointed by the bankruptcy court and were comparable to “quasi-trustees.”

<sup>3</sup> *NexPoint v. Highland Capital Management*, Case No. 21-10449 at DE # 213 (5th Cir. Sep. 12, 2022).

<sup>4</sup> Dugaboy is a family trust of James Dondero (“Mr. Dondero”), the co-founder and former CEO of the Debtor.

Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. (the “Advisors”) [DE # 3551].<sup>5</sup> These objectors argue that the Fifth Circuit’s ruling requires more surgery on the Plan than simply narrowing the defined term for “Exculpated Parties.” The Reorganized Debtor disagreed in a Reply [DE # 3566], and the court thereafter held a hearing to allow oral argument. The court gave an oral ruling from the bench at the hearing, stating that the Reorganized Debtor’s proposal of simply changing the defined term in the Plan for “Exculpated Parties” would seem to properly address the Fifth Circuit’s ruling and mandate, but the parties asked the court to draft a formal written Order providing its reasoning, for the parties’ benefit and in case there were appeals of the court’s ruling on the *Motion*. This constitutes the court’s written ruling.

## II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND

On October 16, 2019, Highland filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. On February 22, 2021, the bankruptcy court entered a Confirmation Order [DE # 1943] confirming the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (as Modified) [Docket No. 1808] (as subsequently modified, the “Plan”). The Confirmation Order was appealed by the Funds, the Advisors, Dugaboy, the Get Good Trust (the latter of which is another family trust of Mr. Dondero), and Mr. Dondero in his individual capacity (“Appellants”) [DE

---

<sup>5</sup> It has been conceded at prior hearings that the Advisors are controlled by Mr. Dondero. The court assumes that is still the case.

## 1957, 1966, 1970, 1972]. Appellants' appeal was certified for direct appeal to the Fifth Circuit.

On August 19, 2022, the Fifth Circuit issued an opinion (the "Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion")<sup>6</sup> and a judgment ("Judgment") affirming in substantial part the Confirmation Order, stating that it reversed "only insofar as the plan exculpates certain non-debtors in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 524(e)," and would "strike those few parties from the plan's exculpation, and affirm on all remaining grounds."<sup>7</sup> The Fifth Circuit remanded to the bankruptcy court "for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court."<sup>8</sup>

On September 2, 2022, the Funds filed a short (four-and-one-half pages) motion for rehearing at the Fifth Circuit (the "Motion for Rehearing").<sup>9</sup> This was on the Friday before Labor Day. The Funds requested "that the Court narrowly amend the [Initial Fifth Circuit] Opinion in order to confirm the Court's holding that the impermissibly exculpated parties are similarly struck from the protections of the injunction and gatekeeper provisions of the plan (in other words, that such parties cannot constitute 'Protected Parties')." As later explained, the Plan contained distinct "Exculpation," "Injunctions," and "Gatekeeper" provisions. On

---

<sup>6</sup> *NexPoint v. Highland Capital Management*, 2022 WL 3571094, Case No. 21-10449, slip opinion previously available at DE # 194 (5th Cir. Aug. 19, 2022). The Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion was attached to the Funds' objection to the *Motion* as an Exhibit A [DE # 3539].

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at p. 2.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> DE # 3539, Exhibit C thereto.

September 7, 2022 (the Tuesday after Labor Day), the Fifth Circuit granted the Motion for Rehearing and, without entertaining responses or oral argument, withdrew the Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion and entered a substituted opinion (the “Final Fifth Circuit Opinion”).<sup>10</sup> The Final Fifth Circuit Opinion *replaced only one sentence* that had been in the Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion:

***“The injunction and gatekeeper provisions are, on the other hand, perfectly lawful”***<sup>11</sup>

with the following sentence:

***“We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions.”***<sup>12</sup>

However, in the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, same as the Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion, the Fifth Circuit stated that, with regard to the Confirmation Order, the panel would “reverse only insofar as the plan exculpates certain non-debtors in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 524(e), strike those few parties from the plan’s exculpation, and affirm on all remaining grounds.”<sup>13</sup> To be clear, no findings, discussion, or rul-

---

<sup>10</sup> *NexPoint v. Highland Capital Management*, 48 F.4th 419, Case No. 21-10449, slip opinion at DE # 210 (5th Cir. Sep. 7, 2022). The Final Fifth Circuit Opinion was attached to the Funds’ objection to the *Motion* as an Exhibit C [DE # 3539]. Most subsequent references to the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion will cite to the published version of it in the West Reporter Service, appearing at 48 F.4th 419.

<sup>11</sup> See slip opinion, at p. 27 [DE # 3539, Exhibit A thereto].

<sup>12</sup> See Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, slip opinion at p. 28 [DE # 3539, Exhibit C thereto]. 48 F.4th at 438.

<sup>13</sup> 48 F.4th at 424.

ings regarding the injunction and gatekeeper provisions that were in the Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion were disturbed.

The Fifth Circuit’s docket reflects that it issued its Judgment and a mandate on September 12, 2022, remanding “to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings in accordance with the opinion of this Court.”<sup>14</sup>

On October 7, 2022, the Fifth Circuit denied a motion by certain Appellants for a stay of the mandate.<sup>15</sup>

Thereafter, on January 10 and 23, 2023, petitions for *writ of certiorari* to the United States Supreme Court were filed by the Reorganized Debtor and certain Appellants.<sup>16</sup> There being no stay of the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion or the mandate, this court now issues this ruling on the *Motion*.

### III. JURISDICTION

The bankruptcy court has jurisdiction to rule on the *Motion* pursuant to the mandate of the Fifth Circuit issued on September 12, 2022. Furthermore, the underlying statutory authority that is applicable is 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a) and 1142.

### IV. THE PLAN PROVISIONS THAT ARE CONCEIVABLY AT ISSUE

To put the relief sought in the *Motion* and the objections thereto into proper context, a review of three

---

<sup>14</sup> *NexPoint v. Highland Capital Management*, Case No. 21-10449 at DE # 213 (5th Cir. Sep. 12, 2022).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at DE # 222 (5th Cir. Oct. 7, 2022).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at DE ## 227 & 228 (5th Cir. Jan. 10 & 23, 2023).



sets of Plan provisions is appropriate. First, the *exculpation provisions*. Second, the *injunction provisions*. Third, the *gatekeeping provisions*. These all had distinct functions; they were not in any way redundant. Sometimes they have been collectively referred to as the “*Protection Provisions*.”

**Exculpations.** The Plan addressed Exculpation at Article IX.C thereof. The “Exculpation” provision, in pertinent part, stated as follows:

Subject in all respects to ARTICLE XII.D of this Plan, to the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, *no Exculpated Party will have or incur*, and each Exculpated Party is hereby exculpated from, any claim, obligation, suit, judgment, damage, demand, debt, right, Cause of Action, remedy, loss, and *liability for conduct occurring on or after the Petition Date* in connection with or arising out of (i) the filing and administration of the Chapter 11 Case; (ii) the negotiation and pursuit of the Disclosure Statement, the Plan, or the solicitation of votes for, or confirmation of, the Plan; (iii) the funding or consummation of the Plan (including the Plan Supplement) or any related agreements, instruments, or other documents, the solicitation of votes on the Plan, the offer, issuance, and Plan Distribution of any securities issued or to be issued pursuant to the Plan, including the Claimant Trust Interests, whether or not such Plan Distributions occur following the Effective Date; (iv) the implementation of the Plan; and (v) any negotiations, transactions, and documentation in connection with the foregoing clauses (i)-(iv); provided, however, *the foregoing will not apply to (a) any acts or*

*omissions of an Exculpated Party arising out of or related to acts or omissions that constitute bad faith, fraud, gross negligence, criminal misconduct, or willful misconduct* or (b) Strand or any Employee other than with respect to actions taken by such Entities from the date of appointment of the Independent Directors through the Effective Date. This exculpation shall be in addition to, and not in limitation of, all other releases, indemnities, exculpations, any other applicable law or rules, or any other provisions of this Plan, including ARTICLE IV.C.2, protecting such Exculpated Parties from liability. (Emphasis added.)

The Plan had a defined term for “Exculpated Parties,” at Article I.B.62 that read as follows:

“**Exculpated Parties**” means, collectively, (i) the Debtor and its successors and assigns, direct and indirect majority-owned subsidiaries, and the Managed Funds, (ii) the Employees, (iii) Strand, (iv) the Independent Directors, (v) the Committee, (vi) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities), (vii) the Professionals retained by the Debtor and the Committee in the Chapter 11 Case, (viii) the CEO/CRO; and (ix) the Related Persons of each of the parties listed in (iv) through (viii); provided, however, that, for the avoidance of doubt, none of James Dondero, Mark Okada, NexPoint Advisors, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries and managed entities), the Charitable Donor Advised Fund, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries, including CLO Holdco, Ltd., and managed entities), Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (and any of its subsidiaries, members, and managed entities), Highland Capital Management Fund

Advisors, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries and managed entities), NexBank, SSB (and any of its subsidiaries), the Hunter Mountain Investment Trust (or any trustee acting for the trust), the Dugaboy Investment Trust (or any trustee acting for the trust), or Grant Scott is included in the term “Exculpated Party.”

Simply stated, the Exculpation Provisions shielded a specified list of parties from any *negligence liability* for *post-petition conduct* in connection with the Highland Chapter 11 cases. The provisions effectuated *an absolution of liability* for the Exculpated Parties—but, again, only for mere negligent conduct occurring on or after the Petition Date and in connection with the case. It is also notable that the Exculpation Provisions deal only with pre-Effective Date Parties (i.e., not any parties created by the terms of the Plan, such as the Litigation Trustee or Claimant Trustee).

**Injunctions.** The Plan addresses Injunctions at Article IX.F, in the first three paragraphs thereof. The “Injunctions” provision, in pertinent part, stated as follows:

Upon entry of the Confirmation Order, all Enjoined Parties are and shall be permanently enjoined, on and after the Effective Date, *from taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan.*

Except as expressly provided in the Plan, the Confirmation Order, or a separate order of the Bankruptcy Court, all Enjoined Parties are and shall be permanently enjoined, on and after the Effective Date, with respect to any Claims and

Equity Interests, from directly or indirectly (i) commencing, conducting, or continuing in any manner any suit, action, or other proceeding of any kind (including any proceeding in a judicial, arbitral, administrative or other forum) against or affecting *the Debtor or the property of the Debtor*, (ii) enforcing, levying, attaching (including any prejudgment attachment), collecting, or otherwise recovering, enforcing, or attempting to recover or enforce, by any manner or means, any judgment, award, decree, or order *against the Debtor or the property of the Debtor*, (iii) creating, perfecting, or otherwise enforcing in any manner, any security interest, lien or encumbrance of any kind *against the Debtor or the property of the Debtor*, (iv) asserting any right of setoff, directly or indirectly, against any obligation due to the *Debtor or against property or interests in property of the Debtor*, except to the limited extent permitted under Sections 553 and 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code, and (v) *acting or proceeding in any manner, in any place whatsoever, that does not conform to or comply with the provisions of the Plan.*

The injunctions set forth herein shall extend to, and apply to any act of the type set forth in any of clauses (i)-(v) of the immediately preceding paragraph against any successors of the Debtor, including, *but not limited to, the Reorganized Debtor, the Litigation Sub-Trust, and the Claimant Trust and their respective property and interests in property.* (Emphasis added.)

The Plan had a defined term for “Enjoined Parties,” at Article I.B.56 that read as follows:

**“Enjoined Parties”** means (i) all Entities who have held, hold, or may hold Claims against or Equity Interests in the Debtor (whether or not proof of such Claims or Equity Interests has been filed and whether or not such Entities vote in favor of, against or abstain from voting on the Plan or are presumed to have accepted or deemed to have rejected the Plan), (ii) James Dondero (“Dondero”), (iii) any Entity that has appeared and/or filed any motion, objection, or other pleading in this Chapter 11 Case regardless of the capacity in which such Entity appeared and any other party in interest, (iv) any Related Entity, and (v) the Related Persons<sup>17</sup> of each of the foregoing.

Simply stated, the injunctions were *not* a release, or absolution of liability, or exculpation *per se*, but were, rather, an equitable device aimed at: (a) enforcing the discharge of the Debtor; (b) protecting the Debtor’s property dealt with by the Plan; and (c) preventing interference with implementation of the Plan. It was directed to claimants, equity interest holders, those who had participated in the Chapter 11 Case (including Mr. Dondero) and parties related to them. In sum—similar to so many Chapter 11 plans that this court sees—this provision was “belts and suspenders” to the Plan discharge and was essentially a ***policing mechanism to deter actions in violations of the discharge or otherwise inconsistent with the Plan.***

---

<sup>17</sup> “Related Entity” and “Related Persons” were defined terms under the Plan, but the definitions will not be set forth herein, because they are not deemed relevant to the court’s analysis.

**Gatekeeper Provisions.** The Plan set forth gatekeeper provisions in the fourth paragraph of Article IX.F, although the gatekeeper provision did not use this title. This provision was very much part and parcel to the Injunctions (which explains why it is located in the same section of the Plan). The provision stated:

Subject in all respects to ARTICLE XII.D, no Enjoined Party may commence or pursue a claim or cause of action of any kind against any Protected Party *that arose or arises from or is related to the Chapter 11 Case, the negotiation of the Plan, the administration of the Plan or property to be distributed under the Plan, the wind down of the business of the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, the administration of the Claimant Trust or the Litigation Sub-Trust, or the transactions in furtherance of the foregoing* without the Bankruptcy Court (i) first determining, after notice and a hearing, that such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim of any kind, including, but not limited to, negligence, bad faith, criminal misconduct, willful misconduct, fraud, or gross negligence against a Protected Party and (ii) specifically authorizing such Enjoined Party to bring such claim or cause of action against any such Protected Party; provided, however, the foregoing will not apply to a claim or cause of action against Strand or against any Employee other than with respect to actions taken, respectively, by Strand or by such Employee from the date of appointment of the Independent Directors through the Effective Date. *The Bankruptcy Court will have sole and exclusive jurisdiction to determine whether a claim or cause of action is colorable and, only to the extent legally permissible and as provided for in*

***ARTICLE XI, shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate the underlying colorable claim or cause of action.*** (Emphasis added.)

The Plan had a defined term for “Protected Parties” as follows:

“**Protected Parties**” means, collectively, (i) the Debtor and its successors and assigns, direct and indirect majority-owned subsidiaries, and the Managed Funds, (ii) the Employees, (iii) Strand, (iv) the Reorganized Debtor, (v) the Independent Directors, (vi) the Committee, (vii) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities), (viii) the Claimant Trust, (ix) the Claimant Trustee, (x) the Litigation Sub-Trust, (xi) the Litigation Trustee, (xii) the members of the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee (in their official capacities), (xiii) New GP LLC, (xiv) the Professionals retained by the Debtor and the Committee in the Chapter 11 Case, (xv) the CEO/CRO; and (xvi) the Related Persons of each of the parties listed in (iv) through (xv); provided, however, that, for the avoidance of doubt, none of James Dondero, Mark Okada, NexPoint Advisors, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries and managed entities), the Charitable Donor Advised Fund, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries, including CLO Holdco, Ltd., and managed entities), Highland CLO Funding, Ltd. (and any of its subsidiaries, members, and managed entities), NexBank, SSB (and any of its subsidiaries), Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. (and any of its subsidiaries and managed entities), the Hunter Mountain Investment Trust (or any trustee acting for the trust), the Dugaboy Investment Trust

(or any trustee acting for the trust), or Grant Scott is included in the term “Protected Party.”

Notably, the list of “Protected Parties” was not identical to the list of “Exculpated Parties.” Namely, the “Protected Parties” list included several parties that were not even in existence prior to confirmation—such as the Claimant Trustee, Claimant Trust Oversight Board, and Litigation Trustee. In any event, simply put, the Gatekeeper Provision was somewhat of a tool to deal with any future, potential lawsuits that might be deemed to run afoul of the Injunctions. It did not effectuate a release or an absolution of any liability. Rather, as the “gatekeeper” nickname implies, it simply provided that a plaintiff would have to *ask* the gatekeeper before bringing a claim. No one would be allowed to bring a claim against a defined universe of “Protected Parties” without first asking the bankruptcy court. The bankruptcy court would have to determine, after notice, that such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim against a Protected Party and specifically authorize such plaintiff to bring such claim against any such Protected Party. If the bankruptcy court were to deny permission, then, presumably, such denial could be appealed.

The Confirmation Order addressed Exculpation, the Injunctions, and the Gatekeeper Provisions at length at pages 48-59.

#### **V. THE RELIEF SOUGHT IN THE MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN**

As noted earlier, in the *Motion*, the Reorganized Debtor proposes that only one change is needed to



make the Plan compliant with the Fifth Circuit’s ruling: narrow the defined term for “Exculpated Parties” to read as follows:

“Exculpated Parties” means, collectively, (i) the Debtor, (ii) the Independent Directors, (iii) the Committee, and (iv) members of the Committee (in their official capacities).

The Reorganized Debtor states that this one simple revision of this defined term “directly addresses all instances of exculpation deemed by the Fifth Circuit to violate section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code, and no other changes” are required to conform the Plan and Confirmation Order to the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion.<sup>18</sup>

The Funds’ Opposition. The Funds support the revision of the defined term “Exculpated Parties,” as proposed by the Reorganized Debtor, but they argue that the defined term “Protected Parties” must likewise be revised to “fully implement[ ] the mandate of the Fifth Circuit . . . .”<sup>19</sup> The Funds point to their Motion for Rehearing filed at the Fifth Circuit, wherein they expressed concern that “the Court’s statement that the injunction and gatekeeper provisions are ‘perfectly lawful,’ might be argued to mean that the injunction and gatekeeper provisions – without any tailoring – are allowed to stand.”<sup>20</sup> The Funds specifically asked the Fifth Circuit panel to revise its opinion to clarify and “to confirm the Court’s holding that the impermissibly exculpated parties are similarly struck

---

<sup>18</sup> DE # 3503, ¶ 11.

<sup>19</sup> DE # 3539, ¶ 3.

<sup>20</sup> DE # 3539, ¶ 5.

from the protections of the injunction and gatekeeper provisions of the Plan (in other words, that such parties cannot constitute ‘Protected Parties’), such that the injunction and gatekeeper provisions extend only to Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors.”<sup>21</sup> The Funds’ argue that the fact that the panel granted the Motion for Rehearing and removed the “perfectly lawful” sentence (replacing it with the sentence noted above) and otherwise left the language unchanged means that the panel agreed with the Funds’ interpretation of the Initial Fifth Circuit Opinion that “the parties protected by the injunction and gatekeeper provisions (the Protected Parties) must similarly be limited to the Properly Exculpated Parties – Highland, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors.”<sup>22</sup> Accordingly, the Funds request that, in addition to narrowing the defined term “Exculpated Parties,” the bankruptcy court order a similar narrowing of the defined term “Protected Parties” to read:

“Protected Parties” means, collectively, (i) the Debtor, (ii) the Independent Directors, (iii) the Committee, and (iv) members of the Committee (in their official capacities).<sup>23</sup>

Dugaboy’s Opposition. Dugaboy filed a short Joinder simply adopting the arguments of the Funds.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> DE # 3539, Exhibit B thereto, at ¶ 3.

<sup>22</sup> DE # 3539, ¶ 14.

<sup>23</sup> DE # 3539, ¶ 19.

<sup>24</sup> DE # 3540.

The Advisors’ Opposition. The Advisors filed an Objection adopting the Funds’ Response but requesting two additional revisions to the Plan.<sup>25</sup> First, the Advisors proposed fully deleting the provision in the Injunctions section (Plan, Art. IX.F., third para.) that “purports to enjoin claims against successors of the Debtor who are not entitled to limited qualified immunity under” the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion.<sup>26</sup> Second, the Advisors proposed “carv[ing] out from the gatekeeping provision of the injunction those suits that are expressly allowed by 28 U.S.C. § 959(a),” by “amend[ing] the fourth paragraph of Article IX.F of the Plan by excepting from the gatekeeping provisions actions that relate to the Independent Directors or Debtor ‘carrying on business connected with [their] property’ as provided in § 959(a).” With respect to the “carve out” request, the Advisors point to footnote 18 of the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, which states, “[W]e also leave the applicability of *Barton’s*<sup>27</sup> limited statutory exception to the bankruptcy and district courts in the first instance.”<sup>28</sup>

Highland’s Reply. Highland replied to all of this by arguing that the Motion for Rehearing—and what the Funds asked for therein—is hugely significant. The Funds specifically requested, in their Motion for

---

<sup>25</sup> DE # 3551.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at ¶ 6.

<sup>27</sup> This is, of course, a reference to *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881).

<sup>28</sup> 48 F.4th at 439 n.18 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 959(a) “(allowing suit, without leave of the appointing court, if the challenged acts relate to the trustee or debtor in possession ‘carrying on business connected with [their] property’”).

Rehearing, that the Fifth Circuit panel (a) limit the definition of “Protected Parties” in the same way that it did with respect to the parties entitled to exculpation, and (b) “tailor” the injunction and gatekeeper provisions, in order to confirm that the Fifth Circuit meant to narrow the parties covered by the injunctions and gatekeeper provisions of the Plan. The Fifth Circuit did none of those things when it granted the Motion for Rehearing; it simply deleted the sentence stating that the gatekeeper provisions and injunction are “perfectly lawful” and otherwise left its initial affirmation of the gatekeeper provisions and injunctions intact. Highland argues that “the Fifth Circuit . . . clarified that the Injunction was ‘sound’ but not ‘perfectly lawful’” and that nothing in the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion supports the position that the Fifth Circuit intended to limit the Protected Parties that are protected by the Gatekeeper Provision from “harassing and frivolous litigation.” Highland further argues that, since the Gatekeeper Provision is not a release, it does not implicate § 524(e), but is necessary to prevent harassment.

#### **VI. RULING ON MOTION TO CONFORM PLAN**

The court grants the request of the Reorganized Debtor, holding that the only thing that needs to be done in response to the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion and mandate is to change the defined term for “Exculpated Parties,” at Art. I.B.62 of the Plan as follows:

“Exculpated Parties’ means, collectively, (i) the Debtor, (ii) the Independent Directors, (iii) the Committee, and (iv) the members of the Committee (in their official capacities).”

In so holding, this court has scoured the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion to be clear what language survived and to discern what the Court did or did not find problematic with the Plan Protections. In that regard, this court notes the following:

On Page 429, the Fifth Circuit states:

We then turn to the merits, conclude the Plan exculpates certain non-debtors beyond the bankruptcy court's authority, and affirm in all other respects.<sup>29</sup>

On Page 432, the Court states:

We do, however, agree with Appellants that the bankruptcy court exceeded its statutory authority under § 524(e) by exculpating certain non-debtors, and so we reverse and vacate the Plan only to that extent.<sup>30</sup>

On Page 435, the Fifth Circuit states, before launching into a discussion of the various type of Plan Protections:

The bankruptcy court deemed the provisions legal, necessary under the circumstances, and in the best interest of all parties. We agree, but only in part. Though the injunction and gatekeeping provisions are sound, the exculpation of certain non-debtors exceeds the bankruptcy court's authority. We reverse and vacate that limited portion of the Plan. . . . In a Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceeding, "discharge of a debt of the debtor does not affect the liability of any other entity on, or the property of any other entity for, such debt."

---

<sup>29</sup> 48 F.4th at 429.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 432.

11 U.S.C. § 524(e). Contrary to the bankruptcy court’s holding, the exculpation here partly runs afoul of that statutory bar on non-debtor discharge by reaching beyond Highland Capital, the Committee, and the Independent Directors. *See Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 251–53. We must reverse and strike the few unlawful parts of the Plan’s exculpation provision.<sup>31</sup>

On pages 437-438, in wrapping up its discussion of the Exculpation Provisions, the Fifth Circuit states:

In sum, our precedent and § 524(e) require any exculpation in a Chapter 11 reorganization plan be limited to the debtor, the creditors’ committee and its members for conduct within the scope of their duties, 11 U.S.C. § 1103(c), and the trustees within the scope of their duties, *see Baron*, 914 F.3d at 993. And so, excepting the Independent Directors and the Committee members, the exculpation of non-debtors here was unlawful. Accordingly, the other non-debtor exculpations must be struck from the Plan. *See Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 253.

As it stands, the Plan’s exculpation provision extends to Highland Capital and its employees and CEO; Strand; the Reorganized Debtor and HCMLP GP LLC; the Independent Directors; the Committee and its members; the Claimant Trust, its trustee, and the members of its Oversight Board; the Litigation Sub-Trust and its trustee; professionals retained by the Highland Capital and the Committee in this case; and all “Related Persons.” Consistent with § 524(e), we strike all

---

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 435.

exculpated parties from the Plan except Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors.<sup>32</sup>

On page 438, immediately after the previously quoted language, the next section of the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion has a subheading “Injunction & Gatekeeper Provisions,” and then states:

***We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions.*** Appellants object to the bankruptcy court’s injunction as vague and the gatekeeper provision as overbroad. We are unpersuaded.<sup>33</sup>

Note that the bolded sentence above is the only new sentence in the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, and it replaced a previous sentence that read: “The injunction and gatekeeper provisions are on the other hand, perfectly lawful.”

Finally, in the penultimate paragraph of the entire Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, the Fifth Circuit states:

In sum, the Plan violates § 524(e), but only insofar as it exculpates and enjoins certain non-debtors. The exculpatory order is therefore vacated as to all parties except Highland Capital, the Committee and its members, and the Independent Directors for conduct within the scope of their duties. We otherwise affirm the inclusion of the injunction and the gatekeeper provisions in the Plan.

---

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* at 437-38.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* at 438 (emphasis added).

On balance, this court does not know how it could be clearer, that the Fifth Circuit was holding that the exculpations of certain parties violated section 524(e), but the other Plan Protections were “sound.”<sup>34</sup>

Of course, this still begs the question: what might the Fifth Circuit have meant in replacing the sentence *“The injunction and gatekeeper provisions are on the other hand, perfectly lawful”* with the sentence *“We now turn to the Plan’s injunction and gatekeeper provisions”*?<sup>35</sup>

It is certainly awkward for this court to attempt to be a mind-reader regarding editorial or wordsmithing decisions undertaken by the Fifth Circuit. All this court can be sure of is that the Fifth Circuit declined the Funds’ request, in their Motion for Rehearing, to strike or modify the defined term “Protected Parties” (that pertains to the Gatekeeper Provision) so that it would be coterminous with the defined term “Exculpated Parties.” The Fifth Circuit did not modify the Gatekeeper Provision or its applicable definition of “Protected Parties” in any way, let alone in the manner that the Funds requested. And the Fifth Circuit did not include anything in its Final Fifth Circuit Opinion to indicate that the panel agreed with the Funds’ analysis.

Moreover, limiting the definition of “Protected Parties” to be coterminous with the defined term “Exculpated Parties” would mean that the Gatekeeper Provision would have no effect on any conduct that occurs after the Plan Effective Date. Why? *Because the*

---

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* at 435.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at 438.



*persons included in the defined term “Exculpated Parties”—as now limited by the Fifth Circuit’s ruling to include only the Debtor, the UCC, the UCC members, and Independent Directors—are all gone now.* They all ceased to exist on the Effective Date. Additionally, the Debtor would not even need a Gatekeeper Provision for pre-Effective Date conduct because the Debtor was discharged. The Gatekeeper Provision is largely forward-looking, to prevent interference with post-Effective-Date management as they consummate the Plan, wind down the assets, and administer the Claimant Trust and the Litigation Sub-Trust. As noted, the defined term for “Protected Parties” includes several parties that did not even exist pre-confirmation such as the Claimant Trustee, Claimant Trust Oversight Board, and Litigation Trustee. It is mostly a tool to deal with any future, potential lawsuits that might be deemed to run afoul of Plan implementation. The Gatekeeper Provision did not effectuate a release or an absolution of any liability. Rather, as the “gatekeeper” nickname implies, it simply provided that a plaintiff would have to *ask* the gatekeeper before bringing a claim against the defined universe of “Protected Parties.” If such a request is made, the bankruptcy court will determine, after notice, whether such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim against a Protected Party and specifically authorize such plaintiff to bring such claim against any such Protected Party. If the bankruptcy court denies permission, then, presumably, such denial could be appealed.

The bankruptcy court humbly suggests that the Fifth Circuit well understood all of this. Perhaps they

deleted the one sentence out of concern that there might be something in the Injunction Provisions that ran afoul of the new, narrowed defined term for “Exculpated Parties”—for example, the catchall clause at Article IX.F(v) of the Injunction Provision. Specifically, that catchall clause, appearing after the injunctions of all sorts of conduct *against the Debtor* or its property, also enjoins parties from “(v) *acting or proceeding in any manner, in any place whatsoever, that does not conform to or comply with the provisions of the Plan.*” Perhaps the Fifth Circuit thought this injunctive language was a little vague or broad, but it had fixed any problem with it, by making clear that no one was absolved from any liability except the Debtor, the UCC, the UCC members, and the Independent Directors. The Fifth Circuit had fixed any problem with the cause by ruling that the defined term “Exculpated Parties” was too broad.

But perhaps the Fifth Circuit was simply making a stylistic edit—maybe they thought the words “perfectly lawful” may have sounded a bit too rosy or glowing, with regard to gatekeeper provisions generally, and they did not want to suggest that they had blessed them for every plan in the future, no matter what the facts and circumstances were. Perhaps the word “sound” seemed more measured and case-specific than the words “perfectly lawful.”

In any event, in light of the Fifth Circuit keeping intact, in its Final Fifth Circuit Opinion, the language that the “the injunction and gatekeeping provisions are sound,” this court sees no need to tailor those provisions in any manner. This tailoring request was

made to the Fifth Circuit in the Motion for Rehearing, and they declined.

Finally, with regard to the Advisors' request that this court delete the provision in the Injunctions section (Plan, Art. IX.F., third para.) that "purports to enjoin claims against successors of the Debtor who are not entitled to limited qualified immunity" pursuant to the Final Fifth Circuit Opinion and "carve out from the gatekeeping provision . . . those suits that are expressly allowed by 28 U.S.C. § 959(a)," the bankruptcy court declines this request. This court does not read footnote 18 of the Fifth Circuit's Final Opinion, which states, "[W]e also leave the applicability of *Barton's*<sup>36</sup> limited statutory exception to the bankruptcy and district courts in the first instance,"<sup>37</sup> as necessitating any modification to the Plan whatsoever.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The court grants the *Motion* and orders that one change be made to the Plan to conform it to the mandate of the Fifth Circuit: revise the definition of "Exculpated Parties" as proposed in the *Motion* and no more.

**### END OF MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER ###**

.

---

<sup>36</sup> This is, of course, a reference to *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881).

<sup>37</sup> 48 F.4th at 439 n.18 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 959(a) "(allowing suit, without leave of the appointing court, if the challenged acts relate to the trustee or debtor in possession 'carrying on business connected with [their] property'")).

84a

**APPENDIX F**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

---

No. 19-34054-sgj11

---

IN RE: HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.<sup>1</sup>

*Reorganized Debtor.*

---

Filed: Feb. 22, 2021

---

**ORDER (I) CONFIRMING THE FIFTH AMENDED  
PLAN OF REORGANIZATION OF HIGHLAND CAP-  
ITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P. (AS MODIFIED) AND  
(II) GRANTING RELATED RELIEF**

---

The Bankruptcy Court<sup>2</sup> having:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Debtor's last four digits of its taxpayer identification number are (6725). The headquarters and service address for the above-captioned Debtor is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201.

<sup>2</sup> Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein have the meanings given to them in the Plan (as defined below). The rules of interpretation set forth in Article I of the Plan apply to this Confirmation Order.

- a. entered, on November 24, 2020, the *Order (A) Approving the Adequacy of the Disclosure Statement, (B) Scheduling A Hearing to Confirm the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (C) Establishing Deadline for Filing Objections to Confirmation of Plan, (D) Approving Form of Ballots, Voting Deadline and Solicitation Procedures, and (E) Approving Form and Manner of Notice* [Docket No. 1476] (the “Disclosure Statement Order”), pursuant to which the Bankruptcy Court approved the adequacy of the *Disclosure Statement Relating to the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1473] (the “Disclosure Statement”) under section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code and authorized solicitation of the Disclosure Statement;
- b. set January 5, 2021, at 5:00 p.m. prevailing Central Time (the “Objection Deadline”), as the deadline for filing objections to confirmation of the *Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (As Modified)* [Docket No. 1808] (as amended, supplemented or modified, the “Plan”);
- c. set January 5, 2021, at 5:00 p.m. prevailing Central Time, as the deadline for voting on the Plan (the “Voting Deadline”) in accordance with the Disclosure Statement Order;
- d. initially set January 13, 2021, at 9:30 a.m. prevailing Central Time, as the date and time to commence the hearing to consider confirmation of the Plan pursuant to Bankruptcy Rules 3017 and 3018, sections 1126, 1128, and 1129 of the

Bankruptcy Code, and the Disclosure Statement Order, which hearing was continued to January 26, 2021, at 9:30 a.m. prevailing Central Time and further continued to February 2, 2021;

- e. reviewed: (i) the Plan; (ii) the Disclosure Statement; and (iii) *Notice of (I) Entry of Order Approving Disclosure Statement; (II) Hearing to Confirm; and (III) Related Important Dates* (the “Confirmation Hearing Notice”), the form of which is attached as Exhibit 1-B to the Disclosure Statement Order;
- f. reviewed: (i) the *Debtor’s Notice of Filing of Plan Supplement for the Third Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1389] filed November 13, 2020; (ii) *Debtor’s Notice of Filing of Plan Supplement for the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1606] filed on December 18, 2020; (iii) the *Debtor’s Notice of Filing of Plan Supplement for the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1656] filed on January 4, 2021; (iv) *Notice of Filing Plan Supplement to the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (with Technical Modifications)* dated January 22, 2021 [Docket No. 1811]; and (v) *Debtor’s Notice of Filing of Plan Supplement to the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (As Modified)* on February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1875]; (collectively, the

documents listed in (i) through (v) of this paragraph, the “Plan Supplements”);

- g. reviewed: (i) the *Notice of (I) Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan, (II) Cure Amounts, if Any, and (III) Related Procedures in Connection Therewith* filed on December 30, 2020 [Docket No. 1648]; (ii) the *Second Notice of (I) Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan, (II) Cure Amounts, if Any, and (III) Related Procedures in Connection Therewith* filed on January 11, 2021 [Docket No.1719]; (iii) the *Third Notice of (I) Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan, (II) Cure Amounts, if Any, and (III) Related Procedures in Connection Therewith* filed on January 15, 2021 [Docket No. 1749]; (iv) the *Notice of Withdrawal of Certain Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases from List of Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan* [Docket No. 1791]; (v) the *Fourth Notice of (I) Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan (II) Cure Amounts, if Any, and (III) Released Procedures in Connection Therewith* filed on January 27, 2021 [Docket No. 1847]; (vi) the *Notice of Hearing on Agreed Motion to (I) Assume Nonresidential Real Property Lease with Crescent TC Investors, L.P. Upon Confirmation of Plan and*

(II) *Extend Assumption Deadline* filed on January 28, 2021 [Docket No. 1857]; and (vii) the *Fifth Notice of (I) Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases to be Assumed by the Debtor Pursuant to the Fifth Amended Plan (II) Cure Amounts, if Any, and (III) Released Procedures in Connection Therewith* filed on February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1873] (collectively, the documents referred to in (i) to (vii) are referred to as “List of Assumed Contracts”);

- h. reviewed: (i) the *Debtor’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Confirmation of the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1814] (the “Confirmation Brief”); (ii) the *Debtor’s Omnibus Reply to Objections to Confirmation of the Fifth Amended Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management*; [Docket No. 1807]; and (iii) the *Certification of Patrick M. Leathern With Respect to the Tabulation of Votes on th Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1772] and *Supplemental Certification of Patrick M Leathern With Respect to the Tabulation of Votes on the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1887] filed on February 3, 2021 (together, the “Voting Certifications”).
- i. reviewed: (i) the *Notice of Affidavit of Publication* dated December 3, 2020 [Docket No. 1505]; (ii) the *Certificate of Service* dated December 23, 2020 [Docket No. 1630]; (iii) the *Supplemental Certificate of Service* dated December



24, 2020 [Docket No. 1637]; (iv) the *Second Supplemental Certificate of Service* dated December 31, 2020 [Docket No. 1653]; (v) the *Certificate of Service* dated December 23, 2020 [Docket No. 1627]; (vi) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 6, 2021 [Docket No. 1696]; (vii) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 7, 2021 [Docket No. 1699]; (viii) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 7, 2021 [Docket No. 1700]; (ix) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 15, 2021 [Docket No. 1761]; (x) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 19, 2021 [Docket No. 1775]; (xi) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 20, 2021 [Docket No. 1787]; (xii) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 26, 2021 [Docket No. 1844]; (xiii) the *Certificate of Service* dated January 27, 2021 [Docket No. 1854]; (xiv) the *Certificate of Service* dated February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1879]; (xv) the *Certificates of Service* dated February 3, 2021 [Docket No. 1891 and 1893]; and (xvi) the *Certificates of Service* dated February 5, 2021 [Docket Nos. 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909] (collectively, the “Affidavits of Service and Publication”);

- j. reviewed all filed<sup>3</sup> pleadings, exhibits, statements, and comments regarding approval of the Disclosure Statement and confirmation of the Plan, including all objections, statements, and reservations of rights;

---

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, use of the term “filed” herein refers also to the service of the applicable document filed on the docket in this Chapter 11 Case, as applicable.

- k. conducted a hearing to consider confirmation of the Plan, which commenced on February 2, 2021, at 9:30 a.m. prevailing Central Time and concluded on February 3, 2021, and issued its oral ruling on February 8, 2021 (collectively, the “Confirmation Hearing”);
- l. heard the statements and arguments made by counsel in respect of confirmation of the Plan and having considered the record of this Chapter 11 Case and taken judicial notice of all papers and pleadings filed in this Chapter 11 Case; and
- m. considered all oral representations, testimony, documents, filings, and other evidence regarding confirmation of the Plan, including (a) all of the exhibits admitted into evidence;<sup>4</sup> (b) the sworn testimony of (i) James P. Seery, Jr., the Debtor’s Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer and a member of the Board of Directors of Strand Advisors, Inc. (“Strand”), the Debtor’s general partner; (ii) John S. Dubel, a member of the Board of Strand; (iii) Marc Tauber, a Vice President at Aon Financial Services; and (iv) Robert Jason Post, the Chief Compliance Officer of NexPoint Advisors, LP (collectively, the “Witnesses”); (c) the credibility

---

<sup>4</sup> The Court admitted the following exhibits into evidence: (a) all of the Debtor’s exhibits lodged at Docket No. 1822 (except TTTTT, which was withdrawn by the Debtor); (b) all of the Debtor’s exhibits lodged at Docket No. 1866; (c) all of the Debtor’s exhibits lodged at Docket No. 1877; (d) all of the Debtor’s exhibits lodged at Docket No. 1895; and (e) Exhibits 6-12 and 15-17 offered by Mr. James Dondero and lodged at Docket No. 1874.

of the Witnesses; and (d) the Voting Certifications.

NOW, THEREFORE, after due deliberation thereon and good cause appearing therefor, the Bankruptcy Court hereby makes and issues the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

**1. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.** The findings and conclusions set forth herein, together with the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the record during the Confirmation Hearing, constitute the Bankruptcy Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52, made applicable to this proceeding pursuant to Bankruptcy Rules 7052 and 9014. To the extent any of the following findings of fact constitute conclusions of law, they are adopted as such. To the extent that any of the following conclusions of law constitute findings of fact, they are adopted as such.

**2. Introduction and Summary of the Plan.** Prior to addressing the specific requirements under the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rules with respect to the confirmation of the Plan, the Bankruptcy Court believes it would be useful to first provide the following background of the Debtor's Chapter 11 Case, the parties involved therewith, and some of the major events that have transpired culminating in the filing and solicitation of the Plan of this very unusual case. Before the Bankruptcy Court is the *Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.*, filed on November 24, 2020, as modified on January 22, 2021 and again on February 1, 2021. The parties have repeatedly referred to the

Plan as an “asset monetization plan” because it involves the orderly wind-down of the Debtor’s estate, including the sale of assets and certain of its funds over time, with the Reorganized Debtor continuing to manage certain other funds, subject to the oversight of the Claimant Trust Oversight Board. The Plan provides for a Claimant Trust to, among other things, manage and monetize the Claimant Trust Assets for the benefit of the Debtor’s economic stakeholders. The Claimant Trustee is responsible for this process, among other duties specified in the Plan’s Claimant Trust Agreement. There is also anticipated to be a Litigation Sub-trust established for the purpose of pursuing certain avoidance or other causes of action for the benefit of the Debtor’s economic constituents.

**3. Confirmation Requirements Satisfied.** The Plan is supported by the Committee and all claimants with Convenience Claims (i.e., general unsecured claims under \$1 million) who voted in Class 7. Claimants with Class 8 General Unsecured Claims, however, voted to reject the Plan because, although the Plan was accepted by 99.8% of the amount of Claims in that class, only 17 claimants voted to accept the Plan while 27 claimants voted to reject the Plan. As a result of such votes, and because Mr. Dondero and the Dondero Related Entities (as defined below) objected to the Plan on a variety of grounds primarily relating to the Plan’s release, exculpation and injunction provisions, the Bankruptcy Court heard two full days of evidence on February 2 and 3, 2021, and considered testimony from five witnesses and thousands of pages of documentary evidence in determining whether the Plan satisfies the confirmation standards required

under the Bankruptcy Code. The Bankruptcy Court finds and concludes that the Plan meets all of the relevant requirements of sections 1123, 1124, and 1129, and other applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, as more fully set forth below with respect to each of the applicable confirmation requirements.

**4. Not Your Garden Variety Debtor.** The Debtor's case is not a garden variety chapter 11 case. The Debtor is a multibillion-dollar global investment adviser registered with the SEC, pursuant to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. It was founded in 1993 by James Dondero and Mark Okada. Mark Okada resigned from his role with Highland prior to the bankruptcy case being filed on October 16, 2019 (the "Petition Date"). Mr. Dondero controlled the Debtor as of the Petition Date but agreed to relinquish control of it on or about January 9, 2020, pursuant to an agreement reached with the Committee, as described below. Although Mr. Dondero remained with the Debtor as an unpaid employee/portfolio manager after January 9, 2020, his employment with the Debtor terminated on October 9, 2020. Mr. Dondero continues to work for and/or control numerous non-debtor entities in the complex Highland enterprise.

**5. The Debtor.** The Debtor is headquartered in Dallas, Texas. As of the Petition Date, the Debtor employed approximately 76 employees. The Debtor is privately-owned: (a) 99.5% by the Hunter Mountain Investment Trust; (b) 0.1866% by The Dugaboy Investment Trust, a trust created to manage the assets of Mr. Dondero and his family; (c) 0.0627% by Mark Okada, personally and through family trusts; and (d) 0.25% by Strand, the Debtor's general partner.

**6. The Highland Enterprise.** Pursuant to various contractual arrangements, the Debtor provides money management and advisory services for billions of dollars of assets, including collateralized loan obligation vehicles (“CLOs”), and other investments. Some of these assets are managed by the Debtor pursuant to shared services agreements with certain affiliated entities, including other affiliated registered investment advisors. In fact, there are approximately 2,000 entities in the byzantine complex of entities under the Highland umbrella. None of these affiliated entities filed for chapter 11 protection. Most, but not all, of these entities are not subsidiaries (direct or indirect) of the Debtor. Many of the Debtor’s affiliated companies are offshore entities, organized in jurisdictions such as the Cayman Islands and Guernsey. *See* Disclosure Statement, at 17-18.

**7. Debtor’s Operational History.** The Debtor’s primary means of generating revenue has historically been from fees collected for the management and advisory services provided to funds that it manages, plus fees generated for services provided to its affiliates. For additional liquidity, the Debtor, prior to the Petition Date, would sell liquid securities in the ordinary course, primarily through a brokerage account at Jefferies, LLC. The Debtor would also, from time to time, sell assets at non-Debtor subsidiaries and cause those proceeds to be distributed to the Debtor in the ordinary course of business. The Debtor’s current Chief Executive Officer, James P. Seery, Jr., credibly testified at the Confirmation Hearing that the Debtor was “run at a deficit for a long time and then would sell

assets or defer employee compensation to cover its deficits.” The Bankruptcy Court cannot help but wonder if that was necessitated because of enormous litigation fees and expenses incurred by the Debtor due to its culture of litigation—as further addressed below.

**8. Not Your Garden Variety Creditor’s Committee.** The Debtor and this chapter 11 case are not garden variety for so many reasons. One of the most obvious standouts in this case is the creditor constituency. The Debtor did not file for bankruptcy because of any of the typical reasons that large companies file chapter 11. For example, the Debtor did not have a large, asset-based secured lender with whom it was in default; it only had relatively insignificant secured indebtedness owing to Jeffries, with whom it had a brokerage account, and one other entity, Frontier State Bank. The Debtor also did not have problems with its trade vendors or landlords. The Debtor also did not suffer any type of catastrophic business calamity. In fact, the Debtor filed for Chapter 11 protection six months before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Rather, the Debtor filed for Chapter 11 protection due to a myriad of massive, unrelated, business litigation claims that it faced—many of which had finally become liquidated (or were about to become liquidated) after a decade or more of contentious litigation in multiple forums all over the world. The Committee in this case has referred to the Debtor—under its former chief executive, Mr. Dondero—as a “serial litigator.” The Bankruptcy Court agrees with that description. By way of example, the members of the Committee (and their history of litigation with the Debtor and others in the Highland complex) are as follows:

- a. **The Redeemer Committee of the Highland Crusader Fund (the “Redeemer Committee”).** This Committee member obtained an arbitration award against the Debtor in the amount of \$190,824,557, inclusive of interest, approximately five months before the Petition Date, from a panel of the American Arbitration Association. It was on the verge of having that award confirmed by the Delaware Chancery Court immediately prior to the Petition Date, after years of disputes that started in late 2008 (and included legal proceedings in Bermuda). This creditor’s claim was settled during this Chapter 11 Case in the amount of approximately \$137,696,610 (subject to other adjustments and details not relevant for this purpose).
- b. **Acis Capital Management, L.P., and Acis Capital Management GP, LLC (“Acis”).** Acis was formerly in the Highland complex of companies, but was not affiliated with Highland as of the Petition Date. This Committee member and its now-owner, Joshua Terry, were involved in litigation with the Debtor dating back to 2016. Acis was forced by Mr. Terry (who was a former Highland portfolio manager) into an involuntary chapter 11 bankruptcy in the Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division before the Bankruptcy Court in 2018, after Mr. Terry obtained an approximately \$8 million arbitration award and judgment against Acis. Mr. Terry ultimately was awarded the equity ownership of Acis by the Bankruptcy Court in the Acis



bankruptcy case. Acis subsequently asserted a multi-million dollar claim against Highland in the Bankruptcy Court for Highland's alleged denuding of Acis to defraud its creditors—primarily Mr. Terry. The litigation involving Acis and Mr. Terry dates back to mid-2016 and has continued on with numerous appeals of Bankruptcy Court orders, including one appeal still pending at the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. There was also litigation involving Mr. Terry and Acis in the Royal Court of the Island of Guernsey and in a state court in New York. The Acis claim was settled during this Chapter 11 Case, in Bankruptcy Court-ordered mediation, for approximately \$23 million (subject to other details not relevant for this purpose), and is the subject of an appeal being pursued by Mr. Dondero.

- c. **UBS Securities LLC and UBS AG London Branch (“UBS”).** UBS is a Committee member that filed a proof of claim in the amount of \$1,039,957,799.40 in this Chapter 11 Case. The UBS Claim was based on a judgment that UBS received from a New York state court in 2020. The underlying decision was issued in November 2019, after a multi-week bench trial (which had occurred many months earlier) on a breach of contract claim against non-Debtor entities in the Highland complex. The UBS litigation related to activities that occurred in 2008 and 2009. The litigation involving UBS and Highland and affiliates was pending for

more than a decade (there having been numerous interlocutory appeals during its history). The Debtor and UBS recently announced an agreement in principle for a settlement of the UBS claim (which came a few months after Bankruptcy Court ordered mediation) which will be subject to a 9019 motion to be filed with the Bankruptcy Court on a future date.

- d. **Meta-E Discovery (“Meta-E”).** Meta-E is a Committee member that is a vendor who happened to supply litigation and discovery-related services to the Debtor over the years. It had unpaid invoices on the Petition Date of more than \$779,000.

It is fair to say that the members of the Committee in this case all have wills of steel. They fought hard before and during this Chapter 11 Case. The members of the Committee, all of whom have volunteered to serve on the Claimant Trust Oversight Board post-confirmation, are highly sophisticated and have had highly sophisticated professionals representing them. They have represented their constituency in this case as fiduciaries extremely well.

**9. Other Key Creditor Constituents.** In addition to the Committee members who were all embroiled in years of litigation with Debtor and its affiliates in various ways, the Debtor has been in litigation with Patrick Daugherty, a former limited partner and employee of the Debtor, for many years in both Delaware and Texas state courts. Mr. Daugherty filed an amended proof of claim in this Chapter 11 Case for

\$40,710,819.42 relating to alleged breaches of employment-related agreements and for defamation arising from a 2017 press release posted by the Debtor. The Debtor and Mr. Daugherty recently announced a settlement of Mr. Daugherty's claim pursuant to which he will receive \$750,000 in cash on the Effective Date of the Plan, an \$8.25 million general unsecured claim, and a \$2.75 million subordinated claim (subject to other details not relevant for this purpose). Additionally, entities collectively known as "HarbourVest" invested more than \$70 million with an entity in the Highland complex and asserted a \$300 million proof of claim against the Debtor in this case, alleging, among other things, fraud and RICO violations. HarbourVest's claim was settled during the bankruptcy case for a \$45 million general unsecured claim and a \$35 million subordinated claim, and that settlement is also being appealed by a Dondero Entity.

**10. Other Claims Asserted.** Other than the Claims just described, most of the other Claims in this Chapter 11 Case are Claims asserted against the Debtor by: (a) entities in the Highland complex—most of which entities the Bankruptcy Court finds to be controlled by Mr. Dondero; (b) employees who contend that are entitled to large bonuses or other types of deferred compensation; and (c) numerous law firms that worked for the Debtor prior to the Petition Date and had outstanding amounts due for their prepetition services.

**11. Not Your Garden Variety Post-Petition Corporate Governance Structure.** Yet another reason this is not your garden variety chapter 11 case is its

post-petition corporate governance structure. Immediately from its appointment, the Committee's relationship with the Debtor was contentious at best. First, the Committee moved for a change of venue from Delaware to Dallas. Second, the Committee (and later, the United States Trustee) expressed its then-desire for the appointment of a chapter 11 trustee due to its concerns over and distrust of Mr. Dondero, his numerous conflicts of interest, and his history of alleged mismanagement (and perhaps worse).

**12. Post-Petition Corporate Governance Settlement with Committee.** After spending many weeks under the threat of the potential appointment of a trustee, the Debtor and Committee engaged in substantial and lengthy negotiations resulting in a corporate governance settlement approved by the Bankruptcy Court on January 9, 2020.<sup>5</sup> As a result of this settlement, among other things, Mr. Dondero relinquished control of the Debtor and resigned his positions as an officer or director of the Debtor and its general partner, Strand. As noted above, Mr. Dondero agreed to this settlement pursuant a stipulation he executed,<sup>6</sup> and he also agreed not to cause any Related

---

<sup>5</sup> This order is hereinafter referred to as the "January 9 Order" and was entered by the Court on January 9, 2020 [Docket No. 339] pursuant to the *Motion of the Debtor to Approve Settlement with Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Regarding the Governance of the Debtor and Procedures for Operation in the Ordinary Course* [Docket No. 281] (the "Settlement Motion").

<sup>6</sup> See Stipulation in Support of Motion of the Debtor for Approval of Settlement With the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Regarding Governance of the Debtor and Procedures for Operations in Ordinary Course [Docket No. 338] (the "Stipulation").

Entity (as defined in the Settlement Motion) to terminate any agreements with the Debtor. The January 9 Order also (a) required that the Bankruptcy Court serve as “gatekeeper” prior to the commencement of any litigation against the three independent board members appointed to oversee and lead the Debtor’s restructuring in lieu of Mr. Dondero and (b) provided for the exculpation of those board members by limiting claims subject to the “gatekeeper” provision to those alleging willful misconduct and gross negligence.

**13. Appointment of Independent Directors.** As part of the Bankruptcy Court-approved settlement, three eminently qualified independent directors were chosen to lead Highland through its Chapter 11 Case. They are: James P. Seery, Jr., John S. Dubel (each chosen by the Committee), and Retired Bankruptcy Judge Russell Nelms. These three individuals are each technically independent directors of Strand (Mr. Dondero had previously been the sole director of Strand and, thus, the sole person in ultimate control of the Debtor). The three independent board members’ resumes are in evidence. The Bankruptcy Court later approved Mr. Seery’s appointment as the Debtor’s Chief Executive Officer, Chief Restructuring Officer, and Foreign Representative. Suffice it to say that this settlement and the appointment of the independent directors changed the entire trajectory of the case and saved the Debtor from the appointment of a trustee. The Bankruptcy Court and the Committee each trusted the independent directors. They were the right solution at the right time. Because of the unique character of the Debtor’s business, the Bankruptcy

Court believed the appointment of three qualified independent directors was a far better outcome for creditors than the appointment of a conventional chapter 11 trustee. Each of the independent directors brought unique qualities to the table. Mr. Seery, in particular, knew and had vast experience at prominent firms with high-yield and distressed investing similar to the Debtor's business. Mr. Dubel had 40 years of experience restructuring large complex businesses and serving on boards in this context. And Retired Judge Nelms had not only vast bankruptcy experience but seemed particularly well-suited to help the Debtor maneuver through conflicts and ethical quandaries. By way of comparison, in the chapter 11 case of Acis, the former affiliate of Highland that the Bankruptcy Court presided over and which company was much smaller in size and scope than Highland (managing only 5-6 CLOs), the creditors elected a chapter 11 trustee who was not on the normal trustee rotation panel in this district but, rather, was a nationally known bankruptcy attorney with more than 45 years of large chapter 11 experience. While the Acis chapter 11 trustee performed valiantly, he was sued by entities in the Highland complex shortly after he was appointed (which the Bankruptcy Court had to address). The Acis trustee was also unable to persuade the Debtor and its affiliates to agree to any actions taken in the case, and he finally obtained confirmation of Acis' chapter 11 plan over the objections of the Debtor and its affiliates on his fourth attempt (which confirmation was promptly appealed).

**14. Conditions Required by Independent Directors.** Given the experiences in Acis and the Debtor's

culture of constant litigation, it was not as easy to get such highly qualified persons to serve as independent board members and, later, as the Debtor's Chief Executive Officer, as it would be in an ordinary chapter 11 case. The independent board members were stepping into a morass of problems. Naturally, they were worried about getting sued no matter how defensible their efforts—given the litigation culture that enveloped Highland historically. Based on the record of this Case and the proceedings in the Acis chapter 11 case, it seemed as though everything always ended in litigation at Highland. The Bankruptcy Court heard credible testimony that none of the independent directors would have taken on the role of independent director without (1) an adequate directors and officers' ("D&O") insurance policy protecting them; (2) indemnification from Strand that would be guaranteed by the Debtor; (3) exculpation for mere negligence claims; and (4) a gatekeeper provision prohibiting the commencement of litigation against the independent directors without the Bankruptcy Court's prior authority. This gatekeeper provision was also included in the Bankruptcy Court's order authorizing the appointment of Mr. Seery as the Debtor's Chief Executive Officer, Chief Restructuring Officer, and Foreign Representative entered on July 16, 2020.<sup>7</sup> The gatekeeper provisions in both the January 9 Order and

---

<sup>7</sup> See Order Approving the Debtor's Motion Under Bankruptcy Code Sections 105(a) and 363(b) Authorizing Retention of James P. Seery, Jr., as Chief Executive Officer, Chief Restructuring Officer, and Foreign Representative Nunc Pro Tunc to March 15, 2020 [Docket No. 854] entered on July 16, 2020 (the "July 16 Order")

July 16 Order are precisely analogous to what bankruptcy trustees have pursuant to the so-called “Barton Doctrine” (first articulated in an old Supreme Court case captioned *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881)). The Bankruptcy Court approved all of these protections in the January 9 Order and the July 16 Order, and no one appealed either of those orders. As noted above, Mr. Dondero signed the Stipulation that led to the settlement that was approved by the January 9 Order. The Bankruptcy Court finds that, like the Committee, the independent board members have been resilient and unwavering in their efforts to get the enormous problems in this case solved. They seem to have at all times negotiated hard and in good faith, which culminated in the proposal of the Plan currently before the Bankruptcy Court. As noted previously, they completely changed the trajectory of this case.

**15. Not Your Garden Variety Mediators.** And still another reason why this was not your garden variety case was the mediation effort. In the summer of 2020, roughly nine months into the chapter 11 case, the Bankruptcy Court ordered mediation among the Debtor, Acis, UBS, the Redeemer Committee, and Mr. Dondero. The Bankruptcy Court selected co-mediators because mediation among these parties seemed like such a Herculean task—especially during COVID-19 where people could not all be in the same room. Those co-mediators were: Retired Bankruptcy Judge Alan Gropper from the Southern District of New York, who had a distinguished career presiding over complex chapter 11 cases, and Ms. Sylvia Mayer, who likewise has had a distinguished career, first as



a partner at a preeminent law firm working on complex chapter 11 cases, and subsequently as a mediator and arbitrator in Houston, Texas. As noted earlier, the Redeemer Committee and Acis claims were settled during the mediation—which seemed nothing short of a miracle to the Bankruptcy Court—and the UBS claim was settled several months later and the Bankruptcy Court believes the ground work for that ultimate settlement was laid, or at least helped, through the mediation. And, as earlier noted, other significant claims have been settled during this case, including those of HarbourVest (who asserted a \$300 million claim) and Patrick Daugherty (who asserted a \$40 million claim). The Bankruptcy Court cannot stress strongly enough that the resolution of these enormous claims—and the acceptance by all of these creditors of the Plan that is now before the Bankruptcy Court—seems nothing short of a miracle. It was more than a year in the making.

**16. Not Your Garden Variety Plan Objectors (That Is, Those That Remain).** Finally, a word about the current, remaining objectors to the Plan before the Bankruptcy Court. Once again, the Bankruptcy Court will use the phrase “not your garden variety”, which phrase applies to this case for many reasons. Originally, there were over a dozen objections filed to the Plan. The Debtor then made certain amendments or modifications to the Plan to address some of these objections, none of which require further solicitation of the Plan for reasons set forth in more detail below. The only objectors to the Plan left at the time of the Confirmation Hearing were Mr. Dondero [Docket No. 1661] and entities that the Bankruptcy Court finds

are owned and/or controlled by him and that filed the following objections:

- a. *Objection to Confirmation of the Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization* (filed by Get Good Trust and The Dugaboy Investment Trust) [Docket No. 1667];
- b. *Objection to Confirmation of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. ailed by Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., Highland Fixed Income Fund, Highland Funds I and its series, Highland Funds II and its series, Highland Global Allocation Fund, Highland Healthcare Opportunities Fund, Highland Income Fund, Highland Merger Arbitrate Fund, Highland Opportunistic Credit Fund, Highland Small-Cap Equity Fund, Highland Socially Responsible Equity Fund, Highland Total Return Fund, Highland/iBoxx Senior Loan ETF, NexPoint Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Capital, Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Strategies Fund, NexPoint Strategic Opportunities Fund)* [Docket No. 1670];
- c. *A Joinder to the Objection filed at 1670 by: NexPoint Real Estate Finance Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Capital, LLC, NexPoint Residential Trust, Inc., NexPoint Hospitality Trust, NexPoint Real Estate Partners, LLC, NexPoint Multifamily Capital Trust, Inc., VineBrook Homes Trust, Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors II, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors III, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors IV, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors V, L.P., NexPoint*

*Real Estate Advisors VI, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors VII, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors VIII, L.P., and any funds advised by the foregoing* [Docket No. 1677];

- d. *NexPoint Real Estate Partners LLC's Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by NexPoint Real Estate Partners LLC f/k/a HCRE Partners LLC)* [Docket No. 1673]; and
- e. *NexBank's Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by NexBank Title, Inc., NexBank Securities, Inc., NexBank Capital, Inc., and NexBank)* [Docket No. 1676]. The entities referred to in (i) through (v) of this paragraph are hereinafter referred to as the "Dondero Related Entities").

**17. Questionability of Good Faith as to Outstanding Confirmation Objections.** Mr. Dondero and the Dondero Related Entities technically have standing to object to the Plan, but the remoteness of their economic interests is noteworthy, and the Bankruptcy Court questions the good faith of Mr. Dondero's and the Dondero Related Entities' objections. In fact, the Bankruptcy Court has good reason to believe that these parties are not objecting to protect economic interests they have in the Debtor but to be disruptors. Mr. Dondero wants his company back. This is understandable, but it is not a good faith basis to lob objections to the Plan. As detailed below, the Bankruptcy Court has slowed down plan confirmation multiple times and urged the parties to talk to Mr. Dondero in an attempt to arrive at what the parties have repeatedly referred to as a "grand bargain," the ultimate

goal to resolve the Debtor's restructuring. The Debtor and the Committee represent that they have communicated with Mr. Dondero regarding a grand bargain settlement, and the Bankruptcy Court believes that they have.

**18. Remote Interest of Outstanding Confirmation Objectors.** To be specific about the remoteness of Mr. Dondero's and the Dondero Related Entities' interests, the Bankruptcy Court will address them each separately. First, Mr. Dondero has a pending objection to the Plan. Mr. Dondero's only economic interest with regard to the Debtor is an unliquidated indemnification claim (and, based on everything the Bankruptcy Court has heard, his indemnification claims would be highly questionable at this juncture). Mr. Dondero owns no equity in the Debtor directly. Mr. Dondero owns the Debtor's general partner, Strand, which in turn owns a quarter percent of the total equity in the Debtor. Second, a joint objection has been filed by The Dugaboy Trust ("Dugaboy") and the Get Good Trust ("Get Good"). The Dugaboy Trust was created to manage the assets of Mr. Dondero and his family and owns a 0.1866% limited partnership interest in the Debtor. *See* Disclosure Statement at 7, n.3. The Bankruptcy Court is not clear what economic interest the Get Good Trust has, but it likewise seems to be related to Mr. Dondero. Get Good filed three proofs of claim relating to a pending federal tax audit of the Debtor's 2008 return, which the Debtor believes arise from Get Good's equity security interests and are subject to subordination as set forth in its Confirmation Brief. Dugaboy filed three claims against the Debtor:

(a) an administrative claim relating to the Debtor's alleged postpetition management of Multi-Strat Credit Fund, L.P., (b) a prepetition claim against a subsidiary of the Debtor for which it seeks to pierce the corporate veil, each of which the Debtor maintains are frivolous in the Confirmation Brief, and (c) a claim arising from its equity security interest in the Debtor, which the Debtor asserts should be subordinated. Another group of objectors that has joined together in one objection is what the Bankruptcy Court will refer to as the "Highland Advisors and Funds." *See* Docket No. 1863. The Bankruptcy Court understands they assert disputed administrative expense claims against the estate that were filed shortly before the Confirmation Hearing on January 23, 2021 [Docket No. 1826], and during the Confirmation Hearing on February 3, 2021 [Docket No. 1888]. At the Confirmation Hearing, Mr. Post testified on behalf of the Highland Advisors and Funds that the Funds have independent board members that run the Funds, but the Bankruptcy Court was not convinced of their independence from Mr. Dondero because none of the so-called independent board members have ever testified before the Bankruptcy Court and all have been engaged with the Highland complex for many years. Notably, the Court questions Mr. Post's credibility because, after more than 12 years of service, he abruptly resigned from the Debtor in October 2020 at the exact same time that Mr. Dondero resigned at the Board of Directors' request, and he is currently employed by Mr. Dondero. Moreover, Dustin Norris, a witness in a prior proceeding (whose testimony was made part of the record at the Confirmation Hearing), recently testified on behalf of the Highland Advisors and Funds in another

proceeding that Mr. Dondero owned and/or controlled these entities. Finally, various NexBank entities objected to the Plan. The Bankruptcy Court does not believe they have liquidated claims against the Debtor. Mr. Dondero appears to be in control of these entities as well.

**19. Background Regarding Dondero Objecting Parties.** To be clear, the Bankruptcy Court has allowed all these objectors to fully present arguments and evidence in opposition to confirmation, even though their economic interests in the Debtor appear to be extremely remote and the Bankruptcy Court questions their good faith. Specifically, the Bankruptcy Court considers them all to be marching pursuant to the orders of Mr. Dondero. In the recent past, Mr. Dondero has been subject to a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction by the Bankruptcy Court for interfering with Mr. Seery's management of the Debtor in specific ways that were supported by evidence. Around the time that this all came to light and the Bankruptcy Court began setting hearings on the alleged interference, Mr. Dondero's company phone, which he had been asked to turn in to Highland, mysteriously went missing. The Bankruptcy Court merely mentions this in this context as one of many reasons that the Bankruptcy Court has to question the good faith of Mr. Dondero and his affiliates in raising objections to confirmation of the Plan.

**20. Other Confirmation Objections.** Other than the objections filed by Mr. Dondero and the Dondero Related Entities, the only other pending objection to

the Plan is the *United States Trustee's Limited Objection to Confirmation of Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization* [Docket No. 1671], which objected to the Plan's exculpation, injunction, and Debtor release provisions. In juxtaposition, to these pending objections, the Bankruptcy Court notes that the Debtor resolved the following objections to the Plan:

- a. *CLO Holdco, Ltd.'s Joinder to Objection to Confirmation of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. and Supplemental Objections to Plan Confirmation* [Docket No. 1675]. This Objection has been resolved pursuant to mutually agreed language by the parties set forth in paragraph VV of the Confirmation Order;
- b. *Objection of Dallas County, City of Allen, Allen ISD, City of Richardson, and Kaufman County to Confirmation of the Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1662]. This Objection has been resolved pursuant to mutually agreed language by the parties set forth in paragraph QQ of the Confirmation Order;
- c. *Senior Employees' Limited Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization (filed by Scott Ellington, Thomas Surgent, Frank Waterhouse, Isaac Leventon)* [Docket No. 1669]. This Objection has been resolved pursuant to mutually agreed language by the parties set forth in paragraph 82 and paragraphs RR and SS of the Confirmation Order;
- d. *Limited Objection of Jack Yang and Brad Borud to Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of*

*Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 1666] and the amended joinder filed by Davis Deadman, Paul Kauffman and Todd Travers [Docket No. 1679]. This Objection and the amended joinder were resolved by agreement of the parties pursuant to modifications to the Plan filed by the Debtor;

- e. *United States' (IRS) Limited Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization* [Docket No. 1668]. This Objection has been resolved pursuant to mutually agreed language by the parties set forth in paragraphs TT and UU of the Confirmation Order; and
- f. *Patrick Hagaman Daugherty's Objection to Confirmation of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization* [Docket No. 1678]. This objection was resolved by the parties pursuant to the settlement of Mr. Daugherty's claim announced on the record of the Confirmation Hearing.

**21. Capitalized Terms.** Capitalized terms used herein, but not defined herein, shall have the respective meanings attributed to such terms in the Plan and the Disclosure Statement, as applicable.

**22. Jurisdiction and Venue.** The Bankruptcy Court has jurisdiction over the Debtor's Chapter 11 Case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2). Venue of this proceeding and this Chapter 11 Case is proper in this district and in the Bankruptcy Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

**23. Chapter 11 Petition.** On the Petition Date, the Debtor commenced a voluntary case under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code in the United States



Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, which case was transferred to the Bankruptcy Court on December 19, 2019. The Debtor continues to operate its business and manage its property as debtor in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. No trustee or examiner has been appointed in this Chapter 11 Case. The Office of the United States Trustee appointed the Committee on October 29, 2019.

**24. Judicial Notice.** The Bankruptcy Court takes judicial notice of the docket in this Chapter 11 Case maintained by the clerk of the Bankruptcy Court and the court-appointed claims agent, Kurtzman Carson Consultants LLC (“KCC”), including, without limitation, all pleadings, notices, and other documents filed, all orders entered, and all evidence and arguments made, proffered or adduced at the hearings held before the Bankruptcy Court during this Chapter 11 Case, including, without limitation, the hearing to consider the adequacy of the Disclosure Statement and the Confirmation Hearing, as well as all pleadings, notices, and other documents filed, all orders entered, and all evidence and arguments made, proffered, or adduced at hearings held before the Bankruptcy Court or the District Court for the Northern District of Texas in connection with an adversary proceeding or appellate proceeding, respectively, related to this Chapter 11 Case.

**25. Plan Supplement Documents.** Prior to the Confirmation Hearing, the Debtor filed each of the Plan Supplements. The Plan Supplements contain, among other documents, the Retained Causes of Action, the Claimant Trust Agreement, the Litigation

Sub-Trust Agreement, the Senior Employee Stipulation, the Related Entity List, the Schedule of Employees, the Reorganized Limited Partnership Agreement, supplements to the Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections, the Schedule of Contracts and Leases to be Assumed, and the other Plan Documents set forth therein (collectively, the “Plan Supplement Documents”).

**26. Retained Causes of Action Adequately Preserved.** The Bankruptcy Court finds that the list of Retained Causes of Action included in the Plan Supplements sufficiently describes all potential Retained Causes of Action, provides all persons with adequate notice of any Causes of Action regardless of whether any specific claim to be brought in the future is listed therein or whether any specific potential defendant or other party is listed therein, and satisfies applicable law in all respects to preserve all of the Retained Causes of Action. The definition of the Causes of Action and Schedule of Retained Causes of Action, and their inclusion in the Plan, specifically and unequivocally preserve the Causes of Action for the benefit of the Reorganized Debtor, the Claimant Trust, or the Litigation Sub-Trust, as applicable.

**27. Plan Modifications Are Non-Material.** In addition to the Plan Supplements, the Debtor made certain non-material modifications to the Plan, which are reflected in (i) the *Redline of Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P. (as Modified)* filed on January 22, 2021 [Docket No. 1809], and (ii) Exhibit B to the *Debtor’s Notice of Filing of Plan Supplement to Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management,*

*L.P. (as Modified)* filed on February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1875] (collectively, the “Plan Modifications”). Section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that a plan proponent may modify its plan at any time before confirmation so long as such modified plan meets the requirements of sections 1122 and 1123 of the Bankruptcy Code. None of the modifications set forth in the Plan Supplements or the Plan Modifications require any further solicitation pursuant to sections 1125, 1126, or 1127 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3019, because, among other things, they do not materially adversely change the treatment of the claims of any creditors or interest holders who have not accepted, in writing, such supplements and modifications. Among other things, there were changes to the projections that the Debtor filed shortly before the Confirmation Hearing (which included projected distributions to creditors and a comparison of projected distributions under the Plan to potential distributions under a hypothetical chapter 7 liquidation). The Plan Supplements and Plan Modifications did not mislead or prejudice any creditors or interest holders nor do they require that Holders of Claims or Equity Interests be afforded an opportunity to change previously cast votes to accept or reject the Plan. Specifically, the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections filed on February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1875] do not constitute any material adverse change to the treatment of any creditors or interest holders but, rather, simply update the estimated distributions based on Claims that were settled in the interim and provide updated financial data. The filing and notice of the Plan Supplements and Plan Modifications were ap-

appropriate and complied with the requirements of section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and the Bankruptcy Rules, and no other solicitation or disclosure or further notice is or shall be required. The Plan Supplements and Plan Modifications each became part of the Plan pursuant section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, is authorized to modify the Plan or Plan Supplement Documents following entry of this Confirmation Order in a manner consistent with section 1127(b) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Plan, and, if applicable, the terms of the applicable Plan Supplement Document.

**28. Notice of Transmittal, Mailing and Publication of Materials.** As is evidenced by the Voting Certifications and the Affidavits of Service and Publication, the transmittal and service of the Plan, the Disclosure Statement, Ballots, and Confirmation Hearing Notice were adequate and sufficient under the circumstances, and all parties required to be given notice of the Confirmation Hearing (including the deadline for filing and serving objections to the confirmation of the Plan) have been given due, proper, timely, and adequate notice in accordance with the Disclosure Statement Order and in compliance with the Bankruptcy Code, the Bankruptcy Rules, the Local Rules, and applicable non-bankruptcy law, and such parties have had an opportunity to appear and be heard with respect thereto. No other or further notice is required. The publication of the Confirmation Hearing Notice, as set forth in the *Notice of Affidavit of Publication* dated December 3, 2020 [Docket No. 1505], complied with the Disclosure Statement Order.

**29. Voting.** The Bankruptcy Court has reviewed and considered the Voting Certifications. The procedures by which the Ballots for acceptance or rejection of the Plan were distributed and tabulated, including the tabulation as subsequently amended to reflect the settlement of certain Claims to be Allowed in Class 7, were fairly and properly conducted and complied with the Disclosure Statement Order, the Bankruptcy Code, the Bankruptcy Rules, and the Local Rules.

**30. Bankruptcy Rule 3016(a).** In accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 3016(a), the Plan is dated and identifies the Debtor as the proponent of the Plan.

**31. Plan Compliance with Bankruptcy Code (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(1)).** As set forth below, the Plan complies with all of the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, thereby satisfying section 1129(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**32. Proper Classification (11 U.S.C. §§ 1122, 1123(a)(1)).** Section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code provides that a plan may place a claim or interest in a particular class only if such claim or interest is substantially similar to the other claims or interest of such class. The Claims and Equity Interests placed in each Class are substantially similar to other Claims and Equity Interests, as the case may be, in each such Class. Valid business, factual, and legal reasons exist for separately classifying the various Classes of Claims and Equity Interests created under the Plan, and such Classes do not unfairly discriminate between Holders of Claims and Equity Interests.

**33. Classification of Secured Claims.** Class 1 (Jefferies Secured Claim) and Class 2 (Frontier Secured Claim) each constitute separate secured claims

held by Jefferies LLC and Frontier State Bank, respectively, and it is proper and consistent with section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code to separately classify the claims of these secured creditors. Class 3 (Other Secured Claims) consists of other secured claims (to the extent any exist) against the Debtor, are not substantially similar to the Secured Claims in Class 1 or Class 2, and are also properly separately classified.

**34. Classification of Priority Claims.** Class 4 (Priority Non-Tax Claims) consists of Claims entitled to priority under section 507(a), other than Priority Tax Claims, and are properly separately classified from non-priority unsecured claims. Class 5 (Retained Employee Claims) consists of the potential claims of employees who may be retained by the Debtor on the Effective Date, which claims will be Reinstated under the Plan, are not substantially similar to other Claims against the Debtor, and are properly classified.

**35. Classification of Unsecured Claims.** Class 6 (PTO Claims) consists solely of the claims of the Debtor's employees for unpaid paid time off in excess of the \$13,650 statutory cap amount under sections 507(a)(4) and (a)(5) of the Bankruptcy Code and are dissimilar from other unsecured claims in Class 7 and Class 8. Class 7 (Convenience Claims) allows holders of eligible and liquidated Claims (below a certain threshold dollar amount) to receive a cash payout of the lesser of 85% of the Allowed amount of the creditor's Claim or such holder's *pro rata* share of the Convenience Claims Cash Pool. Class 7 (Convenience Claims) are provided for administrative convenience purposes in order to allow creditors, most of whom are either trade creditors or holders of professional

claims, to receive treatment provided under Class 7 in lieu of the treatment of Class 8 (General Unsecured Claims). The Plan also provides for reciprocal “opt out” mechanisms to allow holders of Class 7 Claims to elect to receive the treatment for Class 8 Claims. Class 8 creditors primarily constitute the litigation claims of the Debtor. Class 8 Creditors will receive Claimant Trust Interests which will be satisfied pursuant to the terms of the Plan. Class 8 also contains an “opt out” mechanism to allow holders of liquidated Class 8 Claims at or below a \$1 million threshold to elect to receive the treatment of Class 7 Convenience Claims. The Claims in Class 7 (primarily trade and professional Claims against the Debtor) are not substantially similar to the Claims in Class 8 (primarily the litigation Claims against the Debtor), and are appropriately separately classified. Valid business reasons also exist to classify creditors in Class 7 separately from creditors in Class 8. Class 7 creditors largely consist of liquidated trade or service providers to the Debtor. In addition, the Claims of Class 7 creditors are small relative to the large litigation claims in Class 8. Furthermore, the Class 8 Claims were overwhelmingly unliquidated when the Plan was filed. The nature of the Class 7 Claims as being largely liquidated created an expectation of expedited payment relative to the largely unliquidated Claims in Class 8, which consists in large part of parties who have been engaged in years, and in some cases over a decade of litigation with the Debtor. Separate classification of Class 7 and Class 8 creditors was the subject of substantial arm’s-length negotiations between the Debtor and the Committee to appropriately reflect these relative differences.

**36. Classification of Equity Interests.** The Plan properly separately classifies the Equity Interests in Class 10 (Class B/C Limited Partnership Interests) from the Equity Interests in Class 11 (Class A Limited Partnership Interests) because they represent different types of equity security interests in the Debtor and different payment priorities.

**37. Elimination of Vacant Classes.** Section III.C of the Plan provides for the elimination of Classes that do not have at least one holder of a Claim or Equity Interest that is Allowed in an amount greater than zero for purposes of voting to accept or reject the Plan, and are disregarded for purposes of determining whether the Plan satisfies section 1129(a)(8) of the Bankruptcy Code with respect to such Class. The purpose of this provision is to provide that a Class that does not have voting members shall not be included in the tabulation of whether that Class has accepted or rejected the Plan. Pursuant to the Voting Certifications, the only voting Class of Claims or Equity Interests that did not have any members is Class 5 (Retained Employees). As noted above, Class 5 does not have any voting members because any potential Claims in Class 5 would not arise, except on account of any current employees of the Debtor who may be employed as of the Effective Date, which is currently unknown. Thus, the elimination of vacant Classes provided in Article III.C of the Plan does not violate section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code. Class 5 is properly disregarded for purposes of determining whether or not the Plan has been accepted under Bankruptcy Code section 1129(a)(8) because there are no members in that Class. However, the Plan properly



provides for the treatment of any Claims that may potentially become members of Class 5 as of the Effective Date in accordance with the terms of the Plan. The Plan therefore satisfies section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code.

**38. Classification of Claims and Designation of Non-Classified Claims (11 U.S.C. §§ 1122, 1123(a)(1)).** Section 1123(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code requires that the Plan specify the classification of claims and equity security interests pursuant to section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code, other than claims specified in sections 507(a)(2), 507(a)(3), or 507(a)(8) of the Bankruptcy Code. In addition to Administrative Claims, Professional Fee Claims, and Priority Tax Claims, each of which need not be classified pursuant to section 1123(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Plan designates eleven (11) Classes of Claims and Equity Interests. The Plan satisfies sections 1122 and 1123(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**39. Specification of Unimpaired Classes (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(2)).** Article III of the Plan specifies that each of Class 1 (Jefferies Secured Claim), Class 3 (Other Secured Claims), Class 4 (Priority Non-Tax Claims), Class 5 (Retained Employee Claims), and Class 6 (PTO Claims) are Unimpaired under the Plan. Thus, the requirement of section 1123(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**40. Specification of Treatment of Impaired Classes (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(3)).** Article III of the Plan designates each of Class 2 (Frontier Secured Claim), Class 7 (Convenience Claims), Class 8 (General Unsecured Claims), Class 9 (Subordinated Claims), Class 10 (Class B/C Limited Partnership Interests), and

Class 11 (Class A Limited Partnership Interests) as Impaired and specifies the treatment of Claims and Equity Interests in such Classes. Thus, the requirement of section 1123(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**41. No Discrimination (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(4)).** The Plan provides for the same treatment by the Plan proponent for each Claim or Equity Interest in each respective Class unless the Holder of a particular Claim or Equity Interest has agreed to a less favorable treatment of such Claim or Equity Interest. The Plan satisfies this requirement because Holders of Allowed Claims or Equity Interests in each Class will receive the same rights and treatment as other Holders of Allowed Claims or Equity Interests within such holder's respective class, subject only to the voluntary "opt out" options afforded to members of Class 7 and Class 8 in accordance with the terms of the Plan. Thus, the requirement of section 1123(a)(4) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**42. Implementation of the Plan (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(5)).** Article IV of the Plan sets forth the means for implementation of the Plan which includes, but is not limited to, the establishment of: (i) the Claimant Trust; (ii) the Litigation Sub-Trust; (iii) the Reorganized Debtor; and (iv) New GP LLC, in the manner set forth in the Plan Documents, the forms of which are included in the Plan Supplements.

- a. **The Claimant Trust.** The Claimant Trust Agreement provides for the management of the Claimant Trust, as well as the Reorganized Debtor with the Claimant Trust serving as the managing member of New GP LLC (a wholly-

owned subsidiary of the Claimant Trust that will manage the Reorganized Debtor as its general partner). The Claimant Trust, the Claimant Trustee, the management and monetization of the Claimant Trust Assets, and the management of the Reorganized Debtor (through the Claimant Trust's role as managing member of New GP LLC) and the Litigation Sub-Trust will all be managed and overseen by the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee. Additionally, the Plan provides for the transfer to the Claimant Trust of all of the Debtor's rights, title, and interest in and to all of the Claimant Trust Assets in accordance with section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code and for the Claimant Trust Assets to automatically vest in the Claimant Trust free and clear of all Claims, Liens, encumbrances, or interests subject only to the Claimant Trust Interests and the Claimant Trust Expenses, as provided for in the Claimant Trust Agreement. The Claimant Trust will administer the Claimant Trust Assets as provided under the Plan and the Claimant Trust Agreement contained in the Plan Supplements.

- b. **The Litigation Sub-Trust.** The Plan and the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement provide for the transfer to the Litigation Sub-Trust all of the Claimant Trust's rights, title, and interest in and to all of the Estate Claims (as transferred to the Claimant Trust by the Debtor) in accordance with section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code and for the Estate Claims to automatically vest in the Litigation Sub-Trust free and clear of all Claims, Liens, encumbrances, or interests subject only to the Litigation Sub-Trust Interests

and the Litigation Sub-Trust Expenses, as provided for in the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement. The Litigation Trustee is charged with investigating, pursuing, and otherwise resolving any Estate Claims (including those with respect to which the Committee has standing to pursue prior to the Effective Date pursuant to the January 9 Order) pursuant to the terms of the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement and the Plan, regardless of whether any litigation with respect to any Estate Claim was commenced by the Debtor or the Committee prior to the Effective Date.

- c. **The Reorganized Debtor.** The Reorganized Debtor will administer the Reorganized Debtor Assets, which includes managing the wind down of the Managed Funds.

The precise terms governing the execution of these restructuring transactions are set forth in greater detail in the applicable definitive documents included in the Plan Supplements, including the Claimant Trust Agreement, the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement, and the Schedule of Retained Causes of Action. The Plan, together with the documents and forms of agreement included in the Plan Supplements, provides a detailed blueprint for the transactions contemplated by the Plan. The Plan's various mechanisms provide for the Debtor's continued management of its business as it seeks to liquidate the Debtor's assets, wind down its affairs, and pay the Claims of the Debtor's creditors. Upon full payment of Allowed Claims, plus interest as provided in the Plan, any residual value would then flow to the holders of Class 10 (Class B/C Limited Partnership Interests), and Class 11 (Class A Limited

Partnership Interests). Finally, Mr. Seery testified that the Debtor engaged in substantial and arm's length negotiations with the Committee regarding the Debtor's post-Effective Date corporate governance, as reflected in the Plan. Mr. Seery testified that he believes the selection of the Claimant Trustee, Litigation Trustee, and members of the Claimant Trust Oversight Board are in the best interests of the Debtor's economic constituents. Thus, the requirements of section 1123(a)(5) of the Bankruptcy Code are satisfied.

**43. Non-Voting Equity Securities (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(6)).** The Debtor is not a corporation and the charter documents filed in the Plan Supplements otherwise comply with section 1123(a)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code. Therefore, the requirement of section 1123(a)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**44. Selection of Officers and Directors (11 U.S.C. § 1123(a)(7)).** Article IV of the Plan provides for the Claimant Trust to be governed and administered by the Claimant Trustee. The Claimant Trust, the management of the Reorganized Debtor, and the management and monetization of the Claimant Trust Assets and the Litigation Sub-Trust will be managed by the Claimant Trust Oversight Board. The Claimant Trust Oversight Board will consist of: (1) Eric Felton, as representative of the Redeemer Committee; (2) Joshua Terry, as representative of Acis; (3) Elizabeth Kozlowski, as representative of UBS; (4) Paul McVoy, as representative of Meta-E Discovery; and (5) David Pauker. Four of the members of the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee are the holders of several of the largest Claims against the Debtor and/or are current

members of the Committee. Each of these creditors has actively participated in the Debtor's case, both through their fiduciary roles as Committee members and in their individual capacities as creditors. They are therefore intimately familiar with the Debtor, its business, and assets. The fifth member of the Claimant Trustee Oversight Board, David Pauker, is a disinterested restructuring advisor and turnaround manager with more than 25 years of experience advising public and private companies and their investors, and he has substantial experience overseeing, advising or investigating troubled companies in the financial services industry and has advised or managed such companies on behalf of boards or directors, court-appointed trustees, examiners and special masters, government agencies, and private investor parties. The members of the Claimant Trust Oversight Board will serve without compensation, except for Mr. Pauker, who will receive payment of \$250,000 for his first year of service, and \$150,000 for subsequent years.

**45. Selection of Trustees.** The Plan Supplements disclose that Mr. Seery will serve as the Claimant Trustee and Marc Kirschner will serve as the Litigation Trustee. As noted above, Mr. Seery has served as an Independent Board member since January 2020, and as the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer since July 2020, and he has extensive management and restructuring experience, as evidenced from his curriculum vitae which is part of the record. The evidence shows that Mr. Seery is intimately familiar with the Debtor's organizational structure, business, and assets, as well as how Claims

will be treated under the Plan. Accordingly, it is reasonable and in the Estate's best interests to continue Mr. Seery's employment post-emergence as the Claimant Trustee. Mr. Seery, upon consultation with the Committee, testified that he intends to employ approximately 10 of the Debtor's employees to enable him to manage the Debtor's business until the Claimant Trust effectively monetizes its remaining assets, instead of hiring a sub-servicer to accomplish those tasks. Mr. Seery testified that he believes that the Debtor's post-confirmation business can most efficiently and cost-effectively be supported by a sub-set of the Debtor's current employees, who will be managed internally. Mr. Seery shall initially be paid \$150,000 per month for services rendered after the Effective Date as Claimant Trustee; however, Mr. Seery's long-term salary as Claimant Trustee and the terms of any bonuses and severance are subject to further negotiation by Mr. Seery and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board within forty-five (45) days after the Effective Date. The Bankruptcy Court has also reviewed Mr. Kirschner's curriculum vitae. Mr. Kirschner has been practicing law since 1967 and has substantial experience in bankruptcy litigation matters, particularly with respect to his prior experience as a litigation trustee for several litigation trusts, as set forth on the record of the Confirmation Hearing and in the Confirmation Brief. Mr. Kirschner shall be paid \$40,000 per month for the first three months and \$20,000 per month thereafter, plus a success fee related to litigation recoveries. The Committee and the Debtor had arm's lengths negotiations regarding the post-Effective Date corporate governance structure of the Reorganized Debtor and believe that the selection

of the Claimant Trustee, the Litigation Trustee, and the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee are in the best interests of the Debtor's economic stakeholders. Section 1123(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**46. Debtor's Compliance with Bankruptcy Code (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(2)).** Pursuant to section 1129(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtor has complied with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, including sections 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, and 1126 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Bankruptcy Rules, and the Disclosure Statement Order governing notice, disclosure, and solicitation in connection with the Plan, the Disclosure Statement, the Plan Supplements, and all other matters considered by the Bankruptcy Court in connection with this Chapter 11 Case.

**47. Debtor's Solicitation Complied with Bankruptcy Code and Disclosure Statement Order.** Before the Debtor solicited votes on the Plan, the Bankruptcy Court entered the Disclosure Statement Order. In accordance with the Disclosure Statement Order and evidenced by the Affidavits of Service and Publication, the Debtor appropriately served (i) the Solicitation Packages (as defined in the Disclosure Statement Order) on the Holders of Claims in Classes 2, 7, 8 and 9 and Holders of Equity Interests in Classes 10 and 11 who were entitled to vote on the Plan; and (ii) the Notice of Nonvoting Status (as defined in the Disclosure Statement Order) and the Confirmation Hearing Notice to the Holders of Claims in Classes 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6, who were not entitled to vote on the Plan pursuant to the Disclosure Statement Order. The Disclosure Statement Order approved the contents of the Solicitation Packages provided to Holders of Claims and



Equity Interests entitled to vote on the Plan, the notices provided to parties not entitled to vote on the Plan, and the deadlines for voting on and objecting to the Plan. The Debtor and KCC each complied with the content and delivery requirements of the Disclosure Statement Order, thereby satisfying sections 1125(a) and (b) of the Bankruptcy Code, as evidenced by the Affidavits of Service and Publication. The Debtor also satisfied section 1125(c) of the Bankruptcy Code, which provides that the same disclosure statement must be transmitted to each holder of a claim or interest in a particular class. The Debtor caused the same Disclosure Statement to be transmitted to all holders of Claims and Equity Interests entitled to vote on the Plan. The Debtor has complied in all respects with the solicitation requirements of section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code and the Disclosure Statement Order. The Bankruptcy Court rejects the arguments of the Mr. Dondero and certain Dondero Related Entities that the changes made to certain assumptions and projections from the Liquidation Analysis annexed as Exhibit C to the Disclosure Statement (the “Liquidation Analysis”) to the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections require resolicitation of the Plan. The Bankruptcy Court heard credible testimony from Mr. Seery regarding the changes to the Liquidation Analysis as reflected in the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections. Based on the record, including the testimony of Mr. Seery, the Bankruptcy Court finds that the changes between the Liquidation Analysis and the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections do not constitute materially adverse change to the treatment of Claims or Equity In-

terests. Instead, the changes served to update the projected distributions based on Claims that were settled after the approval of the Disclosure Statement and to otherwise incorporate more recent financial data. Such changes were entirely foreseeable given the large amount of unliquidated Claims at the time the Disclosure Statement was approved and the nature of the Debtor's assets. The Bankruptcy Court therefore finds that holders of Claims and Equity Interests were not misled or prejudiced by the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections and the Plan does not need to be resolicited.

**48. Plan Proposed in Good Faith and Not by Means Forbidden by Law (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(3)).** The Debtor has proposed the Plan in good faith and not by any means forbidden by law, thereby satisfying section 1129(a)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code. In determining that the Plan has been proposed in good faith, the Bankruptcy Court has examined the totality of the circumstances surrounding the filing of this Chapter 11 Case, the Plan itself, and the extensive, unrebutted testimony of Mr. Seery in which he described the process leading to Plan's formulation. Based on the totality of the circumstances and Mr. Seery's testimony, the Bankruptcy Court finds that the Plan is the result of extensive arm's-length negotiations among the Debtor, the Committee, and key stakeholders, and promotes the objectives and purposes of the Bankruptcy Code. Specifically, the Debtor's good faith in proposing the Plan is supported by the following facts adduced by Mr. Seery:

- a. The Independent Board determined that it should consider all potential restructuring alternatives, including pursuit of a traditional restructuring and the continuation of the Debtor's business, a potential sale of the Debtor's assets in one or more transactions, an asset monetization plan similar to that described in the Plan, and a so-called "grand bargain" plan that would involve Mr. Dondero's sponsorship of a plan with a substantial equity infusion.
- b. The Debtor subsequently engaged in arm's-length, good faith negotiations with the Committee over an asset monetization Plan commencing in June 2020, which negotiations occurred over the next several months.
- c. Negotiations between the Debtor and the Committee were often contentious over disputes, including, but not limited to, the post-confirmation corporate governance structure and the scope of releases contemplated by the Plan.
- d. While negotiations with the Committee progressed, the Independent Board engaged in discussions with Mr. Dondero regarding a potential "grand bargain" plan which contemplated a significant equity infusion by Mr. Dondero, and which Mr. Seery personally spent hundreds of hours pursuing over many months.
- e. On August 3, 2020, the Bankruptcy Court entered the *Order Directing Mediation* [Docket No. 912] pursuant to which the Bankruptcy Court ordered the Debtor, the Committee, UBS,

Acis, the Redeemer Committee, and Mr. Dondero into mediation. As a result of this mediation, the Debtor negotiated the settlement of the claims of Acis and Mr. Terry, which the Bankruptcy Court approved on October 28, 2020 [Docket No. 1302].

- f. On August 12, 2020, the Debtor filed its *Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization of Highland Capital Management, L.P.* [Docket No. 944] (the “Initial Plan”) and related disclosure statement (the “Initial Disclosure Statement”) which were not supported by either the Committee or Mr. Dondero. The Independent Board filed the Initial Plan and Initial Disclosure Statement in order to act as a catalyst for continued discussions with the Committee while it simultaneously worked with Mr. Dondero on the “grand bargain” plan.
- g. The Bankruptcy Court conducted a contested hearing on the Initial Disclosure Statement on October 27, 2020. The Committee and other parties objected to approval of the Disclosure Statement at the Initial Disclosure Statement hearing, which was eventually continued to November 23, 2020.
- h. Following the Initial Disclosure Statement hearing, the Debtor continued to negotiate with the Committee and ultimately resolved the remaining material disputes and led to the Bankruptcy Court’s approval of the Disclosure Statement on November 23, 2020.
- i. Even after obtaining the Bankruptcy Court’s approval of the Disclosure Statement, the

Debtor and the Committee continued to negotiate with Mr. Dondero and the Committee over a potential “pot plan” as an alternative to the Plan on file with the Bankruptcy Court, but such efforts were unsuccessful. This history conclusively demonstrates that the Plan is being proposed in good faith within the meaning of section 1129(a)(3).

**49. Payments for Services or Costs and Expenses (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(4)).** Article II.B of the Plan provides that Professionals will file all final requests for payment of Professional Fee Claims no later than 60 days after the Effective Date, thereby providing an adequate period of time for interested parties to review such claims. The procedures set forth in the Plan for the Bankruptcy Court’s approval of the fees, costs, and expenses to be paid in connection with this chapter 11 Case, or in connection with the Plan and incident to this Chapter 11 Case, satisfy the objectives of and are in compliance with section 1129(a)(4) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**50. Directors, Officers, and Insiders (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(5)).** Article IV.B of the Plan provides for the appointment of the Claimant Trustee, Litigation Trustee, and the Claimant Trust Oversight Committee and the members thereto. For the reasons more fully explained in paragraphs 44-45 of this Confirmation Order with respect to the requirement of section 1123(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtor has disclosed the nature of compensation of any insider to be employed or retained by the Reorganized Debtor, if applicable, and compensation for any such insider. The appointment of such individuals is consistent

with the interests of Claims and Equity Interests and with public policy. Thus, the Plan satisfies section 1129(a)(5) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**51. No Rate Changes (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(6)).** The Plan does not provide for any rate change that requires regulatory approval. Section 1129(a)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code is thus not applicable.

**52. Best Interests of Creditors (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(7)).** The “best interests” test is satisfied as to all Impaired Classes under the Plan, as each Holder of a Claim or Equity Interest in such Impaired Classes will receive or retain property of a value, as of the Effective Date of the Plan, that is not less than the amount that such Holder would so receive or retain if the Debtor were liquidated under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. On October 15, 2020, the Debtor filed the Liquidation Analysis [Docket 1173], as prepared by the Debtor with the assistance of its advisors and which was attached as Exhibit C to the Disclosure Statement. On January 29, 2021, in advance of Mr. Seery’s deposition in connection with confirmation of the Plan, the Debtor provided an updated version of the Liquidation Analysis to the then-objectors of the Plan, including Mr. Dondero and the Dondero Related Entities. On February 1, 2021, the Debtor filed the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections. The Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections included updates to the Debtor’s projected asset values, revenues, and expenses to reflect: (1) the acquisition of an interest in an entity known as “HCLOF” that the Debtor will acquire as part of its court-approved settlement with HarbourVest and that was valued at \$22.5 million; (2) an increase in the

value of certain of the Debtor's assets due to changes in market conditions and other factors; (3) expected revenues and expenses arising in connection with the Debtor's continued management of the CLOs pursuant to management agreements that the Debtor decided to retain; (4) increases in projected expenses for headcount (in addition to adding two or three employees to assist in the management of the CLOs, the Debtor also increased modestly the projected headcount as a result of its decision not to engage a Sub-Servicer) and professional fees; and (5) an increase in projected recoveries on notes resulting from the acceleration of term notes owed to the Debtor by the following Dondero Related Entities: NexPoint Advisors, L.P.; Highland Capital Management Services, Inc.; and HCRE Partners, LLC (n/k/a NexPoint Real Estate Partners, LLC). Under the Plan, as of the Confirmation Date, (a) Class 7 General Unsecured Creditors are projected to receive 85% on account of their claims; and (b) Class 8 General Unsecured Creditors are projected to receive at least approximately 71% on account of their Claims. Under a hypothetical chapter 7 liquidation, all general unsecured creditors are projected to receive approximately 55% on account of their Claims. The Bankruptcy Court finds that the distributions that Class 7 and 8 General Unsecured Creditors are projected to receive under the Plan substantially exceeds that which they would receive under a chapter 7 liquidation based on Mr. Seery's testimony, including the following credible reasons he posited, among others:

- a. The nature of the Debtor's assets is complex. Certain assets relate to complicated real estate structures and private equity investments in

operating businesses. Mr. Seery's extensive experience with the Debtor during the thirteen months since his appointment as an Independent Director and later Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer, provides him with a substantial learning curve in connection with the disposition of the Debtor's assets and are reasonably expected to result in him being able to realize tens of millions of dollars more value than would a chapter 7 trustee.

- b. Assuming that a hypothetical chapter 7 trustee could even operate the Debtor's business under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code and hire the necessary personnel with the relevant knowledge and experience to assist him or her in selling the Debtor's assets, a chapter 7 trustee would likely seek to dispose of the Debtor's assets in a forced sale liquidation which would generate substantially less value for the Debtor's creditors than the asset monetization plan contemplated by the Plan.
- c. A chapter 7 trustee would be unlikely to retain the Debtor's existing professionals to assist in its efforts to monetize assets, resulting in delays, increased expenses, and reduced asset yields for the chapter 7 estate.
- d. The chapter 7 estate would be unlikely to maximize value as compared to the asset monetization process contemplated by the Plan because potential buyers are likely to perceive a chapter 7 trustee as engaging in a quick, forced "fire sale" of assets; and



- e. The Debtor's employees, who are vital to its efforts to maximum value and recoveries for stakeholders, may be unwilling to provide services to a chapter 7 trustee.

Finally, there is no evidence to support the objectors' argument that the Claimant Trust Agreement's disclaimed liability for ordinary negligence by the Claimant Trustee compared to a chapter 7 trustee's liability has any relevance to creditor recoveries in a hypothetical chapter 7 liquidation. Thus, section 1129(a)(7) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**53. Acceptance by Certain Classes (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(8)).** Classes 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are Unimpaired under the Plan. Class 2 (Frontier Secured Claim), Class 7 (Convenience Claims), and Class 9 (Subordinated Claims) have each voted to accept the Plan in accordance with the Bankruptcy Code, thereby satisfying section 1129(a)(8) as to those Classes. However, Class 8 (General Unsecured Claims), Class 10 (Class B/C Limited Partnership Interests), and Class 11 (Class A Limited Partnership Interests) have not accepted the Plan. Accordingly, section 1129(a)(8) of the Bankruptcy Code has not been satisfied. The Plan, however, is still confirmable because it satisfies the nonconsensual confirmation provisions of section 1129(b), as set forth below.

**54. Treatment of Administrative, Priority, Priority Tax Claims, and Professional Fee Claims (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(9)).** The treatment of Administrative Claims, Priority Claims, and Professional Fee Claims pursuant to Article III of the Plan, and as set forth below with respect to the resolution of the objections filed by the Internal Revenue Service and certain

Texas taxing authorities satisfies the requirements of sections 1129(a)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**55. Acceptance by Impaired Class (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(10)).** Class 2 (Frontier Secured Claims) and Class 7 (Convenience Claims) are each Impaired Classes of Claims that voted to accept the Plan, determined without including any acceptance of the Plan by any insider. Therefore, the requirement of section 1129(a)(10) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**56. Feasibility (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(11)).** Article IV of the Plan provides for the implementation of the Plan through the Claimant Trust, the Litigation Sub-Trust, and the Reorganized Debtor. The Plan provides that the Claimant Trust, among other things, will monetize and distribute the Debtor's remaining assets. The Disclosure Statement, the Amended Liquidation Analysis/Financial Projections, and the other evidence presented at the Confirmation Hearing provide a reasonable probability of success that the Debtor will be able to effectuate the provisions of the Plan. The Plan contemplates the establishment of the Claimant Trust upon the Effective Date, which will monetize the Estate's assets for the benefit of creditors. Mr. Seery testified that the Class 2 Frontier Secured Claim will be paid over time pursuant to the terms of the New Frontier Note and the Reorganized Debtor will have sufficient assets to satisfy its obligations under this note. The Claims of the Holders of Class 7 Claims (as well as those Class 8 creditors who validly opted to receive the treatment of Class 7 Claims) are expected to be satisfied shortly after the Effective Date. Holders of Class 8 Claims (including any holders of Class 7 Claims who opted to receive the

treatment provided to Class 8 Claims) are not guaranteed any recovery and will periodically receive pro rata distributions as assets are monetized pursuant to the Plan and the Claimant Trust Agreement. Thus, section 1129(a)(11) of the Bankruptcy Code is satisfied.

**57. Payment of Fees (11 U.S.C. § 1129(a)(12)).** All fees payable under 28 U.S.C. § 1930 have been paid or will be paid on or before the Effective Date pursuant to Article XII.A of the Plan, thus satisfying the requirement of section 1129(a)(12) of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtor has agreed that the Reorganized Debtor, the Claimant Trust, and the Litigation Sub-Trust shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of quarterly fees to the Office of the United States Trustee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1930 through the entry of the Final Decree for the Debtor or the dismissal or conversion of the Chapter 11 Case.

**58. Retiree Benefits.** The Plan provides for the assumption of the Pension Plan (to the extent such Pension Plan provides “retiree benefits” and is governed by section 1114 of the Bankruptcy Code). Thus, the Plan complies with section 1129(a)(13) of the Bankruptcy Code, to the extent applicable.

**59. Miscellaneous Provisions (11 U.S.C. §§ 1129(a)(14)-(16)).** Sections 1129(a)(14)-(16) of the Bankruptcy Code are inapplicable as the Debtor (i) has no domestic support obligations (section 1129(a)(14)), (ii) is not an individual (section 1129(a)(15)), and (iii) is not a nonprofit corporation (section 1129(a)(16)).

**60. No Unfair Discrimination; Fair and Equitable Treatment (11 U.S.C. § 1129(b)).** The classification

and treatment of Claims and Equity Interests in Classes 8, 10 and 11, which have not accepted the Plan, is proper pursuant to section 1122 of the Bankruptcy Code, does not discriminate unfairly, and is fair and equitable pursuant to section 1129(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

- a. Class 8. The Plan is fair and equitable with respect to Class 8 General Unsecured Claims. While Equity Interests in Class 10 and Class 11 will receive a contingent interest in the Claimant Trust under the Plan (the “Contingent Interests”), the Contingent Interests will not vest unless and until holders of Class 8 General Unsecured Claims and Class 9 Subordinated Claims receive distributions equal to 100% of the amount of their Allowed Claims plus interest as provided under the Plan and Claimant Trust Agreement. Accordingly, as the holders of Equity Interests that are junior to the Claims in Class 8 and Class 9 will not receive or retain under the Plan on account of such junior claim interest any property unless and until the Claims in Class 8 and Class 9 are paid in full plus applicable interest, the Plan is fair and equitable with respect to holders of Class 8 General Unsecured Claims pursuant to section 1129(b)(2)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code and the reasoning of *In re Introgen Therapeutics* 429 B.R 570 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 2010).
- b. Class 10 and Class 11. There are no Claims or Equity Interests junior to the Equity Interests in Class 10 and Class 11. Equity Interests in Class 10 and 11 will neither receive nor retain any property under the Plan unless Allowed

Claims in Class 8 and Class 9 are paid in full plus applicable interest pursuant to the terms of the Plan and Claimant Trust Agreement. Thus, the Plan does not violate the absolute priority rule with respect to Classes 10 and 11 pursuant to Bankruptcy Code section 1129(b)(2)(C). The Plan does not discriminate unfairly as to Equity Interests. As noted above, separate classification of the Class B/C Partnership Interests from the Class A Partnerships Interests is appropriate because they constitute different classes of equity security interests in the Debtor, and each are appropriately separately classified and treated.

Accordingly, the Plan does not violate the absolute priority rule, does not discriminate unfairly, and is fair and equitable with respect to each Class that has rejected the Plan. Thus, the Plan satisfies the requirements of section 1129(b) of the Bankruptcy Code with respect to Classes 8, 10, and 11.

**61. Only One Plan (11 U.S.C. § 1129(c)).** The Plan is the only chapter 11 plan confirmed in this Chapter 11 Case, and the requirements of section 1129(c) of the Bankruptcy Code are therefore satisfied.

**62. Principal Purpose (11 U.S.C. § 1129(d)).** Mr. Seery testified that the principal purpose of the Plan is neither the avoidance of taxes nor the avoidance of the application of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933, and no governmental unit has objected to the confirmation of the Plan on any such grounds. Accordingly, section 1129(d) of the Bankruptcy Code is inapplicable.

**63. Satisfaction of Confirmation Requirements.**

Based upon the foregoing, the Plan satisfies the requirements for confirmation set forth in section 1129 of the Bankruptcy Code and should be confirmed.

**64. Good Faith Solicitation (11 U.S.C. § 1125(e)).**

The Debtor, the Independent Directors, and the Debtor's employees, advisors, Professionals, and agents have acted in good faith within the meaning of section 1125(e) of the Bankruptcy Code and in compliance with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rules in connection with all of their respective activities relating to the solicitation of acceptances of the Plan and their participation in the activities described in section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code, and they are entitled to the protections afforded by section 1125(e) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**65. Discharge (11 U.S.C. § 1141(d)(3)).** The Debtor is entitled to a discharge of debts pursuant to section 1141(d)(3)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code. Under the Plan, the Claimant Trust or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, will continue to manage funds and conduct business in the same manner as the Debtor did prior to Plan confirmation, which includes the management of the CLOs, Multi-Strat, Restoration Capital, the Select Fund and the Korea Fund. Although the Plan projects that it will take approximately two years to monetize the Debtor's assets for fair value, Mr. Seery testified that while the Reorganized Debtor and Claimant Trust will be monetizing their assets, there is no specified time frame by which this process must conclude. Mr. Seery's credible testimony demonstrates that the Debtor will continue to engage in business after consummation of the Plan, within the

meaning of Section 1141(d)(3)(b) and that the Debtor is entitled to a discharge pursuant to section 1141(d)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**66. Retention of Jurisdiction.** The Bankruptcy Court may properly retain jurisdiction over the matters set forth in Article XI of the Plan and/or section 1142 of the Bankruptcy Code to the maximum extent under applicable law.

**67. Additional Plan Provisions (11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)).** The Plan's provisions are appropriate, in the best interests of the Debtor and its Estate, and consistent with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, Bankruptcy Rules, and Local Rules.

**68. Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases (11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)(2)).** The Debtor has exercised reasonable business judgment with respect to the rejection of the Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases pursuant the terms of the Plan and this Confirmation Order, and such rejections are justified and appropriate in this Chapter 11 Case. The Debtor also filed the List of Assumed Contracts, which contain notices to the applicable counterparties to the contracts set forth on Exhibit "FF" to Plan Supplement filed on February 1, 2021 [Docket No. 1875] and which exhibit sets forth the list of executory contracts and unexpired leases to be assumed by the Debtor pursuant to the Plan (collectively, the "Assumed Contracts"). With respect to the Assumed Contracts, only one party objected to the assumption of any of the Assumed Contracts, but that

objection was withdrawn.<sup>8</sup> Any modifications, amendments, supplements, and restatements to the Assumed Contracts that may have been executed by the Debtor during the Chapter 11 Case shall not be deemed to alter the prepetition nature of the Assumed Contracts or the validity, priority, or amount of any Claims that may arise in connection therewith. Assumption of any Assumed Contract pursuant to the Plan and full payment of any applicable Cure pursuant to the Plan shall result in the full release and satisfaction of any Cures, Claims, or defaults, whether monetary or nonmonetary, including defaults of provisions restricting the change in control or ownership interest composition or other bankruptcy-related defaults, arising under any assumed Executory Contract or Unexpired Lease at any time prior to the effective date of assumption.

**69. Compromises and Settlements Under and in Connection with the Plan (11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)(3)).** All of the settlements and compromises pursuant to and in connection with the Plan, comply with the requirements of section 1123(b)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 9019.

**70. Debtor Release, Exculpation and Injunctions (11 U.S.C. § 1123(b)).** The Debtor Release, Exculpation, and Injunction provisions provided in the Plan (i) are within the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1334; (ii) are integral elements of

---

<sup>8</sup> See Notice of Withdrawal of James Dondero's Objection Debtor's Proposed Assumption of Contracts and Cure Amounts Proposed in Connection Therewith [Docket No. 1876]



the transactions incorporated into the Plan, and inextricably bound with the other provisions of the Plan; (iii) confer material benefit on, and are in the best interests of, the Debtor, its Estate, and its creditors; (iv) are fair, equitable, and reasonable; (v) are given and made after due notice and opportunity for hearing; (vi) satisfy the requirements of Bankruptcy Rule 9019; and (vii) are consistent with the Bankruptcy Code and other applicable law, and as set forth below.

**71. Debtor Release.** Section IX.D of the Plan provides for the Debtor's release of the Debtor's and Estate's claims against the Released Parties. Releases by a debtor are discretionary and can be provided by a debtor to persons who have provided consideration to the Debtor and its estate pursuant to section 1123(b)(3)(A) of the Bankruptcy Code. Contrary to the objections raised by Mr. Dondero and certain of the Dondero Related Entities, the Debtor Release is appropriately limited to release claims held by the Debtor and does not purport to release the claims held by the Claimant Trust, Litigation Sub-Trust, or other third parties. The Plan does not purport to release any claims held by third parties and the Bankruptcy Court finds that the Debtor Release is not a "disguised" release of any third party claims as asserted by certain objecting parties. The limited scope of the Debtor Release in the Plan was extensively negotiated with the Committee, particularly with the respect to the Debtor's conditional release of claims against employees, as identified in the Plan, and the Plan's conditions and terms of such releases. The Plan does not release (i) any obligations of any party under the Plan or any

document, instrument, or agreement executed to implement the Plan, (ii) the rights or obligations of any current employee of the Debtor under any employment agreement or plan, (iii) the rights of the Debtor with respect to any confidentiality provisions or covenants restricting competition in favor of the Debtor under any employment agreement with a current or former employee of the Debtor, (iv) any Avoidance Actions, or (v) any Causes of Action arising from willful misconduct, criminal misconduct, actual fraud, or gross negligence of such applicable Released Party as determined by Final Order of the Bankruptcy Court or any other court of competent jurisdiction. The Debtor Release also contains conditions to such releases as set forth in Article X.D of the Plan with respect to employees (the “Release Conditions”). Until the an employee satisfies the Release Conditions or the Release Conditions otherwise terminate, any claims against such employee will be tolled so that if the Release Conditions are not met the Litigation Trustee may pursue claims against an employee at a later date. The evidence before the Bankruptcy Court, including, but not limited to Mr. Seery’s testimony, demonstrates that the Debtor is not aware of any claims against any of the Released Parties, that the Released Parties have been instrumental in assisting the Debtor’s efforts toward confirmation of the Plan and that, therefore, the releases are a *quid pro quo* for the Released Parties’ significant contributions to a highly complex and contentious restructuring. The Committee, whose members hold approximately \$200 million in claims against the Estate, is highly sophisticated and is represented by highly sophisticated professionals, and has actively and vigorously negotiated

the terms of the Debtor Release, which was the subject of significant controversy at the Initial Disclosure Statement hearing held by the Bankruptcy Court on October 27, 2020.

**72. Exculpation.** Section IX.C of the Plan provides for the exculpation of certain Exculpated Parties to the extent provided therein (the “Exculpation Provision”). As explained below, the Exculpation Provision is appropriate under the unique circumstances of this litigious Chapter 11 Case and consistent with applicable Fifth Circuit precedent. First, with respect to the Independent Directors, their agents, and their advisors, including any employees acting at their direction, the Bankruptcy Court finds and concludes that it has already exculpated these parties for acts other than willful misconduct and gross negligence pursuant to the January 9 Order. The January 9 Order was specifically agreed to by Mr. Dondero, who was in control of the Debtor up until entry of the January 9 Order. The January 9 Order was not appealed. In addition to the appointment of the Independent Directors in an already contentious and litigious case, the January 9 Order set the standard of care for the Independent Directors and specifically exculpated them for negligence. Mr. Seery and Mr. Dubel each testified that they had input into the contents of the January 9 Order and would not have agreed to their appointment as Independent Directors if the January 9 Order did not include the protections set forth in paragraph 10 of the January 9 Order. Paragraph 10 of the January 9 Order (1) requires that parties wishing to sue the Independent Directors or their agents and advisors must first seek approval from the Bankruptcy

Court before doing so; (2) sets the standard of care for the Independent Directors during the Chapter 11 Case and exculpated the Independent Directors for acts other than willful misconduct or gross negligence; (3) only permits suits against the Independent Directors to proceed for colorable claims of willful misconduct and gross negligence upon order of the Bankruptcy Court; and (4) does not expire by its terms.

**73. Existing Exculpation of Independent Directors.** The Bankruptcy Court also finds and concludes that it has already exculpated Mr. Seery acting in the capacity as Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer pursuant to the July 16 Order. The Bankruptcy Court concludes its previous approval of the exculpation of the Independent Directors, their agents, advisors and employees working at their direction pursuant to the January 9 Order, and the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer pursuant to the July 16 Order constitutes the law of this case and are *res judicata* pursuant to *In re Republic Supply Co. v. Shoaf*, 815 F.2d 1046 (5th Cir. 1987). The January 9 Order and July 16 Order cannot be collaterally attacked based on the objectors' objection to the exculpation of the Independent Directors, their agents, and advisors, including any employees acting at their direction, as well as the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer, that the Bankruptcy Court already approved pursuant to the January 9 Order and the July 16 Order.

**74. The Exculpation Provision Complies with Applicable Law.** Separate and apart from the *res judicata* effect of the January 9 Order and the July 16 Order, the Bankruptcy Court also finds and concludes

that the Exculpation Provision is consistent with applicable law, including *In re Pacific Lumber Co.*, 584 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2009), for several reasons:

- a. First, the statutory basis for *Pacific Lumber's* denial of exculpation for certain parties other than a creditors' committee and its members is that section 524(e) of the Bankruptcy Code "only releases the debtor, not co-liable third parties." *Pacific Lumber*, 253 F.3d at 253. However, *Pacific Lumber* does not prohibit all exculpations under the Bankruptcy Code and the court in such case specifically approved the exculpations of a creditors' committee and its members on the grounds that "11 U.S.C. § 1103(c), which lists the creditors' committee's powers, implies committee members have qualified immunity for actions within the scope of their duties.... [I]f members of the committee can be sued by persons unhappy with the committee's performance during the case or unhappy with the outcome of the case, it will be extremely difficult to find members to serve on an official committee." *Pacific Lumber*, 253 F.3d at 253 (quoting Lawrence P. King, et al, *Collier on Bankruptcy*, ¶ 1103.05[4][b] (15th Ed. 2008)). *Pacific Lumber's* rationale for permitted exculpation of creditors' committees and their members (which was clearly policy-based and based on a creditors' committee qualified immunity flowing from their duties under section 1103(c) of the Bankruptcy Code and their disinterestedness and importance in chapter 11 cases) does not preclude exculpation to other parties in a particular chapter 11 case that perform similar roles to a creditors' committee and

its members. The Independent Directors, and by extension the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Restructuring Officer, were not part of the Debtor's enterprise prior to their appointment by the Bankruptcy Court under the January 9 Order. The Bankruptcy Court appointed the Independent Directors in lieu of a chapter 11 trustee to address what the Bankruptcy Court perceived as serious conflicts of interest and fiduciary duty concerns with the then-existing management prior to January 9, 2020, as identified by the Committee. In addition, the Bankruptcy Court finds that the Independent Directors expected to be exculpated from claims of negligence, and would likely have been unwilling to serve in contentious cases absent exculpation. The uncontroverted testimony of Mr. Seery and Mr. Dubel demonstrates that the Independent Directors would not have agreed to accept their roles without the exculpation and gatekeeper provision in the January 9 Order. Mr. Dubel also testified as to the increasing important role that independent directors are playing in complex chapter 11 restructurings and that unless independent directors could be assured of exculpation for simple negligence in contentious bankruptcy cases they would be reluctant to accept appointment in chapter 11 cases which would adversely affect the chapter 11 restructuring process. The Bankruptcy Court concludes that the Independent Directors were appointed under the January 9 Order in order to avoid the appointment of a chapter 11 trustee and are analogous to a creditors' committee rather than an incumbent board of

directors. The Bankruptcy Court also concludes that if independent directors cannot be assured of exculpation for simple negligence in contentious bankruptcy cases, they may not be willing to serve in that capacity. Based upon the foregoing, the Bankruptcy Court concludes that *Pacific Lumber's* policy of exculpating creditors' committees and their members from "being sued by persons unhappy with the committee's performance during the case or unhappy with the outcome of the case" is applicable to the Independent Directors in this Chapter 11 Case.<sup>9</sup>

- b. Second, the Bankruptcy Court also concludes that *Pacific Lumber* does not preclude the exculpation of parties if there is a showing that "costs [that] the released parties might incur defending against such suits alleging such negligence are likely to swamp either the Exculpated Parties or the reorganization." *Pacific Lumber*, 584 F.3d at 252. If ever there was a risk of that happening in a chapter 11 reorganization, it is this one. Mr. Seery credibly testified that Mr. Dondero stated outside the courtroom that if Mr. Dondero's pot plan does not get approved, that Mr. Dondero will "burn the place down." The Bankruptcy Court can easily expect that the proposed Exculpated Parties might expect to incur costs that could swamp them and the reorganization based on the prior

---

<sup>9</sup> The same reasoning applies to the inclusion of Strand in the Exculpation Provision because Strand is the general partner of the Debtor through which each of the Independent Board members act.

litigious conduct of Mr. Dondero and his controlled entities that justify their inclusion in the Exculpation Provision.

**75. Injunction.** Section IX.D of the Plan provides for a Plan injunction to implement and enforce the Plan's release, discharge and release provisions (the "Injunction Provision"). The Injunction Provision is necessary to implement the provisions in the Plan. Mr. Seery testified that the Claimant Trustee will monetize the Debtor's assets in order to maximize their value. In order to accomplish this goal, the Claimant Trustee needs to be able to pursue this objective without the interference and harassment of Mr. Dondero and his related entities, including the Dondero Related Entities. Mr. Seery also testified that if the Claimant Trust was subject to interference by Mr. Dondero, it would take additional time to monetize the Debtor's assets and those assets could be monetized for less money to the detriment of the Debtor's creditors. The Bankruptcy Court finds and concludes that the Injunction Provision is consistent with and permissible under Bankruptcy Code sections 1123(a), 1123(a)(6), 1141(a) and (c), and 1142. The Bankruptcy Court rejects assertions by certain objecting parties that the Injunction Provision constitutes a "third-party release." The Injunction Provision is appropriate under the circumstances of this Chapter 11 Case and complies with applicable bankruptcy law. The Bankruptcy Court also concludes that the terms "implementation" and "consummation" are neither vague nor ambiguous.

**76. Gatekeeper Provision.** Section IX.F of the Plan contains a provision contained in paragraph AA



of this Confirmation Order and which the Debtor has referred to as a gatekeeper provision (the “Gatekeeper Provision”). The Gatekeeper Provision requires that Enjoined Parties first seek approval of the Bankruptcy Court before they may commence an action against Protected Parties. Thereafter, if the Bankruptcy Court determines that the action is colorable, the Bankruptcy Court may, if it has jurisdiction, adjudicate the action. The Bankruptcy Court finds that the inclusion of the Gatekeeper Provision is critical to the effective and efficient administration, implementation, and consummation of the Plan. The Bankruptcy Court also concludes that the Bankruptcy Court has the statutory authority as set forth below to approve the Gatekeeper Provision.

**77. Factual Support for Gatekeeper Provision.**

The facts supporting the need for the Gatekeeper Provision are as follows. As discussed earlier in this Confirmation Order, prior to the commencement of the Debtor’s bankruptcy case, and while under the direction of Mr. Dondero, the Debtor had been involved in a myriad of litigation, some of which had gone on for years and, in some cases, over a decade. Substantially all of the creditors in this case are either parties who were engaged in litigation with the Debtor, parties who represented the Debtor in connection with such litigation and had not been paid, or trade creditors who provided litigation-related services to the Debtor. During the last several months, Mr. Dondero and the Dondero Related Entities have harassed the Debtor, which has resulted in further substantial, costly, and time-consuming litigation for the Debtor. Such litiga-

tion includes: (i) entry of a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction against Mr. Dondero [Adv. Proc. No. 20-03190 Docket No. 10 and 59] because of, among other things, his harassment of Mr. Seery and employees and interference with the Debtor's business operations; (ii) a contempt motion against Mr. Dondero for violation of the temporary restraining order, which motion is still pending before the Bankruptcy Court [Adv. Proc. No. 20-03190 Docket No. 48]; (iii) a motion by Mr. Dondero's controlled investors in certain CLOs managed by the Debtor that the Bankruptcy Court referred to as frivolous and a waste of the Bankruptcy Court's time [Docket No. 1528] which was denied by the Court [Docket No. 1605]; (iv) multiple plan confirmation objections focused on ensuring the Dondero Related Entities be able to continue their litigation against the Debtor and its successors post-confirmation [Docket Nos. 1661, 1667, 1670, 1673, 1676, 1677 and 1868]; (v) objections to the approval of the Debtor's settlements with Acis and HarbourVest and subsequent appeals of the Bankruptcy Court's order approving each of those settlements [Docket Nos. 1347 and 1870]; and (vi) a complaint and injunction sought against Mr. Dondero's affiliated entities to prevent them from violating the January 9 Order and entry of a restraining order against those entities [Adv Proc. No. 21-03000 Docket No 1] (collectively, the "Dondero Post-Petition Litigation").

**78. Findings Regarding Dondero Post-Petition Litigation.** The Bankruptcy Court finds that the Dondero Post-Petition Litigation was a result of Mr. Don-

dero failing to obtain creditor support for his plan proposal and consistent with his comments, as set forth in Mr. Seery's credible testimony, that if Mr. Dondero's plan proposal was not accepted, he would "burn down the place." The Bankruptcy Court concludes that without appropriate protections in place, in the form of the Gatekeeper Provision, Mr. Dondero and his related entities will likely commence litigation against the Protected Parties after the Effective Date and do so in jurisdictions other than the Bankruptcy Court in an effort to obtain a forum which Mr. Dondero perceives will be more hospitable to his claims. The Bankruptcy Court also finds, based upon Mr. Seery's testimony, that the threat of continued litigation by Mr. Dondero and his related entities after the Effective Date will impede efforts by the Claimant Trust to monetize assets for the benefit of creditors and result in lower distributions to creditors because of costs and distraction such litigation or the threats of such litigation would cause.

**79. Necessity of Gatekeeper Provision.** The Bankruptcy Court further finds that unless the Bankruptcy Court approves the Gatekeeper Provision, the Claimant Trustee and the Claimant Trust Oversight Board will not be able to obtain D&O insurance, the absence of which will present unacceptable risks to parties currently willing to serve in such roles. The Bankruptcy Court heard testimony from Mark Tauber, a Vice President with AON Financial Services, the Debtor's insurance broker ("AON"), regarding his efforts to obtain D&O insurance. Mr. Tauber credibly testified that of all the insurance carriers that AON approached to provide D&O insurance coverage

after the Effective Date, the only one willing to do so without an exclusion for claims asserted by Mr. Dondero and his affiliates otherwise requires that this Order approve the Gatekeeper Provision. Based on the foregoing, the Bankruptcy Court finds that the Gatekeeper Provision is necessary and appropriate in light of the history of the continued litigiousness of Mr. Dondero and his related entities in this Chapter 11 Case and necessary to the effective and efficient administration, implementation and consummation of the Plan and is appropriate pursuant to *Carroll v. Abide (In re Carroll)* 850 F.3d 811 (5th Cir. 2017). Approval of the Gatekeeper Provision will prevent baseless litigation designed merely to harass the post-confirmation entities charged with monetizing the Debtor's assets for the benefit of its economic constituents, will avoid abuse of the court system and preempt the use of judicial time that properly could be used to consider the meritorious claims of other litigants. Any suit against a Protected Party would effectively be a suit against the Debtor, and the Debtor may be required to indemnify the Protected Parties under the Limited Partnership Agreement, which will remain in effect through the Effective Date, or those certain *Indemnification and Guaranty Agreements*, dated January 9, 2020, between Strand, the Debtor, and each Independent Director, following the Confirmation Date as each such agreement will be assumed pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365 pursuant to the Plan.

**80. Statutory Authority to Approve Gatekeeper Provision.** The Bankruptcy Court finds it has the statutory authority to approve the Gatekeeper Provision under sections 1123(a)(5), 1123(b)(6), 1141,

1142(b), and 105(a). The Gatekeeper Provision is also within the spirit of the Supreme Court’s “Barton Doctrine.” *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881). The Gatekeeper Provision is also consistent with the notion of a prefiling injunction to deter vexatious litigants, that has been approved by the Fifth Circuit in such cases as *Baum v. Blue Moon Ventures, LLC*, 513 F.3d 181, 189 (5th Cir. 2008), and *In re Carroll*, 850 F.3d 811 (5th Cir. 2017).

**81. Jurisdiction to Implement Gatekeeper Provision.** The Bankruptcy Court finds that it will have jurisdiction after the Effective Date to implement the Gatekeeper Provision as post-confirmation bankruptcy court jurisdiction has been interpreted by the Fifth Circuit under *United States Brass Corp. v. Travelers Ins. Group, Inc. (In re United States Brass Corp.)*, 301 F.3d 296 (5th Cir. 2002) and *EOP-Colonnade of Dallas Ltd. P’Ship v. Faulkner (In re Stonebridge Techs., Inc.)*, 430 F.3d 260 (5th Cir. 2005). Based upon the rationale of the Fifth Circuit in *Villegas v. Schmidt*, 788 F.3d 156, 158-59 (5th Cir. 2015), the Bankruptcy Court’s jurisdiction to act as a gatekeeper does not violate *Stern v. Marshall*. The Bankruptcy Court’s determination of whether a claim is colorable, which the Bankruptcy Court has jurisdiction to determine, is distinct from whether the Bankruptcy Court would have jurisdiction to adjudicate any claim it finds colorable.

**82. Resolution of Objections of Scott Ellington and Isaac Leventon.** Each of Scott Ellington (“Mr. Ellington”) and Isaac Leventon (“Mr. Leventon”) (each, a “Senior Employee Claimant”) has asserted certain claims for liquidated but unpaid bonus amounts for

the following periods: 2016, 2017, and 2018, as set forth in Exhibit A to that certain *Senior Employees' Limited Objection to Debtor's Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization* [Docket No. 1669] (the "Senior Employees' Objection") (for each of Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon, the "Liquidated Bonus Claims").

- a. Mr. Ellington has asserted Liquidated Bonus Claims in the aggregate amount of \$1,367,197.00, and Mr. Leventon has asserted Liquidated Bonus Claims in the aggregate amount of \$598,198.00. Mr. Ellington received two Ballots<sup>10</sup> — a Ballot for Class 7 of the Plan and a Ballot for Class 8 of the Plan. Mr. Ellington completed and timely returned both of such Ballots, voted to reject the Plan, and elected to have his Class 8 Liquidated Bonus Claims treated under Class 7 of the Plan, subject to the objections and reservations of rights set forth in the Senior Employees' Objection. If Mr. Ellington is permitted to elect Class 7 treatment for his Liquidated Bonus Claims, then the maximum amount of his Liquidated Bonus Claims will be \$1,000,000.
- b. Mr. Leventon received two Ballots—a Ballot for Class 7 of the Plan and a Ballot for Class 8 of the Plan. Mr. Leventon completed and timely returned both of such Ballots and voted each such Ballots to rejected the Plan.

---

<sup>10</sup> As defined in the Plan, "Ballot" means the forms(s) distributed to holders of Impaired Claims or Equity Interests entitled to vote on the Plan on which to indicate their acceptance or rejection of the Plan.

- c. The Senior Employees' Objection, among other things, objects to the Plan on the grounds that the Debtor improperly disputes the right of Mr. Ellington to elect Class 7 treatment for his Liquidated Bonus Claims and Mr. Leventon's entitlement to receive Class 7 Convenience Class treatment for his Liquidated Bonus Claims. The Debtor contended that neither Mr. Ellington or Mr. Leventon were entitled to elect to receive Class 7 Convenience Class treatment on account of their Liquidated Bonus Claims under the terms of the Plan, the Disclosure Statement Order or applicable law.
- d. The Debtor and Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon negotiated at arms' length in an effort to resolve all issues raised in the Senior Employee's Objection, including whether or not Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon were entitled to Class 7 Convenience Class treatment of their Liquidated Bonus Claims. As a result of such negotiation, the Debtor, Mr. Ellington, and Mr. Leventon have agreed to the settlement described in paragraphs 82(e) through 82(k) below and approved and effectuated pursuant to decretal paragraphs RR through SS (the "Senior Employees' Settlement").
- e. Under the terms of the Senior Employees' Settlement, the Debtor has the right to elect one of two treatments of the Liquidated Bonus Claims for a Senior Employee Claimant. Under the first treatment option ("Option A"), the Liquidated Bonus Claims will be entitled to be treated in Class 7 of the Plan, and the Liquidated Bonus Claims will be entitled to receive

payment in an amount equal to 70.125% of the Class 7 amount of the Liquidated Bonus Claims, subject to the Liquidated Bonus Claims becoming Allowed Claims under the terms of the Plan. Under this calculation, Mr. Ellington would be entitled to receive \$701,250.00 on account of his Class 7 Convenience Class Claim when and as Allowed under the Plan, and Mr. Leventon would be entitled to receive \$413,175.10 on account of his Class 7 Convenience Class Claim when and as Allowed under the Plan. If, however, any party in interest objects to the allowance of the Senior Employee Claimant's Liquidated Bonus Claims and does not prevail in such objection, then such Senior Employee Claimant will be entitled to a payment in an amount equal to 85% of his Allowed Liquidated Bonus Claims (subject, in the case of Mr. Ellington, to the cap imposed on Class 7 Claims). In addition, under Option A, each of Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon would retain their respective rights to assert that the Liquidated Bonus Claims are entitled to be treated as Administrative Expense Claims, as defined in Article I.B.2. of the Plan, in which case the holder of such Liquidated Bonus Claims would be entitled to payment in full of the Allowed Liquidated Bonus Claims. Under Option A, parties in interest would retain the right to object to any motion seeking payment of the Liquidated Bonus Amounts as Administrative Expenses.

- f. Under the second treatment option ("Option B"), the Debtor would agree that the Senior Employee Claimant has Allowed Liquidated



Bonus Claims, no longer subject to objection by any party in interest, in the amounts of the Liquidated Bonus Claims (subject, in the case of Mr. Ellington, to the cap imposed by Class 7). If the Debtor elects Option B as to a Senior Employee Claimant, then such Senior Employee Claimant would be entitled to a payment on account of his Allowed Liquidated Bonus Claims in an amount equal to 60% of the amount of the Liquidated Bonus Claims (which, in Mr. Ellington's case, would be \$600,000 and in Mr. Leventon's case, would be \$358,918.80), and such payment would be the sole recovery on account of such Allowed Liquidated Bonus Claims.

- g. The Debtor may, with the consent of the Committee, elect Option B with respect to a Senior Employee Claimant at any time prior to the occurrence of the Effective Date. If the Debtor does not make an election, then Option A will apply.
- h. Under either Option A or Option B, Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon will retain all their rights with respect to all Claims other than the Liquidated Bonus Amounts, including, but not limited to, their Class 6 PTO Claims, other claims asserted as Class 8 General Unsecured Claims, the Senior Employees' claims for indemnification against the Debtor, and any other claims that they may assert constitute Administrative Expense Claims, and any other such Claims are subject to the rights of any party in interest to object to such Claims, and the Debtor reserves any all of its rights and defenses in connection therewith.

- i. Subject to entry of this Confirmation Order and as set forth and announced on the record at the hearing on confirmation of the Plan and no party objecting thereto, Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon agreed to change the votes in their respective Ballots from rejection to acceptance of the Plan and to withdraw the Senior Employees' Objection.
- j. The Senior Employees' Settlement represents a valid exercise of the Debtor's business judgment and satisfies the requirements for a compromise under Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a).
- k. For the avoidance of doubt, neither Mr. Leventon nor Mr. Ellington shall be a Released Party under the Plan regardless of how the Senior Employee Claimants' Claims are to be treated hereunder.

Based upon the foregoing findings, and upon the record made before the Bankruptcy Court at the Confirmation Hearing, and good and sufficient cause appearing therefor, it is hereby

**ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:**

**A. Confirmation of the Plan.** The Plan is approved in its entirety and **CONFIRMED** under section 1129 of the Bankruptcy Code. The terms of the Plan, including the Plan Supplements and Plan Modifications, are incorporated by reference into and are an integral part of this Confirmation Order.<sup>11</sup>

**B. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.** The findings of fact and the conclusions of law set forth in

---

<sup>11</sup> The Plan is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

this Confirmation Order and on the record of the Confirmation Hearing constitute findings of fact and conclusions of law in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 7052, made applicable to this proceeding by Bankruptcy Rule 9014. All findings of fact and conclusion of law announced by the Bankruptcy Court at the Confirmation Hearing in relation to confirmation of the Plan are hereby incorporated into this Confirmation Order. To the extent that any of the following constitutes findings of fact or conclusions of law, they are adopted as such. To the extent any findings of fact or conclusions of law set forth in this Confirmation Order (including any findings of fact or conclusions of law announced by the Bankruptcy Court at the Confirmation Hearing and incorporated herein) constitutes an order of the Bankruptcy Court, and is adopted as such.

**C. Objections.** Any resolution or disposition of objections to confirmation of the Plan or otherwise ruled upon by the Bankruptcy Court on the record of the Confirmation Hearing is hereby incorporated by reference. All objections and all reservations of rights pertaining to confirmation of the Plan that have not been withdrawn, waived or settled are overruled on the merits, except as otherwise specifically provided in this Confirmation Order.

**D. Plan Supplements and Plan Modifications.** The filing with the Bankruptcy Court of the Plan Supplements and the Plan Modifications constitutes due and sufficient notice thereof. Accordingly, pursuant to section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3019, the Plan Modifications and the Plan Supplements do not require additional disclosure un-

der section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code or resolicitation of votes under section 1126 of the Bankruptcy Code, nor do they require that Holders of Claims or Equity Interests be afforded an opportunity to change previously cast acceptances or rejections of the Plan. The Plan Modifications and the Plan Supplements constitute the Plan pursuant to section 1127(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. Accordingly, the Plan, as modified, is properly before the Bankruptcy Court and all votes cast with respect to the Plan prior to such modification shall be binding and shall apply with respect to the Plan.

**E. Deemed Acceptance of Plan.** In accordance with section 1127 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3019, all Holders of Claims and Equity Interests who voted to accept the Plan (or whom are conclusively presumed to accept the Plan) are deemed to have accepted the Plan as modified by the Plan Modifications. No holder of a Claim shall be permitted to change its vote as a consequence of the Plan Modifications.

**F. Vesting of Assets in the Reorganized Debtor.** Except as otherwise provided in the Plan or this Confirmation Order, on or after the Effective Date, all Reorganized Debtor Assets will vest in the Reorganized Debtor, free and clear of all Liens, Claims, charges or other encumbrances pursuant to section 1141(c) of the Bankruptcy Code, except with respect to such Liens, Claims, charges, and other encumbrances that are specifically preserved under the Plan upon the Effective Date. The Reorganized Debtor shall be the exclusive trustee of the Reorganized Debtor Assets for purposes of 31 U.S.C. § 3713(b) and 26 U.S.C.

§ 6012(b)(3), as well as the representative of the Estate appointed pursuant to section 1123(b)(3)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code with respect to the Reorganized Debtor Assets.

**G. Effectiveness of All Actions.** All actions contemplated by the Plan, including all actions in connection with the Claimant Trust Agreement, the Senior Employee Stipulation, the New GP LLC Documents, the New Frontier Note, the Reorganized Limited Partnership Agreement, the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement, and the other Plan Documents, are authorized to be taken on, prior to, or after the Effective Date, as applicable, under this Confirmation Order, without further application to or order of the Bankruptcy Court, or further action by the directors, managers, officers or partners of the Debtor or the Reorganized Debtor and with the effect that such actions had been taken by unanimous action of such parties.

**H. Restructuring Transactions.** The Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, are authorized to enter into and effectuate the Restructuring provided under the Plan, including, without limitation, the entry into and consummation of the transactions contemplated by the Claimant Trust Agreement, the Senior Employee Stipulation, the New GP LLC Documents, the New Frontier Note, the Reorganized Limited Partnership Agreement, the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement, and the other Plan Documents, and may take any actions as may be necessary or appropriate to effect a corporate restructuring of its business or a corporate restructuring of the overall corporate structure of the Reorganized Debtor, as and to the extent provided in the Plan. Any transfers of assets or equity

interests effected or any obligations incurred through the Restructuring pursuant to the Plan are hereby approved and shall not constitute fraudulent conveyances or fraudulent transfers or otherwise be subject to avoidance.

**I. Preservation of Causes of Action.** Unless a Cause of Action against a Holder of a Claim or an Equity Interest or other Entity is expressly waived, relinquished, released, compromised or settled in the Plan or any Final Order (including, without limitation, this Confirmation Order), such Cause of Action is expressly reserved for later adjudication by the Reorganized Debtor, the Litigation Sub-Trust, or the Claimant Trust, as applicable (including, without limitation, Causes of Action not specifically identified or of which the Debtor may presently be unaware or that may arise or exist by reason of additional facts or circumstances unknown to the Debtor at this time or facts or circumstances that may change or be different from those the Debtor now believes to exist) and, therefore, no preclusion doctrine, including, without limitation, the doctrines of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, issue preclusion, claim preclusion, waiver, estoppel (judicial, equitable or otherwise) or laches will apply to such Causes of Action as a consequence of the confirmation, effectiveness, or consummation of the Plan based on the Disclosure Statement, the Plan, or this Confirmation Order, except where such Causes of Action have been expressly released in the Plan or any other Final Order (including, without limitation, this Confirmation Order). In addition, the right of the Reorganized Debtor, the Claimant Trust, or the Litigation Sub-Trust to pursue or adopt any claims alleged

in any lawsuit in which the Debtor is a plaintiff, defendant or an interested party, against any Entity, including, without limitation, the plaintiffs or co-defendants in such lawsuits, is expressly reserved.

**J. Independent Board of Directors of Strand.**

The terms of the current Independent Directors shall expire on the Effective Date without the need for any further or other action by any of the Independent Directors. For avoidance of doubt, the Assumed Contracts include the *Indemnification and Guaranty Agreement between Highland Capital Management, Strand Advisors, Inc. and James Seery; the Indemnification and Guaranty Agreement between Highland Capital Management, Strand Advisors, Inc. and John Dubel and Indemnification and Guaranty Agreement between Highland Capital Management, Strand Advisors, Inc. and Russell Nelms* and shall each remain in full force and effect notwithstanding the expiration of the terms of any Independent Directors.

**K. Cancellation of Equity Interests and Issuance of New Partnership Interests.** On the Effective Date, all Class A Limited Partnership Interests, including the Class A Limited Partnership Interests held by Strand, as general partner, and Class B/C Limited Partnerships in the Debtor will be deemed cancelled, and all obligations or debts owed by, or Claims against, the Debtor on account of, or based upon, such Class A Limited Partnership Interests and Class B/C Limited Partnership Interests shall be deemed as cancelled, released, and discharged, including all obligations or duties by the Debtor relating to the Equity Interests in any of the Debtor's formation documents, including the Limited Partnership Agreement. As of

the Effective Date and pursuant to the Plan, new Class A Limited Partnership Interests in the Reorganized Debtor will be issued to the Claimant Trust and New GP LLC. The Claimant Trust, as limited partner, will ratify New GP LLC's appointment as general partner of the Reorganized Debtor, and on and following the Effective Date, the Claimant Trust will be the Reorganized Debtor's limited partner and New GP LLC will be its general partner. The Claimant Trust, as limited partner, and New GP LLC, as general partner, will execute the Reorganized Limited Partnership Agreement, which will amend and restate, in all respects, the Debtor's current Limited Partnership Agreement. Following the Effective Date, the Reorganized Debtor will be managed consistent with the terms of the Reorganized Limited Partnership Agreement by New GP LLC. The sole managing member of New GP LLC will be the Claimant Trust, and the Claimant Trustee will be the sole officer of New GP LLC on the Effective Date.

**L. Transfer of Assets to Claimant Trust.** On or prior to the Effective Date, the Debtor shall irrevocably transfer and shall be deemed to have irrevocably transferred to the Claimant Trust all of its rights, title, and interest in and to all of the Claimant Trust Assets, and in accordance with section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Claimant Trust Assets shall automatically vest in the Claimant Trust free and clear of all Claims, Liens, encumbrances, or interests subject only to the Claimant Trust Interests and the Claimant Trust Expenses, as provided for in the Claimant Trust Agreement, and such transfer shall be



exempt from any stamp, real estate transfer, mortgage from any stamp, transfer, reporting, sales, use, or other similar tax. Following the Effective Date, the Claimant Trust will administer the Claimant Trust Assets pursuant to the Plan and the Claimant Trust Agreement.

**M. Transfer of Estate Claims to Litigation Sub-Trust.** On or prior to the Effective Date, the Claimant Trust shall irrevocably transfer and shall be deemed to have irrevocably transferred to the Litigation Sub-Trust all of the Claimant Trust's rights, title, and interest in and to all of the Estate Claims as successor in interest to the Debtor, and in accordance with section 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code, the Estate Claims shall automatically vest in the Litigation Sub-Trust free and clear of all Claims, Liens, encumbrances, or interests subject only to the Litigation Sub-Trust Interests and Litigation Sub-Trust Expenses. The Litigation Trustee will be authorized to investigate, pursue, and otherwise resolve the Estate Claims pursuant to the terms of the Litigation Sub-Trust Agreement and the Plan, including as successor in interest to the Debtor or Committee, as applicable, in any litigation commenced prior to the Effective Date in which Estate Claims are asserted.

**N. Compromise of Controversies.** In consideration for the distributions and other benefits, including releases, provided under the Plan, the provisions of the Plan constitute a good faith compromise and settlement of all Claims, Equity Interests, and controversies resolved under the Plan and the entry of this Confirmation Order constitutes approval of such compromise and settlement under Bankruptcy Rule 9019.

**O. Objections to Claims.** The Claims Objection Deadline shall be the date that is 180 days after the Effective Date, *provided, however*, that the Claims Objection Deadline may be extended by the Bankruptcy Court upon a motion by the Claimant Trustee and as otherwise provided under the Plan.

**P. Assumption of Contracts and Leases.** Effective as of the date of this Confirmation Order, each of the Assumed Contracts shall be assumed by the Debtor without the need for any further notice to or action, order, or approval of the Bankruptcy Court, under section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and the payment of Cures, if any, shall be paid in accordance with the Plan. Each Assumed Contract shall include all modifications, amendments, supplements, restatements, or other agreements related thereto, and all rights related thereto, if any, including all easements, licenses, permits, rights, privileges, immunities, options, rights of first refusal, and any other interests. Modifications, amendments, supplements, and restatements to any of the Assumed Contracts that have been executed by the Debtor during the Chapter 11 Case shall not be deemed to alter the prepetition nature of such Assumed Contracts or the validity, priority, or amount of any Claims that may arise in connection therewith. Assumption of the Assumed Contracts pursuant to Article V.A of the Plan and full payment of any applicable Cure pursuant to the Plan shall result in the full release and satisfaction of any Cures, Claims, or defaults, whether monetary or nonmonetary, including defaults of provisions restricting the change in control

or ownership interest composition, or other bankruptcy-related defaults, arising under any Assumed Contracts.

**Q. Rejection of Contracts and Leases.** Unless previously assumed during the pendency of the Chapter 11 Case or pursuant to the Plan, all other Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases are rejected as of the date of the entry of this Confirmation Order and pursuant to the terms of the Plan. To the extent that any party asserts any damages resulting from the rejection of any Executory Contract or Unexpired Lease, such claim must be filed within **thirty (30) days** following entry of this Confirmation Order, or such claim will be forever barred and disallowed against the Reorganized Debtor.

**R. Assumption of Issuer Executory Contracts.** On the Confirmation Date, the Debtor will assume the agreements set forth on **Exhibit B** hereto (collectively, the “**Issuer Executory Contracts**”) pursuant to section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and Article V of the Plan. In full and complete satisfaction of its obligation to cure outstanding defaults under section 365(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, the Debtor or, as applicable, any successor manager under the Issuer Executory Contracts (collectively, the “**Portfolio Manager**”) will pay to the Issuers<sup>12</sup> a cumulative amount of \$525,000 (the “**Cure Amount**”) as follows:

---

<sup>12</sup> The “Issuers” are: Brentwood CLO, Ltd., Gleneagles CLO, Ltd., Greenbriar CLO, Ltd., Highland CLO 2018-1, Ltd., Highland Legacy Limited, Highland Loan Funding V Ltd., Highland Park CDO I, Ltd., Pam Capital Funding LP, Rockwall CDO II Ltd., Rockwall CDO Ltd., Southfork CLO Ltd., Stratford CLO Ltd., Westchester CLO, Ltd., Aberdeen Loan Funding, Ltd.,

- a. \$200,000 in cash on the date that is five business days from the Effective Date, with such payment paid directly to Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP (“SRZ”) in the amount of \$85,714.29, Jones Walker LLP (“JW”) in the amount of \$72,380.95, and Maples Group (“Maples” and collectively with SRZ and JW, the “Issuers’ Counsel”) in the amount of \$41,904.76 as reimbursement for the attorney’s fees and other legal expenses incurred by the Issuers in connection with the Debtor’s bankruptcy case; and
- b. \$325,000 in four equal quarterly payments of \$81,250.00 (each, a “Payment”), which amounts shall be paid to SRZ in the amount of \$34,821.43, JW in the amount of \$29,404.76, and Maples in the amount of \$17,023.81 as additional reimbursement for the attorney’s fees and other legal expenses incurred by the Issuers in connection with the Debtor’s bankruptcy case (i) from any management fees actually paid to the Portfolio Manager under the Issuer Executory Contracts (the “Management Fees”), and (ii) on the date(s) Management Fees are required to be paid under the Issuer Executory Contracts (the “Payment Dates”), and such obligation shall be considered an irrevocable direction from the Debtor and the Bankruptcy Court to the relevant CLO Trustee to pay, on each Payment Date, the Payment to Issuers’ Counsel, allocated in the proportion set forth in such agreement; *provided, however*, that (x) if

---

Eastland CLO, Ltd., Grayson CLO, Ltd., Highland Credit Opportunities CDO Ltd., Jasper CLO, Ltd., Liberty Cayman Holdings, Ltd., Liberty CLO, Ltd., Red River CLO, Ltd., Valhalla CLO, Ltd.

the Management Fees are insufficient to make any Payment in full on a Payment Date, such shortfall, in addition to any other amounts due hereunder, shall be paid out of the Management Fees owed on the following Payment Date, and (y) nothing herein shall limit either Debtor's liability to pay the amounts set forth herein, nor the recourse of the Issuers or Issuers' Counsel to the Debtor, in the event of any failure to make any Payment.

**S. Release of Issuer Claims.** Effective as of the Confirmation Date, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, each Issuer on behalf of itself and each of its current and former advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, successors, designees, and assigns hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue, (i) the Debtor and (ii) the Professionals retained by the Debtor and the Committee in the Chapter 11 Case, the Independent Directors, the CEO/CRO, and with respect to the Persons listed in this subsection (ii), such Person's Related Persons (collectively, the "Debtor Released Parties"), for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney's fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including,

without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether known or unknown, including, without limitation, those which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the “Issuer Released Claims”).

**T. Release of Debtor Claims against Issuer Released Parties.** Upon entry of this Order, and to the maximum extent permitted by law, the Debtor hereby forever, finally, fully, unconditionally, and completely releases, relieves, acquits, remises, and exonerates, and covenants never to sue [(i) each Issuer and (ii) Wendy Ebanks, (iii) Yun Zheng, (iv) Laura Chisholm, (v) Mora Goddard, (vi) Stacy Bodden, (vii) Suzan Merren (viii) Scott Dakers, (ix) Samit Ghosh, (x) Inderjit Singh, (xi) Ellen Christian, (xii) Andrew Dean, (xiii) Betsy Mortel, (xiv) David Hogan, (xv) Cleveland Stewart, (xvi) Rachael Rankin, (xvii) Otelia Scott, (xviii) Martin Couch, (xx) Feronia Bartley-Davis, (xxi) Charlotte Cloete, (xxii) Christina McLean, (xxiii) Karen Ellerbe, (xxiv) Gennie Kay Bigord, (xxv) Evert Brunkreef, (xxvii) Evan Charles Burtton (collectively, the “Issuer Released Parties”),] for and from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, promises, acts, agreements, liens, losses, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorney’s fees and related costs), damages, injuries, suits, actions, and causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, matured or unmatured, liquidated or unliquidated, contingent or fixed, at law or in equity, statutory or otherwise, including, without limitation, any claims, defenses, and affirmative defenses, whether

known or unknown, which were or could have been asserted in, in connection with, or with respect to the Bankruptcy Case (collectively, the “Debtor Released Claims”); *provided, however*, that notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the release contained herein will apply to the Issuer Released Parties set forth in subsection (ii) above only with respect to Debtor Released Claims arising from or relating to the Issuer Executory Contracts. Notwithstanding anything in this Order to the contrary, the releases set forth in paragraphs S and T hereof will not apply with respect to the duties, rights, or obligations of the Debtor or any Issuer hereunder.

**U. Authorization to Consummate.** The Debtor is authorized to consummate the Plan after the entry of this Confirmation Order subject to satisfaction or waiver of the conditions precedent to the Effective Date of the Plan set forth in Article VIII.A of the Plan. The Plan shall not become effective unless and until the conditions set forth in Article VIII.A of the Plan have been satisfied, or otherwise waived pursuant to Article VIII.B of the Plan.

**V. Professional Compensation.** All requests for payment of Professional Fee Claims for services rendered and reimbursement of expenses incurred prior to the Effective Date must be filed no **later than sixty (60) days after the Effective Date**. The Bankruptcy Court shall determine the Allowed amounts of such Professional Fee Claims after notice and an opportunity for hearing in accordance with the procedures established by the Bankruptcy Code and the Bankruptcy Court. The Debtor shall fund the Professional

Fee Reserve as provided under the Plan. The Reorganized Debtor shall pay Professional Fee Claims in Cash in the amounts the Bankruptcy Court allows. The Debtor is authorized to pay the pre-Effective Date fees and expenses of all ordinary course professionals in the ordinary course of business without the need for further Bankruptcy Court order or approval. From and after the Effective Date, any requirement that Professionals comply with sections 327 through 331 and 1103 (if applicable) of the Bankruptcy Code in seeking retention or compensation for services rendered after such date shall terminate, and the Reorganized Debtor or Claimant Trustee, as applicable, may employ and pay any Professional or Entity employed in the ordinary course of the Debtor's business without any further notice to or action, order, or approval of the Bankruptcy Court.

**W. Release, Exculpation, Discharge, and Injunction Provisions.** The following release, exculpation, discharge, and injunction provisions set forth in the Plan are approved and authorized in their entirety, and such provisions are effective and binding on all parties and Entities to the extent provided therein.

**X. Discharge of Claims and Termination of Interests.** To the fullest extent provided under section 1141(d)(1)(A) and other applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, except as otherwise expressly provided by the Plan or this Confirmation Order, all consideration distributed under the Plan will be in exchange for, and in complete satisfaction, settlement, discharge, and release of, all Claims and Equity Interests of any kind or nature whatsoever against the



Debtor or any of its Assets or properties, and regardless of whether any property will have been distributed or retained pursuant to the Plan on account of such Claims or Equity Interests. Except as otherwise expressly provided by the Plan or this Confirmation Order, upon the Effective Date, the Debtor and its Estate will be deemed discharged and released under and to the fullest extent provided under section 1141(d)(1)(A) and other applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code from any and all Claims and Equity Interests of any kind or nature whatsoever, including, but not limited to, demands and liabilities that arose before the Confirmation Date, and all debts of the kind specified in section 502(g), 502(h), or 502(i) of the Bankruptcy Code.

**Y. Exculpation.** Subject in all respects to Article XII.D of the Plan, to the maximum extent permitted by applicable law, no Exculpated Party will have or incur, and each Exculpated Party is hereby exculpated from, any claim, obligation, suit, judgment, damage, demand, debt, right, Cause of Action, remedy, loss, and liability for conduct occurring on or after the Petition Date in connection with or arising out of (i) the filing and administration of the Chapter 11 Case; (ii) the negotiation and pursuit of the Disclosure Statement, the Plan, or the solicitation of votes for, or confirmation of, the Plan; (iii) the funding or consummation of the Plan (including the Plan Supplement) or any related agreements, instruments, or other documents, the solicitation of votes on the Plan, the offer, issuance, and Plan Distribution of any securities issued or to be issued pursuant to the Plan, including the Claimant Trust Interests, whether or not such

Plan Distributions occur following the Effective Date; (iv) the implementation of the Plan; and (v) any negotiations, transactions, and documentation in connection with the foregoing clauses (i)-(v); *provided, however*, the foregoing will not apply to (a) any acts or omissions of an Exculpated Party arising out of or related to acts or omissions that constitute bad faith, fraud, gross negligence, criminal misconduct, or willful misconduct or (b) Strand or any Employee other than with respect to actions taken by such Entities from the date of appointment of the Independent Directors through the Effective Date. The Plan's exculpation shall be in addition to, and not in limitation of, all other releases, indemnities, exculpations, any other applicable law or rules, or any other provisions of the Plan, including Article IV.C.2 of the Plan, protecting such Exculpated Parties from liability.

**Z. Releases by the Debtor.** On and after the Effective Date, each Released Party is deemed to be, hereby conclusively, absolutely, unconditionally, irrevocably, and forever released and discharged by the Debtor and the Estate, in each case on behalf of themselves and their respective successors, assigns, and representatives, including, but not limited to, the Claimant Trust and the Litigation Sub-Trust from any and all Causes of Action, including any derivative claims, asserted on behalf of the Debtor, whether known or unknown, foreseen or unforeseen, matured or unmatured, existing or hereafter arising, in law, equity, contract, tort or otherwise, that the Debtor or the Estate would have been legally entitled to assert in their own right (whether individually or collectively) or on behalf of the holder of any Claim against,

or Interest in, a Debtor or other Person. Notwithstanding anything contained herein to the contrary, the foregoing release does not release: (i) any obligations of any party under the Plan or any document, instrument, or agreement executed to implement the Plan, (ii) the rights or obligations of any current employee of the Debtor under any employment agreement or plan, (iii) the rights of the Debtor with respect to any confidentiality provisions or covenants restricting competition in favor of the Debtor under any employment agreement with a current or former employee of the Debtor, (iv) any Avoidance Actions, or (v) any Causes of Action arising from willful misconduct, criminal misconduct, actual fraud, or gross negligence of such applicable Released Party as determined by Final Order of the Bankruptcy Court or any other court of competent jurisdiction.

**AA. Injunction.** Upon entry of this Confirmation Order, all Enjoined Parties are and shall be permanently enjoined, on and after the Effective Date, from taking any actions to interfere with the implementation or consummation of the Plan. Except as expressly provided in the Plan, this Confirmation Order, or a separate order of the Bankruptcy Court, all Enjoined Parties are and shall be permanently enjoined, on and after the Effective Date, with respect to any Claims and Equity Interests, from directly or indirectly (i) commencing, conducting, or continuing in any manner, any suit, action, or other proceeding of any kind (including any proceeding in a judicial, arbitral, administrative or other forum) against or affecting the Debtor or the property of the Debtor, (ii) enforcing, levying, attaching (including

any prejudgment attachment), collecting, or otherwise recovering, enforcing, or attempting to recover or enforce, by any manner or means, any judgment, award, decree, or order against the Debtor or the property of the Debtor, (iii) creating, perfecting, or otherwise enforcing in any manner, any security interest, lien or encumbrance of any kind against the Debtor or the property of the Debtor, (iv) asserting any right of setoff, directly or indirectly, against any obligation due to the Debtor or against property or interests in property of the Debtor, except to the limited extent permitted under Sections 553 and 1141 of the Bankruptcy Code, and (v) acting or proceeding in any manner, in any place whatsoever, that does not conform to or comply with the provisions of the Plan. The injunctions set forth in the Plan and this Confirmation Order shall extend to, and apply to any act of the type set forth in any of clauses (i)-(v) of the immediately preceding paragraph against any successors of the Debtor, including, but not limited to, the Reorganized Debtor, the Litigation Sub-Trust, and the Claimant Trust and their respective property and interests in property. Subject in all respects to Article XII.D of the Plan, no Enjoined Party may commence or pursue a claim or cause of action of any kind against any Protected Party that arose or arises from or is related to the Chapter 11 Case, the negotiation of the Plan, the administration of the Plan or property to be distributed under the Plan, the wind down of the business of the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, the administration of the Claimant Trust or the Litigation Sub-Trust, or the transactions in furtherance of the foregoing without the Bankruptcy Court (i) first determining, after notice

and a hearing, that such claim or cause of action represents a colorable claim of any kind, including, but not limited to, negligence, bad faith, criminal misconduct, willful misconduct, fraud, or gross negligence against a Protected Party and (ii) specifically authorizing such Enjoined Party to bring such claim or cause of action against any such Protected Party; *provided, however*, the foregoing will not apply to a claim or cause of action against Strand or against any Employee other than with respect to actions taken, respectively, by Strand or by such Employee from the date of appointment of the Independent Directors through the Effective Date. The Bankruptcy Court will have sole and exclusive jurisdiction to determine whether a claim or cause of action is colorable and, only to the extent legally permissible and as provided for in Article XI of the Plan, shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate the underlying colorable claim or cause of action.

BB. Duration of Injunction and Stays. Unless otherwise provided in the Plan, in this Confirmation Order, or in a Final Order of the Bankruptcy Court, (i) all injunctions and stays entered during the Chapter 11 Case and in existence on the Confirmation Date, shall remain in full force and effect in accordance with their terms; and (ii) the automatic stay arising under section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code shall remain in full force and effect subject to Section 362(c) of the Bankruptcy Code, and to the extent necessary if the Debtor does not receive a discharge, the Bankruptcy Court will enter an equivalent order under Section 105.

**CC. Continuance of January 9 Order and July 16 Order.** Unless otherwise provided in the Plan, in this Confirmation Order, or in a Final Order of the Bankruptcy Court, each of the *Order Approving Settlement with Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors Regarding Governance of the Debtor and Procedures for Operations in the Ordinary Course*, entered by the Bankruptcy Court on January 9, 2020 [Docket No. 339] and *Order Approving the Debtor's Motion Under Bankruptcy Code Sections 105(a) and 363(b) Authorizing Retention of James P. Seery, Jr., as Chief Executive Officer, Chief Restructuring Officer, and Foreign Representative Nunc Pro Tunc to March 15, 2020* [Docket No. 854] entered on July 16, 2020 shall remain in full force and effect from the Confirmation Date and following the Effective Date.

**DD. No Governmental Releases.** Nothing in this Confirmation Order or the Plan shall effect a release of any claim by the United States Government or any of its agencies or any state and local authority whatsoever, including without limitation any claim arising under the Internal Revenue Code, the environmental laws or any criminal laws of the United States or any state and local authority against any party or person, nor shall anything in this Confirmation Order or the Plan enjoin the United States or any state or local authority from bringing any claim, suit, action, or other proceedings against any party or person for any liability of such persons whatever, including without limitation any claim, suit, or action arising under the Internal Revenue Code, the environmental laws or any criminal laws of the United States or any state and

local authority against such persons, nor shall anything in this Confirmation Order or the Plan exculpate any party or person from any liability to the United States Government or any of its agencies or any state and local authority whatsoever, including any liabilities arising under the Internal Revenue Code, the environmental laws, or any criminal laws of the United States or any state and local authority against any party or person.

**EE. Exemption from Transfer Taxes.** Pursuant to section 1146(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, any transfers (whether from the Debtor to the Reorganized Debtor or to any other Person) of property under the Plan or pursuant to: (a) the issuance, distribution, transfer, or exchange of any debt, equity security, or other interest in the Debtor or the Reorganized Debtor; (b) the Restructuring transactions pursuant to the Plan; (c) the creation, modification, consolidation, termination, refinancing, and/or recording of any mortgage, deed of trust, or other security interest, or the securing of additional indebtedness by such or other means; (d) the making, assignment, or recording of any lease or sublease; or (e) the making, delivery, or recording of any deed or other instrument of transfer under, in furtherance of, or in connection with, the Plan, including any deeds, bills of sale, assignments, or other instrument of transfer executed in connection with any transaction arising out of, contemplated by, or in any way related to the Plan, shall not be subject to any document recording tax, stamp tax, conveyance fee, intangibles or similar tax, mortgage tax, real estate transfer tax, mortgage recording tax, Uniform Commercial Code filing or recording fee, regulatory

filing or recording fee, or other similar tax or governmental assessment to the fullest extent contemplated by section 1146(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, and upon entry of this Confirmation Order, the appropriate state or local governmental officials or agents shall forego the collection of any such tax or governmental assessment and accept for filing and recordation of any of the foregoing instruments or other documents without the payment of any such tax, recordation fee, or governmental assessment.

**FF. Cancellation of Notes, Certificates and Instruments.** Except for the purpose of evidencing a right to a distribution under the Plan and except as otherwise set forth in the Plan or as otherwise provided in this Confirmation Order, on the Effective Date, all agreements, instruments, Securities and other documents evidencing any prepetition Claim or Equity Interest and any rights of any Holder in respect thereof shall be deemed cancelled, discharged, and of no force or effect. The holders of or parties to such cancelled instruments, Securities, and other documentation will have no rights arising from or related to such instruments, Securities, or other documentation or the cancellation thereof, except the rights provided for pursuant to the Plan, and the obligations of the Debtor thereunder or in any way related thereto will be fully released, terminated, extinguished and discharged, in each case without further notice to or order of the Bankruptcy Court, act or action under applicable law, regulation, order, or rule or any requirement of further action, vote or other approval or authorization by any Person.



**GG. Documents, Mortgages, and Instruments.**

Each federal, state, commonwealth, local, foreign, or other governmental agency is authorized to accept any and all documents, mortgages, and instruments necessary or appropriate to effectuate, implement, or consummate the Plan, including the Restructuring transactions contemplated under the Plan, and this Confirmation Order.

**HH. Post-Confirmation Modifications.** Subject section 1127(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and the Plan, the Debtor and the Reorganized Debtor expressly reserve their rights to revoke or withdraw, or to alter, amend, or modify materially the Plan, one or more times after Confirmation and, to the extent necessary, may initiate proceedings in the Bankruptcy Court to so alter, amend, or modify the Plan, or remedy any defect or omission, or reconcile any inconsistencies in the Plan or this Confirmation Order, in such manner as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and intent of the Plan. Any such modification or supplement shall be considered a modification of the Plan and shall be made in accordance with Article XII.B of the Plan.

**II. Applicable Nonbankruptcy Law.** The provisions of this Confirmation Order, the Plan and related documents, or any amendments or modifications thereto, shall apply and be enforceable notwithstanding any otherwise applicable nonbankruptcy law.

**JJ. Governmental Approvals Not Required.** This Confirmation Order shall constitute all approvals and consents required, if any, by the laws, rules, or regulations of any state, federal, or other governmental au-

thority with respect to the dissemination, implementation, or consummation of the Plan and the Disclosure Statement, any certifications, documents, instruments or agreements, and any amendments or modifications thereto, and any other acts referred to in, or contemplated by, the Plan and the Disclosure Statement.

**KK. Notice of Effective Date.** As soon as reasonably practicable after the Effective Date, the Reorganized Debtor shall file notice of the Effective Date and shall serve a copy of the same on all Holders of Claims and Equity Interests, and all parties who have filed with the Bankruptcy Court requests to receive notices in accordance with Bankruptcy Rules 2002 and 3020(c). Notwithstanding the above, no notice of Confirmation or Consummation or service of any kind shall be required to be mailed or made upon any Entity to whom the Debtor mailed notice of the Confirmation Hearing, but received such notice returned marked “undeliverable as addressed,” “moved, left no forwarding address” or “forwarding order expired,” or similar reason, unless the Debtor has been informed in writing by such Entity, or is otherwise aware, of that Entity’s new address. The above-referenced notices are adequate under the particular circumstances of this Chapter 11 Case and no other or further notice is necessary.

**LL. Substantial Consummation.** On the Effective Date, the Plan shall be deemed to be substantially consummated under sections 1101 and 1127 of the Bankruptcy Code.

**MM. Waiver of Stay.** For good cause shown, the stay of this Confirmation Order provided by any

Bankruptcy Rule is waived, and this Confirmation Order shall be effective and enforceable immediately upon its entry by the Bankruptcy Court.

**NN. References to and Omissions of Plan Provisions.** References to articles, sections, and provisions of the Plan are inserted for convenience of reference only and are not intended to be a part of or to affect the interpretation of the Plan. The failure to specifically include or to refer to any particular article, section, or provision of the Plan in this Confirmation Order shall not diminish or impair the effectiveness of such article, section, or provision, it being the intent of the Bankruptcy Court that the Plan be confirmed in its entirety, except as expressly modified herein, and incorporated herein by this reference.

**OO. Headings.** Headings utilized herein are for convenience and reference only, and do not constitute a part of the Plan or this Confirmation Order for any other purpose.

**PP. Effect of Conflict.** This Confirmation Order supersedes any Bankruptcy Court order issued prior to the Confirmation Date that may be inconsistent with this Confirmation Order. If there is any inconsistency between the terms of the Plan and the terms of this Confirmation Order, the terms of this Confirmation Order govern and control. If there is any inconsistency between the terms of this Confirmation Order and the terms of a final, executed Plan Supplement Document, the terms of the final, executed Plan Supplement Document will govern and control.

**QQ. Resolution of Objection of Texas Taxing Authorities.** Dallas County, Kaufman County, City of Allen, Allen ISD and City of Richardson (collectively, the

“Tax Authorities”) assert that they are the holders of prepetition and administrative expense claims for 2019, 2020 and 2021 ad valorem real and business personal property taxes. The ad valorem property taxes for tax year 2020 shall be paid in accordance with and to the extent required under applicable non-bankruptcy law. In the event the 2020 taxes are paid after February 1, 2021, the Tax Authorities may assert any rights and amounts they claim are owed with respect to penalties and interest that have accrued through the date of payment and the Debtor and Reorganized Debtor reserve any all rights and defenses in connection therewith.

- a. The Debtor/Reorganized Debtor shall pay all amounts owed to the Tax Authorities for tax year 2021 in accordance with and to the extent required under applicable nonbankruptcy law. The Tax Authorities shall not be required to file and serve an administrative expense claim and request for payment as a condition of allowance of their administrative expense claims pursuant to 11 U.S.C. Section 503(b)(1)(D). With regard to year 2019 ad valorem property taxes, the Tax Authorities will receive payment of their prepetition claims within 30 days of the Effective Date of the Plan. The payment will include interest from the Petition Date through the Effective Date and from the Effective Date through payment in full at the state statutory rate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. Sections 506(b), 511, and 1129, if applicable, subject to all of the Debtor’s and Reorganized Debtor’s rights and defenses in connection therewith. Notwithstanding any other provision in the Plan, the

Tax Authorities shall (i) retain the liens that secure all prepetition and postpetition amounts ultimately owed to them, if any, as well as (ii) the state law priority of those liens until the claims are paid in full.

- b. The Tax Authorities' prepetition claims and their administrative expense claims shall not be discharged until such time as the amounts owed are paid in full. In the event of a default asserted by the Taxing Authorities, the Tax Authorities shall provide notice Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, and may demand cure of any such asserted default. Subject to all of its rights and defenses, the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor shall have fifteen (15) days from the date of the notice to cure the default. If the alleged default is not cured, the Tax Authorities may exercise any of their respective rights under applicable law and pursue collection of all amounts owed pursuant to state law outside of the Bankruptcy Court, subject in all respects to the Debtor's and Reorganized Debtor's applicable rights and defenses. The Debtor/Reorganized Debtor shall be entitled to any notices of default required under applicable nonbankruptcy law and each of the Taxing Authorities, the Debtor and the Reorganized Debtor reserve any and all of their respective rights and defenses in connection therewith. The Debtor's and Reorganized Debtor's rights and defenses under Texas Law and the Bankruptcy Code with respect to this provision of the Confirmation Order, including their right to dispute or object to the Tax Authorities' Claims and liens, are fully preserved.

**RR. Resolution of Objections of Scott Ellington and Isaac Leventon.** Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(a), the Senior Employees' Settlement is approved in all respects. The Debtor may, only with the consent of the Committee, elect Option B for a Senior Employee Claimant by written notice to such Senior Employee Claimant on or before the occurrence of the Effective Date. If the Debtor does not elect Option B, then Option A will govern the treatment of the Liquidated Bonus Claims.

- a. Notwithstanding any language in the Plan, the Disclosure Statement, or this Confirmation Order to the contrary, if Option A applies to the Liquidated Bonus Claims of a Senior Employee Claimant, then the Liquidated Bonus Claims of such Senior Employee Claimant will receive the treatment described in paragraph 82(e) hereof, and if the Debtor timely elects Option B with respect to the Liquidated Bonus Claims of a Senior Employee Claimant, then the Liquidated Bonus Claims of such Senior Employee Claimant will receive the treatment described in paragraph 82(f) hereof.
- b. The Senior Employees' Settlement is hereby approved, without prejudice to the respective rights of Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon to assert all their remaining Claims against the Debtor's estate, including, but not limited to, their Class 6 PTO Claims, their remaining Class 8 General Unsecured Claims, any indemnification claims, and any Administrative Expense Claims that they may assert and is without prejudice to the rights of any party in interest to object to any such Claims.

- c. Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 3018(a), Mr. Ellington and Mr. Leventon were permitted to change their votes on the Plan. Accordingly, Mr. Ellington's votes on his Ballots in Class 7 and Class 8 of the Plan were changed from a rejection of the Plan to acceptance of the Plan, and Mr. Leventon's votes on his Ballots in Class 7 and Class 8 of the Plan were, changed from rejections of the Plan to acceptances of the Plan.
- d. The Senior Employees' Objection is deemed withdrawn.

**SS. No Release of Claims Against Senior Employee Claimants.** For the avoidance of doubt, the Senior Employees' Settlement, as approved herein, shall not, and shall not be deemed to, release any Claims or Causes of Action held by the Debtor against either Senior Employee Claimant nor shall either Senior Employee Claimant be, or be deemed to be, a "Released Party" under the Plan.

**TT. Resolution of Objection of Internal Revenue Service.** Notwithstanding any other provision or term of the Plan or Confirmation Order, the following Default Provision shall control as to the United States of America, Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") and all of its claims, including any administrative claim (the "IRS Claim"):

- (a) Notwithstanding any other provision in the Plan, if the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor, or any successor in interest fails to pay when due any payment required to be made on federal taxes, the IRS Claim, or other payment required

to be made to the IRS under the terms and provisions of this Plan, the Confirmation Order, or the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C.), or fails to timely file any required federal tax return, or if any other event of default as set forth in the Plan occurs, the IRS shall be entitled to give the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor and/or any successor in interest and their counsel of record, by United States Certified Mail, written notice of the failure and/or default with demand that it be cured, and if the failure and/or default is not cured within 14 days of the date of said notice and demand, then the following shall apply to the IRS:

- (1) The administrative collection powers and the rights of the IRS shall be reinstated as they existed prior to the filing of the bankruptcy petition, including, but not limited to, the assessment of taxes, the filing of a notice of Federal tax lien and the powers of levy, seizure, and collection as provided under the Internal Revenue Code;
- (2) The automatic stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362 and any injunction of the Plan or in the Confirmation Order shall, with regard to the IRS only, lift or terminate without further notice or hearing by the Bankruptcy Court, and the entire prepetition liability owed to the IRS, together with any unpaid postpetition tax liabilities, may become due and payable immediately; and
- (3) The IRS shall have the right to proceed to collect from the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor or any successor in interest any of the



prepetition tax liabilities and related penalties and interest through administrative or judicial collection procedures available under the United States Code as if no bankruptcy petition had been filed and as if no plan had been confirmed.

(b) If the IRS declares the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor, or any successor-in-interest to be in default of the Debtor's, the Reorganized Debtor's and/ or any successor- in-interest's obligations under the Plan, then entire prepetition liability of an IRS' Allowed Claim, together with any unpaid postpetition tax liabilities shall become due and payable immediately upon written demand to the Debtor, Reorganized Debtor and/or any successor-in-interest. Failure of the IRS to declare a failure and/or default does not constitute a waiver by the United States or its agency the IRS of the right to declare that the Debtor, Reorganized Debtor, and/or any successor in interest is in default.

(c) The IRS shall only be required to send two notices of failure and/or default, and upon the third event of a failure and/or default, the IRS shall be entitled to proceed as set out in paragraphs (1), (2), and/or (3) herein above without further notice to the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor, or any successor in interest, or its counsel. The collection statute expiration date for all unpaid federal tax liabilities shall be extended pursuant to nonbankruptcy law.

(d) The Internal Revenue Service shall not be bound by any release provisions in the Plan that

would release any liability of the responsible persons of the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor, and/or any successor in interest to the IRS. The Internal Revenue Service may take such actions as it deems necessary to assess any liability that may be due and owing by the responsible persons of the Debtor, the Reorganized Debtor and/or any successor in interest to the Internal Revenue Service.

(e) Nothing contained in the Plan or the Confirmation Order shall be deemed to be a waiver or relinquishment of any rights, claims, causes of action, rights of setoff or recoupment, rights to appeal tax assessments, or other legal or equitable defenses that the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor have under non-bankruptcy law in connection with any claim, liability or cause of action of the United States and its agency the Internal Revenue Service.

(f) The term “any payment required to be made on federal taxes,” as used herein above, is defined as: any payment or deposit required by the Internal Revenue Code to be made by the Debtor from and after the Confirmation Date, or the Reorganized Debtor and/or any successor in interest from and after the Effective Date, to the date the IRS Claim is together with interest paid in full. The term “any required tax return,” as used herein above, is defined as: any tax return or report required by the Internal Revenue Code to be made by the Debtor from and after the Confirmation Date, or the Reorganized Debtor and/or any successor in interest from and after the Effective

Date, to the date the IRS Claim is together with interest paid in full.

**UU. IRS Proof of Claim.** Notwithstanding anything in the Plan or in this Confirmation Order, until all required tax returns are filed with and processed by the IRS, the IRS's proof of claim will not be deemed fixed for purposes of Section 502 of the Bankruptcy Code and may be amended in order to reflect the IRS' assessment of the Debtor's unpaid priority and general unsecured taxes, penalties and interest.

**VV. CLO Holdco, Ltd. Settlement** Notwithstanding anything contained herein to the contrary, nothing in this Order is or is intended to supersede the rights and obligations of either the Debtor or CLO Holdco contained in that certain *Settlement Agreement between CLO Holdco, Ltd., and Highland Capital Management, L.P., dated January 25, 2021* [Docket No. 1838-1] (the "CLOH Settlement Agreement"). In the event of any conflict between the terms of this Order and the terms of the CLOH Settlement Agreement, the terms of the CLOH Settlement Agreement will govern.

**WW. Retention of Jurisdiction.** The Bankruptcy Court may properly, and upon the Effective Date shall, to the maximum extent permitted under applicable law, retain jurisdiction over all matters arising out of, and related to, this Chapter 11 Case, including the matters set forth in Article XI of the Plan and section 1142 of the Bankruptcy Code.

**XX. Payment of Statutory Fees; Filing of Quarterly Reports.** All fees payable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1930 shall be paid on or before the Effective Date. The Reorganized Debtor, the Claimant Trust, and the

Litigation Sub-Trust shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of quarterly fees to the Office of the United States Trustee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1930 through the entry of the Final Decree for the Debtor or the dismissal or conversion of the Chapter 11 Case. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Plan, the U.S. Trustee shall not be required to file any proofs of claim with respect to quarterly fees payable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1930.

**YY. Dissolution of the Committee.** On the Effective Date, the Committee will dissolve, and the members of the Committee and the Committee's Professionals will cease to have any role arising from or relating to the Chapter 11 Case, except in connection with final fee applications of Professionals for services rendered prior to the Effective Date (including the right to object thereto). Notwithstanding the foregoing, any Committee member or Professional may serve following the Effective Date with respect to the Claimant Trust Oversight Board or Litigation Sub-Trust. The Professionals retained by the Committee and the members thereof will not be entitled to assert any fee claims for any services rendered to the Committee or expenses incurred in the service of the Committee after the Effective Date, except for reasonable fees for services rendered, and actual and necessary costs incurred, in connection with any applications for allowance of Professional Fees pending on the Effective Date or filed and served after the Effective Date pursuant to the Plan. Nothing in the Plan shall prohibit or limit the ability of the Debtor's or Committee's Professionals to represent either of the Trustees or to be compensated or reimbursed per the Plan, the

Claimant Trust Agreement, and/or Litigation Sub-Trust in connection with such representation.

**ZZ. Miscellaneous.** After the Effective Date, the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, shall have no obligation to file with the Bankruptcy Court or serve on any parties reports that the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, were obligated to file under the Bankruptcy Code or a court order, including monthly operating reports (even for those periods for which a monthly operating report was not filed before the Effective Date), ordinary course professional reports, reports to any parties otherwise required under the “first” and “second” day orders entered in this Chapter 11 Case (including any cash collateral financing orders entered in this Chapter 11 Case) and monthly or quarterly reports for Professionals; *provided, however*, that the Debtor or Reorganized Debtor, as applicable, will comply with the U.S. Trustee’s post confirmation reporting requirements.

**###END OF ORDER###**

198a

**APPENDIX G**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 23-10534

---

IN THE MATTER OF HIGHLAND  
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

*Debtor,*

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS,  
L.P., *now known as* NEXPOINT ASSET MANAGEMENT,  
L.P.; NEXPOINT ADVISORS, L.P.,

*Appellants,*

v.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

*Appellee.*

---

Filed: April 28, 2025

---

ON PETITION FOR REHEARING  
AND REHEARING EN BANC

Before ELROD, *Chief Judge*, and WILLETT, and  
DUNCAN, *Circuit Judges*\*.

---

\* Judges James L. Dennis and Irma Carrillo Ramirez, did not participate in the consideration of the rehearing en banc.

PER CURIAM:

The petition for panel rehearing is DENIED. Because no member of the panel or judge in regular active service requested that the court be polled on rehearing en banc (FED. R. APP. P. 40 and 5TH CIR. R. 40), the petition for rehearing en banc is DENIED.

## APPENDIX H

### RELEVANT STATUTORY PROVISIONS

#### 11 U.S.C. § 105. Power of court

(a) The court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. No provision of this title providing for the raising of an issue by a party in interest shall be construed to preclude the court from, sua sponte, taking any action or making any determination necessary or appropriate to enforce or implement court orders or rules, or to prevent an abuse of process.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a court may not appoint a receiver in a case under this title.

(c) The ability of any district judge or other officer or employee of a district court to exercise any of the authority or responsibilities conferred upon the court under this title shall be determined by reference to the provisions relating to such judge, officer, or employee set forth in title 28. This subsection shall not be interpreted to exclude bankruptcy judges and other officers or employees appointed pursuant to chapter 6 of title 28 from its operation.

(d) The court, on its own motion or on the request of a party in interest—



201a

(1) shall hold such status conferences as are necessary to further the expeditious and economical resolution of the case; and

(2) unless inconsistent with another provision of this title or with applicable Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, may issue an order at any such conference prescribing such limitations and conditions as the court deems appropriate to ensure that the case is handled expeditiously and economically, including an order that—

(A) sets the date by which the trustee must assume or reject an executory contract or unexpired lease; or

(B) in a case under chapter 11 of this title—

(i) sets a date by which the debtor, or trustee if one has been appointed, shall file a disclosure statement and plan;

(ii) sets a date by which the debtor, or trustee if one has been appointed, shall solicit acceptances of a plan;

(iii) sets the date by which a party in interest other than a debtor may file a plan;

(iv) sets a date by which a proponent of a plan, other than the debtor, shall solicit acceptances of such plan;

(v) fixes the scope and format of the notice to be provided regarding the hearing on approval of the disclosure statement; or

(vi) provides that the hearing on approval of the disclosure statement may be combined with the hearing on confirmation of the plan.

**11 U.S.C. § 524. Effect of discharge**

(a) A discharge in a case under this title—

(1) voids any judgment at any time obtained, to the extent that such judgment is a determination of the personal liability of the debtor with respect to any debt discharged under section 727, 944, 1141, 1192, 1228, or 1328 of this title, whether or not discharge of such debt is waived;

(2) operates as an injunction against the commencement or continuation of an action, the employment of process, or an act, to collect, recover or offset any such debt as a personal liability of the debtor, whether or not discharge of such debt is waived; and

(3) operates as an injunction against the commencement or continuation of an action, the employment of process, or an act, to collect or recover from, or offset against, property of the debtor of the kind specified in section 541(a)(2) of this title that is acquired after the commencement of the case, on account of any allowable community claim, except a community claim that is excepted from discharge under section 523, 1192, 1228(a)(1), or 1328(a)(1), or that would be so excepted, determined in accordance with the provisions of sections 523(c) and 523(d) of this title, in a case concerning the debtor's spouse commenced on the date of the filing of the petition in the case concerning the debtor, whether or not discharge of the debt based on such community claim is waived.

\* \* \*

(e) Except as provided in subsection (a)(3) of this section, discharge of a debt of the debtor does not affect the liability of any other entity on, or the property of any other entity for, such debt.

\* \* \*

(g)(1)(A) After notice and hearing, a court that enters an order confirming a plan of reorganization under chapter 11 may issue, in connection with such order, an injunction in accordance with this subsection to supplement the injunctive effect of a discharge under this section.

(B) An injunction may be issued under subparagraph (A) to enjoin entities from taking legal action for the purpose of directly or indirectly collecting, recovering, or receiving payment or recovery with respect to any claim or demand that, under a plan of reorganization, is to be paid in whole or in part by a trust described in paragraph (2)(B)(i), except such legal actions as are expressly allowed by the injunction, the confirmation order, or the plan of reorganization.

(2)(A) Subject to subsection (h), if the requirements of subparagraph (B) are met at the time an injunction described in paragraph (1) is entered, then after entry of such injunction, any proceeding that involves the validity, application, construction, or modification of such injunction, or of this subsection with respect to such injunction, may be commenced only in the district court in which such injunction was entered, and such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any such proceeding without regard to the amount in controversy.

(B) The requirements of this subparagraph are that—

(i) the injunction is to be implemented in connection with a trust that, pursuant to the plan of reorganization—

(I) is to assume the liabilities of a debtor which at the time of entry of the order for relief has been named as a defendant in personal injury, wrongful death, or property-damage actions seeking recovery for damages allegedly caused by the presence of, or exposure to, asbestos or asbestos-containing products;

(II) is to be funded in whole or in part by the securities of 1 or more debtors involved in such plan and by the obligation of such debtor or debtors to make future payments, including dividends;

(III) is to own, or by the exercise of rights granted under such plan would be entitled to own if specified contingencies occur, a majority of the voting shares of—

(aa) each such debtor;

(bb) the parent corporation of each such debtor; or

(cc) a subsidiary of each such debtor that is also a debtor; and

(IV) is to use its assets or income to pay claims and demands; and

(ii) subject to subsection (h), the court determines that—

(I) the debtor is likely to be subject to substantial future demands for payment arising out of the same or similar conduct or events that gave rise to the claims that are addressed by the injunction;

(II) the actual amounts, numbers, and timing of such future demands cannot be determined;

(III) pursuit of such demands outside the procedures prescribed by such plan is likely to threaten the plan's purpose to deal equitably with claims and future demands;

(IV) as part of the process of seeking confirmation of such plan—

(aa) the terms of the injunction proposed to be issued under paragraph (1)(A), including any provisions barring actions against third parties pursuant to paragraph (4)(A), are set out in such plan and in any disclosure statement supporting the plan; and

(bb) a separate class or classes of the claimants whose claims are to be addressed by a trust described in clause (i) is established and votes, by at least 75 percent of those voting, in favor of the plan; and

(V) subject to subsection (h), pursuant to court orders or otherwise, the trust will operate through mechanisms such as structured, periodic, or supplemental payments, pro rata distributions, matrices, or periodic review of estimates of the numbers and values of present claims and future demands, or other comparable mechanisms, that provide reasonable assurance that the trust will value, and be in a financial position to pay, present claims and future demands that

involve similar claims in substantially the same manner.

(3)(A) If the requirements of paragraph (2)(B) are met and the order confirming the plan of reorganization was issued or affirmed by the district court that has jurisdiction over the reorganization case, then after the time for appeal of the order that issues or affirms the plan—

(i) the injunction shall be valid and enforceable and may not be revoked or modified by any court except through appeal in accordance with paragraph (6);

(ii) no entity that pursuant to such plan or thereafter becomes a direct or indirect transferee of, or successor to any assets of, a debtor or trust that is the subject of the injunction shall be liable with respect to any claim or demand made against such entity by reason of its becoming such a transferee or successor; and

(iii) no entity that pursuant to such plan or thereafter makes a loan to such a debtor or trust or to such a successor or transferee shall, by reason of making the loan, be liable with respect to any claim or demand made against such entity, nor shall any pledge of assets made in connection with such a loan be upset or impaired for that reason;

(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to—

(i) imply that an entity described in subparagraph (A)(ii) or (iii) would, if this paragraph were not applicable, necessarily be liable to any entity by reason of any of the acts described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) relieve any such entity of the duty to comply with, or of liability under, any Federal or State law regarding the making of a fraudulent conveyance in a transaction described in subparagraph (A)(ii) or (iii); or

(iii) relieve a debtor of the debtor's obligation to comply with the terms of the plan of reorganization, or affect the power of the court to exercise its authority under sections 1141 and 1142 to compel the debtor to do so.

(4)(A)(i) Subject to subparagraph (B), an injunction described in paragraph (1) shall be valid and enforceable against all entities that it addresses.

(ii) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 524(e), such an injunction may bar any action directed against a third party who is identifiable from the terms of such injunction (by name or as part of an identifiable group) and is alleged to be directly or indirectly liable for the conduct of, claims against, or demands on the debtor to the extent such alleged liability of such third party arises by reason of—

(I) the third party's ownership of a financial interest in the debtor, a past or present affiliate of the debtor, or a predecessor in interest of the debtor;

(II) the third party's involvement in the management of the debtor or a predecessor in interest of the debtor, or service as an officer, director or employee of the debtor or a related party;

(III) the third party's provision of insurance to the debtor or a related party; or

(IV) the third party's involvement in a transaction changing the corporate structure, or in a loan

or other financial transaction affecting the financial condition, of the debtor or a related party, including but not limited to—

(aa) involvement in providing financing (debt or equity), or advice to an entity involved in such a transaction; or

(bb) acquiring or selling a financial interest in an entity as part of such a transaction.

(iii) As used in this subparagraph, the term "related party" means—

(I) a past or present affiliate of the debtor;

(II) a predecessor in interest of the debtor; or

(III) any entity that owned a financial interest in—

(aa) the debtor;

(bb) a past or present affiliate of the debtor; or

(cc) a predecessor in interest of the debtor.

(B) Subject to subsection (h), if, under a plan of reorganization, a kind of demand described in such plan is to be paid in whole or in part by a trust described in paragraph (2)(B)(i) in connection with which an injunction described in paragraph (1) is to be implemented, then such injunction shall be valid and enforceable with respect to a demand of such kind made, after such plan is confirmed, against the debtor or debtors involved, or against a third party described in subparagraph (A)(ii), if—

(i) as part of the proceedings leading to issuance of such injunction, the court appoints a legal representative for the purpose of protecting the rights of



persons that might subsequently assert demands of such kind, and

(ii) the court determines, before entering the order confirming such plan, that identifying such debtor or debtors, or such third party (by name or as part of an identifiable group), in such injunction with respect to such demands for purposes of this subparagraph is fair and equitable with respect to the persons that might subsequently assert such demands, in light of the benefits provided, or to be provided, to such trust on behalf of such debtor or debtors or such third party.

(5) In this subsection, the term "demand" means a demand for payment, present or future, that—

(A) was not a claim during the proceedings leading to the confirmation of a plan of reorganization;

(B) arises out of the same or similar conduct or events that gave rise to the claims addressed by the injunction issued under paragraph (1); and

(C) pursuant to the plan, is to be paid by a trust described in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

(6) Paragraph (3)(A)(i) does not bar an action taken by or at the direction of an appellate court on appeal of an injunction issued under paragraph (1) or of the order of confirmation that relates to the injunction.

(7) This subsection does not affect the operation of section 1144 or the power of the district court to refer a proceeding under section 157 of title 28 or any reference of a proceeding made prior to the date of the enactment of this subsection.

\* \* \*

**11 U.S.C. § 1123. Contents of plan**

(a) Notwithstanding any otherwise applicable non-bankruptcy law, a plan shall—

(1) designate, subject to section 1122 of this title, classes of claims, other than claims of a kind specified in section 507(a)(2), 507(a)(3), or 507(a)(8) of this title, and classes of interests;

(2) specify any class of claims or interests that is not impaired under the plan;

(3) specify the treatment of any class of claims or interests that is impaired under the plan;

(4) provide the same treatment for each claim or interest of a particular class, unless the holder of a particular claim or interest agrees to a less favorable treatment of such particular claim or interest;

(5) provide adequate means for the plan's implementation, such as—

(A) retention by the debtor of all or any part of the property of the estate;

(B) transfer of all or any part of the property of the estate to one or more entities, whether organized before or after the confirmation of such plan;

(C) merger or consolidation of the debtor with one or more persons;

(D) sale of all or any part of the property of the estate, either subject to or free of any lien, or the distribution of all or any part of the property of the estate among those having an interest in such property of the estate;

211a

- (E) satisfaction or modification of any lien;
  - (F) cancellation or modification of any indenture or similar instrument;
  - (G) curing or waiving of any default;
  - (H) extension of a maturity date or a change in an interest rate or other term of outstanding securities;
  - (I) amendment of the debtor's charter; or
  - (J) issuance of securities of the debtor, or of any entity referred to in subparagraph (B) or (C) of this paragraph, for cash, for property, for existing securities, or in exchange for claims or interests, or for any other appropriate purpose;
- (6) provide for the inclusion in the charter of the debtor, if the debtor is a corporation, or of any corporation referred to in paragraph (5)(B) or (5)(C) of this subsection, of a provision prohibiting the issuance of nonvoting equity securities, and providing, as to the several classes of securities possessing voting power, an appropriate distribution of such power among such classes, including, in the case of any class of equity securities having a preference over another class of equity securities with respect to dividends, adequate provisions for the election of directors representing such preferred class in the event of default in the payment of such dividends;
- (7) contain only provisions that are consistent with the interests of creditors and equity security holders and with public policy with respect to the manner of selection of any officer, director, or trustee under the plan and any successor to such officer, director, or trustee; and

(8) in a case in which the debtor is an individual, provide for the payment to creditors under the plan of all or such portion of earnings from personal services performed by the debtor after the commencement of the case or other future income of the debtor as is necessary for the execution of the plan.

(b) Subject to subsection (a) of this section, a plan may—

(1) impair or leave unimpaired any class of claims, secured or unsecured, or of interests;

(2) subject to section 365 of this title, provide for the assumption, rejection, or assignment of any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor not previously rejected under such section;

(3) provide for—

(A) the settlement or adjustment of any claim or interest belonging to the debtor or to the estate;  
or

(B) the retention and enforcement by the debtor, by the trustee, or by a representative of the estate appointed for such purpose, of any such claim or interest;

(4) provide for the sale of all or substantially all of the property of the estate, and the distribution of the proceeds of such sale among holders of claims or interests;

(5) modify the rights of holders of secured claims, other than a claim secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence, or of holders of unsecured claims, or leave unaffected the rights of holders of any class of claims; and

213a

(6) include any other appropriate provision not inconsistent with the applicable provisions of this title.

(c) In a case concerning an individual, a plan proposed by an entity other than the debtor may not provide for the use, sale, or lease of property exempted under section 522 of this title, unless the debtor consents to such use, sale, or lease.

(d) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section and sections 506(b), 1129(a)(7), and 1129(b) of this title, if it is proposed in a plan to cure a default the amount necessary to cure the default shall be determined in accordance with the underlying agreement and applicable nonbankruptcy law.