

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

FEBRUARY-MARCH 2023

**EDITOR'S NOTE: CRYPTO CRISIS**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**CRYPTO PLATFORMS IN CRISIS: BANKRUPTCY CONSIDERATIONS – PART I**

Kenneth Aulet

**THE ROLE OF A CREDITORS' COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE, PRESERVE AND PURSUE  
CAUSES OF ACTION IN CRYPTO BANKRUPTCIES**

Jeffrey Cohen, Andrew Behlmann and Phillip Khezri

**UTILIZING STRUCTURED FINANCE TECHNIQUES IN DISTRESSED SITUATIONS**

Michael L. Urschel, Roger G. Schwartz, Matthew Warren and Timothy W. Hoffmann

**ALL FOR ONE? DEBT CO-INVESTORS NEED NOT BEHAVE AS MUSKETEERS**

Jason Ulezalka and Jonathan W. Young

**POSTPETITION PAYMENT FOR PREPETITION DELIVERY OF GOODS UNDER  
BANKRUPTCY CODE SECTION 503(b)(9) DOES NOT REDUCE CREDITOR'S SUBSEQUENT  
NEW VALUE DEFENSE TO PREFERENCE LAWSUIT, CIRCUIT COURT RULES**

Andrew M. Troop and Andrew V. Alfano

**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK HOLDS THAT BANKRUPTCY CODE SAFE HARBORS  
PROTECT AGAINST FOREIGN LAW AVOIDANCE CLAIMS UNDER CHAPTER 15**

Casey Servais

**A STUNNING OPINION ON "DUNNING" LETTERS: REVISED OPINION FOLLOWING REVIEW**

Steven J. Brotman and Dale A. Evans Jr.

**FINANCIAL CONDUCT AUTHORITY'S EXPECTATIONS FOR REGULATED FIRM  
RESTRUCTURINGS AND INSOLVENCIES**

Sonya Van de Graaff, Prav Reddy, Mark Johnson, Dominique Hodgson and Georgina Vale



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

---

VOLUME 19

NUMBER 2

February–March 2023

---

**Editor's Note: Crypto Crisis**

Victoria Prussen Spears

51

**Crypto Platforms in Crisis: Bankruptcy Considerations—Part I**

Kenneth Aulet

54

**The Role of a Creditors' Committee to Investigate, Preserve and Pursue Causes of Action in Crypto Bankruptcies**

Jeffrey Cohen, Andrew Behlmann and Phillip Khezri

65

**Utilizing Structured Finance Techniques in Distressed Situations**

Michael L. Urschel, Roger G. Schwartz, Matthew Warren and Timothy W. Hoffmann

70

**All for One? Debt Co-Investors Need Not Behave as Musketeers**

Jason Ulezalka and Jonathan W. Young

78

**Postpetition Payment for Prepetition Delivery of Goods Under Bankruptcy Code Section 503(b)(9) Does Not Reduce Creditor's Subsequent New Value Defense to Preference Lawsuit, Circuit Court Rules**

Andrew M. Troop and Andrew V. Alfano

82

**Southern District of New York Holds That Bankruptcy Code Safe Harbors Protect Against Foreign Law Avoidance Claims Under Chapter 15**

Casey Servais

86

**A Stunning Opinion on “Dunning” Letters: Revised Opinion Following Review**

Steven J. Brotman and Dale A. Evans Jr.

91

**Financial Conduct Authority's Expectations for Regulated Firm Restructurings and Insolvencies**

Sonya Van de Graaff, Prav Reddy, Mark Johnson, Dominique Hodgson and Georgina Vale

94

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Ryan D. Kearns, J.D., at ..... 513.257.9021  
Email: ..... ryan.kearns@lexisnexis.com  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

**Example:** Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2023)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**SCOTT L. BAENA**

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP*

**ANDREW P. BROZMAN**

*Clifford Chance US LLP*

**MICHAEL L. COOK**

*Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP*

**MARK G. DOUGLAS**

*Jones Day*

**MARK J. FRIEDMAN**

*DLA Piper*

**STUART I. GORDON**

*Rivkin Radler LLP*

**PATRICK E. MEARS**

*Barnes & Thornburg LLP*

*Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law* is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

# A Stunning Opinion on “Dunning” Letters: Revised Opinion Following Review

*By Steven J. Brotman and Dale A. Evans Jr.\**

*The authors discuss a recent en banc opinion by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit that allows debt collectors to continue utilizing third-party vendors to mail correspondence, including dunning letters, to consumers.*

In a recently issued revised opinion, an en banc panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has reversed 2021’s controversial opinion that potentially spelled trouble for debt collectors utilizing third-party vendors to prepare and mail correspondence to consumers.

## BACKGROUND

In 2021, the Eleventh Circuit released *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Services, Inc.*,<sup>1</sup> in which the court reviewed a debtor’s Article III standing as well as a debt collector’s liability under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) for communications with a third party.

Of particular significance was the court’s holding that the debt collector’s transmission of a debtor’s information to a third-party vendor that created and mailed “dunning” letters—a notice to a debtor of an overdue payment—was a violation of the FDCPA.

Following a petition for rehearing, the review of amicus curiae briefs, and the U.S. Supreme Court’s intervening decision in *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*,<sup>2</sup> the Eleventh Circuit panel vacated its prior opinion and substituted it with a new opinion on October 28, 2021, *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Services, Inc.*<sup>3</sup>

While one judge from the original panel changed his position based on the analysis in *TransUnion*, the decision from the court remained the same: a debtor

---

\* Steven J. Brotman, an associate in the West Palm Beach office of Locke Lord LLP, focuses his practice on consumer finance, Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) class action and business litigation. Dale A. Evans Jr., a partner in the firm’s office in West Palm Beach, is a commercial litigator whose practice focuses on complex and class action lawsuits at the trial and appellate levels. The authors may be contacted at [steven.brotman@lockelord.com](mailto:steven.brotman@lockelord.com) and [dale.evans@lockelord.com](mailto:dale.evans@lockelord.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Services, Inc.*, 994 F.3d 1341 (11th Cir. 2021).

<sup>2</sup> *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 141 S. Ct. 2190 (2021).

<sup>3</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Services, Inc.*, 17 F.4th 1016 (11th Cir. 2021).

had Article III standing to maintain a lawsuit against a debt collector for the alleged provision of a debtor's sensitive information to a third-party vendor in connection with the collection of a debt. The court followed the same test articulated by *TransUnion* in its determination of standing: that a plaintiff's asserted harm must be of the same "kind, not degree" as a protected legal interest at common law. While the dissent agreed that *TransUnion's* "kind, not degree" analysis was appropriate, it did not agree that the allegations in *Hunstein* passed muster.

On November 17, 2021, the Eleventh Circuit vacated the substitute opinion and agreed to reconsider en banc whether a debt collector's transmission of private debtor information to its mail vendor violated the FDCPA.<sup>4</sup>

## THE DECISION

Following oral arguments, the en banc panel, in *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*,<sup>5</sup> held that the debtor did not have standing because "a bare procedural violation of the statute was not enough, at least on its own, to establish concrete injury."

Using the same approach as the Supreme Court in *TransUnion*, the panel compared the elements of the alleged statutory violation with those of an existing tort claim. Though the debtor did not identify any specific harm in his complaint, he argued to the panel that the debt collector's act caused a concrete injury because it was analogous to the common-law tort of public disclosure.

The panel, however, held that the debtor's theory lacked the express requirement of "disclosure" to the public." Without publicity, the court held, "a disclosure cannot possibly cause the sort of reputational harm remediated at the common law."

Calling the analysis of Hunstein's claims "an exercise in simplicity," the panel held that simply providing information regarding a debt to a mail vendor to prepare and mail a letter on the debt collector's behalf does not constitute the publicity of the information necessary for the common law tort—no matter how personal—to the public at large.

The panel's decision, however, was not unanimous. The dissent urged the "eminently reasonable inference" that the employees of the mail vendor must have read, and thus received, Hunstein's private information.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Services, Inc.*, 17 F.4th 1103 (11th Cir. 2021).

<sup>5</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, No. 19-14434 (11th Cir. 2022).

But at oral argument, however, Hunstein’s counsel failed to resonate that argument and only argued the employees had “access” to the information, not that they actually read or perceived the information.

## CONCLUSION

The en banc opinion allows debt collectors to continue utilizing third-party vendors to mail correspondence, including dunning letters, to consumers. It is unclear, however, whether a consumer could survive a motion to dismiss with more detailed allegations regarding damages and the extent to which an employee of the mail vendor accesses or reviews private information to prepare written correspondence.

But, the Supreme Court and the Eleventh Circuit have consistently dismissed lawsuits based on bare statutory violations.<sup>6</sup>

Clearly, consumers will need to move the needle much further to avoid dismissal for lack of standing in lawsuits based merely on statutory violations.

Lenders and loan servicers that continue using mail vendors to communicate with customers should continue to ensure that proper safeguards are in place to prevent disclosure to the general public and should ensure that both their internal policies and those maintained by their mail vendors prevent the unauthorized disclosure of private information.

---

<sup>6</sup> See *TransUnion, Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 342 (2016); *Thole v. U. S. Bank N.A.*, 140 S. Ct. 1615, 1620 (2020); *Muransky v. Godiva Chocolatier, Inc.*, 979 F.3d 917, 930 (11th Cir. 2020).