

1
2 **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ENTERED 7/26/05
FILED
JUL 26 2005
CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
DEPUTY
104

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re
LYON'S OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
Debtor.

Bankruptcy No. 01-10624-JM
Memorandum Decision

I. Overview

This dispute concerns the objection filed by Lyon's of California, Inc., as the reorganized debtor ("Debtor"), to the claim of the State Compensation Insurance Fund ("State Fund"), which concerns workers' compensation insurance provided to the Debtor. The Debtor filed its petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code ("Code") on October 12, 2001.

There are two workers' compensation insurance policies involved in this case. The first policy ("First Policy") insured the Debtor from March 13, 2001 to November 27, 2001. The second policy ("Second Policy") covers the period from September 30, 2002 to November 24, 2003.

1 On March 14, 2002, the Debtor served all creditors with notice
2 of a claims bar date. The bar date was May 3, 2002. In response,
3 State Fund filed a proof of claim ("Claim No. 397") on May 1, 2002.
4 It asserted a prepetition, unsecured, priority claim in the amount of
5 \$460,560.87 for the time period between March 13, 2001 to October 12,
6 2001. Claim No. 397 made no mention of any debt owed for the time
7 period from October 12, 2001 (the date the petition was filed) and
8 November 27, 2001 (when the First Policy expired). There were no
9 documents attached to the proof of claim.

10 On August 15, 2002, the Debtor served creditors, including State
11 Fund, with notice of the bar date for administrative claims ("First
12 Administrative Claims Bar Date"). This bar date was September 30,
13 2002, and it applied to all administrative claims that might have
14 arisen between the date of the filing of the petition date, October
15 12, 2001, and April 30, 2002.

16 On August 22, 2002, State Fund filed another proof of claim
17 (Claim No. 456), again asserting an unsecured, priority claim. State
18 Fund checked off on the form that Claim No. 456 amended the prior
19 claim. The amended amount of the claim was \$601,053.14. State Fund
20 left blank the space provided for "Date debt was incurred" on Claim
21 No. 456. Nothing on the face of Claim 456 indicated that State Fund
22 was including an administrative claim along with its earlier asserted
23 unsecured prepetition claim.

24 State Fund attached five pages of documents to Claim No. 456.
25 On only one of those pages was there any indication that the claim
26 might cover a period of time that included insurance coverage
27 postpetition. That page listed a "Report/Audit Period" as October 1,
28 2001 to November 27, 2001, and indicated the amount for the total

1 premium was for "10/01/01 - 11/27/01."

2 An order setting a second administrative claims bar date ("Second
3 Administrative Claims Bar Date") was entered on October 22, 2002. The
4 order required the filing of administrative claims incurred from May
5 1, 2002, through October 15, 2002, to be filed by December 2, 2002.
6 On October 24, 2002, the Debtor served creditors with its "Notice of
7 Second Administrative Claims Bar Date." The address listed for State
8 Fund in the proof of service did not match the address provided by
9 State Fund in either Claim No. 397 or Claim No. 456.

10 The order confirming the Debtor's Second Amended Plan of
11 Reorganization ("Plan") was entered on February 3, 2003. Pursuant to
12 the Plan, the effective date was 60 days after the order confirming
13 the Plan became final. That order became final on February 14, 2003,
14 and therefore, the effective date was April 15, 2003.

15 The Debtor filed its objection to State Fund's claim on July 14,
16 2003. The Debtor objected to the accounting and to State Fund's
17 assertion it was entitled to priority for a portion of its claim.

18 On August 7, 2003, State Fund filed two proofs of claim. One
19 claim, no. 521 (Claim No. 521), changed the amount of the unsecured,
20 priority claim to \$426,815.49, and included a general, unsecured claim
21 in the amount of \$52,457.61. State Fund indicated that the debt was
22 incurred between March 13, 2001 and October 12, 2001, which mirrored
23 the dates provided in Claim No. 397, the first proof of claim.

24 In the other claim, No. 520 (Claim No. 520), State Fund asserted
25 for the first time that it had an administrative claim for the period
26 between October 12, 2001 and November 27, 2001. The amount of the
27 claim was set at \$106,780.04.

28 State Fund filed two more proofs of claim on January 12, 2004.

1 On Claim No. 525 ("Claim No. 525") State Fund apparently looked to
2 amend its original unsecured claim. It stated that the pertinent debt
3 had been incurred between March 13, 2001 and October 12, 2002. It is
4 unclear whether the date of October 12, 2002 is a typographical error,
5 intended to be October 12, 2001, the date of the petition. In any
6 case, State Fund asserted a priority claim of \$426,815.49, and an
7 unsecured debt of \$52,457.71, for a total claim of \$479,273.10.

8 In the other claim filed on that date, claim no. 526 ("Claim No.
9 526"), State Fund stated that the claim was for a postpetition
10 administrative claim. It stated that the debt represented in Claim
11 No. 526 was incurred between October 12, 2001 and November 27, 2001
12 and between September 30, 2002 and November 25, 2003. This was the
13 first proof of claim in which State Fund sought payment based on the
14 Second Policy. The amount of the claim was \$447,479.72.

15 Then, on May 28, 2004, State Fund filed its last two proofs of
16 claim. It stated that claim no. 527 ("Claim No. 527") was for the
17 period from March 13, 2001 to October 12, 2002. The claim was
18 characterized as an unsecured claim, with \$426,815.49 allegedly
19 entitled to be treated as a priority claim and \$52,457.61 as general
20 unsecured claim.

21 In claim no. 528 ("Claim No. 528"), State Fund asserted a debt
22 allegedly incurred between October 12, 2001 and November 27, 2001, and
23 also between September 30, 2002 and November 24, 2003. The amount
24 claimed was \$483,906.93. Claim No. 528 increased the amount stated
25 in Claim No. 526, and mirrored it in all other respects.

26 To summarize the various claims filed, Claim Nos. 397, 456, 521,
27 525 and 527 were all for prepetition unsecured claims. Claim Nos.
28 520, 526 and 528 specifically requested payment of an administrative

1 claim. Claim No. 520 only concerned the First Policy, while Claim
2 Nos. 526 and 528 included claims for both policies.

3 II. Late Filed Administrative Claim under First Policy

4 The bar date for unsecured creditors was May 3, 2002. Claim No.
5 397, which was filed on May 1, 2002, was timely filed. The First
6 Administrative Claims Bar Date was September 30, 2002. Claim No. 456,
7 filed on August 22, 2002, was timely filed relative only to the First
8 Administrative Claims Bar Date. All other proofs of claim were
9 untimely filed.

10 The first issue concerns whether the late filed proofs of claim
11 relate back to a timely filed proof of claim, and as such, can be
12 treated as timely filed. Specifically, the question is whether Claim
13 Nos. 520, 526 and/or 528, wherein State Fund asserted an
14 administrative claim based on the First Policy, could be said to
15 relate back in time to Claim No. 397 or Claim No. 456.

16 State Fund contends that the Debtor had to know of the workers'
17 compensation insurance being provided postpetition and, given that
18 knowledge, the timely proofs of claim put the Debtor on notice that
19 it had a right to an administrative claim, even if the claims
20 themselves failed to specifically use the term "administrative claim."
21 In other words, according to State Fund, the Debtor and creditors
22 should not have relied on how the State Fund itself characterized the
23 claim, but should have done an independent analysis of the claim,
24 which allegedly would have shown the debt, at least in part, was
25 incurred postpetition.

26 The Debtor contends that the recharacterization of the claim from
27 an unsecured claim with priority to an administrative claim amounts
28 to the filing of a new claim. Consequently, it argues that the

1 proofs of claim for the administrative claim were not timely filed and
2 should be denied on that basis. It also argues that allowing the
3 amendment would be inequitable because the estate is administratively
4 insolvent and administrative claimholders who filed timely claims
5 would be prejudice if State Fund's claim is allowed. The Debtor
6 asserts that State Fund knew of the bar date, that it filed a claim
7 and could have filed a proper claim in the first instance. It also
8 argues that the Debtor and creditors relied on the characterization
9 of the claim as unsecured in proposing and voting on the confirmed
10 plan and that creditors would be prejudiced now if the amendment were
11 allowed. It also contends that State Fund has not provided any reason
12 why the administrative claim was late filed.

13 Allowing an amendment to a claim is within the sound discretion
14 of the Court. In re Roberts Farms Inc., 980 F.2d 1248 (9th Cir. 1992)
15 and In re Wilson, 96 B.R. 257, 263 (9th Cir. BAP 1988). The Court
16 considers whether the amendment would result in any undue prejudice
17 and whether there is some justification for State Fund's failure to
18 file a proper claim within the limitations period. In determining the
19 prejudicial effect the Court will look to such elements as bad faith
20 or unreasonable delay in filing the amendment, impact on other
21 claimants, reliance by the debtor or other creditors and change of the
22 debtor's position. Wilson, 96 B.R. at 262.

23 State Fund did not specifically assert an administrative claim
24 until it filed Claim No. 520 on August 7, 2003. This was more than
25 a year after the First Administrative Claims Bar Date. It was also
26 six months after the plan of reorganization was confirmed.
27 Additionally, State Fund did not raise the prospect of an
28 administrative claim until the Debtor filed an objection to State

1 Fund's unsecured, priority claim. The Court finds that this was an
2 unreasonable delay in filing Claim No. 520. Furthermore, State Fund
3 has not offered any justification for the delay in filing that claim.

4 Additionally, allowing Claim No. 520 to relate back to the timely
5 filed claims would prejudice creditors. The Debtor provided an
6 estimate of the amount of administrative claims prior to confirmation
7 of the Plan. The \$106,780.04 set forth in Claim No. 520 represents
8 nearly a 10% increase in the administrative class. Administrative
9 creditors were entitled to payment in full upon the effective date
10 pursuant Code Section 1129(a)(9)(A). However, they consented to
11 receiving payment over time under the Plan. Those payments are to be
12 made on a pro rata basis from various sources. Allowing State Fund's
13 late filed administrative claim will undoubtedly create delays in
14 payment to other administrative creditors, and any delay could
15 increase the risk on non-payment to such creditors.

16 State Fund contends that its timely claims provided adequate
17 notice to the Debtor and any creditors of its right to assert an
18 administrative claim, despite State Fund not characterizing it as
19 such. However, a party in interest reviewing the claims registry
20 would not have had any reason to know State Fund was entitled to an
21 administrative claim based on Claim No. 397 or Claim No. 456.

22 On Claim No. 456, State Fund set forth that the debt was incurred
23 prepetition. On its face there was nothing in the claim to indicate
24 that State Fund sought payment on a postpetition debt. Additionally,
25 State Fund failed to provide a date for when the debt was incurred on
26 Claim No. 456. Also, State Fund did not attach any documents to Claim
27 No. 397. Furthermore, the only page attached to Claim No. 456 that
28 arguably suggested State Fund had a claim for postpetition insurance

1 coverage made reference to a period of time that was both prepetition
2 as well as postpetition. Therefore, it was too ambiguous to stand as
3 the only basis for State Fund's assertion that its proof of claim gave
4 notice of its alleged administrative claim.

5 The Court rejects State Fund's contention that adequate notice
6 was provided to the Debtor and the other creditors that it was
7 entitled to an administrative claim. Claim No. 520, in which State
8 Fund first explicitly sought payment for an administrative claim for
9 the period from October 12, 2001 to November 27, 2001 was a new claim,
10 and does not relate back to earlier filed claims. See Matter of
11 Alliance Operating Corp., 60 F.3d 1174, 1175 (5th Cir. 1995)(amendment
12 to a proof of claim, which changed the nature of the claim from
13 unsecured to priority status, set forth a new claim and could not
14 relate back to a previously filed claim); In re Metro Transportation
15 Company, 117 B.R. 143, 148 (E.Pa. 1990)(attempt to reclassify claim
16 is actually an attempt to file a new claim). Claim Nos. 526 and 528
17 did nothing more than amend Claim 520. Therefore, the Court will
18 disallow State Fund's claim for an administrative claim based on the
19 First Policy as set forth in Claim Nos. 520, 526 and 528.

20 III. Claim under Second Policy up to Date of Confirmation

21 The next issue concerns the extent to which State Fund is
22 entitled to an administrative claim flowing from the Second Policy.
23 The Second Policy did not become effective until September 30, 2002.
24 There seems to be some confusion regarding the applicable bar date.
25 In its pleadings, the Debtor contended that State Fund could have met
26 the First Administrative Claims Bar Date of September 30, 2002. At
27 the hearing, counsel for the Debtor reversed course and stated that
28 State Fund should have an administrative claim for unpaid premiums

1 from the date of the inception of the Second Policy until the date the
2 plan was confirmed, in other words, from September 30, 2002 until
3 February 3, 2003, because the Second Policy became effective on the
4 same day as the First Administrative Claims Bar Date. In other words,
5 State Fund could hardly have filed its claim based on the Second
6 Policy before the First Administrative Claims Bar Date when the Second
7 Policy did not even become effective until the date of the First
8 Administrative Claims Bar Date itself.

9 The Debtor never made any mention of the Second Administrative
10 Claims Bar Date. That bar date applied to administrative claims
11 incurred from May 1, 2002, through October 15, 2002. Such claims
12 needed to be filed by December 2, 2002. Arguably State Fund should
13 have filed its claim under the Second Policy by December 2, 2002. The
14 Debtor had ample opportunity to raise this issue, but failed to do so.
15 Therefore, the argument is waived. This may be just as well since it
16 appears that the Debtor, by not using the address provided by State
17 Fund on its initial proofs of claim, failed to properly serve State
18 Fund with notice of the Second Administrative Claims Bar Date.
19 Consequently, State Fund is allowed an administrative claim for
20 premiums due from September 30, 2002, until February 3, 2003. The
21 Court now turns to the question of whether State Fund is also allowed
22 an administrative claim under the Second Policy after February 3,
23 2003.

24 IV. Post Confirmation Administrative Claim

25 The remaining issue is whether State Fund can seek compensation
26 from the estate for premiums due after confirmation of the plan of
27 reorganization. The Debtor contends that any further responsibility
28 on behalf of the estate for the premiums due was barred once the plan

1 was confirmed. State Fund contends that it calculated the
2 postpetition amounts due using the Debtor's own books and records,
3 suggesting that this shows that the Debtor continued to benefit from
4 the workers' compensation insurance being provided, either directly
5 or indirectly. It specifically contends that "workers' compensation
6 insurance was absolutely necessary for the operation of Debtor's
7 restaurants throughout Chapter 11 reorganization and throughout the
8 implementation of the Liquidating Plan over which this Court has
9 continuing jurisdiction." State Fund's Response to Supplemental Brief
10 of Debtor Re Objection to Claim, filed January 19, 2005.

11 State Fund has not made it clear under what Code Section it seeks
12 payment as an administrative claim for coverage under the Second
13 Policy. Presumably it seeks payment pursuant to Section 503(b)(1).
14 Under that Section, "any claim for administrative expenses and costs
15 must be the actual and necessary costs of preserving the estate for
16 the benefit of its creditors." In re Dant & Russell, Inc., 853 F.2d
17 700, 706 (9th Cir. 1988). The court in Dant & Russell further stated:

18 two factors must be weighed: maintaining the estate in as
19 healthy a form as possible for the benefit of creditors
20 while allowing essential costs of administering an ongoing
21 business venture to be paid up front, thereby giving the
22 debtor its best shot at emerging as a vital concern.
23 Baldwin-United Corp., 43 B.R. at 452. Although a claim may
24 meet the implicit requirement of section 503(b)(1)(A),
25 namely that any claims under the section must have a
26 distinct postpetition character, bankruptcy courts have
27 broad discretion in determining whether to award
28 administrative expense priority. Baldwin-United Corp., 43
B.R. at 453; Matter of Hearth & Hinge, Inc., 28 B.R. 595
(Bankr.S.D.Ohio 1983) (administrative expense priority
granted where storage and appraisal of the debtor's
property protected and preserved the major portion of the
estate's assets and thus conferred a benefit upon the
debtor and its creditors). That discretion is limited by
the clear intent of section 503(b)(1)(A): the actual and
necessary costs of preserving the estate. See Matter of
Jartran, Inc., 732 F.2d 584 at 586 (7th Cir. 1984).

1 In making its argument that the estate should not be liable to
2 State Fund post-confirmation, the Debtor pointed out that under
3 paragraph 12.1 of the Plan, the property of the estate vested in the
4 Reorganized Debtor on the effective date of the Plan. The Debtor
5 asserts that State Fund could proceed against the Reorganized Debtor
6 for post-confirmation premiums.

7 However, the Court finds that paragraph 12.1 justifies awarding
8 State Fund a portion of its claim post-confirmation because until the
9 property vested in the Reorganized Debtor the estate had an interest
10 in maintaining workers' compensation insurance. The Court is
11 satisfied that the workers' compensation insurance provided by State
12 Fund was an actual and necessary expense of preserving the estate for
13 the benefit of creditors up until the effective date of the Plan. The
14 effective date under the Plan was April 15, 2003. Therefore, State
15 Fund is allowed an administrative claim under the Second Policy from
16 September 30, 2002, until April 15, 2003.

17 V. Summary

18 State Fund asserted an administrative claim in Claim Nos. 520,
19 526 and 528. The Court rejects State Fund's argument that those
20 claims should relate back in time to a timely filed claim. Therefore,
21 the Court denies State Fund's administrative claim based on the First
22 Policy as late filed.

23 Claims No. 526 and 528 also included a request for the payment
24 of an administrative claim based on the Second Policy. The Debtor
25 conceded that State Fund was entitled to an administrative claim from
26 the time the policy started, September 30, 2002, until the
27 confirmation date. Additionally, the Court determines that since the
28 property of the estate did not vest in the Reorganized Debtor until


1 the effective date of April 15, 2003, that the estate benefitted from
2 the Second Policy until that date. Therefore, State Fund is allowed
3 an administrative claim based on the Second Policy from September 30,
4 2002, until April 15, 2003. Counsel for the parties shall meet and
5 confer to determine if they can agree on a dollar amount for this
6 portion of State Fund's administrative claim. The remainder of State
7 Fund's claim under the Second Policy (from April 16, 2003 until
8 November 24, 2003) is disallowed as against the bankruptcy estate.

9 Counsel for the Reorganized Debtor shall file an order consistent
10 with this Memorandum Decision within 21 days of the entry of this
11 Decision.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JUL 26 2005

Date: _____



Hon. James W. Meyers
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE