1	EDICA NVDEDC EGO (D. N. 121105)	
1 2	ERIC A. NYBERG, ESQ. (Bar No. 131105) CHRIS D. KUHNER, ESQ. (Bar No. 173291) KORNFIELD, PAUL & NYBERG, P.C.	
3	1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2675 Oakland, California 94612	
4	Telephone: (510) 763-1000 Facsimile: (510) 273-8669	
5	Attorneys for Fred and Linda Koelling	
6		
7	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	In re	Case No. 04-41044 T Chapter 11
11	QMECT, INC., etc.,	•
12	Debtor-in-Possession.	
13	In re	Case No. 04-46443 T Chapter 11
14	FRED AND LINDA KOELLING,	
15 16	Debtor-in-Possession.	
17	QMECT, INC., etc.,	A.P. No. 04-4190 AT A.P. No. 04-4365 AT
18	Plaintiffs,	A.P. No. 04-4366 AT
19	vs.	(Consolidated)
20	BURLINGAME CAPITAL PARTNERS II,	
21	L.P., etc. et al.,	SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDED MOTION FOR RECOVERY OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS
22	Defendants.	
23	And Related Adversary Proceedings	
24		Date: TBA Time:TBA
25		Ctrm:201 United States Bankruptcy Court
26		1300 Clay Street Oakland, California
27		Canianu, Camoi ma
28		
	Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Amended Motion for Recovery of Attorneys' Fees and Costs	

Fred and Linda Koelling, Chapter 11 Debtors-In-Possession in the above-referenced Chapter 11 bankruptcy case (the "Koellings"), hereby submit this supplemental brief in opposition to the Amended Motion for Recovery of Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Amended Motion") filed by Burlingame Capital Partners II, L.P. ("Burlingame"). The purpose of this supplemental opposition is to provide the Court with the Koellings' arguments in light of the United States Supreme Court's ruling in <u>Travelers Casualty</u> & Surety Co. of America v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 127 S. Ct. 1199 (2007).

I. The Supreme Court's Ruling In <u>Travelers</u> Eliminates Any Basis For Fees To Be Awarded To Burlingame.

In <u>Travelers</u>, the Supreme Court of the United States overruled <u>In re Fobian</u>, 951 F. 2d 1149, 1159 (9th Cir. 1991). Fobian held that an unsecured creditor could recover post-petition attorneys fees, but to only recover those fees incurred litigating non-bankruptcy issues. The ruling in <u>Travelers</u> eliminates the so called "Fobian Rule," but did not rule post-petition fees are recoverable by an unsecured creditor.

Without the authority of Fobian¹, Burlingame has no basis to recover any post-petition fees. It was only under the "Fobian Rule" which allowed for the recovery of post-petition fees incurred litigating non-bankruptcy related matters. As will been seen below, there is no other basis under the Bankruptcy Code for the recovery of post-petition attorneys fees by an unsecured or under secured creditor.

It is undisputed that Burlingame is an under secured creditor. Through its Amended Motion, Burlingame is attempting to leap frog other unsecured or under secured creditors and recover post-

¹In fact, Burlingame concedes in its reply that <u>Fobian</u> is the basis for its fee request. <u>See</u> Burlingame's Reply Brief, page 3, lines 10-13 ("The Amended Motion is based on In re Fobian, as outlined by the Court's Memorandum and Order, and other related and applicable 9th Circuit authority")

petition collection costs incurred in this bankruptcy. Without the "Fobian Rule," in order to achieve this unfair and extraordinary result, Burlingame must look to some other authority for this request.

As this Court previously stated in its Memorandum of Order Denying Motion for Post-Petition Attorneys Fee Without Prejudice ("Memorandum Re: Post-Petition Attorneys Fees") entered on November 16, 2006, "if an unsecured creditor is entitled to include its post-petition attorneys fees in its claim, what is the need for Section 506(b)?"²

Although Burlingame has argued that it is not making the fee request under Section 506(b), that is the sole basis upon which it could bring the Amended Motion post <u>Travelers</u>.

11 U.S.C. Section 506(b) provides as follows:

"(b) to the extent that an allowed secured claim is secured by property the value of which is greater than the amount of such claim, there shall be allowed to the holder of such claim, interest on such claim, and reasonable fees, costs or charges provided for under which such claim arose."

In this provision, the Congress specifically provided that contractual attorneys fees are allowed for a creditor whose claim is secured by collateral that is more valuable than the debt owed. Clearly, this means that Congress intended that if the claim was not secured, that you would not be entitled to attorneys fees. Any other reading makes 11 U.S.C. Section 506(b) superfluous, which would go in contravention of the directive that statutes are to be read to give them meaning to every word. <u>Duncan v. Walker</u>, 533 U.S. 167, 174 (2001). In other words, if all creditors, unsecured, under secured, and over secured, were allowed a claim for contractual post-petition attorneys fees by virtue of Section 502(b), then Section 506(b) would serve no purpose.

²Memorandum Re: Post-Petition Attorneys Fee, Page 4 - Footnote 2

Again, there are cases in the Ninth Circuit which support such a reading. These cases include, among others, Kord Enterprises II v. California Commerce Bank, (In re Kord Enterprises II, 139 F. 3d. 684, 687 (9th Cir. 1998). In this case, the Court held that under 11 U.S.C. 506(b), a creditor is only entitled to attorneys fees in a bankruptcy case if: (1) the claim is an allowed secured claim; (2) the creditor is over secured; (3) the fees are reasonable; and (4) the fees are provided for under the agreement. Other cases cited in the Opposition to Burlingame Capital Partners II, L.P.'s Amended Motion for Recovery of Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Opposition to Amended Motion") have similar holdings. Since it is not disputed that Burlingame is an under secured creditor, Burlingame can not meet the elements set forth in 11 U.S.C. Section 506(b).

By overruling In re Fobian, the Supreme Court strengthen the Koellings argument and weakened Burlingame's argument. Specifically, with In re Fobian, Burlingame had at least an argument under Ninth Circuit case law (not statutory law) to request post-petition fees relating to the litigation of non-bankruptcy issues. The overruling of In re Fobian removes that authority and Burlingame must rely on the statutory frame work in the Bankruptcy Code. The only provisions for Burlingame to rely upon are 11 U.S.C. Sections 502 and 506. As set forth above, those sections clearly preclude under secured creditors from recovering post-petition fees, whether they incurred litigating bankruptcy or non-bankruptcy issues.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Koellings request that the Court deny the Amended Motion in full.

Dated: April 26, 2007 KORNFIELD, PAUL & NYBERG, P.C.

By: Chris D. Kuhner /s/
(Bar No. 173291)
Attorneys for Fred and Linda Koelling

Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Amended Motion for Recovery of Attorneys' Fees and Costs -4- Amended Motion for 9:17 am

DECLARATION OF SERVICE 1 2 I, the undersigned, declare: 3 I am employed in the City of Oakland, County of Alameda, California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action. My business address is 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2675, Oakland, 4 California 94612. 5 I am readily familiar with the business practices of my employer, Kornfield, Paul & Nyberg, 6 P.C., for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal 7 Service and that correspondence is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. 8 On April 27, 2007, I served the following document(s): 9 SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDED MOTION FOR RECOVERY OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS 10 by placing copies of said document(s) in sealed envelope(s) and served in the manner or manners 11 described below addressed as follows: 12 Robert R. Moore, Esq. William Huckins, Esq. Marlene M. Moffitt, Esq. Allen, Matkins, Leck, Gamble, Mallory & 13 14 Natsis, LLP 15 Three Embarcadero Center, 12th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-4074 16 I placed such envelope(s) for collection and mailing at my employer's office following ordinary business 17 practices, addressed to the addressee(s) designated. 18 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 27th day of April, 2007 at Oakland, California. 19 20 Gail M. Aviles /s/ 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Amended Motion for Recovery of Attorneys' Fees and Costs