



## Financial Restructuring & Reorganization ADVISORY ■

**MAY 8, 2020**

### Delaware Courts Leery of Shareholder Obstruction

---

“Blocking rights”—corporate governance provisions designed to prevent management from putting a company in a Chapter 11 case without certain stockholders’ consent—have increasingly been the focus of bankruptcy courts across the country. On May 5, 2020, Judge Mary Walrath of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware refused to dismiss a corporate debtor’s pending bankruptcy case on account of the debtor’s failure to seek the consent of a stockholder with blocking rights.

Pace Industries, an Arkansas-based manufacturer of aluminum, zinc, and die cast and major supplier to the auto industry, sought Chapter 11 protection on April 12 in the District of Delaware, along with 10 affiliated entities (*In re Pace Industries*, No. 1:20-bk-10927). Leading up to the bankruptcy filing, Pace was experiencing severe liquidity issues to the extent that it had a mere \$150,000 in cash at the time of filing. Still, Pace and its affiliates entered bankruptcy already proposing a prepackaged plan that would restructure approximately \$324 million in debt, primarily through a debt-for-equity swap.

Five days after the bankruptcy petition was filed, the majority shareholder sought to dismiss the bankruptcy case because Pace did not obtain the shareholder’s consent before seeking Chapter 11 protection. In its motion to dismiss, the shareholder alleged that its stock purchase agreement gave it the right to approve or veto any bankruptcy or liquidation filings in exchange for its equity infusion.

In its objection to the motion to dismiss, the company argued that circumstances such as Pace’s allowed a company to seek bankruptcy protection without the shareholder’s consent because enforcing the right would conflict with the important public policy of assuring companies can seek federal bankruptcy relief when needed or when it would be inequitable. Pace further alleged that the shareholder’s attempt to block the bankruptcy filing was actually aimed at achieving leverage in its negotiations with the debtor’s lenders.

At the hearing, the debtor’s position was supported by the agent for its \$232.1 million in secured notes. The agent emphasized at the hearing that, were the court to rule for the shareholder, the agent and other creditors were prepared to immediately launch an involuntary Chapter 11 proceeding, which would ultimately place the debtor back in the same position.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

At the hearing, the shareholder pointed the court to the recent Fifth Circuit ruling on a similar issue where it concluded that an investor was not prevented from exercising its blocking rights to stop the corporation from seeking bankruptcy protection. Judge Walrath indicated that she “respectfully would decline to follow that case.” She stated further, “I do believe, under Delaware state law, contrary to the Fifth Circuit, my interpretation of the law would and does find that blocking rights, such as exercised in the circumstances of this case, would create a fiduciary duty on the part of the shareholder.”

Judge Walrath ultimately sided with the debtor and the agent to its secured lenders, holding that the shareholder’s blocking rights provision “violates public policy and is void.”

Due to COVID-19 and the state of the global economy, many companies are considering or are currently engaging in the process of a bankruptcy filing. Companies with blocking rights governance provisions (and the stockholders that enjoy those rights) should carefully examine the outcome of this ruling to determine whether their provision is enforceable. Similarly, any lender that has obtained or intends to require the issuance of an authority to file an opinion, analyzing the interplay of state-based corporate law and federal bankruptcy law with the authority needed to commence a bankruptcy case, should carefully consider whether bankruptcy courts will follow Judge Walrath’s ruling.

Alston & Bird has formed a multidisciplinary [task force](#) to advise clients on the business and legal implications of the coronavirus (COVID-19). You can [view all our work](#) on the coronavirus across industries and [subscribe](#) to our future webinars and advisories.

You can subscribe to future **Financial Restructuring & Reorganization** advisories and other Alston & Bird publications by completing our [publications subscription form](#).

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Gerard S. Catalanello  
212.210.9509  
gerard.catalanello@alston.com

Diane C. Stanfield  
213.576.1039  
diane.stanfield@alston.com

Christopher K. Coleman  
404.881.4941  
chris.coleman@alston.com

William S. Sugden  
404.881.4778  
will.sugden@alston.com

Dennis J. Connolly  
404.881.7269  
212.905.9154  
dennis.connolly@alston.com

James J. Vincequerra  
212.210.9503  
james.vincequerra@alston.com

Jonathan T. Edwards  
404.881.4985  
212.905.9126  
jonathan.edwards@alston.com

John W. Weiss  
212.210.9412  
john.weiss@alston.com

William Hao  
212.210.9417  
william.hao@alston.com

David A. Wender  
404.881.7354  
david.wender@alston.com

Leib M. Lerner  
213.576.1193  
leib.lerner@alston.com

# ALSTON & BIRD

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2020

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777  
BEIJING: Hanwei Plaza West Wing ■ Suite 21B2 ■ No. 7 Guanghua Road ■ Chaoyang District ■ Beijing, 100004 CN ■ +86 10 8592 7500  
BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719  
CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111  
DALLAS: Chase Tower ■ 2200 Ross Avenue ■ Suite 2300 ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899  
LONDON: 5th Floor, Octagon Point, St. Paul's ■ 5 Cheapside ■ London, EC2V 6AA, UK ■ +44.0.20.3823.2225  
LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213.576.1100  
NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 15th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444  
RALEIGH: 555 Fayetteville Street ■ Suite 600 ■ Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, 27601-3034 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260  
SAN FRANCISCO: 560 Mission Street ■ Suite 2100 ■ San Francisco, California, USA, 94105-0912 ■ 415.243.1000 ■ Fax: 415.243.1001  
SILICON VALLEY: 950 Page Mill Road ■ Palo Alto, California, USA, 94304 ■ 650-838-2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001  
WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.239.3300 ■ Fax: 202.239.3333