

Corporate M&A Advisor

October 2006

Deepening Insolvency—A Guide for Corporate Boards and Executive Officers

In recent years, officers and directors of bankrupt companies have increasingly become the target of lawsuits by bankruptcy trustees and creditors' committees on various breach of fiduciary duties grounds, aimed primarily to obtain recovery against the company's insurance policies. Included in that arsenal of claims is a deepening insolvency cause of action. Deepening insolvency is generally alleged in situations where fraudulent conduct regarding the disclosure of a company's true financial condition has occurred at a time when the company has incurred additional debt, which conduct causes a loss of company value—and thus harm to the company. As a result of such claims, an issue has developed whether the board of an insolvent company is protected by the business judgment rule when it elects to continue to operate the company in hopes of effecting a successful turn-around.

Deepening insolvency, or the fraudulent prolonging of an insolvent corporation's life through the incurrence of additional debt, first was recognized as a separate cause of action five years ago by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.¹ Since then, there has been a growing trend among federal courts in favor of such claims against officers and directors, as well as against a corporation's professional advisors. However,

in recent months the Delaware courts (both federal and state) have significantly limited, if not eliminated, the theory of deepening insolvency as an independent cause of action. Nevertheless, this rejection by the courts should not be read to absolve officers and directors of insolvent corporations of their responsibilities. Rather, a company's board and management still must operate on an informed basis and in good faith in exercising their fiduciary duties, including those duties to creditors that arise when the company enters or is in the "zone" or vicinity of insolvency.

A few months ago, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in *In re CitX Corp., Inc.*² shed some light regarding the breadth of the claim of deepening insolvency by finding, among other things, that: (i) mere negligence, without any bad act or fraudulent conduct, will not support a claim for deepening insolvency; (ii) claimants must show an injury to the corporation itself and not just to its creditors; and (iii) deepening insolvency is not an independent theory of damages. Despite the clarification, the Third Circuit did not rule on whether deepening insolvency was still a viable independent cause of action against a company's board and management.

Additionally, in a significant decision for Delaware corporations, in August 2006, the Delaware Court of Chancery in *Trenwick America Litigation Trust*³ became the first state court to weigh in on this issue and, to some courts' and commentators' surprise, rejected deepening insolvency as a separate cause of action under Delaware law. In so doing, the court made clear that Delaware law has never imposed an absolute obligation on an insolvent company's board to cease operations and liquidate. Indeed, the *Trenwick* court determined that the board may under such circumstances take actions, in good faith and with diligence, aimed at increasing company value, even if such actions require the incurrence of additional debt.⁴ Moreover, the court held that if such actions prove unsuccessful and the company's insolvency deepens, the board is protected by the business judgment rule.⁵

What does this mean going forward for officers and directors of an insolvent company? We suggest the following:

- The business judgment rule will afford protection where the actions of the directors and/or officers of an insolvent company are made on an informed basis and good-faith belief, even if the strategy proves fruitless and results in the continued insolvency of the company.
- Directors' fiduciary duties with respect to an insolvent company (or one that is in the "zone or vicinity of insolvency") do not require directors to automatically cease operations and to liquidate the company. Rather, such duties, whether the company is solvent, in the zone or vicinity of insolvency or insolvent, remain the same—to maximize the economic value of the corporation. What changes is to which constituency(ies) such duties of care and loyalty are primarily owed (e.g., once insolvent, the primary fiduciary duties run to creditors).
- The elimination of a separate "deepening insolvency" cause of action (under Delaware law) does not increase the protection afforded officers and directors. Rather, the financial condition of the company (i.e., insolvency) is likely to be a material factor in a court's determination whether the board's decision to incur additional debt at the time was undertaken with due care and fidelity and is otherwise protected by the business judgment rule.
- While the *Trenwick* decision is limited to Delaware law, and only binding in the Third Circuit, it serves as a rational guideline for directors and officers to follow in acting on behalf of an insolvent company and its constituencies and reaffirms that the proper means to examine the conduct of officers and directors, especially under workout situations, is the "traditional fiduciary duty rule."⁶
- Claims against officers and directors for deepening insolvency will likely continue, albeit they may be asserted under the context of a more traditional breach of fiduciary duty claim. The decisions recently issued by the Delaware courts, however, offer protection for actions undertaken within the board's business judgment.

¹ *Official Comm. of Unsec. Creditors v. R.F. Lafferty*, 276 F.3d 340 (3d Cir. 2001) (under Pennsylvania law).

² 448 F.3d 672 (3d Cir. 2006) (under Delaware law).

³ *Trenwick America Litigation Trust v. Ernst & Young L.L.P.*, 2006 WL 2434228, at 64 (Del. Ch. Aug. 10, 2006).

⁴ *Id.* at 62–63.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.* at 64.

Corporate M&A Advisor is published by the law firm of Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. It is intended to keep our clients and interested parties generally informed on developments in the Corporate M&A industry. It is not a substitute for professional advice.

© 2006 Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. Reproduction of this bulletin is permitted only with credit to Vedder Price.

If you have any questions regarding material in this issue of *Corporate M&A Advisor* or suggestions for a specific topic you would like addressed in a future issue, please contact the executive editor, Michael A. Nemeroff (Group Chair) at 312/609-7858 or at mnemeroff@vedderprice.com.

Authors: Michael Schein and Bridget A. Adaska. Mr. Schein can be reached at our New York office at 212/407-6920 (mschein@vedderprice.com).

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.

About Vedder Price

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. is a national full-service law firm with approximately 230 attorneys in Chicago, New York City, Washington, D.C. and Roseland, New Jersey.

The Finance and Transactions Group

The Finance and Transactions Group of Vedder Price actively represents publicly held and private corporations, financiers, leveraged buy-out firms, private equity funds, venture capitalists, lenders, and related parties in a broad range of matters, including mergers and acquisitions; equity and debt financing; mezzanine financing; venture capital; private equity investments; and related transactions.

Principal Members of the Finance and Transactions Group:

Chicago:

Michael A. Nemeroff (*Chair*)
 Robert J. Stucker
 Thomas P. Desmond
 John T. McEnroe
 Daniel O'Rourke
 Guy E. Snyder
 Douglas J. Lipke
 Thomas E. Schnur
 Dean N. Gerber
 John R. Obiala
 Jonathan H. Bogaard

Chicago

222 North LaSalle Street
 Chicago, Illinois 60601
 312/609-7500
 Fax: 312/609-5005

New York

805 Third Avenue
 New York, New York 10022
 212/407-7700
 Fax: 212/407-7799

Principal Members (*continued*)

William A. Kummerer
 Michael G. Beemer
 Robert J. Moran
 Dalius F. Vasys
 Daniel T. Sherlock
 Douglas M. Hambleton
 Richard L. Williams III
 Timothy W. O'Donnell
 Lane R. Moyer
 Jeffrey C. Davis
 Michael M. Eidelman
 Geoffrey R. Kass
 William J. Bettman
 Paul R. Hoffman
 John T. Blatchford
 Dana S. Armagno
 N. Paul Coyle
 Matthew T. O'Connor
 Peter J. Kelly
 Ernest W. Torain, Jr.
 Eric S. Prezant
 Eric J. Rietz
 Joseph H. Kye
 David P. Kaminski
 Adam S. Lewis
 Jennifer Durham King
 Kathryn L. Stevens
 James W. Morrissey

Leslie Allen Bayles
 Allen J. Gable
 Venu V. Talanki
 Nicholas S. Harned
 Marie H. Godush
 John M. Gall
 Magda M. Boyles
 Laura Carroll DeBolt
 J.L. Cherwin, Jr.
 David J. Borkon
 Earnest Gregory
 Eliza W. Hommel
 Bridget A. Adaska
 Dozie Okpalaobieri

New York and New Jersey:

Steven R. Berger
 Denise L. Blau
 John E. Bradley
 Michael J. Edelman
 John I. Karesh
 Francis X. Nolan III
 Michael Schein
 Ronald Scheinberg
 Donald A. Wassall
 Amy S. Berns
 Daniel Barlin

Washington, D.C.

888 16th Street, N.W., Suite 800
 Washington, D.C. 20006
 202/355-1395
 Fax: 202/349-1394

New Jersey

Five Becker Farm Road
 Roseland, New Jersey 07068
 973/597-1100
 Fax: 973/597-9607