

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
In re:

MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY, f/k/a  
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Chapter 11

Case No. 09-50026 (MG)  
(Jointly Administered)

Debtors.

-----X  
MOTORS LIQUIDATION COMPANY AVOIDANCE  
ACTION TRUST, by and through the Wilmington Trust  
Company, solely in its capacity as Trust Administrator and  
Trustee,

Adversary Proceeding

Plaintiff,

Case No. 09-00504 (MG)

against

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., *et al.*,

Defendants.  
-----X

**STIPULATION AND ORDER REGARDING  
FIXTURE CLASSIFICATION AND VALUATION**

**WHEREAS**, defendants were lenders to General Motors Corporation (“Old GM”) under a \$1.5 billion Term Loan Agreement and Collateral Agreement dated November 29, 2006 (as amended thereafter) (the “Term Loan”);

**WHEREAS**, among other disputes, the parties to the above-captioned action (the “**Action**”) dispute the scope and value of the collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a perfected security interest (the “Perfected Security Interest”);

**WHEREAS**, between April and June 2017, the Court held a trial in the Action as to the fixture classification and valuation of 40 representative assets selected by the parties (the “Representative Assets”), as well as certain additional representative disputes;

**WHEREAS**, on September 26, 2017, the Court issued a *Memorandum Opinion Regarding Fixture Classification and Valuation* (ECF No. 1015) (as corrected on October 4, 2017) (the “Memorandum Opinion”) in the Action deciding: (a) whether each of the Representative Assets was or was not a fixture, (b) the value of certain of the Representative Assets as of the agreed upon valuation date of June 30, 2009 (the “Valuation Date”), and (c) the additional representative disputes;

**WHEREAS**, since the Court issued the Memorandum Opinion, plaintiff and the Defendants’ Steering Committee have engaged in extensive negotiations as to the impact of the Memorandum Opinion on the parties’ pre-trial disputes regarding in which Old GM assets the Term Lenders had a Perfected Security Interest, as well as the value of those assets as of the Valuation Date;

**WHEREAS**, plaintiff and the undersigned defendants have reached certain agreements as to the impact of the Court’s Memorandum Opinion on the parties’ disputes as to which of the assets listed on GM’s June 2009 fixed asset ledger (produced as NEWGM000005131 and NEWGM000036121) (the “June 2009 eFAST ledger”) are or are not collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest and, in certain cases, those assets’ value as of the Valuation Date;

**WHEREAS**, plaintiff and the undersigned defendants continue to dispute whether other assets listed on the June 2009 eFAST ledger are collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest;

**WHEREAS**, for certain assets listed on the June 2009 eFAST ledger that the parties agree are collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest, plaintiff and the undersigned defendants dispute the value;

**WHEREAS**, plaintiff and the undersigned defendants dispute the scope and value of Construction Work In Progress (“CWIP”) assets (*i.e.*, assets that do not appear on the June 2009 eFast ledger and which had not yet been put into service, but which defendants argue that GM had installed as of June 2009) that defendants contend are collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest;

**WHEREAS**, plaintiff and the undersigned defendants dispute the scope and value of equipment owned by the Saturn Corporation that is not listed on the June 2009 eFast ledger (“Saturn Equipment”), defendants contend the Saturn Equipment is collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest, and defendants understand that some or all of the Saturn Equipment was classified by Old GM and/or Saturn Corporation as special tools (“Saturn Special Tools”);

**WHEREAS**, the parties wish to formally stipulate to and finally resolve the disputes on which they have reached agreements, while (a) continuing to negotiate and/or litigate additional disputes before the Court and (b) reserving all rights to challenge the Memorandum Opinion’s rulings on appeal;

**IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED**, by and among counsel for the undersigned parties, that:

1. Applying the principles underlying the rulings in the Memorandum Opinion without prejudice to any party’s right to challenge those rulings on appeal, each of the assets from the June 2009 eFAST ledger identified as “Collateral” in the “Collateral Classification” column of the spreadsheet that is attached as Exhibit A hereto is an asset of Old GM or Saturn Corporation that is collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest.

2. Applying the principles underlying the rulings in the Memorandum Opinion without prejudice to any party's right to challenge those rulings on appeal, each of the assets from the June 2009 eFAST ledger identified as "Not Collateral" in the "Collateral Classification" column of the spreadsheet that is attached as Exhibit A hereto is an asset of Old GM or Saturn Corporation that is not collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest.

3. Each of the assets from the June 2009 eFAST ledger identified as "Disputed" in the "Collateral Classification" column of the spreadsheet that is attached as Exhibit A hereto is an asset of Old GM or Saturn Corporation for which the parties dispute how the principles underlying the rulings in the Memorandum Opinion should be applied to determine whether the asset is collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest.

4. Applying the principles underlying the rulings in the Memorandum Opinion without prejudice to any party's right to challenge those rulings on appeal, each of the assets from the June 2009 eFAST ledger for which a value is provided in the "Valuation" column of the spreadsheet that is attached as Exhibit A hereto had that value as of the Valuation Date.

5. Each of the assets from the June 2009 eFAST ledger for which "Disputed" appears in the "Valuation" column of the spreadsheet that is attached as Exhibit A hereto is an asset for which the parties dispute how the principles underlying the rulings in the Memorandum Opinion should be applied to determine the value as of the Valuation Date.

6. Defendants represent and agree that all assets potentially constituting collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants had a Perfected Security Interest are one of the following: (a) identified on Exhibit A hereto; (b) CWIP assets; or (c) Saturn Equipment assets. Defendants have identified on Exhibit B hereto the CWIP assets that, based on discovery to date,

they believe represent collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants have a Perfected Security Interest. Defendants have identified on Exhibit C hereto the Saturn Special Tools that, based on discovery to date, they believe represent Saturn Equipment in which defendants have a Perfected Security Interest. Defendants have not to date identified any Saturn Equipment other than the Saturn Special Tools. Defendants reserve the right to supplement Exhibits B and C hereto if, after additional discovery, defendants identify additional CWIP or Saturn Equipment assets that they believe represent collateral for the Term Loan in which defendants have a Perfected Security Interest.

7. All parties reserve all rights to appeal the Memorandum Opinion's rulings.

8. In the event that the Court's rulings in the Memorandum Opinion are reversed in whole or in part in an appellate decision, this stipulation shall be deemed withdrawn and without effect to the extent inconsistent with the appellate opinion.

9. Nothing in this stipulation or Exhibits A-C hereto shall preclude the parties from contesting the collateral classification or valuation of any assets listed as disputed on Exhibits A-C hereto or subsequently identified pursuant to the reservation of rights in paragraph 6 hereof.

10. The parties agree that the agreements as to collateral classification and value on Exhibit A hereto shall not be used as the basis for arguing that another party is taking an inconsistent position as to other, disputed assets or values.





**KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES & FRIEDMAN  
LLP**

By:           /s/ Andrew K. Glenn          

Andrew K. Glenn  
Joshua N. Paul  
Michelle G. Bernstein  
Isaac S. Sasson  
1633 Broadway  
New York, New York 10019  
(212) 506-1700  
Email: aglenn@kasowitz.com  
Email: jpaul@kasowitz.com  
Email: mgenet@kasowitz.com  
Email: isasson@kasowitz.com

*Attorneys for the Ad Hoc Group of Term Lenders  
listed in Appendix A to Dkt. No. 670*

**HAHN & HESSEN LLP**

By:           /s/ Mark T. Power          

Mark T. Power  
Alison M. Ladd  
488 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Telephone: (212) 478-7200  
Email: mpower@hahnessen.com  
Email: aladd@hahnessen.com

*Attorneys for Certain Term Loan Investor Defendants  
identified on Exhibit 1 to Dkt. No. 788*

*Remainder of page intentionally left blank*



**DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP**

By:           /s/ Elliot Moskowitz  
Elliot Moskowitz  
Marc J. Tobak  
M. Nick Sage  
450 Lexington Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
Email: elliot.moskowitz@davispolk.com  
Email: marc.tobak@davispolk.com  
Email: m.nick.sage@davispolk.com

*Attorneys for Certain Term Loan Lender  
Defendants identified on Exhibit 1 to Dkt. No.  
788*

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 22, 2018  
New York, New York

          /s/ Martin Glenn  
MARTIN GLENN  
United States Bankruptcy Judge