Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 1 of 12

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

In re PATRIOT COAL CORPORATION, et al., Debtors.¹
Chapter 11 Case No. 12-51502-659 (Jointly Administered)
Objection Deadline: November 12, 2013 at 4:00 p.m. (prevailing Central Time)
Hearing Date: November 19, 2013 at 10:00 a.m. (prevailing Central Time)
Hearing Location: Courtroom 7 North

NOTICE AND DEBTORS' MOTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 362 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND BANKRUPTCY RULE 4001 FOR AN ORDER MODIFYING THE AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT PAYMENTS OF DEFENSE EXPENSES UNDER INSURANCE POLICY

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT this motion is scheduled for hearing on November 19, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. (prevailing Central Time), in Bankruptcy Courtroom Seventh Floor North, in the Thomas F. Eagleton U.S. Courthouse, 111 South Tenth Street, St. Louis, Missouri, 63102.

WARNING: ANY RESPONSE OR OBJECTION TO THIS MOTION MUST BE FILED WITH THE COURT BY 4:00 P.M. (PREVAILING CENTRAL TIME) ON NOVEMBER 12, 2013. A COPY MUST BE PROMPTLY SERVED UPON THE UNDERSIGNED. FAILURE TO FILE A TIMELY RESPONSE MAY RESULT IN THE COURT GRANTING THE RELIEF REQUESTED PRIOR TO THE HEARING DATE.

¹ The Debtors are the entities listed on Schedule 1 attached hereto. The employer tax identification numbers and addresses for each of the Debtors are set forth in the Debtors' chapter 11 petitions.

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 2 of 12

DEBTORS' MOTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 362 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE AND BANKRUPTCY RULE 4001 FOR AN ORDER MODIFYING THE AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT PAYMENTS OF DEFENSE EXPENSES UNDER INSURANCE POLICY

Patriot Coal Corporation ("**Patriot**") and its subsidiaries that are debtors and debtors in possession in these proceedings (collectively, the "**Debtors**") respectfully represent:

Relief Requested

1. By this motion (the "Motion"), the Debtors respectfully move this Court,

pursuant to section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code, Rule 4001 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "**Bankruptcy Rules**") and Rule 4001-1 of the Local Rules of Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Missouri (the "**Local Rules**"), for entry of an order (the "**Proposed Order**")² (i) granting relief from the automatic stay, to the extent it applies, to advance and/or pay under an insurance policy those defense expenses being incurred by the insured persons of the Debtors, and (ii) requiring notice to the Debtors and the official committee of unsecured creditors (the "**Creditors' Committee**") regarding the insurance coverage provided and the amounts paid.³

Background and Jurisdiction

On July 9, 2013 (the "Petition Date"), each Debtor other than Brody Mining,
 LLC and Patriot Ventures LLC (collectively, the "Initial Debtors") commenced with the United
 States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the "SDNY Bankruptcy
 Court") a voluntary case under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. On December 19, 2012, the

² The Proposed Order granting relief requested in this Motion will be provided to the Core Parties (as defined below) and National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa. A copy of the Proposed Order will be made available at *www.patriotcaseinfo.com/orders.php*.

³ The Debtors are submitting this Motion without prejudice to any future motion to extend the automatic stay to apply to suits naming the Debtors' officers, directors, and/or employees as defendants.

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 3 of 12

SDNY Bankruptcy Court entered an order transferring the Initial Debtors' chapter 11 cases to this Court (the "**Transfer Order**") [ECF No. 1789].⁴ Subsequently, Brody Mining, LLC and Patriot Ventures LLC (together, the "**New Debtors**") each commenced its chapter 11 case by filing a petition for voluntary relief with this Court on September 23, 2013. The Debtors are authorized to operate their businesses and manage their properties as debtors in possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. The Initial Debtors' cases are being jointly administered pursuant to Rule 1015(b) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the "**Bankruptcy Rules**") and the Joint Administration Order entered on July 10, 2012 [ECF No. 30], and the New Debtors' cases are being jointly administered with the Initial Debtors' cases pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 1015(b) and the Order Directing Joint Administration of Chapter 11 Cases entered by this Court on September 27, 2013 in each of the New Debtors' chapter 11 cases.

3. Additional information about the Debtors' businesses and the events leading up to the Petition Date can be found in the Declaration of Mark N. Schroeder pursuant to Local Bankruptcy rule 1007-2 of the SDNY Bankruptcy Court, filed on July 9, 2012 [ECF No. 4], which is incorporated herein by reference.

4. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction to consider this matter pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper
before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

⁴ Pursuant to the Transfer Order, all orders previously entered in these chapter 11 cases remain in full force and effect in accordance with their terms notwithstanding the transfer of venue.

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 4 of 12

Factual Background

5. In January 2012, John Renner, his wife Patty Renner, and his three minor children (collectively, "**Plaintiffs**") filed suit in the Circuit Court of Monongalia County, West Virginia (the "**Complaint**") (Exhibit A). The Complaint named as defendants Randy Coffindaffer and Joseph B. "Blair" McGill (collectively "**Individual Defendants**"), in addition to Debtors Eastern Associated Coal, LLC and Patriot Coal Corporation (collectively, and together with the Individual Defendants, "**Defendants**"). The Complaint alleges that on February 2, 2010, the Defendants unlawfully terminated the employment of Mr. Renner, purportedly for violating one or more mandatory health and safety regulations and falsifying records regarding such violations. Plaintiffs allege that the purported reasons for Mr. Renner's termination were pre-textual. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages, punitive damages, reinstatement of employment, fringe benefits and seniority rights, and costs. Although the suit remains stayed against the Debtors pursuant to the automatic stay provision of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. § 362(a), it is set to proceed against the Individual Defendants.

The Insurance Policy

6. Before the Petition Date, National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa., a subsidiary of the American International Group, Inc., formerly Chartis Inc., initially issued the Employee Practices Liability Insurance Policy No. 01-308-55-92 (the "**Policy**"), which was in effect for the period October 31, 2011 to October 31, 2012 (Exhibit B). Subject to all of its terms and conditions, the Policy potentially affords coverage up to a maximum aggregate limit of liability of \$10,000,000, including Defense Costs.⁵

⁵ Unless otherwise defined herein, each capitalized term shall have the meaning ascribed to such term in the Policy.

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 5 of 12

7. Under the Policy's Insuring Agreement, coverage is provided to Insureds for Loss arising from a Claim first made against such Insured during the Policy Period and reported to the Insurer pursuant to the terms of the Policy for any actual or alleged Employment Practices Violations.

8. The Policy defines Insured(s) to mean "Individual Insureds" and "the Company," and defines Individual Insured(s) to include "any Employee(s) of the Company."

9. The Policy defines "Loss" to mean "damages (including back pay and front pay), judgments, settlements, pre- and post-judgement [sic] interest and Defense Costs." The Policy defines "Defense Costs" to mean "reasonable and necessary fees, costs and expenses consented to by the Insurer (including premiums for any appeal bond, attachment bond or similar bond, but without any obligation to apply for or furnish any such bond) resulting solely from the investigation, adjustment, defense and appeal of a Claim against the Insureds, but excluding salaries of officers or Employees of the Company."

10. The Policy defines "Employment Practices Violations" to include wrongful dismissal, discharge or termination (either actual or constructive) of employment and retaliation.

11. Clause 6 of the Policy, titled "Retention" and contained in Endorsement No. 9 of the Policy, provides that, "in the event a Company refuses to pay an applicable Retention due to Financial Insolvency, then the Insurer shall commence advancing Loss within the Retention, subject to the other terms, conditions and exclusions of this policy...."

12. The Policy defines "Financial Insolvency" as (i) the appointment by any state or federal official, agency or court of a receiver, conservator, liquidator, trustee, rehabilitator or similar official to take control of, supervise, manage or liquidate a Company; or (ii) the

5

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 6 of 12

Company becoming a debtor-in-possession pursuant to the United States bankruptcy law, and as to both (i) and (ii), the equivalent status outside the United States of America.

Basis for Relief

13. The Debtors seek the entry of an order granting relief from the automatic stay provided for in section 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, to the extent it applies, to allow the National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa. to advance Defense Expenses to the Individual Defendants, and to any future covered individuals who might be named as defendants in related or similar actions, in each case as permitted under the Policy.

The Automatic Stay Should Be Modified, to the Extent it Applies, Because Good Cause Exists to Modify the Stay

14. It is not clear whether the proceeds of the Policy are property of the Debtors' estate. *See In re MF Global Holdings, Ltd., et al.*, 469 B.R. 177, 190 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2012) (stating that "the courts are in disagreement over whether the proceeds of a liability insurance policy are property of the estate." (quoting *In re Downey Fin. Corp.*, 428 B.R. 595, 603 (Bankr. D. Del. 2010)). However, whether or not the insurance proceeds of the Policy are deemed to be property of the estate, good cause exists for this Court to grant relief from the automatic stay for the purpose of permitting the National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa. to advance Defense Costs to the Individual Defendants, and to any covered individuals who might be named as defendants in future related actions, as permitted under the Policy. In *MF Global*, the court, under circumstances similar to those presented here, declined to rule as to whether the proceeds of the insurance policy at issue in that case were property of the estate, but lifted the stay in any event for good cause shown. 469 B.R. at 191; *see also In re Global Crossing Sec. & ERISA Litig.*, 225 F.R.D. 436, 463-64 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 7 of 12

15. Section 362(d) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that "the court shall grant relief from the stay . . . for cause." 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). "Because neither the Code nor the legislative history provides a specific definition of what constitutes 'cause' under § 362(d), courts must determine whether relief is appropriate on a case by case basis, taking into consideration the interests of the debtor, the claimants and the estate." *See In re MacInnis*, 235 B.R. 255, 259 (S.D.N.Y. 1998).

16. In making the determination of whether to grant relief from the stay for cause, courts in the Eighth Circuit look to balance the potential prejudice to the debtor, to the bankruptcy estate, and to the other creditors against the hardship to the moving party if relief is not granted. *See, e.g., Wiley v. Hartzler (In re Wiley)*, 288 B.R. 818, 822 (B.A.P. 8th Cir. 2003). Courts consider several factors in weighing harm to these parties, including: (1) judicial economy; and (2) the cost of defense or other potential burden to the bankruptcy estate and the impact of the litigation on other creditors.⁶

17. As detailed above, the Policy provides coverage to Individual Insureds who have a present need for payment of their Defense Expenses. This need is routinely held to justify modifying the automatic stay to prevent insured individuals from suffering irreparable harm. *See Adelphia Commc'ns Corp. v. Assoc. Ins. Serv., Ltd. (In re Adelphia Commc'ns Corp.)*, 285 B.R. 580, 598 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002) (granting relief from stay in order to permit primary insurer to advance defense costs), *vacated and remanded on other grounds*, 298 B.R. 49 (S.D.N.Y. 2003); *see also Downey*, 428 B.R. 595 (same).

⁶ The other factors considered when applicable are: (1) trial readiness; (2) the resolution of preliminary bankruptcy issues; and (3) the creditor's chance of success on the merits. *Id*.

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 8 of 12

18. The Individual Insureds' need to access insurance coverage to pay Defense Costs far outweighs any potential harm that could be suffered by the Debtors. "Lifting the automatic stay to permit [an insurance company] to advance defense costs on behalf of Individual Insureds would not severely prejudice Debtors' estates. But failure to do so would significantly injure the Individual Insureds, whose defense costs are covered by the [Policies]." *MF Global*, 429 B.R. at 193. Although it is true that to the extent the aggregate coverage limit is reduced by the payment of proceeds to the Individual Defendants there is less coverage available for the Debtors, the possibility that the aggregate coverage will be significantly diminished by the defense of the Individual Defendants is entirely speculative at this point. *See Downey*, 428 B.R. at 609 (modifying the stay to permit the payment of insurance proceeds where "there is no chance that lifting the stay would allow the insureds to run up unlimited defense costs and ultimately exhaust the Policy coverage.").

19. Equitable considerations further support a modification of the stay in this case, as they did in *MF Global*. 469 B.R. at 176-77 ("[T]he Individual Insureds would suffer significant hardships if the Policies were disabled . . . [B]ankruptcy courts should be wary of impairing the contractual rights of [individual insureds] even in cases where the policies provide entity coverage.") (internal citations omitted). As is the case with any company, Patriot's employees rely upon the protection of liability insurance while carrying out their duties. Patriot's ability to hire and retain key employees would be hindered if the contract providing for this employment practices liability coverage were impaired. *See Adelphia*, 285 B.R. at 598. This Court should accordingly modify the automatic stay, to the extent it applies, to avoid conflict with the "usual claim submission, determination and payment processes dictated by the Policies." *MF Global*, 469 B.R. at 177.

8

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 9 of 12

Notice

20. Consistent with the Order Establishing Certain Notice, Case Management and Administration Procedures entered on March 22, 2013 [ECF No. 3361] (the "Case Management Order"), the Debtors will serve notice of this Motion on the (i) Core Parties (as defined in the Case Management Order) and (ii) National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa. (collectively, the "Service Parties"). All parties who have requested electronic notice filings in these cases through the Court's ECF system will automatically receive notice of this Motion through the ECF system no later than the day after its filing with the Court. A copy of this Motion and any order approving it will also be made available on the Debtors' Case Information Website (located at www.patriotcaseinfo.com). A copy of the Proposed Order will be provided to the Service Parties, and will be available at www.patriotcaseinfo.com/orders.php (the "Patriot Order Website"). The Proposed Order may be modified or withdrawn at any time without further notice. If any significant modifications are made to the Proposed Order, an amended Proposed Order will be made available on the Patriot Orders Website, and no further notice will be provided. In light of the relief requested, the Debtors submit that no further notice is necessary. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Case Management order, if no objections are timely filed and served in accordance therewith, the relief requested herein may be entered without a hearing.

No Previous Request

21. No previous request for the relief sought herein has been made by the Debtors to this or any other court.

9

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 10 of 12

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully request that the Court grant the relief requested

herein and such other and further relief as is just and proper.

Dated: October 29, 2013 New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Amelia T.R. Starr

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP

Amelia T.R. Starr Marshall S. Huebner Brian M. Resnick Michelle M. McGreal

450 Lexington Avenue New York, New York 10017 (212) 450-4000 Fax: (212) 607-7983

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

-and-

BRYAN CAVE LLP

Lloyd A. Palans, #22650MO Brian C. Walsh, #58091MO Laura Uberti Hughes, #60732MO One Metropolitan Square

211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 259-2000
Fax: (314) 259-2020

Local Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

In re

Chapter 11 Case No. 12-51502-659 (Jointly Administered)

PATRIOT COAL CORPORATION, et al.,

Debtors.

SUMMARY OF EXHIBITS

The following exhibits (the "**Exhibits**") referenced in the *Debtors' Motion Pursuant to* Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 4001 for an Order Modifying the Automatic Stay to Permit Payments of Defense Expenses Under Insurance Policy will be provided to the Core Parties and National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pa. Copies of the Exhibits will also be made available at *www.patriotcaseinformation.com/exhibits.php* and will be made available for inspection at the hearing.

Exhibit A:	Complaint, John Renner, et al. v. Eastern Assoc. Coal,
	LLC, et al., Civ. Action No. 12-C-27 (W. Va. Cir. Ct.
	Monongalia Cnty.)
Exhibit B:	Employment Practices Liability Insurance Policy No. 01- 308-55-92

Case 12-51502 Doc 4891 Filed 10/29/13 Entered 10/29/13 16:47:59 Main Document Pg 12 of 12

SCHEDULE 1 (Debtor Entities)

1.	Affinity Mining Company	51.	KE Ventures, I
2.	Apogee Coal Company, LLC	52.	Little Creek LI
3.	Appalachia Mine Services, LLC	53.	Logan Fork Co
4.	Beaver Dam Coal Company, LLC	54.	Magnum Coal
5.	Big Eagle, LLC	55.	Magnum Coal
6.	Big Eagle Rail, LLC	56.	Martinka Coal
7.	Black Stallion Coal Company, LLC	57.	Midland Trail l
8.	Black Walnut Coal Company	58.	Midwest Coal
9.	Bluegrass Mine Services, LLC	59.	Mountain Viev
10.	Brook Trout Coal, LLC	60.	New Trout Coa
11.	Catenary Coal Company, LLC	61.	Newtown Ener
12.	Central States Coal Reserves of Kentucky, LLC	62.	North Page Co
13.	Charles Coal Company, LLC	63.	Ohio County C
14.	Cleaton Coal Company	64.	Panther LLC
15.	Coal Clean LLC	65.	Patriot Beaver
16.	Coal Properties, LLC	66.	Patriot Coal Co
17.	Coal Reserve Holding Limited Liability Company No. 2	67.	Patriot Coal Co
18.	Colony Bay Coal Company	68.	Patriot Coal Sa
19.	Cook Mountain Coal Company, LLC	69.	Patriot Coal Se
20.	Corydon Resources LLC	70.	Patriot Leasing
21.	Coventry Mining Services, LLC	71.	Patriot Midwes
22.	Coyote Coal Company LLC	72.	Patriot Reserve
23.	Cub Branch Coal Company LLC	73.	Patriot Trading
24.	Dakota LLC	74.	PCX Enterprise
25.	Day LLC	75.	Pine Ridge Coa
26.	Dixon Mining Company, LLC	76.	Pond Creek La
27.	Dodge Hill Holding JV, LLC	77.	Pond Fork Proc
28.	Dodge Hill Mining Company, LLC	78.	Remington Ho
29.	Dodge Hill of Kentucky, LLC	79.	Remington II L
30.	EACC Camps, Inc.	80.	Remington LL
31.	Eastern Associated Coal, LLC	81.	Rivers Edge M
32.	Eastern Coal Company, LLC	82.	Robin Land Co
33.	Eastern Royalty, LLC	83.	Sentry Mining,
34.	Emerald Processing, L.L.C.	84.	Snowberry Lar
35.	Gateway Eagle Coal Company, LLC	85.	Speed Mining
36.	Grand Eagle Mining, LLC	86.	Sterling Smoke
37.	Heritage Coal Company LLC	87.	TC Sales Com
38.	Highland Mining Company, LLC	88.	The Presidents
39.	Hillside Mining Company	89.	Thunderhill Co
10			

- 40. Hobet Mining, LLC
- 41. Indian Hill Company LLC
- 42. Infinity Coal Sales, LLC
- 43. Interior Holdings, LLC
- 44. IO Coal LLC
- 45. Jarrell's Branch Coal Company
- 46. Jupiter Holdings LLC
- 47. Kanawha Eagle Coal, LLC
- 48. Kanawha River Ventures I, LLC
- 49. Kanawha River Ventures II, LLC
- 50. Kanawha River Ventures III, LLC

- LLC
- LC
- oal Company
- Company LLC
- Sales LLC
- Company, LLC
- Energy LLC
- Resources II, LLC
- w Coal Company, LLC
- al Holdings II, LLC
- gy, Inc.
- al Corp.
- Coal Company, LLC
- Dam Holdings, LLC
- ompany, L.P.
- orporation
- ales LLC
- ervices LLC
- Company LLC
- st Holdings, LLC
- e Holdings, LLC
- LLC
- es, Inc.
- al Company, LLC
- and Resources, LLC
- cessing LLC
- oldings LLC
- LLC
- С
- lining, Inc.
- ompany, LLC
- LLC
- nd Company LLC
- eless Coal Company, LLC
- pany, LLC
- Energy Company LLC
- oal LLC
- Trout Coal Holdings, LLC 90.
- 91. Union County Coal Co., LLC
- 92. Viper LLC
- Weatherby Processing LLC 93.
- 94. Wildcat Energy LLC
- 95. Wildcat, LLC
- 96. Will Scarlet Properties LLC
- 97. Winchester LLC
- 98. Winifrede Dock Limited Liability Company
- 99. Yankeetown Dock, LLC
- 100. Brody Mining, LLC
- Patriot Ventures LLC 101.