Intellectual Property and Innovation American Inn of Court

Thursday, February 27, 2020

Inn Luncheon Roundtable

CLE Materials

Topic

Mission Product Holdings v. Tempnology and Bankruptcy in the Context of IP Transactions

Facilitated By

Albany | Joann Sternheimer, Partner, Lippes Mathias Wexler Friedman LLP
Syracuse | Jeff Dove, Partner, Barclay Damon LLP

Contents

stayed pending appeal. The protection runs to a good faith lender, whether or not he knew of the pendency of the appeal.

A claim arising as a result of lending or borrowing under this section will be a priority claim, as defined in proposed section 507(a)(1), even if the claim is granted a super-priority over administrative expenses and is to be paid in advance of other first priority claims.

REFERENCES IN TEXT

Section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933, referred to in subsec. (f), is classified to section 77e of Title 15, Commerce and Trade.

The Trust Indenture Act of 1939, referred to in subsec. (f), is title III of act May 27, 1933, ch. 38, as added Aug. 3, 1939, ch. 411, 53 Stat. 1149, as amended, which is classified generally to subchapter III (§77aaa et seq.) of chapter 2A of Title 15. For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see section 77aaa of Title 15 and Tables.

AMENDMENTS

1994—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(9)(A), substituted "1203, 1204, or 1304" for "1304, 1203, or 1204".

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(9)(B), struck out "(15 U.S.C. 77e)" after "Act of 1933" and "(15 U.S.C. 77aaa et seq.)" after "Act of 1939".

1986—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 99–554 inserted reference to sections 1203 and 1204 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1994 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 103–394 effective Oct. 22, 1994, and not applicable with respect to cases commenced under this title before Oct. 22, 1994, see section 702 of Pub. L. 103–394, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1986 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 99–554 effective 30 days after Oct. 27, 1986, but not applicable to cases commenced under this title before that date, see section 302(a), (c)(1) of Pub. L. 99–554, set out as a note under section 581 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

§365. Executory contracts and unexpired leases

(a) Except as provided in sections 765 and 766 of this title and in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the trustee, subject to the court's approval, may assume or reject any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor.

(b)(1) If there has been a default in an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor, the trustee may not assume such contract or lease unless, at the time of assumption of such contract or lease, the trustee—

(A) cures, or provides adequate assurance that the trustee will promptly cure, such default other than a default that is a breach of a provision relating to the satisfaction of any provision (other than a penalty rate or penalty provision) relating to a default arising from any failure to perform nonmonetary obligations under an unexpired lease of real property, if it is impossible for the trustee to cure such default by performing nonmonetary acts at and after the time of assumption, except that if such default arises from a failure to operate in accordance with a nonresidential real property lease, then such default shall be cured by performance at and after the time of assumption in accordance with such lease, and pecuniary losses resulting from such default shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph;

(B) compensates, or provides adequate assurance that the trustee will promptly compensate, a party other than the debtor to such contract or lease, for any actual pecuniary loss to such party resulting from such default; and

(C) provides adequate assurance of future performance under such contract or lease.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply to a default that is a breach of a provision relating to—

(A) the insolvency or financial condition of the debtor at any time before the closing of the case;

(B) the commencement of a case under this title;

(C) the appointment of or taking possession by a trustee in a case under this title or a custodian before such commencement; or

(D) the satisfaction of any penalty rate or penalty provision relating to a default arising from any failure by the debtor to perform nonmonetary obligations under the executory contract or unexpired lease.

(3) For the purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection and paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f), adequate assurance of future performance of a lease of real property in a shopping center includes adequate assurance—

(A) of the source of rent and other consideration due under such lease, and in the case of an assignment, that the financial condition and operating performance of the proposed assignee and its guarantors, if any, shall be similar to the financial condition and operating performance of the debtor and its guarantors, if any, as of the time the debtor became the lessee under the lease;

(B) that any percentage rent due under such lease will not decline substantially;

(C) that assumption or assignment of such lease is subject to all the provisions thereof, including (but not limited to) provisions such as a radius, location, use, or exclusivity provision, and will not breach any such provision contained in any other lease, financing agreement, or master agreement relating to such shopping center; and

(D) that assumption or assignment of such lease will not disrupt any tenant mix or balance in such shopping center.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if there has been a default in an unexpired lease of the debtor, other than a default of a kind specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the trustee may not require a lessor to provide services or supplies incidental to such lease before assumption of such lease unless the lessor is compensated under the terms of such lease for any services and supplies provided under such lease before assumption of such lease.

(c) The trustee may not assume or assign any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties, if—

(1)(A) applicable law excuses a party, other than the debtor, to such contract or lease from accepting performance from or rendering performance to an entity other than the debtor or the debtor in possession, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties; and

(B) such party does not consent to such assumption or assignment; or

(2) such contract is a contract to make a loan, or extend other debt financing or financial accommodations, to or for the benefit of the debtor, or to issue a security of the debtor; or

(3) such lease is of nonresidential real property and has been terminated under applicable nonbankruptcy law prior to the order for relief.

(d)(1) In a case under chapter 7 of this title, if the trustee does not assume or reject an executory contract or unexpired lease of residential real property or of personal property of the debtor within 60 days after the order for relief, or within such additional time as the court, for cause, within such 60-day period, fixes, then such contract or lease is deemed rejected.

(2) In a case under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title, the trustee may assume or reject an executory contract or unexpired lease of residential real property or of personal property of the debtor at any time before the confirmation of a plan but the court, on the request of any party to such contract or lease, may order the trustee to determine within a specified period of time whether to assume or reject such contract or lease.

(3) The trustee shall timely perform all the obligations of the debtor, except those specified in section 365(b)(2), arising from and after the order for relief under any unexpired lease of nonresidential real property, until such lease is assumed or rejected, notwithstanding section 503(b)(1) of this title. The court may extend, for cause, the time for performance of any such obligation that arises within 60 days after the date of the order for relief, but the time for performance shall not be extended beyond such 60-day period. This subsection shall not be deemed to affect the trustee's obligations under the provisions of subsection (b) or (f) of this section. Acceptance of any such performance does not constitute waiver or relinquishment of the lessor's rights under such lease or under this title.

(4)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), an unexpired lease of nonresidential real property under which the debtor is the lessee shall be deemed rejected, and the trustee shall immediately surrender that nonresidential real property to the lessor, if the trustee does not assume or reject the unexpired lease by the earlier of—

(i) the date that is 120 days after the date of the order for relief; or

(ii) the date of the entry of an order confirming a plan.

(B)(i) The court may extend the period determined under subparagraph (A), prior to the expiration of the 120-day period, for 90 days on the motion of the trustee or lessor for cause.

(ii) If the court grants an extension under clause (i), the court may grant a subsequent extension only upon prior written consent of the lessor in each instance.

(5) The trustee shall timely perform all of the obligations of the debtor, except those specified in section 365(b)(2), first arising from or after 60 days after the order for relief in a case under chapter 11 of this title under an unexpired lease of personal property (other than personal property leased to an individual primarily for personal, family, or household purposes), until such lease is assumed or rejected notwithstanding section 503(b)(1) of this title, unless the court, after notice and a hearing and based on the equities of the case, orders otherwise with respect to the obligations or timely performance thereof. This subsection shall not be deemed to affect the trustee's obligations under the provisions of subsection (b) or (f). Acceptance of any such performance does not constitute waiver or relinquishment of the lessor's rights under such lease or under this title.

(e)(1) Notwithstanding a provision in an executory contract or unexpired lease, or in applicable law, an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor may not be terminated or modified, and any right or obligation under such contract or lease may not be terminated or modified, at any time after the commencement of the case solely because of a provision in such contract or lease that is conditioned on—

(A) the insolvency or financial condition of the debtor at any time before the closing of the case;

(B) the commencement of a case under this title; or

(C) the appointment of or taking possession by a trustee in a case under this title or a custodian before such commencement.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection does not apply to an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties, if—

(A)(i) applicable law excuses a party, other than the debtor, to such contract or lease from accepting performance from or rendering performance to the trustee or to an assignee of such contract or lease, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties; and

(ii) such party does not consent to such assumption or assignment; or

(B) such contract is a contract to make a loan, or extend other debt financing or financial accommodations, to or for the benefit of the debtor, or to issue a security of the debtor.

(f)(1) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, notwithstanding a provision in an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor, or in applicable law, that prohibits, restricts, or conditions the assignment of such contract or lease, the trustee may assign such contract or lease under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) The trustee may assign an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor only if—

(A) the trustee assumes such contract or lease in accordance with the provisions of this section; and

(B) adequate assurance of future performance by the assignee of such contract or lease is provided, whether or not there has been a default in such contract or lease.

(3) Notwithstanding a provision in an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor,

or in applicable law that terminates or modifies, or permits a party other than the debtor to terminate or modify, such contract or lease or a right or obligation under such contract or lease on account of an assignment of such contract or lease, such contract, lease, right, or obligation may not be terminated or modified under such provision because of the assumption or assignment of such contract or lease by the trustee.

(g) Except as provided in subsections (h)(2) and (i)(2) of this section, the rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor constitutes a breach of such contract or lease—

(1) if such contract or lease has not been assumed under this section or under a plan confirmed under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title, immediately before the date of the filing of the petition; or

(2) if such contract or lease has been assumed under this section or under a plan confirmed under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title—

(A) if before such rejection the case has not been converted under section 1112, 1208, or 1307 of this title, at the time of such rejection; or

(B) if before such rejection the case has been converted under section 1112, 1208, or 1307 of this title—

(i) immediately before the date of such conversion, if such contract or lease was assumed before such conversion; or

(ii) at the time of such rejection, if such contract or lease was assumed after such conversion.

(h)(1)(A) If the trustee rejects an unexpired lease of real property under which the debtor is the lessor and—

(i) if the rejection by the trustee amounts to such a breach as would entitle the lessee to treat such lease as terminated by virtue of its terms, applicable nonbankruptcy law, or any agreement made by the lessee, then the lessee under such lease may treat such lease as terminated by the rejection; or

(ii) if the term of such lease has commenced, the lessee may retain its rights under such lease (including rights such as those relating to the amount and timing of payment of rent and other amounts payable by the lessee and any right of use, possession, quiet enjoyment, subletting, assignment, or hypothecation) that are in or appurtenant to the real property for the balance of the term of such lease and for any renewal or extension of such rights to the extent that such rights are enforceable under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

(B) If the lessee retains its rights under subparagraph (A)(ii), the lessee may offset against the rent reserved under such lease for the balance of the term after the date of the rejection of such lease and for the term of any renewal or extension of such lease, the value of any damage caused by the nonperformance after the date of such rejection, of any obligation of the debtor under such lease, but the lessee shall not have any other right against the estate or the debtor on account of any damage occurring after such date caused by such nonperformance.

(C) The rejection of a lease of real property in a shopping center with respect to which the lessee elects to retain its rights under subparagraph (A)(ii) does not affect the enforceability under applicable nonbankruptcy law of any provision in the lease pertaining to radius, location, use, exclusivity, or tenant mix or balance.

(D) In this paragraph, "lessee" includes any successor, assign, or mortgagee permitted under the terms of such lease.

(2)(A) If the trustee rejects a timeshare interest under a timeshare plan under which the debtor is the timeshare interest seller and—

(i) if the rejection amounts to such a breach as would entitle the timeshare interest purchaser to treat the timeshare plan as terminated under its terms, applicable nonbankruptcy law, or any agreement made by timeshare interest purchaser, the timeshare interest purchaser under the timeshare plan may treat the timeshare plan as terminated by such rejection; or

(ii) if the term of such timeshare interest has commenced, then the timeshare interest purchaser may retain its rights in such timeshare interest for the balance of such term and for any term of renewal or extension of such timeshare interest to the extent that such rights are enforceable under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

(B) If the timeshare interest purchaser retains its rights under subparagraph (A), such timeshare interest purchaser may offset against the moneys due for such timeshare interest for the balance of the term after the date of the rejection of such timeshare interest, and the term of any renewal or extension of such timeshare interest, the value of any damage caused by the nonperformance after the date of such rejection, of any obligation of the debtor under such timeshare plan, but the timeshare interest purchaser shall not have any right against the estate or the debtor on account of any damage occurring after such date caused by such nonperformance.

(i)(1) If the trustee rejects an executory contract of the debtor for the sale of real property or for the sale of a timeshare interest under a timeshare plan, under which the purchaser is in possession, such purchaser may treat such contract as terminated, or, in the alternative, may remain in possession of such real property or timeshare interest.

(2) If such purchaser remains in possession—

(A) such purchaser shall continue to make all payments due under such contract, but may, offset against such payments any damages occurring after the date of the rejection of such contract caused by the nonperformance of any obligation of the debtor after such date, but such purchaser does not have any rights against the estate on account of any damages arising after such date from such rejection, other than such offset; and

(B) the trustee shall deliver title to such purchaser in accordance with the provisions of such contract, but is relieved of all other obligations to perform under such contract.

(j) A purchaser that treats an executory contract as terminated under subsection (i) of this section, or a party whose executory contract to purchase real property from the debtor is rejected and under which such party is not in possession, has a lien on the interest of the debtor in such property for the recovery of any portion of the purchase price that such purchaser or party has paid.

(k) Assignment by the trustee to an entity of a contract or lease assumed under this section relieves the trustee and the estate from any liability for any breach of such contract or lease occurring after such assignment.

(*l*) If an unexpired lease under which the debtor is the lessee is assigned pursuant to this section, the lessor of the property may require a deposit or other security for the performance of the debtor's obligations under the lease substantially the same as would have been required by the landlord upon the initial leasing to a similar tenant.

(m) For purposes of this section 365 and sections 541(b)(2) and 362(b)(10), leases of real property shall include any rental agreement to use real property.

(n)(1) If the trustee rejects an executory contract under which the debtor is a licensor of a right to intellectual property, the licensee under such contract may elect—

(A) to treat such contract as terminated by such rejection if such rejection by the trustee amounts to such a breach as would entitle the licensee to treat such contract as terminated by virtue of its own terms, applicable nonbankruptcy law, or an agreement made by the licensee with another entity; or

(B) to retain its rights (including a right to enforce any exclusivity provision of such contract, but excluding any other right under applicable nonbankruptcy law to specific performance of such contract) under such contract and under any agreement supplementary to such contract, to such intellectual property (including any embodiment of such intellectual property to the extent protected by applicable nonbankruptcy law), as such rights existed immediately before the case commenced, for—

(i) the duration of such contract; and

(ii) any period for which such contract may be extended by the licensee as of right under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

(2) If the licensee elects to retain its rights, as described in paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection, under such contract—

(A) the trustee shall allow the licensee to exercise such rights;

(B) the licensee shall make all royalty payments due under such contract for the duration of such contract and for any period described in paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection for which the licensee extends such contract; and

(C) the licensee shall be deemed to waive—

(i) any right of setoff it may have with respect to such contract under this title or applicable nonbankruptcy law; and

(ii) any claim allowable under section 503(b) of this title arising from the performance of such contract.

(3) If the licensee elects to retain its rights, as described in paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection, then on the written request of the licensee the trustee shall—

(A) to the extent provided in such contract, or any agreement supplementary to such contract, provide to the licensee any intellectual property (including such embodiment) held by the trustee; and

(B) not interfere with the rights of the licensee as provided in such contract, or any agreement supplementary to such contract, to such intellectual property (including such embodiment) including any right to obtain such intellectual property (or such embodiment) from another entity.

(4) Unless and until the trustee rejects such contract, on the written request of the licensee the trustee shall—

(A) to the extent provided in such contract or any agreement supplementary to such contract—

(i) perform such contract; or

(ii) provide to the licensee such intellectual property (including any embodiment of such intellectual property to the extent protected by applicable nonbankruptcy law) held by the trustee; and

(B) not interfere with the rights of the licensee as provided in such contract, or any agreement supplementary to such contract, to such intellectual property (including such embodiment), including any right to obtain such intellectual property (or such embodiment) from another entity.

(*o*) In a case under chapter 11 of this title, the trustee shall be deemed to have assumed (consistent with the debtor's other obligations under section 507), and shall immediately cure any deficit under, any commitment by the debtor to a Federal depository institutions regulatory agency (or predecessor to such agency) to maintain the capital of an insured depository institution, and any claim for a subsequent breach of the obligations thereunder shall be entitled to priority under section 507. This subsection shall not extend any commitment that would otherwise be terminated by any act of such an agency.

(p)(1) If a lease of personal property is rejected or not timely assumed by the trustee under subsection (d), the leased property is no longer property of the estate and the stay under section 362(a) is automatically terminated.

(2)(A) If the debtor in a case under chapter 7 is an individual, the debtor may notify the creditor in writing that the debtor desires to assume the lease. Upon being so notified, the creditor may, at its option, notify the debtor that it is willing to have the lease assumed by the debtor and may condition such assumption on cure of any outstanding default on terms set by the contract.

(B) If, not later than 30 days after notice is provided under subparagraph (A), the debtor notifies the lessor in writing that the lease is assumed, the liability under the lease will be assumed by the debtor and not by the estate.

(C) The stay under section 362 and the injunction under section 524(a)(2) shall not be violated by notification of the debtor and negotiation of cure under this subsection.

(3) In a case under chapter 11 in which the debtor is an individual and in a case under chapter 13, if the debtor is the lessee with respect to

personal property and the lease is not assumed in the plan confirmed by the court, the lease is deemed rejected as of the conclusion of the hearing on confirmation. If the lease is rejected, the stay under section 362 and any stay under section 1301 is automatically terminated with respect to the property subject to the lease.

(Pub. L. 95–598, Nov. 6, 1978, 92 Stat. 2574; Pub. L. 98–353, title III, §§362, 402–404, July 10, 1984, 98 Stat. 361, 367; Pub. L. 99–554, title II, §§257(j), (m), 283(e), Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3115, 3117; Pub. L. 100–506, §1(b), Oct. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 2538; Pub. L. 101–647, title XXV, §2522(c), Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 4866; Pub. L. 102–365, §19(b)–(e), Sept. 3, 1992, 106 Stat. 982–984; Pub. L. 103–394, title II, §§205(a), 219(a), (b), title V, §501(d)(10), Oct. 22, 1994, 108 Stat. 4122, 4128, 4145; Pub. L. 103–429, §1, Oct. 31, 1994, 108 Stat. 4377; Pub. L. 109–8, title III, §§309(b), 328(a), title IV, §404, Apr. 20, 2005, 119 Stat. 82, 100, 104.)

Historical and Revision Notes

LEGISLATIVE STATEMENTS

Section 365(b)(3) represents a compromise between H.R. 8200 as passed by the House and the Senate amendment. The provision adopts standards contained in section 365(b)(5) of the Senate amendment to define adequate assurance of future performance of a lease of real property in a shopping center.

Section 365(b)(4) of the House amendment indicates that after default the trustee may not require a lessor to supply services or materials without assumption unless the lessor is compensated as provided in the lease.

Section 365(c)(2) and (3) likewise represent a compromise between H.R. 8200 as passed by the House and the Senate amendment. Section 365(c)(2) is derived from section 365(b)(4) of the Senate amendment but does not apply to a contract to deliver equipment as provided in the Senate amendment. As contained in the House amendment, the provision prohibits a trustee or debtor in possession from assuming or assigning an executory contract of the debtor to make a loan, or extend other debt financing or financial accommodations, to or for the benefit of the debtor, or the issuance of a security of the debtor.

Section 365(e) is a refinement of comparable provisions contained in the House bill and Senate amendment. Sections 365(e)(1) and (2)(A) restate section 365(e) of H.R. 8200 as passed by the House. Sections 365(e)(2)(B) expands the section to permit termination of an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor if such contract is a contract to make a loan, or extend other debt financing or financial accommodations, to or for the benefit of the debtor, or for the issuance of a security of the debtor.

Characterization of contracts to make a loan, or extend other debt financing or financial accommodations, is limited to the extension of cash or a line of credit and is not intended to embrace ordinary leases or contracts to provide goods or services with payments to be made over time.

Section 365(f) is derived from H.R. 8200 as passed by the House. Deletion of language in section 365(f)(3) of the Senate amendment is done as a matter of style. Restrictions with respect to assignment of an executory contract or unexpired lease are superfluous since the debtor may assign an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor only if such contract is first assumed under section 364(f)(2)(A) of the House amendment.

Section 363(h) of the House amendment represents a modification of section 365(h) of the Senate amendment. The House amendment makes clear that in the case of a bankrupt lessor, a lessee may remain in possession for the balance of the term of a lease and any renewal or extension of the term only to the extent that such renewal or extension may be obtained by the lessee without the permission of the landlord or some third party under applicable non-bankruptcy law.

SENATE REPORT NO. 95–989

Subsection (a) of this section authorizes the trustee, subject to the court's approval, to assume or reject an executory contract or unexpired lease. Though there is no precise definition of what contracts are executory, it generally includes contracts on which performance remains due to some extent on both sides. A note is not usually an executory contract if the only performance that remains is repayment. Performance on one side of the contract would have been completed and the contract is no longer executory.

Because of the volatile nature of the commodities markets and the special provisions governing commodity broker liquidations in subchapter IV of chapter 7, the provisions governing distribution in section 765(a) will govern if any conflict between those provisions and the provisions of this section arise.

Subsections (b), (c), and (d) provide limitations on the trustee's powers. Subsection (b) requires the trustee to cure any default in the contract or lease and to provide adequate assurance of future performance if there has been a default, before he may assume. This provision does not apply to defaults under ipso facto or bankruptcy clauses, which is a significant departure from present law.

Subsection (b)(3) permits termination of leases entered into prior to the effective date of this title in liquidation cases if certain other conditions are met.

Subsection (b)(4) [enacted as (c)(2)] prohibits the trustee's assumption of an executory contract requiring the other party to make a loan or deliver equipment to or to issue a security of the debtor. The purpose of this subsection is to make it clear that a party to a transaction which is based upon the financial strength of a debtor should not be required to extend new credit to the debtor whether in the form of loans, lease financing, or the purchase or discount of notes.

Subsection (b)(5) provides that in lease situations common to shopping centers, protections must be provided for the lessor if the trustee assumes the lease, including protection against decline in percentage rents, breach of agreements with other tenants, and preservation of the tenant mix. Protection for tenant mix will not be required in the office building situation.

Subsection (c) prohibits the trustee from assuming or assigning a contract or lease if applicable nonbankruptcy law excuses the other party from performance to someone other than the debtor, unless the other party consents. This prohibition applies only in the situation in which applicable law excuses the other party from performance independent of any restrictive language in the contract or lease itself.

Subsection (d) places time limits on assumption and rejection. In a liquidation case, the trustee must assume within 60 days (or within an additional 60 days, if the court, for cause, extends the time). If not assumed, the contract or lease is deemed rejected. In a rehabilitation case, the time limit is not fixed in the bill. However, if the other party to the contract or lease requests the court to fix a time, the court may specify a time within which the trustee must act. This provision will prevent parties in contractual or lease relationships with the debtor from being left in doubt concerning their status vis-a-vis the estate.

Subsection (e) invalidates ipso facto or bankruptcy clauses. These clauses, protected under present law, automatically terminate the contract or lease, or permit the other contracting party to terminate the contract or lease, in the event of bankruptcy. This frequently hampers rehabilitation efforts. If the trustee may assume or assign the contract under the limitations imposed by the remainder of the section, the contract or lease may be utilized to assist in the debtor's rehabilitation or liquidation.

The unenforcibility [sic] of ipso facto or bankruptcy clauses proposed under this section will require the courts to be sensitive to the rights of the nondebtor party to executory contracts and unexpired leases. If the trustee is to assume a contract or lease, the court will have to insure that the trustee's performance under the contract or lease gives the other contracting party the full benefit of his bargain.

This subsection does not limit the application of an ipso facto or bankruptcy clause if a new insolvency or receivership occurs after the bankruptcy case is closed. That is, the clause is not invalidated in toto, but merely made inapplicable during the case for the purposes of disposition of the executory contract or unexpired lease.

Subsection (f) partially invalidates restrictions on assignment of contracts or leases by the trustee to a third party. The subsection imposes two restrictions on the trustee: he must first assume the contract or lease, subject to all the restrictions on assumption found in the section, and adequate assurance of future performance must be provided to the other contracting party. Paragraph (3) of the subsection invalidates contractual provisions that permit termination or modification in the event of an assignment, as contrary to the policy of this subsection.

Subsection (g) defines the time as of which a rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease constitutes a breach of the contract or lease. Generally, the breach is as of the date immediately preceding the date of the petition. The purpose is to treat rejection claims as prepetition claims. The remainder of the subsection specifies different times for cases that are converted from one chapter to another. The provisions of this subsection are not a substantive authorization to breach or reject an assumed contract. Rather, they prescribe the rules for the allowance of claims in case an assumed contract is breached, or if a case under chapter 11 in which a contract has been assumed is converted to a case under chapter 7 in which the contract is rejected.

Subsection (h) protects real property lessees of the debtor if the trustee rejects an unexpired lease under which the debtor is the lessor (or sublessor). The subsection permits the lessee to remain in possession of the leased property or to treat the lease as terminated by the rejection. The balance of the term of the lease referred to in paragraph (1) will include any renewal terms that are enforceable by the tenant, but not renewal terms if the landlord had an option to terminate. Thus, the tenant will not be deprived of his estate for the term for which he bargained. If the lessee remains in possession, he may offset the rent reserved under the lease against damages caused by the rejection, but does not have any affirmative rights against the estate for any damages after the rejection that result from the rejection.

Subsection (i) gives a purchaser of real property under a land installment sales contract similar protection. The purchaser, if the contract is rejected, may remain in possession or may treat the contract as terminated. If the purchaser remains in possession, he is required to continue to make the payments due, but may offset damages that occur after rejection. The trustee is required to deliver title, but is relieved of all other obligations to perform.

A purchaser that treats the contract as terminated is granted a lien on the property to the extent of the purchase price paid. A party with a contract to purchase land from the debtor has a lien on the property to secure the price already paid, if the contract is rejected and the purchaser is not yet in possession.

Subsection (k) relieves the trustee and the estate of liability for a breach of an assigned contract or lease that occurs after the assignment.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 95–595

Subsection (c) prohibits the trustee from assuming or assigning a contract or lease if applicable nonbankruptcy law excuses the other party from performance to someone other than the debtor, unless the other party consents. This prohibition applies only in the situation in which applicable law excuses the other party from performance independent of any restrictive language in the contract or lease itself. The purpose of this subsection, at least in part, is to prevent the trustee from requiring new advances of money or other property. The section permits the trustee to continue to use and pay for property already advanced, but is not designed to permit the trustee to demand new loans or additional transfers of property under lease commitments.

Thus, under this provision, contracts such as loan commitments and letters of credit are nonassignable, and may not be assumed by the trustee.

Subsection (e) invalidates ipso facto or bankruptcy clauses. These clauses, protected under present law, automatically terminate the contract or lease, or permit the other contracting party to terminate the contract or lease, in the event of bankruptcy. This frequently hampers rehabilitation efforts. If the trustee may assume or assign the contract under the limitations imposed by the remainder of the section, then the contract or lease may be utilized to assist in the debtor's rehabilitation or liquidation.

The unenforceability of ipso facto or bankruptcy clauses proposed under this section will require the courts to be sensitive to the rights of the nondebtor party to executory contracts and unexpired leases. If the trustee is to assume a contract or lease, the courts will have to insure that the trustee's performance under the contract or lease gives the other contracting party the full benefit of his bargain. An example of the complexity that may arise in these situations and the need for a determination of all aspects of a particular executory contract or unexpired lease is the shopping center lease under which the debtor is a tenant in a shopping center.

A shopping center is often a carefully planned enterprise, and though it consists of numerous individual tenants, the center is planned as a single unit, often subject to a master lease or financing agreement. Under these agreements, the tenant mix in a shopping center may be as important to the lessor as the actual promised rental payments, because certain mixes will attract higher patronage of the stores in the center, and thus a higher rental for the landlord from those stores that are subject to a percentage of gross receipts rental agreement. Thus, in order to assure a landlord of his bargained for exchange, the court would have to consider such factors as the nature of the business to be conducted by the trustee or his assignee, whether that business complies with the requirements of any master agreement, whether the kind of business proposed will generate gross sales in an amount such that the percentage rent specified in the lease is substantially the same as what would have been provided by the debtor, and whether the business proposed to be conducted would result in a breach of other clauses in master agreements relating, for example, to tenant mix and location.

This subsection does not limit the application of an ipso facto or bankruptcy clause to a new insolvency or receivership after the bankruptcy case is closed. That is, the clause is not invalidated in toto, but merely made inapplicable during the case for the purpose of disposition of the executory contract or unexpired lease.

AMENDMENTS

2005—Subsec. (b)(1)(A). Pub. L. 109–8, § 328(a)(1)(A), inserted before semicolon at end "other than a default that is a breach of a provision relating to the satisfaction of any provision (other than a penalty rate or penalty provision) relating to a default arising from any failure to perform nonmonetary obligations under an unexpired lease of real property, if it is impossible for the trustee to cure such default by performing nonmonetary acts at and after the time of assumption, except that if such default arises from a failure to operate in accordance with a nonresidential real property lease, then such default shall be cured by performance at and after the time of assumption in accordance with such lease, and pecuniary losses resulting from such default shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph".

Subsec. (b)(2)(D). Pub. L. 109–8, §328(a)(1)(B), substituted "penalty rate or penalty provision" for "penalty rate or provision".

Subsec. (c)(4). Pub. L. 109–8, §328(a)(2), struck out par. (4) which read as follows: "such lease is of nonresidential real property under which the debtor is the lessee of an aircraft terminal or aircraft gate at an airport at which the debtor is the lessee under one or more additional nonresidential leases of an aircraft terminal or aircraft gate and the trustee, in connection with such assumption or assignment, does not assume all such leases or does not assume and assign all of such leases to the same person, except that the trustee may assume or assign less than all of such leases with the airport operator's written consent."

Subsec. (d)(4). Pub. L. 109–8, §404(a), amended par. (4) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (4) read as follows: "Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), in a case under any chapter of this title, if the trustee does not assume or reject an unexpired lease of nonresidential real property under which the debtor is the lessee within 60 days after the date of the order for relief, or within such additional time as the court, for cause, within such 60-day period, fixes, then such lease is deemed rejected, and the trustee shall immediately surrender such nonresidential real property to the lessor."

Subsec. (d)(5) to (10). Pub. L. 109–8, §328(a)(3), redesignated par. (10) as (5) and struck out former pars. (5) to (9) which related to rejection of leases under which the debtor is an affected air carrier that is the lessee of an aircraft terminal or aircraft gate.

Subsec. (f)(1). Pub. L. 109–8, §404(b), substituted "provided in subsections (b) and" for "provided in subsection".

Pub. L. 109–8, §328(a)(4), struck out "; except that the trustee may not assign an unexpired lease of nonresidential real property under which the debtor is an affected air carrier that is the lessee of an aircraft terminal or aircraft gate if there has occurred a termination event" before period at end.

Subsec. (p). Pub. L. 109–8, §309(b), added subsec. (p).

1994—Subsec. (b)(2)(D). Pub. L. 103–394, §219(a), added subpar. (D).

Subsec. (d)(6)(C). Pub. L. 103–429, §1(1), substituted "section 40102(a) of title 49" for "section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 App. U.S.C. 1301)".

Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(A), which directed the substitution of "section 40102 of title 49" for "the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301)", could not be executed because the phrase "(49 U.S.C. 1301)" did not appear in text.

Subsec. (d)(10). Pub. L. 103–394, §219(b), added par. (10).

Subsec. (g)(2)(A), (B). Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(B), substituted "1208, or 1307" for "1307, or 1208".

Subsec. (h). Pub. L. 103–394, §205(a), amended subsec. (h) generally. Prior to amendment, subsec. (h) read as follows:

"(h)(1) If the trustee rejects an unexpired lease of real property of the debtor under which the debtor is the lessor, or a timeshare interest under a timeshare plan under which the debtor is the timeshare interest seller, the lessee or timeshare interest purchaser under such lease or timeshare plan may treat such lease or timeshare plan as terminated by such rejection, where the disaffirmance by the trustee amounts to such a breach as would entitle the lessee or timeshare interest purchaser to treat such lease or timeshare plan as terminated by virtue of its own terms, applicable nonbankruptcy law, or other agreements the lessee or timeshare interest purchaser has made with other parties; or, in the alternative, the lessee or timeshare interest purchaser may remain in possession of the leasehold or timeshare interest under any lease or timeshare plan the term of which has commenced for the balance of such term and for any renewal or extension of such term that is enforceable by such lessee or timeshare interest purchaser under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

"(2) If such lessee or timeshare interest purchaser remains in possession as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, such lessee or timeshare interest purchaser may offset against the rent reserved under such lease or moneys due for such timeshare interest for the balance of the term after the date of the rejection of such lease or timeshare interest, and any such renewal or extension thereof, any damages occurring after such date caused by the nonperformance of any obligation of the debtor under such lease or timeshare plan after such date, but such lessee or timeshare interest purchaser does not have any rights against the estate on account of any damages arising after such date from such rejection, other than such offset."

Subsec. (n)(1)(B). Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(C), substituted "a right to" for "a right to to".

Subsec. (*o*). Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(D), substituted "a Federal depository institutions regulatory agency (or predecessor to such agency)" for "the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Comptroller of the Currency, or the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or its predecessors or successors,".

Subsec. (p). Pub. L. 103–429, §1(2), which directed the amendment of subsec. (p) by substituting "section 40102(a) of title 49" for "section 101(3) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958", could not be executed because subsec. (p) was repealed by Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(E). See below.

Pub. L. 103–394, §501(d)(10)(E), struck out subsec. (p), which read as follows: "In this section, 'affected air carrier' means an air carrier, as defined in section 101(3) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, that holds 65 percent or more in number of the aircraft gates at an airport—

"(1) which is a Large Air Traffic Hub as defined by the Federal Aviation Administration in Report FAA–AP 92–1, February 1992; and

"(2) all of whose remaining aircraft gates are leased or under contract on the date of enactment of this subsection."

1992—Subsec. (c)(4). Pub. L. 102–365, §19(c), added par. (4).

Subsec. (d)(5) to (9). Pub. L. 102–365, §19(b), added pars. (5) to (9).

Subsec. (f)(1). Pub. L. 102–365, §19(d), substituted for period at end "; except that the trustee may not assign an unexpired lease of nonresidential real property under which the debtor is an affected air carrier that is the lessee of an aircraft terminal or aircraft gate if there has occurred a termination event."

Subsec. (p). Pub. L. 102–365, §19(e), added subsec. (p).

1990—Subsec. (*o*). Pub. L. 101–647 added subsec. (*o*).

1988—Subsec. (n). Pub. L. 100–506 added subsec. (n).

1986—Subsec. (c)(1)(A). Pub. L. 99–554, §283(e)(1), struck out "or an assignee of such contract or lease" after "debtor in possession".

Subsec. (c)(3). Pub. L. 99–554, §283(e)(2), inserted "is" after "lease" and "and" after "property".

Subsecs. (d)(2), (g)(1). Pub. L. 99–554, §257(j), (m)(1), inserted reference to chapter 12.

Subsec. (g)(2). Pub. L. 99–554, §257(m)(2), inserted references to chapter 12 and section 1208 of this title.

Subsec. (h)(1). Pub. L. 99–554, §283(e)(2), inserted "or timeshare plan" after "to treat such lease".

Subsec. (m). Pub. L. 99–554, §283(e)(3), substituted "362(b)(10)" for "362(b)(9)".

1984—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 98–353, §362(a), amended subsec. (a) generally, making minor changes.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 98–353, §362(a), amended subsec. (b) generally, inserting in par. (3) reference to par. (2)(B) of subsec. (f) of this section, in par. (3)(A) inserting provisions relating to financial condition and operating performance in the case of an assignment, and in par. (3)(C) substituting "that assumption or assignment of such lease is subject to all the provisions thereof, including (but not limited to) provisions such as a radius, location, use, or exclusivity provision, and will not breach any such provision contained in any other lease, financing agreement, or master agreement relating to such shopping center" for "that assumption or assignment of such lease will not breach substantially any provision, such as a radius, location, use, or exclusivity provision, in any other lease, financing agreement, or master agreement relating to such shopping center".

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 98–353, § 362(a), amended subsec. (c) generally, substituting in par. (1)(A) "applicable law excuses a party, other than the debtor, to such contract or lease from accepting performance from or rendering performance to an entity other than the debtor or the debtor in possession or an assignee of such contract or lease, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties" for "applicable law excuses a party, other than the debtor, to such contract or lease from accepting performance from or rendering performance to the trustee or an assignee of such contract or lease, whether or not such contract or lease prohibits or restricts assignment of rights or delegation of duties" and adding par. (3).

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 98–353, § 362(a), amended subsec. (d) generally, inserting in par. (1) reference to residential real property or personal property of the debtor, inserting in par. (2) reference to residential real property or personal property of the debtor, and adding pars. (3) and (4).

Subsec. (h)(1). Pub. L. 98–353, § 402, amended par. (1) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (1) read as follows: "If the trustee rejects an unexpired lease of real property of the debtor under which the debtor is the lessor, the lessee under such lease may treat the lease as terminated by such rejection, or, in the alternative, may remain in possession for the balance of the term of such lease and any renewal or extension of such term that is enforceable by such lessee under applicable nonbankruptcy law."

Subsec. (h)(2). Pub. L. 98–353, § 403, amended par. (2) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (2) read as follows: "If such lessee remains in possession, such lessee may offset against the rent reserved under such lease for the balance of the term after the date of the rejection of such lease, and any such renewal or extension, any damages occurring after such date caused by the nonperformance of any obligation of the debtor after such date, but such lessee does not have any rights against the estate on account of any damages arising after such date from such rejection, other than such offset."

Subsec. (i)(1). Pub. L. 98–353, § 404, amended par. (1) generally, inserting provisions relating to timeshare interests under timeshare plans.

Subsecs. (*l*), (m). Pub. L. 98–353, § 362(b), added subsecs. (*l*) and (m).

Effective Date of 2005 Amendment

Amendment by Pub. L. 109–8 effective 180 days after Apr. 20, 2005, and not applicable with respect to cases commenced under this title before such effective date, except as otherwise provided, see section 1501 of Pub. L. 109–8, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

Effective Date of 1994 Amendment

Amendment by Pub. L. 103–394 effective Oct. 22, 1994, and not applicable with respect to cases commenced under this title before Oct. 22, 1994, see section 702 of Pub. L. 103–394, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

Effective Date of 1992 Amendment

Section 19(f) of Pub. L. 102–365 provided that: "The amendments made by this section [amending this section] shall be in effect for the 12-month period that begins on the date of enactment of this Act [Sept. 3, 1992] and shall apply in all proceedings involving an affected air carrier (as defined in section 365(p) of title 11, United States Code, as amended by this section) that are pending during such 12-month period. Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives on whether this section shall apply to proceedings that are commenced after such 12-month period."

Effective Date of 1988 Amendment

Amendment by Pub. L. 100–506 effective Oct. 18, 1988, but not applicable to any case commenced under this title before such date, see section 2 of Pub. L. 100–506, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

Effective Date of 1986 Amendment

Amendment by section 257 of Pub. L. 99–554 effective 30 days after Oct. 27, 1986, but not applicable to cases commenced under this title before that date, see section 302(a), (c)(1) of Pub. L. 99–554, set out as a note under section 581 of Title 28, Judiciary and Judicial Procedure.

Amendment by section 283 of Pub. L. 99–554 effective 30 days after Oct. 27, 1986, see section 302(a) of Pub. L. 99–554.

Effective Date of 1984 Amendment

Amendment by Pub. L. 98–353 effective with respect to cases filed 90 days after July 10, 1984, see section 552(a) of Pub. L. 98–353, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

Airport Leases

Section 19(a) of Pub. L. 102–365 provided that: "Congress finds that—

"(1) there are major airports served by an air carrier that has leased a substantial majority of the airport's gates;

"(2) the commerce in the region served by such a major airport can be disrupted if the air carrier that leases most of its gates enters bankruptcy and either discontinues or materially reduces service; and

"(3) it is important that such airports be empowered to continue service in the event of such a disruption."

§ 366. Utility service

(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, a utility may not alter, refuse, or discontinue service to, or discriminate against, the trustee or the debtor solely on the basis of the commencement of a case under this title or that a debt owed by the debtor to such utility for service rendered before the order for relief was not paid when due.

(b) Such utility may alter, refuse, or discontinue service if neither the trustee nor the debtor, within 20 days after the date of the order for relief, furnishes adequate assurance of payment, in the form of a deposit or other security, for service after such date. On request of a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, the court may order reasonable modification of the amount of the deposit or other security necessary to provide adequate assurance of payment.

(c)(1)(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term "assurance of payment" means—

(i) a cash deposit;

(ii) a letter of credit;

(iii) a certificate of deposit;

(iv) a surety bond;

(v) a prepayment of utility consumption; or

(vi) another form of security that is mutually agreed on between the utility and the debtor or the trustee.

In the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

No. 11-3920

SUNBEAM PRODUCTS, INC.,doing business as
Jarden Consumer Solutions,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CHICAGO AMERICAN MANUFACTURING, LLC,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 09 A 341—**Pamela S. Hollis**, *Judge.*

ARGUED MAY 22, 2012—DECIDED JULY 9, 2012

Before EASTERBROOK, *Chief Judge*, and WILLIAMS and TINDER, *Circuit Judges*.

EASTERBROOK, *Chief Judge*. Lakewood Engineering & Manufacturing Co. made and sold a variety of consumer products, which were covered by its patents and trademarks. In 2008, losing money on every box fan, Lakewood contracted their manufacture to Chicago

American Manufacturing (CAM). The contract authorized CAM to practice Lakewood's patents and put its trademarks on the completed fans. Lakewood was to take orders from retailers such as Sears, Walmart, and Ace Hardware; CAM would ship directly to these customers on Lakewood's instructions. Because Lakewood was in financial distress, CAM was reluctant to invest the money necessary to gear up for production—and to make about 1.2 million fans that Lakewood estimated it would require during the 2009 cooling season—without assured payment. Lakewood provided that assurance by authorizing CAM to sell the 2009 run of box fans for its own account if Lakewood did not purchase them.

In February 2009, three months into the contract, several of Lakewood's creditors filed an involuntary bankruptcy petition against it. The court appointed a trustee, who decided to sell Lakewood's business. Sunbeam Products, doing business as Jarden Consumer Solutions, bought the assets, including Lakewood's patents and trademarks. Jarden did not want the Lakewood-branded fans CAM had in inventory, nor did it want CAM to sell those fans in competition with Jarden's products. Lakewood's trustee rejected the executory portion of the CAM contract under 11 U.S.C. §365(a). When CAM continued to make and sell Lakewood-branded fans, Jarden filed this adversary action. It will receive 75% of any recovery and the trustee the other 25% for the benefit of Lakewood's creditors.

The bankruptcy judge held a trial. After determining that the Lakewood–CAM contract is ambiguous, the judge relied on extrinsic evidence to conclude that CAM was entitled to make as many fans as Lakewood estimated it would need for the entire 2009 selling season and sell them bearing Lakewood's marks. *In re Lakewood Engineering & Manufacturing Co.*, 459 B.R. 306, 333–38 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2011). Jarden contends in this court—following certification by the district court of a direct appeal under 28 U.S.C. §158(d)(2)(A)—that CAM had to stop making and selling fans once Lakewood stopped having requirements for them. The bankruptcy court did not err in reading the contract as it did, but the effect of the trustee's rejection remains to be determined.

Lubrizol Enterprises, Inc. v. Richmond Metal Finishers, Inc., 756 F.2d 1043 (4th Cir. 1985), holds that, when an intellectual-property license is rejected in bankruptcy, the licensee loses the ability to use any licensed copyrights, trademarks, and patents. Three years after *Lubrizol*, Congress added §365(n) to the Bankruptcy Code. It allows licensees to continue using the intellectual property after rejection, provided they meet certain conditions. The bankruptcy judge held that §365(n) allowed CAM to practice Lakewood's patents when making box fans for the 2009 season. That ruling is no longer contested. But "intellectual property" is a defined term in the Bankruptcy Code: 11 U.S.C. §101(35A) provides that "intellectual property" includes patents, copyrights, and trade secrets. It does not mention trademarks. Some bankruptcy judges have inferred from the omission that Congress codified *Lubrizol* with respect to trademarks, but an omission is just an omission. The limited definition in §101(35A) means that §365(n) does not affect trademarks one way or the other. According to the Senate committee report on the bill that included §365(n), the omission was designed to allow more time for study, not to approve *Lubrizol*. See S. Rep. No. 100–505, 100th Cong., 2d Sess. 5 (1988). See also *In re Exide Technologies*, 607 F.3d 957, 966–67 (3d Cir. 2010) (Ambro, J., concurring) (concluding that §365(n) neither codifies nor disapproves *Lubrizol* as applied to trademarks). The subject seems to have fallen off the legislative agenda, but this does not change the effect of what Congress did in 1988.

The bankruptcy judge in this case agreed with Judge Ambro that §365(n) and §101(35A) leave open the question whether rejection of an intellectual-property license ends the licensee's right to use trademarks. Without deciding whether a contract's rejection under §365(a) ends the licensee's right to use the trademarks, the judge stated that she would allow CAM, which invested substantial resources in making Lakewood-branded box fans, to continue using the Lakewood marks "on equitable grounds". 459 B.R. at 345; see also *id.* at 343–46. This led to the entry of judgment in CAM's favor, and Jarden has appealed.

What the Bankruptcy Code provides, a judge cannot override by declaring that enforcement would be "inequitable." See, e.g., *Toibb v. Radloff*, 501 U.S. 157, 162 (1991); *In re Kmart Corp.*, 359 F.3d 866, 871 (7th Cir. 2004); *In re Sinclair*, 870 F.2d 1340 (7th Cir. 1989). There are hundreds of bankruptcy judges, who have many different ideas about what is equitable in any given situation. Some may think that equity favors licensees' reliance interests; others may believe that equity favors the creditors, who can realize more of their claims if the debtor can terminate IP licenses. Rights depend, however, on what the Code provides rather than on notions of equity. Recently the Supreme Court emphasized that arguments based on views about the purposes behind the Code, and wise public policy, cannot be used to supersede the Code's provisions. It remarked: "The Bankruptcy Code standardizes an expansive (and sometimes unruly) area of law, and it is our obligation to interpret the Code clearly and predictably using well established principles of statutory construction." *RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 132 S. Ct. 2065, 2073 (2012).

Although the bankruptcy judge's ground of decision is untenable, that does not necessarily require reversal. We need to determine whether *Lubrizol* correctly understood §365(g), which specifies the consequences of a rejection under §365(a). No other court of appeals has agreed with *Lubrizol*—or for that matter disagreed with it. *Exide*, the only other appellate case in which the subject came up, was resolved on the ground that the contract was not executory and therefore could not be rejected. (*Lubrizol* has been cited in other appellate opinions, none of which concerns the effect of rejection on intellectual-property licenses.) Judge Ambro, who filed a concurring opinion in *Exide*, concluded that, had the contract been eligible for rejection under §365(a), the licensee could have continued using the trademarks. 607 F.3d at 964–68. Like Judge Ambro, we too think *Lubrizol* mistaken.

Here is the full text of §365(g):

> Except as provided in subsections (h)(2) and (i)(2) of this section, the rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor constitutes a breach of such contract or lease—
>
> (1) if such contract or lease has not been assumed under this section or under a plan confirmed under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title, immediately before the date of the filing of the petition; or
>
> (2) if such contract or lease has been assumed under this section or under a plan confirmed under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title—
>
> (A) if before such rejection the case has not been converted under section 1112, 1208, or 1307 of this title, at the time of such rejection; or
>
> (B) if before such rejection the case has been converted under section 1112, 1208, or 1307 of this title—
>
> (i) immediately before the date of such conversion, if such contract or lease was assumed before such conversion; or
>
> (ii) at the time of such rejection, if such contract or lease was assumed after such conversion.

Most of these words don't affect our situation. Subsections (h)(2) and (i)(2) are irrelevant, and paragraph (1) tells us that the rejection takes effect immediately before the petition's filing. For our purpose, therefore, all that matters is the opening proposition: that rejection "constitutes a breach of such contract".

Outside of bankruptcy, a licensor's breach does not terminate a licensee's right to use intellectual property. Lakewood had two principal obligations under its contract with CAM: to provide CAM with motors and cord sets (CAM was to build the rest of the fan) and to pay for the completed fans that CAM drop-shipped to retailers. Suppose that, before the bankruptcy began, Lakewood had broken its promise by failing to provide the motors. CAM might have elected to treat that breach as ending its own obligations, see Uniform Commercial Code §2–711(1), but it also could have covered in the market by purchasing motors and billed Lakewood for the extra cost. UCC §2–712. CAM had bargained for the security of being able to sell Lakewood-branded fans for its own account if Lakewood defaulted; outside of bankruptcy, Lakewood could not have ended CAM's right to sell the box fans by failing to perform its own duties, any more than a borrower could end the lender's right to collect just by declaring that the debt will not be paid.

What §365(g) does by classifying rejection as breach is establish that in bankruptcy, as outside of it, the other party's rights remain in place. After rejecting a contract, a debtor is not subject to an order of specific performance. See *NLRB v. Bildisco & Bildisco*, 465 U.S. 513, 531 (1984); *Midway Motor Lodge of Elk Grove v. Innkeepers'*

Telemanagement & Equipment Corp., 54 F.3d 406, 407 (7th Cir. 1995). The debtor's unfulfilled obligations are converted to damages; when a debtor does not assume the contract before rejecting it, these damages are treated as a pre-petition obligation, which may be written down in common with other debts of the same class. But nothing about this process implies that any rights of the other contracting party have been vaporized. Consider how rejection works for leases. A lessee that enters bankruptcy may reject the lease and pay damages for abandoning the premises, but rejection does not abrogate the lease (which would absolve the debtor of the need to pay damages). Similarly a lessor that enters bankruptcy could not, by rejecting the lease, end the tenant's right to possession and thus re-acquire premises that might be rented out for a higher price. The bankrupt lessor might substitute damages for an obligation to make repairs, but not rescind the lease altogether.

Bankruptcy law does provide means for eliminating rights under some contracts. For example, contracts that entitle creditors to preferential transfers (that is, to payments exceeding the value of goods and services provided to the debtor) can be avoided under 11 U.S.C. §547, and recent payments can be recouped. A trustee has several avoiding powers. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 544–51. But Lakewood's trustee has never contended that Lakewood's contract with CAM is subject to rescission. The trustee used §365(a) rather than any of the avoiding powers—and rejection is not "the functional equivalent of a rescission, rendering void the contract and requiring that the parties be put back in the positions they occupied before the contract was formed." *Thompkins v. Lil' Joe Records, Inc.*, 476 F.3d 1294, 1306 (11th Cir. 2007). It "merely frees the estate from the obligation to perform" and "has absolutely no effect upon the contract's continued existence". *Ibid.* (internal citations omitted).

Scholars uniformly criticize *Lubrizol*, concluding that it confuses rejection with the use of an avoiding power. See, e.g., Douglas G. Baird, *Elements of Bankruptcy* 130–40 & n.10 (4th ed. 2006); Michael T. Andrew, *Executory Contracts in Bankruptcy: Understanding "Rejection"*, 59 U. Colo. L. Rev. 845, 916–19 (1988); Jay Lawrence Westbrook, *The Commission's Recommendations Concerning the Treatment of Bankruptcy Contracts*, 5 Am. Bankr. Inst. L. Rev. 463, 470–72 (1997). *Lubrizol* itself devoted scant attention to the question whether rejection cancels a contract, worrying instead about the right way to identify executory contracts to which the rejection power applies.

Lubrizol does not persuade us. This opinion, which creates a conflict among the circuits, was circulated to all active judges under Circuit Rule 40(e). No judge favored a hearing *en banc*. Because the trustee's rejection of Lakewood's contract with CAM did not abrogate CAM's contractual rights, this adversary proceeding properly ended with a judgment in CAM's favor.

AFFIRMED

United States Court of Appeals
For the First Circuit

No. 16-9016

IN RE: TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, n/k/a Old Cold LLC,
Debtor.

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC.,

Appellant,

v.

TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, n/k/a Old Cold LLC,

Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE PANEL
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

Before

Torruella, Lynch, and Kayatta,
Circuit Judges.

Robert J. Keach, with whom Lindsay K.Z. Milne and Bernstein, Shur, Sawyer & Nelson, P.A. were on brief, for appellant.

Lee A. Harrington, with whom Daniel W. Sklar and Nixon Peabody LLP were on brief, for appellee.

January 12, 2018

KAYATTA, Circuit Judge. Generally speaking, when a company files for protection under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, the trustee or the debtor-in-possession may secure court approval to "reject" any executory contract of the debtor, meaning that the other party to the contract is left with a damages claim for breach, but not the ability to compel further performance. 11 U.S.C. §§ 365(a), 1107(a); see NLRB v. Bildisco & Bildisco, 465 U.S. 513, 531-32 (1984); Mason v. Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors, for FBI Distrib. Corp. & FBC Distrib. Corp. (In re FBI Distrib. Corp.), 330 F.3d 36, 43-44 (1st Cir. 2003). When the rejected contract, however, is one "under which the debtor is a licensor of a right to intellectual property," the licensee may elect to "retain its rights . . . to such intellectual property," thereby continuing the debtor's duty to license the intellectual property. 11 U.S.C. § 365(n)(1). In this case, Tempnology, LLC ("Debtor") -- a debtor-in-possession seeking to reorganize under Chapter 11 -- rejected an agreement giving certain marketing and distribution rights to Mission Product Holdings, Inc. The parties agree that Mission can insist that the rejection not apply to nonexclusive patent licenses contained in the rejected agreement. They disagree as to whether the rejection applies to the agreement's grants of a trademark license and of exclusive rights to sell certain of Debtor's goods. In the case of the trademark license, resolving that disagreement poses for this circuit an issue of first impression concerning which other circuits are split. For the following reasons, we agree with the bankruptcy court that the rejection left Mission with only a pre-petition damages claim in lieu of any obligation by Debtor to further perform under either the trademark license or the grant of exclusive distribution rights.

I.

Debtor made specialized products -- such as towels, socks, headbands, and other accessories -- designed to remain at low temperatures even when used during exercise, which it marketed under the "Coolcore" and "Dr. Cool" brands. A significant intellectual property portfolio supported Debtor's products. This portfolio consisted of two issued patents, four pending patents, research studies, and a multitude of registered and pending trademarks.

On November 21, 2012, Mission and Debtor executed a Co-Marketing and Distribution Agreement, which serves as the focal point of this appeal. The Agreement provided Mission with three relevant categories of rights.

First, Debtor granted Mission distribution rights to certain of its manufactured products within the United States.[1]

[1] In addition to the United States, the exclusive geographic territory also included "other countries and territories that [Mission] acquires exclusive distribution rights to pursuant to its first rights of refusal and notice."

These products, called "Cooling Accessories," were defined in the Agreement as "products of the specific types listed on Exhibit A" and "manufactured by or on behalf of [Debtor]." They also included "additional products that are hereafter developed by [Debtor]." Exhibit A broke down the thirteen listed products into two categories: "Exclusive" and "Non-Exclusive" Cooling Accessories. For "Exclusive Cooling Accessories" -- comprised of towels, wraps, hoodies, bandanas, multi-chills, and doo rags -- Debtor agreed that "it will not license or sell" the products "to anyone other than [Mission] during the Term." Mission's rights with respect to the remaining Cooling Accessories -- comprised of socks, headbands, wristbands, sleeves, skullcaps, yoga mats, and baselayers -- were nonexclusive because Debtor reserved for itself the "right to sell . . . to vertically integrated companies as well as customers that are not Sports Distributors or retailers in the Sporting Channel."

Second, Debtor granted Mission a nonexclusive license to Debtor's intellectual property. This "non-exclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, fully paid-up, perpetual, worldwide, fully-transferable license" granted Mission the right "to sublicense (through multiple tiers), use, reproduce, modify, and create derivative work based on and otherwise freely exploit" Debtor's products -- including Cooling Accessories -- and its intellectual property. This irrevocable license, however, expressly excluded any rights to Debtor's trademarks.

Trademarks were the subject of the third bucket of rights. Section 15(d) of the Agreement granted Mission a "non-exclusive, non-transferable, limited license" for the term of the Agreement "to use [Debtor's] trademark and logo (as well as any other Marks licensed hereunder) for the limited purpose of performing its obligations hereunder, exercising its rights and promoting the purposes of this Agreement." This license came with limitations. Mission was forbidden from using the trademarks in a manner that was disparaging, inaccurate, or otherwise inconsistent with the terms of the Agreement. Further, Mission was required to "comply with any written trademark guidelines" and Debtor had "the right to review and approve all uses of its Marks," except for certain pre-approved uses.

The Agreement also included a provision permitting either party to terminate the Agreement without cause. On June 30, 2014, Mission exercised this option, triggering a "Wind-Down Period" of approximately two years. Debtor, in turn, issued a notice of immediate termination for cause on July 22, 2014, claiming that Mission's hiring of Debtor's former president violated the Agreement's restrictive covenants. Pursuant to the Agreement's terms, Mission's challenge to Debtor's immediate termination for cause went before an arbitrator. The arbitrator determined that Debtor had waived any grounds for immediate termination under the restrictive covenant and that the Agreement remained in effect until the expiration of the Wind-Down Period. That ruling meant that Mission was contractually entitled to retain its distribution and trademark rights until July 1, 2016, and its nonexclusive intellectual property rights in perpetuity.

Intervening events, however, put an earlier end to the parties' contractual relationship. Although Debtor posted profits in 2012, its financial outlook dimmed. After accruing multi-million dollar net operating losses in 2013 and 2014, Debtor filed a voluntary petition for Chapter 11 bankruptcy on September 1, 2015. The following day, Debtor moved to reject seventeen of its contracts, including the Agreement, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365(a).

Section 365(a) permits a debtor-in-possession,[2] with the court's approval, to "reject any executory contract" that, in the debtor's business judgment, is not beneficial to the company. See Agarwal v. Pomona Valley Med. Grp., Inc. (In re Pomona Valley Med. Grp., Inc.), 476 F.3d 665, 669-71 (9th Cir. 2007); see also Bildisco & Bildisco, 465 U.S. at 520, 523. In its memoranda

[2] Although this provision of the statute only refers to the powers of a trustee, per 11 U.S.C. § 1107(a), a Chapter 11 "debtor in possession shall have all the rights . . . and powers, and shall perform all the functions and duties, . . . of a trustee serving in a case under this chapter." See also In re FBI Distrib. Corp., 330 F.3d at 42 n.8 (citing this provision).

supporting its motion, Debtor informed the bankruptcy court that it sought to reject the Agreement because it hindered Debtor's ability to derive revenue from other marketing and distribution opportunities. Debtor faulted Mission -- and particularly the Agreement's grant of exclusive distribution rights -- for its bankruptcy. It alleged that the Agreement "suffocated the Debtor's ability to market and distribute its products" after Mission failed to fulfill its obligations, "essentially starving the Debtor from any income."

Mission objected to the rejection motion, arguing that 11 U.S.C. § 365(n) allowed Mission to retain both its intellectual property license and its exclusive distribution rights. Section 365(n) provides an exception from section 365(a)'s broad rejection authority by limiting the debtor-in-possession's ability to terminate intellectual property licenses it has granted to other parties.

On September 21, 2015, the bankruptcy court granted Debtor's motion to reject certain executory contracts, except for the Agreement, for which it ordered further hearing. In a subsequent one-sentence order, the bankruptcy court granted the motion to reject the Agreement, "subject to Mission Product Holdings's election to preserve its rights under 11 U.S.C. § 365(n)." Debtor then moved for a determination of the applicability and scope of Mission's rights under section 365(n).

In that motion, Debtor conceded that Mission retained its nonexclusive, perpetual license to certain of Debtor's intellectual properties -- which did not include its trademarks -- but argued that section 365(n) did not cover either Mission's exclusive distribution rights or the trademark license. Mission again objected, arguing that the relief Debtor requested required an adversary proceeding pursuant to Rule 7001(2) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

After holding a nontestimonial hearing, the bankruptcy court concluded that Mission's election pursuant to section 365(n) did not preserve either the exclusive distribution rights or the trademark license. The court found that section 365(n) only protected intellectual property rights, and Mission's exclusive distributorship could not fairly be characterized as such. With respect to trademarks, the court reasoned that Congress's decision to leave trademarks off the definitional list of intellectual properties in 11 U.S.C. § 101(35A) left the trademark license unprotected from rejection. Finally, the court rejected Mission's argument that the Bankruptcy Code required an adversary proceeding to determine the issue. The court viewed "the Motion in the context of rejection under § 365, which is a contested matter under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014."

Mission appealed to the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel for the First Circuit ("BAP"). The BAP affirmed the bankruptcy court's order with respect to Mission's exclusive distribution rights, concluding that "Mission's attempt to re-characterize its exclusive product distribution rights under the Agreement as an intellectual property license [is] unsupported by either the letter or the spirit of the Agreement." Like the bankruptcy court, the BAP read section 365(n)'s protection of "exclusivity provision[s]" as encompassing only the exclusivity attributes, such as they might be, of intellectual property rights. The BAP also affirmed the bankruptcy court's determination that the section 365(n) motion did not require Debtor to commence an adversary proceeding under Bankruptcy Rule 7001.

Regarding trademarks, however, the BAP diverged from the bankruptcy court. Although the BAP agreed that section 365(n) failed to protect Mission's rights to Debtor's trademarks, it disagreed as to the effect of that conclusion. Rather than finding that rejection extinguished the non-debtor's rights, the BAP followed the Seventh Circuit's ruling in Sunbeam Products, Inc. v. Chicago American Manufacturing, LLC, 686 F.3d 372 (7th Cir. 2012). The BAP held that, because section 365(g) deems the effect of rejection to be a breach of contract, and a licensor's breach of a trademark agreement outside the bankruptcy context does not necessarily terminate the licensee's rights, rejection under section 365(g) likewise does not necessarily eliminate those rights. Thus, the BAP reversed the bankruptcy court's determination that Mission no longer had protectable rights in Debtor's trademarks and trade names.

This appeal ensued. We affirm the bankruptcy court's determinations. We conclude that section 365(n) does not apply to Mission's right to be the exclusive distributor of Debtor's products, or to its trademark license. Unlike the BAP and the Seventh Circuit, we also hold that Mission's right to use Debtor's trademarks did not otherwise survive rejection of the Agreement.

II.

On appeal from a decision by the BAP, "[w]e accord no special deference to determinations made by the [BAP]," and instead "train the lens of our inquiry directly on the bankruptcy court's decision."[3] Wheeling & Lake Erie Ry. Co. v. Keach (In re Montreal, Maine & Atl. Ry., Ltd.), 799 F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 2015). In doing so, we review the bankruptcy court's factual findings for clear error and its conclusions of law de novo. DeGiacomo v. Traverse (In re Traverse), 753 F.3d 19, 24 (1st Cir. 2014).

---

[3] We do nevertheless pay great attention to the considered opinion of the three experienced bankruptcy judges who sit on the BAP. Among other things, our consideration of such an opinion reduces the likelihood that our court of general appellate jurisdiction is blindsided by the effect that a decision might have on matters or issues of bankruptcy law and practice that are beyond the ken of the parties in a particular proceeding.

III.

We begin with the statutory framework that defines the scope of Debtor's ability, "subject to the court's approval," to "assume or reject any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor." 11 U.S.C. § 365(a). Executory contracts, although not defined in the Bankruptcy Code, are generally considered to be contracts "on which performance is due to some extent on both sides." In re FBI Distrib. Corp., 330 F.3d at 40 n.5 (quoting Bildisco & Bildisco, 465 U.S. at 522 n.6); see also Parkview Adventist Med. Ctr. v. United States ex rel. Dep't of Health & Human Servs., 842 F.3d 757, 763 n.12 (1st Cir. 2016). Section 365(a) permits the debtor-in-possession to assume those contracts that are beneficial and reject those that may hinder its recovery. In re FBI Distrib. Corp., 330 F.3d at 42. It provides an "elixir for use in nursing a business back to good health" by allowing the trustee or debtor-in-possession to "prescribe it as an emetic to purge the bankruptcy estate of obligations that promise to hinder a reorganization." Thinking Machs. Corp. v. Mellon Fin. Servs. Corp. (In re Thinking Machs. Corp.), 67 F.3d 1021, 1024 (1st Cir. 1995). Section 365(a) thus furthers Chapter 11's "paramount objective" of rehabilitating debtors. In re FBI Distrib. Corp., 330 F.3d at 41. In lieu of the rejected obligation, a debtor is left with a liability for what the Code deems to be a pre-petition breach of the contract. 11 U.S.C.

§ 365(g) ("[T]he rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor constitutes a breach of such contract or lease . . . immediately before the date of the filing of the petition . . . .").

In 1985, the Fourth Circuit was tasked with applying this framework to an intellectual property license granted by a debtor. See Lubrizol Enters., Inc. v. Richmond Metal Finishers, Inc., 756 F.2d 1043 (4th Cir. 1985). The Fourth Circuit held that the term "executory contract" in section 365(a) encompassed intellectual property licenses, id. at 1045, and that under section 365(g) the effect of rejection was to terminate an intellectual property license, id. at 1048. The court based its reasoning on what it saw as the animating principles behind section 365(g), thus distinguishing "statutory breach" from common law breach:

> Even though § 365(g) treats rejection as breach, the legislative history of § 365(g) makes clear that the purpose of the provision is to provide only a damages remedy for the non-bankrupt party. . . . [T]he statutory "breach" contemplated by § 365(g) controls, and provides only a money damages remedy for the non-bankrupt party. . . . Allowing specific performance would obviously undercut the core purpose of rejection under § 365(a).

Id.

Three years later, Congress responded. Rather than amending either section 365(a) or section 365(g), Congress enacted a brand new section 365(n). See S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 8 (1988). Section 365(n)(1) gives to a licensee of intellectual property rights a choice between treating the license as terminated and asserting a claim for pre-petition damages -- a remedy the licensee held already under section 365(g) -- or retaining its intellectual property rights under the license. It states, in full:

> If the trustee rejects an executory contract under which the debtor is a licensor of a right to intellectual property, the licensee under such contract may elect--
>
> (A) to treat such contract as terminated by such rejection if such rejection by the trustee amounts to such a breach as would entitle the licensee to treat such contract as terminated by virtue of its own terms, applicable nonbankruptcy law, or an agreement made by the licensee with another entity; or
>
> (B) to retain its rights (including a right to enforce any exclusivity provision of such contract, but excluding any other right under applicable nonbankruptcy law to specific performance of such contract) under such contract and under any agreement supplementary to such contract, to such intellectual property (including any embodiment of such intellectual property to the extent protected by applicable nonbankruptcy law), as such rights existed immediately before the case commenced, for--
>
> (i) the duration of such contract; and
>
> (ii) any period for which such contract may be extended by the licensee as of right under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

11 U.S.C. § 365(n)(1).

Congress also amended the definition of intellectual property, thus defining the scope of the new section 365(n)(1). Under 11 U.S.C. § 101(35A),

> The term "intellectual property" means--
> (A) trade secret;
> (B) invention, process, design, or plant protected under title 35;
> (C) patent application;
> (D) plant variety;
> (E) work of authorship protected under title 17; or
> (F) mask work protected under chapter 9 of title 17;
> to the extent protected by applicable nonbankruptcy law.

IV.

With the foregoing framework in mind, we turn now to Mission's arguments on appeal. We consider first its contention that its exclusive distribution rights remained unaffected by Debtor's rejection of the Agreement. We then address Mission's contention that its trademark license also remained in effect during the two-year Wind-Down Period. What is at issue for these parties, practically speaking, is whether to classify as pre-petition or post-petition liability any damages caused by Debtor's failure to honor its executory obligations during the two-year Wind-Down Period.

A.

Section 365(n)(1)(B) allows Mission "to retain its rights (including a right to enforce any exclusivity provision of such contract . . .) under such contract and under any agreement supplementary to such contract, to such intellectual property (including any embodiment of such intellectual property to the extent protected by applicable nonbankruptcy law)." Mission would have us read the words "any exclusivity provision of such contract" in the foregoing parenthetical as meaning any "exclusivity provision" in the entire contract (or any supplementary agreement), whether or not the provision grants exclusive use of a pertinent intellectual property right.

We disagree. We start in section 365(a) with the universe of all executory contracts that a debtor may seek to reject; section 365(n)(1) then focuses on a subset of that universe ("executory contract[s] under which the debtor is a licensor of a right to intellectual property"); subsection (n)(1)(B) then says what happens to intellectual property rights granted under such contracts (the licensee may "retain its rights"); and the parenthetical merely makes clear that those rights "to such intellectual property" include any exclusivity attributes of those rights. In this manner, subsection (n)(1)(B) protects, for example, an exclusive license to use a patent, but does not protect an exclusive right to sell a product merely because that right appears in a contract that also contains a license to use intellectual property.

Our reading aligns with the legislative record. In enacting section 365(n), Congress made clear that it was responding to a "particular problem arising out of recent court decisions." S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 5. The limited "purpose of the bill is to amend Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code to make clear that the rights of an intellectual property licensee to use the licensed property cannot be unilaterally cut off." Id. at 1. The amendment is "not in any way intended to address broader matters under Section 365." Id. at 5. Congress, it seems, was focused on a narrow issue, and only intended its amendment to address that issue. It did not intend the scope of its amendment to extend beyond the licensee's bargained-for intellectual property rights post-rejection, as Mission's position would necessarily require. Further supporting our reading of the statutory text, Congress's description of the protected exclusivity rights in both relevant congressional reports is limited to license rights, and does not mention or imply the protection of exclusive rights other than those to intellectual property. The House Report, describing the House's version of the bill,[4] states that, "[u]nder the legislation, any right in the license agreement giving the licensee an exclusive license will

[4] Congress ultimately adopted the Senate version, although the language of this section of the House bill is identical to its Senate counterpart.

still be enforceable by the licensee, but other rights of the licensee cannot be specifically enforced." H.R. Rep. No. 100-1012, at 6 (1988). Similarly, the Senate Report says that "if the contract granted exclusive use to the licensee, such exclusivity would be preserved to the license." S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 9.

Mission's fallback position is to argue that, in this instance, its exclusive distribution right is, de facto, a provision that renders its right to use Debtor's intellectual property exclusive. The unstated premise is that because Mission has an exclusive right to sell certain of Debtor's products made using Debtor's intellectual property, no one else can use the intellectual property. Hence, Mission reasons, the exclusive distribution right is an "exclusivity provision" of the intellectual property right.

The most obvious defect in this argument is its premise. The Agreement and record are clear that Debtor can use its intellectual property to make and sell products other than those for which the Agreement grants Mission exclusive distribution rights. The only thing that is exclusive is the right to sell certain products, not the right to practice, for example, the patent that is used to make those products. An exclusive right to sell a product is not equivalent to an exclusive right to exploit the product's underlying intellectual property.

But, argues Mission, because of its exclusive distribution rights, no one can use the Debtor's patent to make at least some products if those products are to be sold in Mission's territory. Perhaps. But this is simply a restriction on the right to sell certain products that, like many products, happen to be made using a patent. And the exclusivity Mission seeks to maintain would apply fully even if there were no patent license at all. Given that the right to sell a product is clearly not included within the statute's definition of intellectual property, we are not going to treat it as such merely because of a coincidental practical effect it may have in limiting the scope of the manner in which a patent might be exploited, especially where the Agreement itself expressly makes clear that any patent license is nonexclusive. To hold otherwise would be to find buried in a parenthetical to a statutory subsection an implied exception to rejection that would, in practical terms, likely cover as much commercial territory as do some of the rights expressly defined as protected. <u>See</u> <u>Whitman</u> v. <u>Am. Trucking Ass'n</u>, 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001) ("Congress . . . does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes."). The fact that Mission can cite no circuit court precedent for its effort to paint its exclusive distribution right as a de facto exclusive intellectual property right further buttresses our conclusion.[5]

Mission also argues that its nonexclusive license of intellectual property "lacks meaningful value" unless it retains an exclusive right to sell certain of Debtor's products. Why this is so is not apparent given that section 365(n) protects the nonexclusive license, hence Mission retained the right to use the intellectual property. The Agreement itself spells out myriad ways that Mission could exploit its nonexclusive intellectual property rights that were presumably unaffected by rejection of its exclusive distribution right: Mission could still "sublicense (through multiple tiers), use, reproduce, modify, and create derivative work based on" Debtor's intellectual property. And if those rights lacked meaningful value, that hardly becomes a reason for turning rights that are not intellectual property rights into intellectual property rights. Rather, it simply suggests that most of the contract's value was apparently in the exclusive distribution agreement.

Nor does the reference in section 365(n)(1)(B) to "any embodiment of such intellectual property" help Mission.

---

[5] Mission cites Encino Bus. Mgmt., Inc. v. Prize Frize, Inc. (In re Prize Frize, Inc.), 32 F.3d 426 (9th Cir. 1994), but the contract in that case granted an "exclusive license to utilize the proprietary rights." Id. at 427. This case is clearly distinguishable, as Mission was granted no such right.

Embodiment is a term of art associated with intellectual property. The Senate Report includes a letter informing the Judiciary Committee of the Department of Commerce's view of the bill, which states that "[a]lthough 'embodiment' is not defined, we assume the term arises from the copyright law." S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 12. Black's Law Dictionary tags the term as belonging to patent law, and offers three alternate definitions: (1) "[t]he tangible manifestation of an invention"; (2) "[t]he method for using this tangible form"; or (3) "[t]he part of a patent application or patent that describes a concrete manifestation of the invention." *Embodiment*, Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014). Black's Law Dictionary further notes that while intellectual property "is a mental construct" without "physical structure," an embodiment "is a specific physical form of the invention" and thus "[e]ach embodiment exists in the real world." Id. (quoting Morgan D. Rosenberg, The Essentials of Patent Claim Drafting xvii (2012)).

Where the statutory language includes a term of art, resort to sources beyond the text is particularly appropriate to make clear the intended meaning of that term. See Molzof v. United States, 502 U.S. 301, 307 (1992). Both the Senate Report and the Department of Commerce letter offer additional insight into the meaning of "embodiment" and its application to a licensee's rights. The Senate Report provides three examples of protected rights, and concludes with two traits that all protected rights must contain:

> [T]he parties might have agreed that the licensor would prepare a prototype incorporating the licensed intellectual property. If such a prototype was prepared prior to the filing of the petition for relief, but had not been delivered to the licensee at that time, then the licensee can compel the delivery of the prototype in accordance with the terms of the rejected license. Other examples of embodiments include genetic material needed to produce certain biotechnological products and computer program source codes. There are many other possible examples of embodiments, but critical to any right of the licensee to obtain such embodiments under this bill is the prepetition agreement of the parties that the licensee have access to such material and the physical existence of such material on the day of the bankruptcy filing.

S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 9-10 (emphasis added). The Department of Commerce letter states:

> Where the licensed intellectual property is not a work of authorship, we assume the term "embodiment" would be interpreted in a similar sense of enablement in a manner reasonable in the circumstances and would not necessarily include all physical manifestations of the intellectual property. For example, an embodiment of a licensed process might be interpreted to include technical data sufficient to enable the licensee to operate the process, but not a manufacturing facility using (or embodying) the process; and an embodiment of a licensed invention might be interpreted to include a sample of the invention, but not all inventory.

S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 12 (emphasis added).

A few common themes appear in these explanations. First, the pre-petition agreement must give the licensee access to the embodiment of intellectual property. Second, an embodiment of intellectual property is a tangible or physical object that exists pre-petition. Third, an embodiment of intellectual property is something inherently limited in number -- it is a prototype or example of a product, but does not include all products produced using the intellectual property. Finally, we can infer that the purpose of this provision is to allow the licensee to exploit its right to the underlying intellectual property.

Here, we have no object to which Mission requires access in order to exploit an intellectual property right. Rather, we have a prosaic, nonexclusive right to use a patented process, and an unremarkable and entirely independent right to be the exclusive distributor of some but not all goods made with that process. There is simply no "embodiment" at issue in the relevant statutory sense.

Nor does this case, as Mission contends, bear on the enforceability of all negative covenants independent of an intellectual property license. If a party possesses an intellectual property license, perhaps the Code may protect from rejection certain negative covenants -- such as confidentiality -- that do not materially restrict the debtor's reorganization, are tied closely to the intellectual property license, and are necessary to implement its terms. See Biosafe Int'l, Inc. v. Controlled Shredders, Inc. (In re Szombathy), Nos. 94 B 15536, 95

A 01035, 1996 WL 417121, at *11 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. July 9, 1996) rev'd in part sub nom. Szombathy v. Controlled Shredders, Inc., Nos. 94 B 15536, 95 A 01035, 1997 WL 189314 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 14, 1997). But we are not presented with that situation here.

Finally, we observe that Mission salts its brief with several undeveloped suggestions that rejection under section 365(a), even if allowed, might not extinguish a right to demand specific performance of the negative covenant implicit in the exclusive distribution rights. Mission attempts to support these suggestions by citing In re Szombathy, 1996 WL 417121, and by emphasizing that case's reliance on a quote from the Department of Commerce's letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee. Neither source seems to come close to carrying the meaning claimed by Mission. In any event, even as Mission tendered an analogous argument in connection with its trademark license (which we address, below), it never raised any such argument in the bankruptcy court as a basis for preserving its exclusive distribution rights. Hence, the argument is waived in this civil action. See Argentaria v. Wiscovitch-Rentas (In re Net-Velázquez), 625 F.3d 34, 40 (1st Cir. 2010) ("The proposition is well established that, 'absent the most extraordinary circumstances, legal theories not raised squarely in the lower court cannot be broached for the first time on appeal.'" (quoting

Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers Union, Local No. 59 v. Superline Transp. Co., 953 F.2d 17, 21 (1st Cir. 1992))).

B.

We next consider whether Mission retained its rights to use Debtor's trademarks post-rejection. In defining the intellectual property eligible for the protection of section 365(n), Congress expressly listed six kinds of intellectual property. 11 U.S.C. § 101(35A). Trademark licenses (hardly something one would forget about) are not listed, even though relatively obscure property such as "mask work protected under chapter 9 of title 17" is included. Id. Nor does the statute contain any catchall or residual clause from which one might infer the inclusion of properties beyond those expressly listed.

One might reasonably conclude that Congress's decision not to include trademark licenses within the protective ambit of section 365(n) must mean that such licenses are not exempt from section 365(a) rejection. On the other hand, the conclusion that an agreement finds no haven from rejection in section 365(n) does not entirely exhaust the possible arguments for finding that a right under that agreement might otherwise survive rejection. For example, we have held that a counterparty's right to compel the return of its own property survives rejection of a contract under which the debtor has possession of that property. See Abboud v.

The Ground Round, Inc. (In re The Ground Round, Inc.), 482 F.3d 15, 19 (1st Cir. 2007). This case, though, does not present us with a request by a party following rejection to recover its own property temporarily in the hands of the debtor. Rather, it presents a demand by a party to continue using the debtor's property.

Regarding trademarks specifically, the Senate Report states that Congress "postpone[d]" action on trademark licenses "to allow the development of equitable treatment of this situation by bankruptcy courts." S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 5. The only circuit to address this issue squarely has resisted the temptation to find in this ambiguous comment outside the statutory text a toehold for unfettered "equitable" dispensations from section 365(a) rejection when it would otherwise apply. See Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 375 ("What the Bankruptcy Code provides, a judge cannot override by declaring that enforcement would be 'inequitable.'"). We agree. See Law v. Siegel, 134 S. Ct. 1188, 1194-95 (2014) ("We have long held that 'whatever equitable powers remain in the bankruptcy courts must and can only be exercised within the confines of' the Bankruptcy Code." (quoting Norwest Bank Worthington v. Ahlers, 485 U.S. 197, 206 (1988))).

There is, though, an alternative argument for finding that a right to use a debtor's trademark continues post-rejection. That argument rests not on equitable dispensation from rejection, but instead on an exploration of exactly what rejection means. The argument, as accepted by the Seventh Circuit in Sunbeam, runs thus: Under section 365(g), section 365(a) rejection constitutes a breach of contract that "frees the estate from the obligation to perform." Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 377 (quoting Thompkins v. Lil' Joe Records, Inc., 476 F.3d 1294, 1306 (11th Cir. 2007)). "But nothing about this process implies that any rights of the other contracting party have been vaporized." Id. Therefore, reasoned the Seventh Circuit, while rejection converts a debtor's duty to perform into a liability for pre-petition damages, it leaves in place the counterparty's right to continue using a trademark licensed to it under the rejected agreement. In so reasoning, the Seventh Circuit found itself unpersuaded by the contrary approach taken by the Fourth Circuit in Lubrizol. Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 378; see also In re Exide Techs., 607 F.3d 957, 964-68 (3d Cir. 2010) (Ambro, J., concurring).

Of course, to be precise, rejection as Congress viewed it does not "vaporize" a right. Rather, rejection converts the right into a pre-petition claim for damages. Putting that point of vocabulary to one side, and leaving open the possibility that courts may find some unwritten limitations on the full effects of section 365(a) rejection, we find trademark rights to provide a poor candidate for such dispensation. Congress's principal aim in providing for rejection was to "release the debtor's estate from burdensome obligations that can impede a successful reorganization." Bildisco & Bildisco, 465 U.S. at 528. Sunbeam therefore largely rests on the unstated premise that it is possible to free a debtor from any continuing performance obligations under a trademark license even while preserving the licensee's right to use the trademark. See Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 377. Judge Ambro's concurrence in In re Exide Technologies shares that premise. See 607 F.3d at 967 (Ambro, J., concurring) (assuming that the bankruptcy court could allow the licensee to retain trademark rights even while giving the debtor "a fresh start").

Careful examination undercuts that premise because the effective licensing of a trademark requires that the trademark owner -- here Debtor, followed by any purchaser of its assets -- monitor and exercise control over the quality of the goods sold to the public under cover of the trademark. See 3 J. Thomas McCarthy, McCarthy on Trademarks & Unfair Competition § 18:48 (5th ed. 2017) ("Thus, not only does the trademark owner have the right to control quality, when it licenses, it has the duty to control quality."). Trademarks, unlike patents, are public-facing messages to consumers about the relationship between the goods and the trademark owner. They signal uniform quality and also protect a business from competitors who attempt to profit from its developed goodwill. See Societe Des Produits Nestle, S.A. v. Casa Helvetia, Inc., 982 F.2d 633, 636 (1st Cir. 1992). The licensor's monitoring and control thus serve to ensure that the public is not deceived as to the nature or quality of the goods sold. Presumably, for this reason, the Agreement expressly reserves to Debtor the ability to exercise this control: The Agreement provides that Debtor "shall have the right to review and approve all uses of its Marks," except for certain pre-approved uses. Importantly, failure to monitor and exercise this control results in a so-called "naked license," jeopardizing the continued validity of the owner's own trademark rights. McCarthy, supra, § 18:48; see also Eva's Bridal Ltd. v. Halanick Enters., Inc., 639 F.3d 788, 790 (7th Cir. 2011) ("[A] naked license abandons a mark."); Restatement (Third) of Unfair Competition § 33 ("The owner of a trademark, trade name, collective mark, or certification mark may license another to use the designation. . . . Failure of the licensor to exercise reasonable control over the use of the designation by the licensee can result in abandonment . . . .").

The Seventh Circuit's approach, therefore, would allow Mission to retain the use of Debtor's trademarks in a manner that would force Debtor to choose between performing executory obligations arising from the continuance of the license or risking the permanent loss of its trademarks, thereby diminishing their value to Debtor, whether realized directly or through an asset sale. Such a restriction on Debtor's ability to free itself from its executory obligations, even if limited to trademark licenses alone, would depart from the manner in which section 365(a) otherwise operates. And the logic behind that approach (no rights of the counterparty should be "vaporized" in favor of a damages claim) would seem to invite further leakage. If trademark rights categorically survive rejection, then why not exclusive distribution rights as well? Or a right to receive advance notice before termination of performance? And so on.

Although claiming to follow Sunbeam, our dissenting colleague seems to reject its categorical approach in favor of what Sunbeam itself rejected -- an "equitable remedy" that would consider in some unspecified manner the "terms of the Agreement, and non-bankruptcy law." See Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 375-76. In so doing, our colleague gives great weight to a few lines in the Senate Report, treating them variously as "guidance," as a statement of Congress's "intent," and even as a mandate that "instruct[s]" the courts. In short, the dissent's interpretative approach seems to accord a line in the Senate Report the force of a line in the statute itself. Moreover, it does so by taking a line out of the Senate Report addressing section 365(n), which itself has no relevant ambiguity, and then uses that line to inform the dissent's interpretation of the previously enacted section 365(a). And while it is true that the Senate Report references equitable consideration, the dissent also seems to overlook the fact that when Congress otherwise intended to grant bankruptcy courts the ability to "equitably" craft exceptions to the Code's rules, it did so in the statute itself. See, e.g., 11 U.S.C. § 365(d)(5) (requiring the trustee to perform the obligations of the debtor until an unexpired lease is assumed or rejected "unless the court, after notice and a hearing and based on the equities of the case, orders otherwise"); id. § 552(b)(1) (stating that a security agreement may extend to proceeds or profits acquired after the commencement of the case "to the extent provided by such security agreement and by applicable nonbankruptcy law, except to any extent that the court, after notice and a hearing and based on the equities of the case, orders otherwise"); see also id. § 502(j) ("A reconsidered claim may be allowed or disallowed according to the equities of the case."); id. § 557(d)(2)(D) (allowing the expedited disposition of grain by, inter alia, "such other methods as is equitable in the case"); id. § 723(d) ("[T]he court, after notice and a hearing, shall determine an equitable distribution of the surplus so recovered . . . ."); id. § 1113(c) (listing whether "the balance of the equities clearly favors rejection of such agreement" as a factor for a court to consider in determining whether to approve an application for rejection of a collective bargaining agreement); id. § 1114(g) (requiring a court to modify the payment of retirement benefits if the court finds that "such modification is necessary to permit the reorganization of the debtor and assures that all creditors, the debtor, and all of the affected parties are treated fairly and equitably, and is clearly favored by the balance of the equities").

Even if we did sit in the chancellor's chair in applying section 365(a), we would likely hesitate to adopt our colleague's approach. Under such a case-specific, equitable approach, one might in theory preclude rejection only where the burden of quality assurance on the debtor will be minimal. The problem, though, is that in the bankruptcy context especially, where the licensor and licensee are at odds over continuing to deal with each other, the burden will likely often be greater than normal. Here, for example, the adversarial relationship between Debtor and Mission may portend less eager compliance. More importantly, in all cases there will be some burden, and it will usually not be possible to know at the time of the bankruptcy proceeding how great the burden will prove to be, as it will depend very much on the subsequent actions of the licensee. Conversely, the burden imposed on the counterparty of having its trademark right converted to a pre-petition damages claim at a time when the relationship signaled by the trademark is itself ending will in most instances be less than the burden of having patent rights so converted. The counterparty may still make and sell its products -- or any products -- just so long as it avoids use of the trademark precisely when the message conveyed by the trademark may no longer be accurate. We therefore find unappealing the prospect of saddling bankruptcy proceedings with the added cost and delay of attempting to draw fact-sensitive and unreliable distinctions between greater and lesser burdens of this type. See RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank, 566 U.S. 639, 649 (2012) ("[I]t is our obligation to interpret the Code clearly and predictably using well established principles of statutory construction."). There is, too, the public's interest in not being misled as to the origin and quantity of goods that consumers buy.

In sum, the approach taken by Sunbeam entirely ignores the residual enforcement burden it would impose on the debtor just as the Code otherwise allows the debtor to free itself from executory burdens. The approach also rests on a logic that invites further degradation of the debtor's fresh start options. Our colleague's alternative, "equitable" approach seems similarly flawed, and has the added drawback of imposing increased uncertainty and costs on the parties in bankruptcy proceedings. For these reasons, we favor the categorical approach of leaving trademark licenses unprotected from court-approved rejection, unless and until Congress should decide otherwise. See James M. Wilton & Andrew G. Devore, Trademark Licensing in the Shadow of Bankruptcy, 68 Bus. Law. 739, 771-76 (2013).

C.

Mission's final argument is that the bankruptcy court erred by not holding an adversary proceeding under Bankruptcy Rule 7001. Mission contends that because the rule governing adversary proceedings includes within its ambit determinations of an "interest in property," the bankruptcy court was required to hold such a hearing to determine the scope of Mission's rights. The bankruptcy court instead treated the issue as a contested matter under Rule 9014. We need not address this argument directly, because we find that even if an adversary proceeding was required, any error was harmless.

Mission contends that it was prejudiced because it was not given a fair opportunity to develop an evidentiary record. But the issues at stake can be resolved -- and are resolved, in our de novo review -- without reliance on any disputed facts outside the four corners of the Agreement. The logical leap Mission asks us to make -- that extrinsic evidence would be both appropriate and lead to a different result -- is unsupported by any possible extrinsic evidence to which Mission points. Further, the bankruptcy court permitted Mission and Debtor to conduct discovery following its September 21, 2015 order. There is no evidence, however, that either party had a need for or in fact did conduct discovery, and if they did, Mission offers no explanation for how this discovery generated any factual dispute that need be resolved in a testimonial hearing. Requiring Debtor to commence an adversary proceeding would only have delayed the resolution of critical issues without changing the bankruptcy court's ultimate determination.

V.

For the foregoing reasons, the bankruptcy court's decision is affirmed.

-Concurring and Dissenting Opinion Follows-

TORRUELLA, Circuit Judge **(Concurring in part, dissenting in part)**. I agree with the majority that 11 U.S.C. § 365(n) does not protect Mission's exclusive distribution rights or its non-exclusive trademark license. The plain language of this subsection identifies "intellectual property," which, for purposes of chapter 11, does not encompass trademarks. See 11 U.S.C. § 101(35A). However, I disagree with the majority's bright-line rule that the omission of trademarks from the protections of section 365(n) leaves a non-rejecting party without any remaining rights to use a debtor's trademark and logo. As Judge Easterbrook wrote, "an omission is just an omission," and simply implies that section 365(n) does not determine how trademark licenses should be treated -- one way or the other. Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 375. I would follow the Seventh Circuit and the BAP in finding that Mission's rights to use Debtor's trademark did not vaporize as a result of Debtor's rejection of the executory contract.

The majority focuses on the Bankruptcy Code's protection of debtors' ability to reorganize and to escape "burdensome obligations." But, as the majority acknowledges, in some situations, the Bankruptcy Code also provides protections to non-debtor parties of an executory contract, allowing the courts to determine an equitable remedy pursuant to the terms of a rejected contract. See Ohio v. Kovacs, 469 U.S. 274, 280 (1985); see also In re Nickels Midway Pier, LLC, 255 F. App'x 633, 637-38 (3d Cir.

2007); Abboud, 482 F.3d at 19. Thus, to determine the effect of a section 365(a) rejection on a trademark license, we look to the plain text of section 365 as a whole, which dictates the parameters of such a rejection of an executory contract.

A plain language review reveals section 365's silence as to the treatment of a trademark license post-rejection. Where a statute is silent, we look to the legislative history for assistance. DiGiovanni v. Traylor Bros., Inc., 75 F.3d 748, 755 (1st Cir. 1996) (citing Cabral v. I.N.S., 15 F.3d 193, 194 (1st Cir. 1994)). Resultantly, our examination leads us back to Congress's intent when it enacted section 365(n). The Senate Committee report makes clear that Congress enacted section 365(n) as a direct response to the Fourth Circuit's decision in Lubrizol, 756 F.2d 1043, where the court found that rejection of a contract for an intellectual property license deprived the licensee of all rights previously granted under that license. See S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 2-3. In so doing, Congress intended to "correct[] the perception of some courts that Section 365 was ever intended to be a mechanism for stripping innocent licensee [sic] of rights central to the operations of their ongoing business." Id., at 4.

Specific to trademark licenses, the Senate Committee report explains that the purposeful omission of trademarks was not designed to leave trademark licensees unprotected, but rather was "designed to allow more time for study, not to approve Lubrizol."

Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 375. The relevant portion of the Senate report reads:

> [T]he bill does not address the rejection of executory trademark[s], ... While such rejection is of concern because of the interpretation of [§] 365 by the Lubrizol court and others, . . . such contracts raise issues beyond the scope of this legislation. In particular, trademark . . . relationships depend to a large extent on control of the quality of the products or services sold by the licensee. Since these matters could not be addressed without more extensive study, it was determined to postpone congressional action in this area and to allow the development of equitable treatment of this situation by bankruptcy courts.

S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 5. This legislative history expresses congressional concern about the application of Lubrizol's holding to trademarks licenses until further studies are done, and, rather than continue to apply Lubrizol's holding, encourages "equitable treatment" by the courts to resolve disputes arising in the meantime. Id. Why would Congress have provided this guidance if it meant for Lubrizol -- the very case Congress rejected -- to apply to trademark licenses? Congress has yet to advise the courts about the results of any further studies; as such, the majority's judicially created bright-line rule contravenes congressional intent.

The majority's view infers that the omission of trademarks from section 101(35A)'s definition of "intellectual property," and therefore the protections of section 365(n), implies that section 365 categorically affords no protections to licensees of trademarks. Yet, Congress's own interpretation of section 365(n) informs us that the bill does not "address or intend any inference to be drawn concerning the treatment of executory contracts which are unrelated to intellectual property." Id. "In light of these direct congressional statements of intent, it is simply more freight than negative inference will bear to read rejection of a trademark license to effect the same result as termination of that license." In re Exide Techs., 607 F.3d at 967 (Ambro, J., concurring) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

Instead, like the BAP below, I find it appropriate to view a debtor's section 365(a) rejection through the broader lens of section 365, as the Seventh Circuit did in Sunbeam. Section 365(g) states that "the rejection of an executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor constitutes a breach of such contract or lease." 11 U.S.C. § 365(g). Similar to other contractual breaches outside of the bankruptcy context, a rejection pursuant to section 365(a) does not automatically terminate a non-rejecting party's rights under a contract. Sunbeam, 686 F.3d at 377. Admittedly, "[w]hat the Bankruptcy Code provides, a judge cannot override by declaring that enforcement would be inequitable." Id. at 375 (internal quotation marks omitted). Given the Bankruptcy Code's silence as to the post-rejection rights that a trademark licensee does or does not retain, and in accordance with principles governing breaches of contract, we must resolve the dispute by looking to the terms of the contract to which these sophisticated parties agreed, and other applicable non-bankruptcy law. While the majority mistakenly insists that that this approach rejects the one followed in Sunbeam, it is precisely what the Seventh Circuit called for in finding that rejection does not abrogate a contract. Id. at 377. The majority takes issue with this consideration in what it terms as "some unspecified manner," but ignores that "the development of equitable treatment" is precisely what Congress has instructed the courts to do. See S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 6. Instead, the majority's view that a section 365(a) rejection eliminates a licensee's rights to the bargained-for use of a debtor's trademark effectively treats a debtor's rejection as a contract cancellation, rather than a contractual breach, putting the court at odds with legislative intent. It also "makes bankruptcy more a sword than a shield, putting debtor-licensors in a catbird seat they often do not deserve." In re Exide Techs., 607 F.3d at 967-68 (Ambro, J., concurring).

I respect my colleagues' concern that following the Seventh Circuit's holding that a section 365(a) rejection does not categorically eviscerate the trademark rights that a debtor-licensor bargained away may "require[] that the trademark owner -- here Debtor -- monitor and exercise control over the quality of the goods sold to the public" post-rejection. However, licensees have trademark quality assurance obligations under the terms of their individual contracts which can be enforced through further legal action and the equitable remedy of specific performance. In the current case, Mission's obligations are laid out in Section 15(d) of the Agreement, which states that, inter alia, Mission shall not use the trademarks in a disparaging or inaccurate manner, shall comply with written trademark guidelines, and shall not create a unitary composite mark. The majority speculates that the remaining burden on the debtor will be too great in the bankruptcy context, and therefore, if it "were in the chancellor's chair," it would not follow this approach. However, we need not enter such a debate as it is not the role of the courts to legislate, as the majority's approach effectively does, through the creation of bright-line rules in the face of congressional intent. Congress contemplated the majority's concern when it enacted section 365(n), recognizing "that there may be circumstances in which the future affirmative performance obligations under a license cannot be performed in a manner that benefits the estate." S. Rep. No. 100-505, at 4-5. The legislative history indicates that treatment of trademark licenses is one such circumstance.

Accordingly, the BAP was correct to follow the Seventh Circuit's lead in finding that, even though 11 U.S.C. § 365(n) does not provide Mission protection of its license to use Debtor's trademarks, Debtor's rejection of the executory contract does not rescind the Agreement and eviscerate any of Mission's remaining trademark rights. Instead, as Congress has instructed the bankruptcy courts to do, the effect of Debtor's rejection on Mission's trademark license should be guided by the terms of the Agreement, and non-bankruptcy law, to determine the appropriate equitable remedy of the functional breach of contract. I respectfully dissent.

FOLEY

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Trademarks, Bankruptcy, and Leverage: What Manufacturers and Other Trademark License Parties Should Know About A Potential Landmark Case Before the Supreme Court

06 March 2019

Manufacturing Industry Advisor

On February 20, 2019, the United States Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the case *Mission Products, Inc. v. Tempnology, LLC*. The case has important implications for manufacturers and other parties to trademark licenses when a trademark licensor files, or threatens to file, bankruptcy. Lower courts including the First Circuit found that, in the event of a trademark licensor bankruptcy filing, the licensor may reject the trademark license, prevent the licensee from further use of the license, and leave the licensee with the sole remedy of filing a claim in the bankruptcy case. Other courts have disagreed with the effect of a trademark license rejection in bankruptcy, finding that a trademark licensee may retain certain rights following a licensor rejection. When the Supreme Court rules, the *Tempnology* case is slated to be a landmark decision both on the general issue of what rejection truly means in bankruptcy and on the specific issue of whether a trademark licensee's rights can essentially be destroyed in a licensor bankruptcy case.

The decision is likely to have broad implications for trademark license parties no matter which way the Supreme Court rules. If the court holds that the rejection of a trademark license effectively terminates the rights of a licensee, both licensors and licenses will know that such a "nuclear option" is available in bankruptcy and negotiating leverage will swing heavily toward a licensor. On the other hand, a decision finding that licensees retain rights post-rejection will make a bankruptcy filing a much less attractive option for a licensor as a solution for dealing with a licensee. Both trademark licensors and licensees should therefore be aware that the bankruptcy sword or shield (depending on your perspective) may be about to change.

The *Tempnology* case involved Tempnology, LLC, a company that manufactured athletic sportswear and licensed the right to use its COOLCORE trademark and related rights to a licensee called Mission Product Holdings, Inc. More details about the company, the bankruptcy court decision, and the First Circuit decision can be found here. In summary, Tempnology attempted to use its Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing as a means to terminate the rights of the trademark license to Mission. Normally, following the rejection of an agreement such as a license in a bankruptcy case, non-debtor parties are limited to filing a general unsecured claim. Depending on the case, general unsecured claimants may receive much less than the face value of their claims. However, some courts have held that rejection does not "vaporize" a licensee's rights and the non-debtor licensee thus may retain certain post-rejection enforcement rights. To that point, outside of the bankruptcy context, a licensor's breach of a trademark license agreement does not mean that the licensee no longer has any rights in the license. In fact, state law provides a number of licensee remedies short of termination.

On appeal to the First Circuit, the court disagreed with the characterization that refusing to permit post-rejection rights would "vaporize" a trademark licensee's rights. The licensee continued to have rights, the court noted, but they were limited to filing a claim for rejection damages. The court further noted that the purpose of rejection under the Bankruptcy Code is to free a debtor of costly obligations and that this purpose would be thwarted if a trademark licensor debtor were required to deal with post-rejection assertions of rights by the licensee.

Mission appealed to the Supreme Court and certiorari was granted on October 26, 2018. While Mission requested review of several issues, the Supreme Court limited the matter to one issue: whether a debtor/licensor's rejection of a license agreement terminates rights of the licensee that would survive the licensor's breach under applicable non-bankruptcy law. In addition to the briefs filed by the parties, there were several notable amici curiae briefs, the majority of which adopted Mission's position that a trademark licensee should retain certain rights post-rejection. Such amici curiae briefs in support of Mission included the United States, the New York Intellectual Property Law Association, a number of revered law professors, and the International Trademark Association. Moreover, the United States, as represented by the Assistant to the Solicitor General, participated in oral argument in support of Mission.

During the oral arguments, the Justices probed the issue of a trademark licensor's obligations, including contractual obligations under the terms of a license as well as obligations to maintain the trademark under the Lanham Act. This is an important point because rejection is designed to relieve a debtor of its contractual obligations in order to unburden the bankruptcy estate. The Lanham Act, however, may impose continuing obligations on the licensor with respect to the rejected license. Mission argued that Bankruptcy Code section 365 and the concept of rejection speaks to contractual obligations and that the obligation to maintain a trademark is outside the agreement. Justice Breyer challenged the argument with an analogy of a landlord for an igloo whose obligation included air conditioning the premises: "You know, you break your promise to air condition, no more igloo." There were also some notable statements from the United States, which called the Tempnology's position "extortionate" because the threat of a rejection would put the licensee to the "choice between paying a higher royalty payment or shutting down their business and firing all their workers."

Tempnology responded by arguing that a trademark license involves a special relationship that deals with the trademark owner's reputation. The Justices challenged Tempnology on that point by asking how a licensor's breach would be treated outside of bankruptcy. When pressed on the point, Tempnology could not point to any case law or other authority that would compel the licensee to stop using the license as a result of the licensor's breach. Justice Kagan succinctly summarized the parties' positions that Mission was arguing rejection means breach and Tempnology was arguing that rejection means rescission. The fact that the applicable Bankruptcy Code section – section 365(g) – uses the word "breach" suggests that the Justices may be leaning in favor of Mission in the case. Note, however, the issue of mootness may preclude a substantive decision in this case. Both Justices Gorsuch and Sotomayor asked pointed questions on why the case is not moot on a number of grounds, including the fact that no court actually entered an order specifically preventing Mission from using the COOLCORE trademark post-rejection. The United States responded that the effect of the bankruptcy court order was to prevent such usage. It is not entirely clear, but it seemed that the Justices were able to get past the issue of mootness.

The issues in the *Tempnology* case have broad implications on whether a Chapter 11 bankruptcy can be used as a sword by a trademark licensor to relieve itself of what it perceives as burdensome licensee obligations. Under the law as adopted by the First Circuit, the scales are tipped decidedly in the favor of a debtor/licensor. If the Supreme Court rules in favor of Mission, it will provide clarity on what exactly rejection means in these circumstances and it will constitute a significant readjustment of negotiating leverage.

Syllabus

NOTE: Where it is feasible, a syllabus (headnote) will be released, as is being done in connection with this case, at the time the opinion is issued. The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See *United States* v. *Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U. S. 321, 337.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Syllabus

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC. *v.* TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, NKA OLD COLD LLC

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

No. 17–1657. Argued February 20, 2019—Decided May 20, 2019

Petitioner Mission Product Holdings, Inc., entered into a contract with Respondent Tempnology, LLC, which gave Mission a license to use Tempnology's trademarks in connection with the distribution of certain clothing and accessories. Tempnology filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy and sought to reject its agreement with Mission. Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code enables a debtor to "reject any executory contract"—meaning a contract that neither party has finished performing. 11 U. S. C. §365(a). It further provides that rejection "constitutes a breach of such contract." §365(g). The Bankruptcy Court approved Tempnology's rejection and further held that the rejection terminated Mission's rights to use Tempnology's trademarks. The Bankruptcy Appellate Panel reversed, relying on Section 365(g)'s statement that rejection "constitutes a breach" to hold that rejection does not terminate rights that would survive a breach of contract outside bankruptcy. The First Circuit rejected the Panel's judgment and reinstated the Bankruptcy Court's decision.

Held:

1. This case is not moot. Mission presents a plausible claim for money damages arising from its inability to use Tempnology's trademarks, which is sufficient to preserve a live controversy. See *Chafin* v. *Chafin*, 568 U. S. 165, 172. Tempnology's various arguments that Mission is not entitled to damages do not so clearly preclude recovery as to render this case moot. Pp. 6–7.

2. A debtor's rejection of an executory contract under Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code has the same effect as a breach of that contract outside bankruptcy. Such an act cannot rescind rights that the contract previously granted. Pp. 7–16.

Syllabus

(a) Section 365(g) provides that rejection "constitutes a breach." And "breach" is neither a defined nor a specialized bankruptcy term—it means in the Code what it means in contract law outside bankruptcy. See *Field* v. *Mans*, 516 U. S. 59, 69. Outside bankruptcy, a licensor's breach cannot revoke continuing rights given to a counterparty under a contract (assuming no special contract term or state law). And because rejection "constitutes a breach," the same result must follow from rejection in bankruptcy. In preserving a counterparty's rights, Section 365 reflects the general bankruptcy rule that the estate cannot possess anything more than the debtor did outside bankruptcy. See *Board of Trade of Chicago* v. *Johnson*, 264 U. S. 1, 15. And conversely, allowing rejection to rescind a counterparty's rights would circumvent the Code's stringent limits on "avoidance" actions—the exceptional cases in which debtors may unwind pre-bankruptcy transfers that undermine the bankruptcy process. See, *e.g.*, §548(a). Pp. 8–12.

(b) Tempnology's principal counterargument rests on a negative inference drawn from provisions of Section 365 identifying categories of contracts under which a counterparty may retain specified rights after rejection. See §§365(h), (i), (n). Tempnology argues that these provisions indicate that the ordinary consequence of rejection must be something different—*i.e.*, the termination of contractual rights previously granted. But that argument offers no account of how to read Section 365(g) (rejection "constitutes a breach") to say essentially its opposite. And the provisions Tempnology treats as a reticulated scheme of exceptions each emerged at a different time and responded to a discrete problem—as often as not, correcting a judicial ruling of just the kind Tempnology urges.

Tempnology's remaining argument turns on how the special features of trademark law may affect the fulfillment of the Code's goals. Unless rejection terminates a licensee's right to use a trademark, Tempnology argues, a debtor must choose between monitoring the goods sold under a license or risking the loss of its trademark, either of which would impede a debtor's ability to reorganize. But the distinctive features of trademarks do not persuade this Court to adopt a construction of Section 365 that will govern much more than trademark licenses. And Tempnology's plea to facilitate reorganizations cannot overcome what Section 365(a) and (g) direct. In delineating the burdens a debtor may and may not escape, Section 365's edict that rejection is breach expresses a more complex set of aims than Tempnology acknowledges. Pp. 12–16.

879 F. 3d 389, reversed and remanded.

KAGAN, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C. J., and THOMAS, GINSBURG, BREYER, ALITO, SOTOMAYOR, and KAVANAUGH, JJ., joined. SOTOMAYOR, J., filed a concurring opinion. GORSUCH, J., filed a dissenting opinion.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 17–1657

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC., PETITIONER *v.* TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, NKA OLD COLD LLC

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

[May 20, 2019]

JUSTICE KAGAN delivered the opinion of the Court.

Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code enables a debtor to "reject any executory contract"—meaning a contract that neither party has finished performing. 11 U. S. C. §365(a). The section further provides that a debtor's rejection of a contract under that authority "constitutes a breach of such contract." §365(g).

Today we consider the meaning of those provisions in the context of a trademark licensing agreement. The question is whether the debtor-licensor's rejection of that contract deprives the licensee of its rights to use the trademark. We hold it does not. A rejection breaches a contract but does not rescind it. And that means all the rights that would ordinarily survive a contract breach, including those conveyed here, remain in place.

I

This case arises from a licensing agreement gone wrong. Respondent Tempnology, LLC, manufactured clothing and accessories designed to stay cool when used in exercise. It marketed those products under the brand name "Coolcore," using trademarks (*e.g.,* logos and labels) to distinguish the gear from other athletic apparel. In 2012, Tempnology entered into a contract with petitioner Mission Product Holdings, Inc. See App. 203–255. The agreement gave Mission an exclusive license to distribute certain Coolcore products in the United States. And more important here, it granted Mission a non-exclusive license to use the Coolcore trademarks, both in the United States and around the world. The agreement was set to expire in July 2016. But in September 2015, Tempnology filed a petition for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. And it soon afterward asked the Bankruptcy Court to allow it to "reject" the licensing agreement. §365(a).

Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code sets out a framework for reorganizing a bankrupt business. See §§1101–1174. The filing of a petition creates a bankruptcy estate consisting of all the debtor's assets and rights. See §541. The estate is the pot out of which creditors' claims are paid. It is administered by either a trustee or, as in this case, the debtor itself. See §§1101, 1107.

Section 365(a) of the Code provides that a "trustee [or debtor], subject to the court's approval, may assume or reject any executory contract." §365(a). A contract is executory if "performance remains due to some extent on both sides." *NLRB* v. *Bildisco & Bildisco*, 465 U. S. 513, 522, n. 6 (1984) (internal quotation marks omitted). Such an agreement represents both an asset (the debtor's right to the counterparty's future performance) and a liability (the debtor's own obligations to perform). Section 365(a) enables the debtor (or its trustee), upon entering bankruptcy, to decide whether the contract is a good deal for the estate going forward. If so, the debtor will want to assume the contract, fulfilling its obligations while benefiting from the counterparty's performance. But if not, the debtor will want to reject the contract, repudiating any further performance of its duties. The bankruptcy court will generally approve that choice, under the deferential "business judgment" rule. *Id.*, at 523.

According to Section 365(g), "the rejection of an executory contract[ ] constitutes a breach of such contract." As both parties here agree, the counterparty thus has a claim against the estate for damages resulting from the debtor's nonperformance. See Brief for Petitioner 17, 19; Brief for Respondent 30–31. But such a claim is unlikely to ever be paid in full. That is because the debtor's breach is deemed to occur "immediately before the date of the filing of the [bankruptcy] petition," rather than on the actual post-petition rejection date. §365(g)(1). By thus giving the counterparty a pre-petition claim, Section 365(g) places that party in the same boat as the debtor's unsecured creditors, who in a typical bankruptcy may receive only cents on the dollar. See *Bildisco*, 465 U. S., at 531–532 (noting the higher priority of post-petition claims).

In this case, the Bankruptcy Court (per usual) approved Tempnology's proposed rejection of its executory licensing agreement with Mission. See App. to Pet. for Cert. 83–84. That meant, as laid out above, two things on which the parties agree. First, Tempnology could stop performing under the contract. And second, Mission could assert (for whatever it might be worth) a pre-petition claim in the bankruptcy proceeding for damages resulting from Tempnology's nonperformance.

But Tempnology thought still another consequence ensued, and it returned to the Bankruptcy Court for a declaratory judgment confirming its view. According to Tempnology, its rejection of the contract also terminated the rights it had granted Mission to use the Coolcore trademarks. Tempnology based its argument on a negative inference. See Motion in No. 15–11400 (Bkrtcy. Ct. NH), pp. 9–14. Several provisions in Section 365 state that a counterparty to specific kinds of agreements may keep exercising contractual rights after a debtor's rejection. For example, Section 365(h) provides that if a bankrupt landlord rejects a lease, the tenant need not move out; instead, she may stay and pay rent (just as she did before) until the lease term expires. And still closer to home, Section 365(n) sets out a similar rule for some types of intellectual property licenses: If the debtor-licensor rejects the agreement, the licensee can continue to use the property (typically, a patent), so long as it makes whatever payments the contract demands. But Tempnology pointed out that neither Section 365(n) nor any similar provision covers trademark licenses. So, it reasoned, in that sort of contract a different rule must apply: The debtor's rejection must extinguish the rights that the agreement had conferred on the trademark licensee. The Bankruptcy Court agreed. See *In re Tempnology, LLC*, 541 B. R. 1 (Bkrtcy. Ct. NH 2015). It held, relying on the same "negative inference," that Tempnology's rejection of the licensing agreement revoked Mission's right to use the Coolcore marks. *Id.*, at 7.

The Bankruptcy Appellate Panel reversed, relying heavily on a decision of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit about the effects of rejection on trademark licensing agreements. See *In re Tempnology, LLC*, 559 B. R. 809, 820–823 (Bkrtcy. App. Panel CA1 2016); *Sunbeam Products, Inc.* v. *Chicago Am. Mfg., LLC*, 686 F. 3d 372, 376–377 (CA7 2012). Rather than reason backward from Section 365(n) or similar provisions, the Panel focused on Section 365(g)'s statement that rejection of a contract "constitutes a breach." Outside bankruptcy, the court explained, the breach of an agreement does not eliminate rights the contract had already conferred on the non-breaching party. See 559 B. R., at 820. So neither could a rejection of an agreement in bankruptcy have that effect. A rejection "convert[s]" a "debtor's unfulfilled obligations" to a pre-petition damages claim. *Id.*, at 822 (quoting *Sunbeam*, 686 F. 3d, at 377). But it does not "terminate the contract" or "vaporize[ ]" the counterparty's rights. 559 B. R., at 820, 822 (quoting *Sunbeam*, 686 F. 3d, at 377). Mission could thus continue to use the Coolcore trademarks.

But the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit rejected the Panel's and Seventh Circuit's view, and reinstated the Bankruptcy Court decision terminating Mission's license. See *In re Tempnology, LLC*, 879 F. 3d 389 (2018). The majority first endorsed that court's inference from Section 365(n) and similar provisions. It next reasoned that special features of trademark law counsel against allowing a licensee to retain rights to a mark after the licensing agreement's rejection. Under that body of law, the majority stated, the trademark owner's "[f]ailure to monitor and exercise [quality] control" over goods associated with a trademark "jeopardiz[es] the continued validity of [its] own trademark rights." *Id.*, at 402. So if (the majority continued) a licensee can keep using a mark after an agreement's rejection, the licensor will need to carry on its monitoring activities. And according to the majority, that would frustrate "Congress's principal aim in providing for rejection": to "release the debtor's estate from burdensome obligations." *Ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted). Judge Torruella dissented, mainly for the Seventh Circuit's reasons. See *id.*, at 405–407.

We granted certiorari to resolve the division between the First and Seventh Circuits. 586 U. S. ___ (2018). We now affirm the Seventh's reasoning and reverse the decision below.[1]

[1] In its briefing before this Court, Mission contends that its exclusive distribution rights survived the licensing agreement's rejection for the same reason as its trademark rights did. See Brief for Petitioner 40–44; *supra*, at 2. But the First Circuit held that Mission had waived that argument, see 879 F. 3d, at 401, and we have no reason to doubt that conclusion. Our decision thus affects only Mission's trademark rights.

II

Before reaching the merits, we pause to consider Tempnology's claim that this case is moot. Under settled law, we may dismiss the case for that reason only if "it is impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief whatever" to Mission assuming it prevails. *Chafin* v. *Chafin*, 568 U. S. 165, 172 (2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). That demanding standard is not met here.

Mission has presented a claim for money damages—essentially lost profits—arising from its inability to use the Coolcore trademarks between the time Tempnology rejected the licensing agreement and its scheduled expiration date. See Reply Brief 22, and n. 8. Such claims, if at all plausible, ensure a live controversy. See *Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div.* v. *Craft*, 436 U. S. 1, 8–9 (1978). For better or worse, nothing so shows a continuing stake in a dispute's outcome as a demand for dollars and cents. See 13C C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure §3533.3, p. 2 (3d ed. 2008) (Wright & Miller) ("[A] case is not moot so long as a claim for monetary relief survives"). Ultimate recovery on that demand may be uncertain or even unlikely for any number of reasons, in this case as in others. But that is of no moment. If there is any chance of money changing hands, Mission's suit remains live. See *Chafin*, 568 U. S., at 172.

Tempnology makes a flurry of arguments about why Mission is not entitled to damages, but none so clearly precludes recovery as to make this case moot. First, Tempnology contends that Mission suffered no injury because it "never used the trademark[s] during [the post-rejection] period." Brief for Respondent 24; see Tr. of Oral Arg. 33. But that gets things backward. Mission's non-use of the marks during that time is precisely what gives rise to its damages claim; had it employed the marks, it would not have lost any profits. So next, Tempnology argues that Mission's non-use was its own "choice," for which damages cannot lie. See *id.*, at 26. But recall that the Bankruptcy Court held that Mission *could not* use the marks after rejection (and its decision remained in effect through the agreement's expiration). See *supra*, at 4. And although (as Tempnology counters) the court issued "no injunction," Brief for Respondent 26, that difference does not matter: Mission need not have flouted a crystal-clear ruling and courted yet more legal trouble to preserve its claim. Cf. 13B Wright & Miller §3533.2.2, at 852 ("[C]ompliance [with a judicial decision] does not moot [a case] if it remains possible to undo the effects of compliance," as through compensation). So last, Tempnology claims that it bears no blame (and thus should not have to pay) for Mission's injury because all it did was "ask[ ] the court to make a ruling." Tr. of Oral Arg. 34–35. But whether Tempnology did anything to Mission amounting to a legal wrong is a prototypical merits question, which no court has addressed and which has no obvious answer. That means it is no reason to find this case moot.

And so too for Tempnology's further argument that Mission will be unable to convert any judgment in its favor to hard cash. Here, Tempnology notes that the bankruptcy estate has recently distributed all of its assets, leaving nothing to satisfy Mission's judgment. See Brief for Respondent 27. But courts often adjudicate disputes whose "practical impact" is unsure at best, as when "a defendant is insolvent." *Chafin*, 568 U. S., at 175. And Mission notes that if it prevails, it can seek the unwinding of prior distributions to get its fair share of the estate. See Reply Brief 23. So although this suit "may not make [Mission] rich," or even better off, it remains a live controversy—allowing us to proceed. *Chafin*, 568 U. S., at 176.

III

What is the effect of a debtor's (or trustee's) rejection of a contract under Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code?

The parties and courts of appeals have offered us two starkly different answers. According to one view, a rejection has the same consequence as a contract breach outside bankruptcy: It gives the counterparty a claim for damages, while leaving intact the rights the counterparty has received under the contract. According to the other view, a rejection (except in a few spheres) has more the effect of a contract rescission in the non-bankruptcy world: Though also allowing a damages claim, the rejection terminates the whole agreement along with all rights it conferred. Today, we hold that both Section 365's text and fundamental principles of bankruptcy law command the first, rejection-as-breach approach. We reject the competing claim that by specifically enabling the counterparties in some contracts to retain rights after rejection, Congress showed that it wanted the counterparties in all other contracts to lose their rights. And we reject an argument for the rescission approach turning on the distinctive features of trademark licenses. Rejection of a contract—any contract—in bankruptcy operates not as a rescission but as a breach.

A

We start with the text of the Code's principal provisions on rejection—and find that it does much of the work. As noted earlier, Section 365(a) gives a debtor the option, subject to court approval, to "assume or reject any executory contract." See *supra*, at 2. And Section 365(g) describes what rejection means. Rejection "constitutes a breach of [an executory] contract," deemed to occur "immediately before the date of the filing of the petition." See *supra*, at 3. Or said more pithily for current purposes, a rejection is a breach. And "breach" is neither a defined nor a specialized bankruptcy term. It means in the Code what it means in contract law outside bankruptcy. See *Field* v. *Mans*, 516 U. S. 59, 69 (1995) (Congress generally meant for the Bankruptcy Code to "incorporate the established meaning" of "terms that have accumulated settled meaning" (internal quotation marks omitted)). So the first place to go in divining the effects of rejection is to non-bankruptcy contract law, which can tell us the effects of breach.

Consider a made-up executory contract to see how the law of breach works outside bankruptcy. A dealer leases a photocopier to a law firm, while agreeing to service it every month; in exchange, the firm commits to pay a monthly fee. During the lease term, the dealer decides to stop servicing the machine, thus breaching the agreement in a material way. The law firm now has a choice (assuming no special contract term or state law). The firm can keep up its side of the bargain, continuing to pay for use of the copier, while suing the dealer for damages from the service breach. Or the firm can call the whole deal off, halting its own payments and returning the copier, while suing for any damages incurred. See 13 R. Lord, Williston on Contracts §39:32, pp. 701–702 (4th ed. 2013) ("[W]hen a contract is breached in the course of performance, the injured party may elect to continue the contract or refuse to perform further"). But to repeat: The choice to terminate the agreement and send back the copier is for the *law firm*. By contrast, the *dealer* has no ability, based on its own breach, to terminate the agreement. Or otherwise said, the dealer cannot get back the copier just by refusing to show up for a service appointment. The contract gave the law firm continuing rights in the copier, which the dealer cannot unilaterally revoke.

And now to return to bankruptcy: If the rejection of the photocopier contract "constitutes a breach," as the Code says, then the same results should follow (save for one twist as to timing). Assume here that the dealer files a Chapter 11 petition and decides to reject its agreement with the law firm. That means, as above, that the dealer will stop servicing the copier. It means, too, that the law firm has an option about how to respond—continue the contract or walk away, while suing for whatever damages go with its choice. (Here is where the twist comes in: Because the rejection is deemed to occur "immediately before" bankruptcy, the firm's damages suit is treated as a pre-petition claim on the estate, which will likely receive only cents on the dollar. See *supra*, at 3.) And most important, it means that assuming the law firm wants to keep using the copier, the dealer cannot take it back. A rejection does not terminate the contract. When it occurs, the debtor and counterparty do not go back to their pre-contract positions. Instead, the counterparty retains the rights it has received under the agreement. As after a breach, so too after a rejection, those rights survive.

All of this, it will hardly surprise you to learn, is not just about photocopier leases. Sections 365(a) and (g) speak broadly, to "any executory contract[s]." Many licensing agreements involving trademarks or other property are of that kind (including, all agree, the Tempnology-Mission contract). The licensor not only grants a license, but provides associated goods or services during its term; the licensee pays continuing royalties or fees. If the licensor breaches the agreement outside bankruptcy (again, barring any special contract term or state law), everything said above goes. In particular, the breach does not revoke the license or stop the licensee from doing what it allows. See, *e.g.*, *Sunbeam*, 686 F. 3d, at 376 ("Outside of bankruptcy, a licensor's breach does not terminate a licensee's right to use [the licensed] intellectual property"). And because rejection "constitutes a breach," §365(g), the same consequences follow in bankruptcy. The debtor can stop performing its remaining obligations under the agreement. But the debtor cannot rescind the license already conveyed. So the licensee can continue to do whatever the license authorizes.

In preserving those rights, Section 365 reflects a general bankruptcy rule: The estate cannot possess anything more than the debtor itself did outside bankruptcy. See *Board of Trade of Chicago* v. *Johnson*, 264 U. S. 1, 15 (1924) (establishing that principle); §541(a)(1) (defining the estate to include the "interests *of the debtor* in property" (emphasis added)). As one bankruptcy scholar has put the point: Whatever "limitation[s] on the debtor's property [apply] outside of bankruptcy[ ] appl[y] inside of bankruptcy as well. A debtor's property does not shrink by happenstance of bankruptcy, but it does not expand, either." D. Baird, Elements of Bankruptcy 97 (6th ed. 2014). So if the not-yet debtor was subject to a counterparty's contractual right (say, to retain a copier or use a trademark), so too is the trustee or debtor once the bankruptcy petition has been filed. The rejection-as-breach rule (but *not* the rejection-as-rescission rule) ensures that result. By insisting that the same counterparty rights survive rejection as survive breach, the rule prevents a debtor in bankruptcy from recapturing interests it had given up.

And conversely, the rejection-as-rescission approach would circumvent the Code's stringent limits on "avoidance" actions—the exceptional cases in which trustees (or debtors) may indeed unwind pre-bankruptcy transfers that undermine the bankruptcy process. The most notable example is for fraudulent conveyances—usually, something-for-nothing transfers that deplete the estate (and so cheat creditors) on the eve of bankruptcy. See §548(a). A trustee's avoidance powers are laid out in a discrete set of sections in the Code, see §§544–553, far away from Section 365. And they can be invoked in only narrow circumstances—unlike the power of rejection, which may be exercised for any plausible economic reason. See, *e.g.*, §548(a) (describing the requirements for avoiding fraudulent transfers); *supra*, at 2–3. If trustees (or debtors) could use rejection to rescind previously granted interests, then rejection would become functionally equivalent to avoidance. Both, that is, would roll back a prior transfer. And that result would subvert everything the Code does to keep avoidances cabined—so they do not threaten the rule that the estate can take only what the debtor possessed before filing. Again, then, core tenets of bankruptcy law push in the same direction as Section 365's text: Rejection is breach, and has only its consequences.

B

Tempnology's main argument to the contrary, here as in the courts below, rests on a negative inference. See Brief for Respondent 33–41; *supra,* at 3–4. Several provisions of Section 365, Tempnology notes, "identif[y] categories of contracts under which a counterparty" may retain specified contract rights "notwithstanding rejection." Brief for Respondent 34. Sections 365(h) and (i) make clear that certain purchasers and lessees of real property and timeshare interests can continue to exercise rights after a debtor has rejected the lease or sales contract. See §365(h)(1) (real-property leases); §365(i) (real-property sales contracts); §§365(h)(2), (i) (timeshare interests). And Section 365(n) similarly provides that licensees of some intellectual property—but not trademarks—retain contractual rights after rejection. See §365(n); §101(35A); *supra,* at 4. Tempnology argues from those provisions that the ordinary consequence of rejection must be something different—*i.e.,* the termination, rather than survival, of contractual rights previously granted. Otherwise, Tempnology concludes, the statute's "general rule" would "swallow the exceptions." Brief for Respondent 19.

But that argument pays too little heed to the main provisions governing rejection and too much to subsidiary ones. On the one hand, it offers no account of how to read Section 365(g) (recall, rejection "constitutes a breach") to say essentially its opposite (*i.e.,* that rejection and breach have divergent consequences). On the other hand, it treats as a neat, reticulated scheme of "narrowly tailored exception[s]," *id.*, at 36 (emphasis deleted), what history reveals to be anything but. Each of the provisions Tempnology highlights emerged at a different time, over a span of half a century. See, *e.g.*, 52 Stat. 881 (1938) (real-property leases); §1(b), 102 Stat. 2538 (1988) (intellectual property). And each responded to a discrete problem—as often as not, correcting a judicial ruling of just the kind Tempnology urges. See Andrew, Executory Contracts in Bankruptcy, 59 U. Colo. L. Rev. 845, 911–912, 916–919 (1988) (identifying judicial decisions that the provisions overturned); compare, *e.g.*, *In re Sombrero Reef Club, Inc.*, 18 B. R. 612, 618–619 (Bkrtcy. Ct. SD Fla. 1982), with, *e.g.*, §§365(h)(2), (i). Read as generously as possible to Tempnology, this mash-up of legislative interventions says nothing much of anything about the content of Section 365(g)'s general rule. Read less generously, it affirmatively refutes Tempnology's rendition. As one bankruptcy scholar noted after an exhaustive review of the history: "What the legislative record [reflects] is that whenever Congress has been confronted with the consequences of the [view that rejection terminates all contractual rights], it has expressed its disapproval." Andrew, 59 U. Colo. L. Rev., at 928. On that account, Congress enacted the provisions, as and when needed, to reinforce or clarify the general rule that contractual rights survive rejection.[2]

---

[2] At the same time, Congress took the opportunity when drafting those provisions to fill in certain details, generally left to state law, about the post-rejection relationship between the debtor and counterparty. See, *e.g.*, Andrew, Executory Contracts in Bankruptcy, 59 U. Colo. L. Rev. 845, 903, n. 200 (1988) (describing Congress's addition of subsidiary rules for real property leases in Section 365(h)); Brief for United States as *Amicus Curiae* 29 (noting that Congress similarly set out detailed rules for patent licenses in Section 365(n)). The provisions are therefore not redundant of Section 365(g): Each sets out a remedial scheme embellishing on or tweaking the general rejection-as-breach

Consider more closely, for example, Congress's enactment of Section 365(n), which addresses certain intellectual property licensing agreements. No one disputes how that provision came about. In *Lubrizol Enterprises* v. *Richmond Metal Finishers*, the Fourth Circuit held that a debtor's rejection of an executory contract worked to revoke its grant of a patent license. See 756 F. 2d 1043, 1045–1048 (1985). In other words, *Lubrizol* adopted the same rule for patent licenses that the First Circuit announced for trademark licenses here. Congress sprang into action, drafting Section 365(n) to reverse *Lubrizol* and ensure the continuation of patent (and some other intellectual property) licensees' rights. See 102 Stat. 2538 (1988); S. Rep. No. 100–505, pp. 2–4 (1988) (explaining that Section 365(n) "corrects [*Lubrizol*'s] perception" that "Section 365 was ever intended to be a mechanism for stripping innocent licensee[s] of rights"). As Tempnology highlights, that provision does not cover trademark licensing agreements, which continue to fall, along with most other contracts, within Section 365(g)'s general rule. See Brief for Respondent 38. But what of that? Even put aside the claim that Section 365(n) is part of a pattern—that Congress whacked Tempnology's view of rejection wherever it raised its head. See *supra*, at 13. Still, Congress's repudiation of *Lubrizol* for patent contracts does not show any intent to *ratify* that decision's approach for almost all others. Which is to say that no negative inference arises. Congress did nothing in adding Section 365(n) to alter the natural reading of Section 365(g)—that rejection and breach have the same results.

Tempnology's remaining argument turns on the way special features of trademark law may affect the fulfillment of the Code's goals. Like the First Circuit below, Tempnology here focuses on a trademark licensor's duty to

---

rule.

monitor and "exercise quality control over the goods and services sold" under a license. Brief for Respondent 20; see *supra,* at 5. Absent those efforts to keep up quality, the mark will naturally decline in value and may eventually become altogether invalid. See 3 J. McCarthy, Trademarks and Unfair Competition §18:48, pp. 18–129, 18–133 (5th ed. 2018). So (Tempnology argues) unless rejection of a trademark licensing agreement terminates the licensee's rights to use the mark, the debtor will have to choose between expending scarce resources on quality control and risking the loss of a valuable asset. See Brief for Respondent 59. "Either choice," Tempnology concludes, "would impede a [debtor's] ability to reorganize," thus "undermining a fundamental purpose of the Code." *Id.,* at 59–60.

To begin with, that argument is a mismatch with Tempnology's reading of Section 365. The argument is trademark-specific. But Tempnology's reading of Section 365 is not. Remember, Tempnology construes that section to mean that a debtor's rejection of a contract terminates the counterparty's rights "unless the contract falls within an express statutory exception." *Id.,* at 27–28; see *supra,* at 12. That construction treats trademark agreements identically to most other contracts; the only agreements getting different treatment are those falling within the discrete provisions just discussed. And indeed, Tempnology could not have discovered, however hard it looked, any trademark-specific rule in Section 365. That section's special provisions, as all agree, do not mention trademarks; and the general provisions speak, well, generally. So Tempnology is essentially arguing that distinctive features of trademarks should persuade us to adopt a construction of Section 365 that will govern not just trademark agreements, but pretty nearly every executory contract. However serious Tempnology's trademark-related concerns, that would allow the tail to wag the

Doberman.

And even putting aside that incongruity, Tempnology's plea to facilitate trademark licensors' reorganizations cannot overcome what Sections 365(a) and (g) direct. The Code of course aims to make reorganizations possible. But it does not permit anything and everything that might advance that goal. See, *e.g., Florida Dept. of Revenue* v. *Piccadilly Cafeterias, Inc.*, 554 U. S. 33, 51 (2008) (observing that in enacting Chapter 11, Congress did not have "a single purpose," but "str[uck] a balance" among multiple competing interests (internal quotation marks omitted)). Here, Section 365 provides a debtor like Tempnology with a powerful tool: Through rejection, the debtor can escape all of its future contract obligations, without having to pay much of anything in return. See *supra,* at 3. But in allowing rejection of those contractual duties, Section 365 does not grant the debtor an exemption from all the burdens that generally applicable law—whether involving contracts or trademarks—imposes on property owners. See 28 U. S. C. §959(b) (requiring a trustee to manage the estate in accordance with applicable law). Nor does Section 365 relieve the debtor of the need, against the backdrop of that law, to make economic decisions about preserving the estate's value—such as whether to invest the resources needed to maintain a trademark. In thus delineating the burdens that a debtor may and may not escape, Congress also weighed (among other things) the legitimate interests and expectations of the debtor's counterparties. The resulting balance may indeed impede some reorganizations, of trademark licensors and others. But that is only to say that Section 365's edict that rejection is breach expresses a more complex set of aims than Tempnology acknowledges.

IV

For the reasons stated above, we hold that under Section 365, a debtor's rejection of an executory contract in bankruptcy has the same effect as a breach outside bankruptcy. Such an act cannot rescind rights that the contract previously granted. Here, that construction of Section 365 means that the debtor-licensor's rejection cannot revoke the trademark license.

We accordingly reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeals and remand the case for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 17–1657

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC., PETITIONER *v.* TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, NKA OLD COLD LLC

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

[May 20, 2019]

JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR, concurring.

I agree with the Court that a debtor's choice to reject an executory contact under 11 U. S. C. §365(a) functions as a breach of the contract rather than unwinding the rejected contract as if it never existed. *Ante*, at 8–10. This result follows from traditional bankruptcy principles and from the general rule set out in §365(g) of the Bankruptcy Code. I also agree that no specific aspects of trademark law compel a contrary rule that equates rejection with rescission. I therefore join the Court's opinion in full. I write separately to highlight two potentially significant features of today's holding.

First, the Court does not decide that every trademark licensee has the unfettered right to continue using licensed marks postrejection. The Court granted certiorari to decide whether rejection "terminates rights of the licensee that would survive the licensor's breach under applicable nonbankruptcy law." Pet. for Cert. i. The answer is no, for the reasons the Court explains. But the baseline inquiry remains whether the licensee's rights would survive a breach under applicable nonbankruptcy law. Special terms in a licensing contract or state law could bear on that question in individual cases. See *ante*, at 9–10; Brief for American Intellectual Property Law Association as *Amicus Curiae* 20–25 (discussing examples of contract terms that could potentially lead a bankruptcy court to limit licensee rights postrejection).

Second, the Court's holding confirms that trademark licensees' postrejection rights and remedies are more expansive in some respects than those possessed by licensees of other types of intellectual property. Those variances stem from §365(n), one of several subject-specific provisions in the Bankruptcy Code that "embellis[h] on or twea[k]" the general rejection rule. *Ante*, at 13, n. 2. Section 365(n)—which applies to patents, copyrights, and four other types of intellectual property, but not to trademarks, §101(35A)—alters the general rejection rule in several respects. For example, a covered licensee that chooses to retain its rights postrejection must make all of its royalty payments; the licensee has no right to deduct damages from its payments even if it otherwise could have done so under nonbankruptcy law. §365(n)(2)(C)(i). This provision and others in §365(n) mean that the covered intellectual property types are governed by different rules than trademark licenses.

Although these differences may prove significant for individual licensors and licensees, they do not alter the outcome here. The Court rightly rejects Tempnology's argument that the presence of §365(n) changes what §365(g) says. As the Senate Report accompanying §365(n) explained, the bill did not "address or intend any inference to be drawn concerning the treatment of executory contracts" under §365's general rule. S. Rep. No. 100–505, p. 5 (1988); see *ante*, at 14. To the extent trademark licensees are treated differently from licensees of other forms of intellectual property, that outcome leaves Congress with the option to tailor a provision for trademark licenses, as it has repeatedly in other contexts. See *ante*, at 13–14.

With these observations, I join the Court's opinion.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 17–1657

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC., PETITIONER *v.* TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, NKA OLD COLD LLC

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

[May 20, 2019]

JUSTICE GORSUCH, dissenting.

This Court is not in the business of deciding abstract questions, no matter how interesting. Under the Constitution, our power extends only to deciding "Cases" and "Controversies" where the outcome matters to real parties in the real world. Art. III, §2. Because it's unclear whether we have anything like that here, I would dismiss the petition as improvidently granted.

This case began when Mission licensed the right to use certain of Tempnology's trademarks. After Tempnology entered bankruptcy, it sought and won from a bankruptcy court an order declaring that Mission could no longer use those trademarks. On appeal and now in this Court, Mission seeks a ruling that the bankruptcy court's declaration was wrong. But whoever is right about that, it isn't clear how it would make a difference: After the bankruptcy court ruled, the license agreement expired by its own terms, so nothing we might say here could restore Mission's ability to use Tempnology's trademarks.

Recognizing that its original case seems to have become moot, Mission attempts an alternative theory in briefing before us. Now Mission says that if it prevails here it will, on remand, seek money damages from Tempnology's estate for the profits it lost when, out of respect for the bankruptcy court's order, it refrained from using the trademarks while its license still existed.

But it's far from clear whether even this theory can keep the case alive. A damages claim "suffices to avoid mootness only if viable," which means damages must at least be "legally available for [the alleged] wrong." 13C C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure §3533.3, p. 22 (3d ed. 2008). Yet, as far as Mission has told us, Tempnology did nothing that could lawfully give rise to a damages claim. After all, when Tempnology asked the bankruptcy court to issue a declaratory ruling on a question of law, it was exercising its protected "First Amendment right to petition the Government for redress of grievances." *Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc.* v. *NLRB*, 461 U. S. 731, 741 (1983). And petitioning a court normally isn't an actionable wrong that can give rise to a claim for damages. Absent a claim of malice (which Mission hasn't suggested would have any basis here), the ordinary rule is that "'no action lies against a party for resort to civil courts'" or for "the assertion of a legal argument." *Lucsik* v. *Board of Ed. of Brunswick City School Dist.*, 621 F. 2d 841, 842 (CA6 1980) (*per curiam*); see, *e.g.*, *W. R. Grace & Co.* v. *Rubber Workers*, 461 U. S. 757, 770, n. 14 (1983); *Russell* v. *Farley*, 105 U. S. 433, 437–438 (1882).

Maybe Mission's able lawyers will conjure something better on remand. But, so far at least, the company hasn't come close to articulating a viable legal theory on which a claim for damages could succeed. And where our jurisdiction is so much in doubt, I would decline to proceed to the merits. If the legal questions here are of sufficient importance, a live case presenting them will come along soon enough; there is no need to press the bounds of our constitutional authority to reach them today.

FOLEY

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

The Supreme Court Decision Mission Product Holdings, Inc. v. Tempnology, LLC Has Broad Implications for Licenses and Other Agreements in Bankruptcy: Analysis

22 May 2019

Manufacturing Industry Advisor

On May 20, 2019, the United States Supreme Court decided the case *Mission Product Holdings, Inc. v. Tempnology, LLC*. The facts of the case and its potential implications were discussed previously on this blog here. In the 8-1 decision authored by Justice Kagan, the court ruled that agreements rejected by a debtor in bankruptcy will not be deemed terminated or rescinded. Rather, the non-debtor party will retain whatever rights it would have under applicable non-bankruptcy law following a breach of the agreement. While the decision dealt with a rejected trademark license, the court made clear that the ruling applied broadly to every type of agreement rejected by a debtor under section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Rejection of agreements very often serves as a critical tool in Chapter 11 by allowing a debtor to walk away from burdensome obligations. The fact that non-debtor parties will retain certain post-rejection rights will require debtors – and potential debtors – to consider how rejection will address their reorganization goals. Non-debtor parties, on the other hand, should consider how best to use the negotiating leverage granted to them by the Supreme Court.

The *Mission Products* case involved Tempnology, LLC, a company that manufactured athletic sportswear and licensed the right to use its COOLCORE trademark and related rights to a licensee called Mission Product Holdings, Inc. In summary, Tempnology attempted to use its Chapter 11 bankruptcy filing as a means to reject a trademark license with Mission, and thus terminate Mission's rights under the license. Many courts have held that, following the rejection of an agreement such as a license in a bankruptcy case, non-debtor parties are limited to filing a general unsecured claim. Depending on the case, general unsecured claimants may receive much less than the face value of their claims. However, some courts – including the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in a 2012 case called *Sunbeam Products, Inc. v. Chicago American Manufacturing, LLC* – have held that rejection does not terminate a licensee's rights and that the non-debtor licensee retains certain post-rejection enforcement rights. To that point, outside of the bankruptcy context, a licensor's breach of a trademark license agreement does not mean that the licensee no longer has any rights in the license. In fact, state law provides a number of licensee remedies short of termination.

In the *Mission Products* case, the bankruptcy court held that termination of the license agreement revoked Mission's right to use the COOLCORE marks. The Bankruptcy Appellate Panel reversed, relying upon the *Sunbeam* court's rationale. On appeal to the First Circuit, the court reinstated the bankruptcy court decision that rejection effectively terminated the license agreement. The Supreme Court granted certiorari to address the split between the Seventh and First Circuits.

Justice Kagan began the court's analysis by disposing of any argument that the matter was moot. Tempnology argued that there was no live controversy because the license agreement terminated by its terms and all assets had been distributed in the bankruptcy case. The court found that the matter was not moot for several reasons, including that Mission may be able to "seek the unwinding of prior distributions to get its fair share of the estate." However, while eight justices found that the matter was not moot, Justice Gorsuch wrote a short dissent, asserting that the inability of Mission's lawyers to articulate a theory that would actually result in a claim for damages mooted the matter.

As to the substance of the case, the court directly addressed the meaning and effect of rejection under bankruptcy law. The court noted that two competing views had arisen. On one side – articulated in the *Sunbeam* decision – rejection acts merely as a breach and the non-debtor party has not only a claim for damages against the debtor, but also retains the post-breach rights the non-debtor party would have outside of bankruptcy. On the other side – articulated by the First Circuit – rejection acts as a rescission of the agreement, leaving the non-debtor party with the sole remedy of filing a claim in the bankruptcy case. The court came down firmly on the *Sunbeam* side of the dispute, largely based on a finding that Bankruptcy Code section 365(g) unambiguously states that rejection of a license or other "executory contract" constitutes a breach of such agreement, which is deemed to have occurred immediately before the filing of the bankruptcy case.

Critical to the court's decision was a finding that a party – including a debtor in bankruptcy – should not be permitted to use its breach to deny the other party its rights under a contract. The court set forth a hypothetical involving a copy machine lease to make the point. Assume, the court stated, that a law firm leased a copy machine from a dealer and the lease required the dealer to provide monthly service in exchange for a fee. Assume further that the dealer later breaches the agreement by refusing to provide service. The law firm is thereby presented with a choice. The firm could retain the copier, continue to make the service payments, and sue the dealer for damages. Alternatively, the firm could cease making payments, return the copier to the dealer, and sue for damages. The key issue, the court pointed out, is that the decision of whether to terminate the agreement and return the copier is for the law firm to make. The dealer cannot, based on its own breach, terminate the agreement and reclaim the copy machine. Likewise, the court reasoned, if the dealer had filed Chapter 11 bankruptcy, the dealer would not be able to use rejection – which is deemed a breach under section 365(g) – to terminate the lease and to reclaim the copier. The court reasoned that to determine otherwise would be to grant the debtor with avoidance powers not set forth in the Bankruptcy Code. The court noted that powers such as avoiding a fraudulent transfer can be invoked only in narrow circumstances and that interpreting section 365 to provide for a new – very broad – avoidance power "would subvert everything the Code does to keep avoidances cabined."

The court also rejected Tempnology's arguments that there was a "negative implication" created by other provisions in Bankruptcy Code section 365, such as sections 365(h) and 365(n). Those sections provide specified post-rejection protections to certain parties, including non-residential real property tenants in the case of 365(h) and intellectually property licensees in the case of section 365(n). Tempnology argued that because Congress provided post-rejection protections to such specifically identified parties, it followed that all other parties had no post-rejection rights. The court reviewed the legislative history of the subsections of section 365 and found no grand plan by Congress to protect certain parties, while leaving others behind. Rather, the enactments occurred "over a span of half a century" as a result of a "mash-up of legislative intervention." The court also made clear that, while section 365(n) applies to certain intellectual property licenses, it does not apply to trademark licenses. Thus, in a somewhat ironic twist, the fact that Congress left trademark licensees out of the "protection" of section 365(n) means that trademark licensees may be better off post-rejection because they are not required to fit within the confines of the 365(n) terms.

Finally, the court addressed Tempnology's concern that allowing trademark licensees to retain post-rejection rights is contrary to the reorganization policies of Chapter 11 because it will require the debtor/licensor "to choose between expending scarce resources on quality control and risking the loss of a valuable asset," i.e., the mark. The court rejected this argument for a number of reasons, including that section 365 involves all types of leases and executory contracts and thus to allow a particular concern relating to trademark licenses to define the meaning of rejection "would allow the tail to wag the Doberman." More broadly, the court noted that while the Bankruptcy Code favors reorganizations, "it does not permit anything and everything that might advance that goal."

As such, the court reversed the First Circuit decision and remanded the case to the bankruptcy court. In addition, Justice Sotomayor wrote a concurring opinion "to highlight two potentially significant features" of the holding. First, Justice Sotomayor noted that the decision should not be read to grant every trademark licensee the unfettered right to continue using the mark post-rejection. Rather, a case-by-case inquiry must be made to determine whether, in fact, the licensee's rights would survive a breach under applicable non-bankruptcy law. Second, the court's decision sets forth separate post-rejection effects for trademark licensees versus licensees of other types of intellectual property. Justice Sotomayor suggested that, given that outcome, Congress may wish to tailor post-rejection remedies that specifically apply to trademark licensees.

While the *Mission Products* case answers the question of whether a rejection should be treated as a termination or a rescission, the case is certain to raise other questions in future cases. As Justice Sotomayor stated in her concurrence, it will be necessary to conduct an analysis of non-bankruptcy law to determine the scope of the non-debtor party's post-rejection rights. That likely will inject a degree of uncertainty into the planning and strategy of many potential Chapter 11 bankruptcy cases. In addition, disputes over such post-rejection rights may lead to higher Chapter 11 costs. This may exacerbate the existing concerns among many that Chapter 11 is too expensive. That said, while *Mission Products* may limit the options of some debtors, certain powerful tools (the automatic stay, lien avoidance, non-consensual "cram down" contract modifications) exist only in bankruptcy. Without a doubt, creative debtors' counsel will determine how to continue making use of such powerful bankruptcy tools, even though the concept of rejection is not quite as powerful as some lower courts interpreted it to be.