

50-275/323

1 JAMES L. LOPES (No. 63678)
2 JEFFREY L. SCHAFFER (No. 91404)
3 GARY M. KAPLAN (No. 155530)
4 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY,
5 FALK & RABKIN
6 A Professional Corporation
7 Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor
8 San Francisco, California 94111-4065
9 Telephone: 415/434-1600
10 Facsimile: 415/217-5910

11 Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor in Possession
12 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

13 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 In re

17 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
18 COMPANY, a California corporation,

19 Debtor.

20 Federal I.D. No. 94-0742640

Case No. 01-30923 DM

Chapter 11 Case

Date: January 16, 2002

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Place: 235 Pine St., 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California

Judge: Hon. Dennis Montali

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
FALK
& RABKIN
A Professional Corporation

21 PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S NOTICE OF MOTION
22 AND MOTION FOR ORDER FURTHER EXTENDING
23 EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD FOR PLAN OF REORGANIZATION;
24 SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

25
26 A001 Add: Rids Dgo Mail Center
27
28

1 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on January 16, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., or as soon
3 thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Courtroom of the Honorable Dennis Montali,
4 located at 235 Pine Street, 22nd Floor, San Francisco, California, Pacific Gas and Electric
5 Company, the debtor and debtor in possession in the above-captioned Chapter 11 case (the
6 "Debtor" or "PG&E"), will and hereby does move the Court for entry of an order pursuant to
7 Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(d) further extending, from February 4, 2002 until June 30,
8 2002 (or such later date as the Court may hereafter order based upon a subsequent motion
9 filed on or before June 30, 2002), the period during which PG&E maintains "plan
10 exclusivity" pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(c)(3) (the "Motion"). As set forth
11 below, PG&E submits that there is "cause" to grant the requested extensions pursuant to
12 Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(d).

13 This Motion is based on the facts and law set forth herein, the record of this case
14 and any evidence presented at or prior to the hearing on this Motion.

15 **PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE** that pursuant to Rule 9014-1(c)(2) of the
16 Bankruptcy Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Northern District of
17 California, any opposition to the Motion and the relief requested herein must be filed with
18 the Bankruptcy Court and served upon appropriate parties (including counsel for PG&E) at
19 least five (5) days prior to the scheduled hearing date. If there is no timely objection to the
20 requested relief, the Court may enter an order granting such relief without further hearing.

21
22 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

23 I.

24 **INTRODUCTION.**

25 PG&E is an investor-owned utility providing electric and gas services to millions
26 of California residents and businesses. Beginning in approximately May 2000, as a result of
27 the partial deregulation of the power industry, PG&E was forced to pay dramatically
28 increased wholesale prices for electricity. PG&E has, however, been prevented from

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
FAIK
& RAIBIN
A Professional Corporation

1 passing these costs on to retail customers, resulting in a staggering financial shortfall. In the
2 face of the deterioration in PG&E's financial condition, and with little progress having been
3 made toward a resolution of the crisis, PG&E by early April 2001 determined that a
4 Chapter 11 reorganization offered the best prospects for protecting the interests of its
5 creditors, customers, employees and shareholders alike. Accordingly, on April 6, 2001 (the
6 "Petition Date"), PG&E filed a voluntary petition under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code.
7 PG&E continues to manage and operate its business and property as a debtor in possession
8 pursuant to Sections 1107 and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. No trustee has been appointed.

9 II.

10 FACTUAL BACKGROUND.

11 1. As set forth in previous papers filed with the Court, PG&E has reported assets of
12 tens of billions of dollars and more than thirteen thousand creditors. In addition to the sheer
13 size of this case, it is exceedingly complex, based on, inter alia, PG&E's status as a utility
14 company subject to a myriad of state and federal statutes, rules and regulations. PG&E also
15 continues to grapple with an unprecedented energy crisis.

16 2. Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Sections 1121(b) and (c), PG&E had the exclusive
17 right to file a plan for 120 days after the Petition Date (i.e., until August 6, 2001¹), and, if it
18 filed a plan by such time, an additional sixty days during which it would maintain plan
19 exclusivity (i.e., until October 3, 2001).

20 3. By its Order Extending Exclusivity Period filed on July 20, 2001, this Court (a)
21 extended the exclusive period under Section 1121 during which only the Debtor may file a
22 plan by four months, until December 6, 2001, and (b) in the event that the Debtor filed a
23 plan by December 6, 2001, extended the period during which the Debtor maintains plan
24 exclusivity pursuant to Section 1121(c)(3) by four months, until February 4, 2002. That
25 Order expressly authorized PG&E to seek further extension of these time periods by filing a

26 _____
27 ¹ The 120th day after the Petition Date was actually August 4, 2001. Since that date
28 fell on a Saturday, pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9006(a), the 120-day
period expired on Monday, August 6, 2001.

1 subsequent motion on or before December 6, 2001 and February 4, 2002, respectively.

2 4. On September 20, 2001, PG&E (and co-proponent PG&E Corporation, PG&E's
3 parent company) filed the "Plan of Reorganization Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy
4 Code for Pacific Gas and Electric Company" (as amended from time to time, the "Plan"),
5 and an accompanying Disclosure Statement (as amended from time to time, the "Disclosure
6 Statement").

7 5. By filing the Plan prior to December 6, 2001, pursuant to the Court's July 20,
8 2001 Order, the Debtor maintains plan exclusivity pursuant to Section 1121(c)(3) until
9 February 4, 2002, or such later date as the Court may order based on motion filed by
10 February 4, 2002.

11 6. By its Order Rescheduling Hearing on Approval of Disclosure Statement filed on
12 December 5, 2001 (memorializing a status conference with respect to the Disclosure
13 Statement held on December 4, 2001), the Court: (a) directed the Debtor to file an amended
14 Plan and Disclosure Statement by December 19, 2001 and serve it upon parties who had
15 submitted objections to the Disclosure Statement; (b) scheduled a hearing for January 14,
16 2002 on approval of the Disclosure Statement, except for matters with respect to whether the
17 amended Plan is facially invalid based on sovereign immunity and/or preemption grounds;
18 (c) scheduled a hearing for January 25, 2002 on whether the amended Plan is facially invalid
19 based on sovereign immunity and/or preemption grounds; and (d) established briefing
20 schedules with respect to the foregoing.

21 7. By this Motion, PG&E requests that the Court enter an order pursuant to
22 Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(d) further extending, from February 4, 2002 until June 30,
23 2002 (or such later date as the Court may hereafter order based upon a subsequent motion
24 filed on or before June 30, 2002), the period during which PG&E maintains plan exclusivity
25 pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(c)(3).

26 8. Although the Plan has broad creditor support, including the Official Committee
27 of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee") and other creditor constituencies, approximately
28 70 parties have filed objections to the Disclosure Statement, many of which also reflect

1 opposition to the Plan. While PG&E anticipates resolving a great deal of these objections
2 through revisions to the Plan and Disclosure Statement, and will continue to seek prompt
3 resolution or adjudication of remaining unresolved issues, in view of the sheer number and
4 complexity of the issues involved, it may take months to fully resolve these matters and
5 obtain confirmation of the Plan. For example, based on a number of objections raised by
6 interested parties on sovereign immunity and preemption grounds, as discussed above, the
7 Court has scheduled a hearing and separate briefing on these relatively complicated issues.
8 In addition, the objections submitted to the Disclosure Statement provide a preview of
9 dozens of contested issues with respect to confirmation of the Plan, many of which are likely
10 to be quite time-consuming to resolve or adjudicate.

11 9. PG&E submits that its efforts to file and confirm its Plan on a "fast track" is
12 unprecedented under the circumstances. In the absence of a pre-negotiated or prepackaged
13 Chapter 11 plan, it is commonplace for one or more years to elapse before a large corporate
14 debtor even files a plan, while still maintaining exclusivity. This is one of the largest and
15 perhaps most complex Chapter 11 cases ever commenced, yet PG&E has, within the early
16 months of the case, already filed the Plan and is in the process of obtaining approval of the
17 Disclosure Statement. PG&E clearly has no intent to delay the case, which costs the estate
18 literally millions of dollars per week in fees, costs and interest accruals with respect to
19 creditor claims. Indeed, PG&E is diligently working the plan process through a fast track,
20 and trying to accelerate the resolution of this case for creditors and other interested parties as
21 quickly as possible. In fact, PG&E has substantially revised the Plan and Disclosure
22 Statement to address concerns raised by interested parties, continues to meet and confer with
23 parties who oppose the Disclosure Statement and Plan, and will continue to seek prompt
24 adjudication of disputed issues. The requested extension will protect this process while the
25 Plan efforts are concluded expeditiously. By contrast, a failure to extend exclusivity will
26 create needless confusion and conflict that will presumably prejudice all parties.

27 10. The requested extension of the exclusivity period under Section 1121(c)(3)
28 should allow a reasonable and adequate time for obtaining confirmation of the Plan, after

1 approval of the Disclosure Statement. The requested extension date of June 30, 2002 is
2 consistent with the Support Agreement between PG&E and PG&E Corporation, the co-
3 Proponents of the Plan, and the Committee with respect to the Plan (on file with the Court)
4 and the Plan itself, which both envision confirmation of the Plan by June 30, 2002.

5 11. Based on the foregoing, PG&E submits that there is "cause" to grant the
6 requested extension pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(d).

7 III.

8 CAUSE EXISTS UNDER BANKRUPTCY CODE
9 SECTION 1121(d) TO EXTEND THE EXCLUSIVE TIME PERIOD
10 UNDER SECTION 1121(c)(3) FOR PG&E'S PLAN.

11 A. Section 1121(d) Permits A Court To Extend, For Cause, The Exclusivity Periods
12 For The Debtor's Filing Of A Reorganization Plan Beyond The Initial 120 Day
13 And 180 Day Periods Provided Therein.

14 The United States Supreme Court and Congress have both recognized that the
15 principal goal of Chapter 11 is the successful rehabilitation of the debtor's business. NLRB
16 v. Bildisco & Bildisco, 465 U.S. 513, 527 (1984); United States v. Whiting Pools, Inc., 462
17 U.S. 198, 203 (1983); see also H.R. Rep. No. 95-595, at 220 (1977), reprinted in 1978
18 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5963, 6179-80 (hereinafter "House Report"). Rehabilitation preserves and
19 generates going concern value and increases the pool of assets available for distribution to
20 creditors. Id.; see also In re Lange, 75 B.R. 154, 156 (Bankr. N.D. Ohio 1987) ("[t]he
21 purpose of a Chapter 11 reorganization is to assist financially distressed business entities by
22 providing them temporary relief from creditors while they attempt to successfully restructure
23 themselves to a viable status") (citing In re Winshall Settlor's Trust, 758 F.2d 1136, 1137
24 (6th Cir. 1985)).

25 Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 1121, Congress provided Chapter 11
26 debtors with time to attempt to reach agreement with its creditors, leaving to the Bankruptcy
27 Court the discretion as to how much time should be allowed. Section 1121(b) establishes an
28 initial period of 120 days after the order for relief during which only the debtor may file a

1 plan.² If the debtor files a plan within the 120-day period, Section 1121(c)(3) allows an
2 additional 60 days during which only the debtor may obtain acceptances of the plan.³

3 Bankruptcy Code Section 1121(d) provides that the Court may extend both such
4 exclusivity periods for "cause."⁴ Although the Bankruptcy Code does not define "cause" for
5 purposes of Section 1121(d) or establish formal criteria for an extension of the exclusivity
6 periods, Congress recognized that the debtor should be given a meaningful opportunity to
7 formulate and negotiate a plan. House Report, at 231-32, 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 6191. At
8 the same time, Congress recognized that an open-ended exclusivity period could encourage a
9 debtor to stall in order to exact undue concessions from creditors and could unnecessarily
10 delay creditors. S. Rep. No. 95-989, at 118 (1978), reprinted in 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5787,
11 5904 (hereinafter, "Senate Report"). Thus, the courts must necessarily strike an appropriate
12 balance.

13 To achieve this objective, cause "is to be viewed flexibly in order to allow the
14 debtor to reach an agreement." In re McLean Indus., Inc., 87 B.R. 830, 833 (Bankr.
15 S.D.N.Y. 1987) (internal quotation marks omitted); Gaines v. Perkins (In re Perkins), 71
16 B.R. 294, 297 (W.D. Tenn. 1987) ("[t]he hallmark of [Section 1121(d)] is flexibility"). This
17 standard allows the court "maximum flexibility to suit various types of reorganization
18 proceedings." In re Public Serv. Co., 88 B.R. 521, 534 (Bankr. D.N.H. 1988); accord In re
19 Gibson & Cushman Dredging Corp., 101 B.R. 405, 409 (E.D.N.Y. 1989).

22 ² Section 1121(b) provides that "[e]xcept as otherwise provided in this section, only the
23 debtor may file a plan until after 120 days after the date of the order for relief under this
24 chapter." 11 U.S.C. §1121(b). Pursuant to Bankruptcy Code Section 301, the order for
relief was entered on the Petition Date.

25 ³ Section 1121(c)(3), provides, in relevant part, that non-debtor parties in interest may
26 file a plan "if and only if . . . the debtor has not filed a plan that has been accepted, before
180 days after the date of the order for relief under this chapter, by each class of claims or
interests that is impaired under the plan." 11 U.S.C. §1121(c)(3).

27 ⁴ Section 1121(d) provides, in relevant part, that "[o]n request of a party in interest . . .
28 the court may for cause reduce or increase the 120-day period or the 180-day period referred
to in this section." 11 U.S.C. §1121(d) (emphasis added).

1 creditors. In addition to the sheer size of this case, it is exceedingly complex, based on, inter
2 alia, PG&E's status as a utility company subject to a myriad of state and federal statutes,
3 rules and regulations, and the fact that PG&E continues to grapple with an unprecedented
4 energy crisis.

5 On these facts, the additional extension of almost five months of the plan
6 exclusivity period under Section 1121(c)(3) is both reasonable and appropriate.

7 C. Courts Have Found Cause To Extend Exclusivity Periods In Circumstances Such
8 As These Where The Debtor Has Made Substantial Progress Toward A
9 Successful Reorganization.

10 The legislative history and the case law interpreting Section 1121 have
11 established that exclusivity period extensions are appropriate where the debtor displays some
12 likelihood of a successful, consensual reorganization. Senate Report, at 118, 1978
13 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 5904 ("the granted extension should be based on a showing of some
14 promise of probable success"). Thus, in evaluating whether there is cause for extending the
15 exclusivity periods under Section 1121, courts have examined whether the debtor has made
16 good-faith progress toward reorganization, including the status of negotiations between the
17 debtor and third parties, which, if successful, would enable the debtor to file a viable plan.
18 See, e.g., In re McLean Indus., 87 B.R. at 834; In re United Press Int'l, 60 B.R. at 269; In re
19 Nicolet, Inc., 80 B.R. 733, 741-42 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1987); In re Perkins, 71 B.R. at 298.

20 For example, in In re Pine Run Trust, 67 B.R. at 435, the court granted a 90-day
21 extension of both plan exclusivity periods where "substantial progress had been made in
22 negotiations [between the debtors and the creditors' committee] that, all concede, are critical
23 to a successful reorganization [and] there was no evidence presented that the debtors sought
24 this additional extension in order to pressure their creditors to accede to their reorganization
25 demands"). Similarly, the court in In re Swatara Coal Co., 49 B.R. 898, 899-900 (Bankr.
26 E.D. Pa. 1985), granted a five-month extension of each of the Section 1121 exclusivity
27 periods based on the debtor's ongoing negotiations with a potential joint venturer. See also
28 In re McLean Indus., 87 B.R. at 833-35 ("a finding that the debtor is not seeking to extend
exclusivity to pressure creditors to accede to [the debtor's] reorganization demands . . . and

1 the fact that the debtor is paying its [postpetition] bills as they come due” provided “cause”
2 to extend the exclusivity periods) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted); In re
3 Homestead Partners, Ltd., 197 B.R. 706, 720 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1996) (cause exists to extend
4 exclusivity where the debtor has made substantial progress toward gaining acceptance of a
5 plan, recalcitrance of certain creditors has posed a significant hurdle to timely plan
6 development and presence of complex legal issues has occupied much of debtor’s plan-
7 making opportunity); In re Gibson & Cushman Dredging Corp., 101 B.R. at 409-10
8 (considering the debtor’s “continued attempts to negotiate with the creditor’s committee,”
9 “the Debtor’s ability to carry on business during the bankruptcy proceeding,” the fact “that
10 there was no danger of dissipation of assets to the creditor’s detriment,” and the fact that
11 “the debtor’s assets were not only being preserved, but augmented” in extending
12 exclusivity); In re Trainer’s Inc., 17 B.R. 246, 247 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1982) (cause to grant
13 extension existed where debtors had made “substantial efforts” towards reorganization
14 through sale of their primary asset and further negotiations were required; extension denied
15 on other grounds).

HOWARD
RICE
NEMEROVSKI
CANADY
FALK
& RAEBIN
A Professional Corporation

16 As discussed above, PG&E has already made substantial efforts towards a
17 successful reorganization. Indeed, in view of the size and complexity of this case, it is
18 unprecedented that in the early months of this case, PG&E has already filed the Disclosure
19 Statement and Plan, which enjoys broad creditor support (including by the Committee and
20 other creditor constituencies), and is in the process of obtaining approval of the Disclosure
21 Statement.

22 Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that PG&E seeks the requested
23 extensions in order to pressure its creditors to accede to its reorganization demands. Rather,
24 as discussed above, PG&E is diligently working the plan process through a fast track, and
25 trying to accelerate the resolution of this case for creditors and other interested parties as
26 quickly as possible. In fact, PG&E has substantially revised the Plan and Disclosure
27 Statement to address concerns raised by interested parties, continues to meet and confer with
28 parties who oppose the Disclosure Statement and Plan, and will continue to seek prompt

1 adjudication of disputed issues. The requested extension will protect this process while the
2 Plan efforts are concluded expeditiously.

3 IV.

4 CONCLUSION.

5 Wherefore, PG&E respectfully requests that this Court enter its Order:

- 6 1. Determining that notice of the Motion was appropriate under the
7 circumstances;
- 8 2. Granting the Motion;
- 9 3. Extending, from February 4, 2002 until June 30, 2002 (or such later date as
10 the Court hereafter may order based upon a subsequent motion filed on or before June 30,
11 2002), the period during which PG&E maintains plan exclusivity pursuant to Bankruptcy
12 Code Section 1121(c)(3); and
- 13 4. For such other relief as this Court determines to be equitable and just.

14 DATED: December 17, 2001.

15 Respectfully,

16 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY,
17 FALK & RABKIN
18 A Professional Corporation

19 By: 
20 GARY M. KAPLAN

21 Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor in Possession
22 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
23
24
25
26
27
28