## United States Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware

JUDGE PETER J. WALSH

824 MARKET STREET WILMINGTON, DE 19801 (302) 252-2925

November 5, 2010

Christopher P. Simon
Patrick M. Brannigan
Cross & Simon, LLC
913 North Market Street
11<sup>th</sup> floor
P.O. Box 1380
Wilmington, DE 19899-1380

Attorneys for Sun Indalex Finance, LLC

Michael J. Roeschenthaler William C. Price Brad A. Funari McGuirewoods LLP 625 Liberty Avenue 23<sup>rd</sup> Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Counsel to the Official Committee 900 SW Fifth Avenue # 2600 of Unsecured Creditors Portland, OR 97204

Norman L. Pernick Karen M. McKinley Cole, Schotz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard, P.A. 500 Delaware Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Wilmington, DE 19801

Co-Counsel to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

Re: In re: IH 1, Inc., et al. Case No. 09-10982 (PJW)

Dear Counsel:

Peter C. Hughes
Dilworth Paxson LLP
One Customs House - Suite 500
704 King Street
P.O. Box 1031
Wilmington, DE 19801

Maura Fay McIlvain Peter C. Hughes Dilworth Paxson LLP 1500 Market Street Suite 3500E Philadelphia, PA 19102

Counsel to George L. Miller, Chapter 7 Trustee

Brandy A. Sargent Stoel Rives LLP 900 SW Fifth Avenue # 2600 Portland, OR 97204

Counsel to Huron Consulting Services LLC

This is my ruling with respect to the Sun Indalex Finance, LLC's ("Sun") motion to reconsider the order granting the final fee application of Huron Consulting Services LLC ("Huron") (Doc. # 991). For the reasons summarized below, I will deny the motion.

Sun relies heavily on the June 24, 2010 supplemental affidavit submitted by Mr. Sandeep Gupta, an FTI representative, in which he claims that at a May 20, 2009 meeting with representatives of Huron, he gave them and discussed a spread sheet which contains a line item of \$400,000 for fees to be paid to Huron as the financial advisor to the Committee. Of course, this fact is flat contradicted in the declarations submitted by five representatives of Huron who were in attendance at that May 20, 2009 meeting. But aside from that challenge, I have a more fundamental issue as to FTI's authority or the Debtors' authority to dictate a budget that binds Huron as the financial advisor to the Committee. Neither the DIP financing motion (Doc. # 75), nor the interim DIP financing order (Doc. # 118), nor the final DIP financing order (Doc. # 223) identify a budget. approving Huron's retention was entered on May 12, 2009 (Doc. # That retention order makes no reference whatsoever to a budget. So far as I can tell from the record, neither FTI nor the Debtors had any authority at the May 20, 2009 meeting to dictate a budget to Huron. Of course, I have had numerous cases where the

professionals agree to a budget which limits their fees. But those were consensual budgets. I am not aware of anything in the record of this case that suggests that Huron, post retention, was bound to a budget dictated by FTI or the Debtors that limited Huron's allowable fees.

- (2) Sun complains that Huron spent an inordinate amount of time investigating and assisting in the development of a draft complaint to avoid transactions between the Debtors and insiders. Huron responds that early on in the case the Committee felt that such an action would be the only source for recoveries for unsecured creditors. It is obvious that the Trustee's filed Complaint significantly mirrors the draft complaint prepared by the Committee. Obviously, the Trustee exercised his independent judgment in filing the Complaint and I find that that filing vindicates the efforts undertaken by Huron in an extensive investigation of the insiders' conduct and the resulting draft complaint.
- (3) I note that in this case the Court entered an order appointing a fee examiner. In the examiner's reports (Doc. ## 760, 855 and 898) he discussed what he preliminarily believed to be certain shortcomings (including staffing) in the Huron fee applications. However, Huron responded and the fee examiner accepted the responses. Accordingly, except as to a few minor reductions, the applications were cleared by the fee examiner. I

believe fee examiners reports significantly undercut the position taken by Sun in its motion.

Very truly yours,

Pto Many at 9

Peter J. Walsh

PJW:ipm

Attachment

## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

| In | re: |       |    |          | ) | ) Chapter 11 |           |       |
|----|-----|-------|----|----------|---|--------------|-----------|-------|
|    |     |       |    |          | ) |              |           |       |
| ΙH | 1,  | INC., | et | al.,     | ) |              |           |       |
|    |     |       |    |          | ) | Case No.     | 09-10982  | (PJW) |
|    |     |       |    | Debtors. | ) |              |           |       |
|    |     |       |    |          | ) | (Jointly     | Administe | ered) |
|    |     |       |    |          | ) |              |           |       |

## ORDER

For the reasons set forth in the Court's letter ruling of this date, the motion (Doc. # 991) of Sun Indalex Finance, LLC to reconsider the order granting the final fee application of Huron Consulting Services LLC is **denied**.

Pt M.N

Peter J. Walsh United States Bankruptcy Judge

Dated: November 5, 2010