UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE:)	Chapter 11
WASHINGTON MUTUAL, INC., ET AL.,)	Case No. 08-12229 (MFW)
Debtor.		Wilmington, Delaware October 28, 2009

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARY F. WALRATH,
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Debtor: BRIAN S. ROSEN, ESQUIRE

MATTHEW L. CURRO, ESQUIRE Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP

767 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10153

MARK D. COLLINS, ESQUIRE

Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

One Rodney Square
920 North King Street

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

For J.P. Morgan Chase: ADAM G. LANDIS, ESQUIRE

Landis, Rath & Cobb, LLP

919 Market Street

Suite 1800

Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Audio Operator: BRANDON MCCARTHY

Transcribed by: DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING

P. O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026

Off: (856) 435-7172 Fax: (856) 435-7124

Email: <u>dianadoman@comcast.net</u>

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

<u>I N D E X</u>

ARGUMENT:

By: Mr. Rosen 3, 4, 7, 10

By: Mr. Landis 11

THE COURT:

Ruling 4, 7, 10, 11

CLERK: All rise. Please be seated. 1 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 2 MR. ROSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brian Rosen 3 and Matthew Curro, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, together with Mark 4 Collins from Richards, Layton & Finger, on behalf of Washington 5 Mutual, Inc. Your Honor, keeping with your help on my 6 7 calendar --THE COURT: Uh-huh. 8 MR. ROSEN: -- and your statement to me about making 9 sure the calendar for Washington Mutual didn't exceed an 10 11 hour, --12 THE COURT: You're going to fulfil your promise, 13 right? 14 MR. ROSEN: There is no doubt about it. We have very few matters on. Actually, we think, if you go to page 5 of the 15 agenda, Your Honor, that is the first matter that is going 16 forward. And, there are two uncontested claims objections. 17 The first is what we refer to as the 11th claims 18 objection. It is non-substantive, Your Honor. It was filed to 19 20 deal with claims that were filed in the wrong Chapter 11 case and that we were seeking to have recharacterized as claims 21 filed against the correct debtor. 22 23 THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ROSEN: And, we have received no responses to that objection.

24

25

THE COURT: And, that looked fine to me, so I will sustain it.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. The next was the 13th omnibus objection. And, this was with respect to what we refer to as misclassified claims. And, specifically, Your Honor, these were claims filed against the debtors by current and former members of the board of directors.

And, the three claims that were objected to in the 13th omnibus are claims in which the debtors are in agreement as to the total amount asserted, but which reflected an incorrect amount that was entitled to the priority treatment. So, what we were seeking to do was to reclassify the priority treatment to reflect what is contained in the debtor's books and records. Again, Your Honor, we received no responses to that.

THE COURT: We'll be discussing the non-substantive nature of misclassified claims at the rules committee meeting. But, --

MR. ROSEN: I -- I did hear about something that may have occurred yesterday or the day before in that regard, Your Honor. We do have the claims here, if the Court would like to see them. And, we can certainly hand copies up to the Court. We do also have Mr. Goulding --

THE COURT: Well, let me -- let me say one thing. I mean, you say as the basis that it doesn't agree with the debtor's books and records. But, your books and records don't

Rosen - Argument really talk about priorities under the code. 1 MR. ROSEN: Well, -- (pause). Okay. Your Honor, can 2 3 I hand you a set? THE COURT: Of the proofs of claim? 4 5 MR. ROSEN: Yes. THE COURT: Sure. Thank you. 6 MR. ROSEN: I don't which one is on top, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Let's see. Phillip Matthews (phonetic). 8 MR. ROSEN: Okay. Phillip Matthews, which is claim 9 1446, -- there actually was no amount specified in that 10 particular one, Your Honor. But, it was filed, Your Honor, as 11 a priority -- I'm sorry, it was, up top. I apologize. 12 13 THE COURT: As a --14 MR. ROSEN: It was --15 THE COURT: -- wage --16 MR. ROSEN: The 19,022.35. THE COURT: Yes. 17 18 MR. ROSEN: And, what we were trying to do there was 19 limit it to the statutory amount, Your Honor, --20 THE COURT: Okay. MR. ROSEN: -- and move the balance into the general 21 22 unsecured category. The second one, Your Honor, -- I'm not

sure which one you have. Do you want to do Thomas Leopard

THE COURT: Charles Lillis?

(phonetic) or Charles Lillis?

23

24

25

MR. ROSEN: Okay. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROSEN: Mr. Lillis' claim was in the amount of \$203,387.26. Again, Your Honor, we're seeking to limit that one to the statutory amount. The --

THE COURT: Well, it says 1500 on your exhibit.

MR. ROSEN: I apologize, Your Honor. I was talking to the front piece, which had the 203, and I apologize.

MR. ROSEN: And, then we were looking to have reclassified to the 1500 and the balance of the 201 reclassified as a general unsecured claim.

THE COURT: Well, why 1500?

MR. ROSEN: Well, we do have, again, Mr. Goulding here with us. And, Mr. Goulding would testify that the documentation indicates that that was the only amount that was entitled to the priority treatment with respect to the fees and that were incurred during -- during the 180-day period.

THE COURT: Okay. Director's fees incurred during the 180-day period.

MR. ROSEN: Exactly, Your Honor. And, when we -and, then we get to the second one, which is the Leopard proof of claim, similarly, Your Honor, although it was filed in the amount of 43,000 and change, --

THE COURT: Well, go -- go back to the 1500.

MR. ROSEN: Sure.

2

THE COURT: How do you determine that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ROSEN: We -- again, Your Honor, based upon our

books and records that show the attendance at meetings and other fees and expenses that were incurred for reimburs -entitled for reimbursement. Mr. Goulding would testify that, based upon the documentation that was provided by the board's secretary that shows the attendance, as well as the fees and expenses, that is how we got to the 1500 amount.

Likewise, the board's secretary would show, for the next one, Your Honor, Leopard, that it was 4,973 and 51 cents as associated with the period within the 180 days, and for board fees and fees and expenses.

THE COURT: All right. It's not self evident from the proof of claim, but I'll accept that proffered testimony.

MR. ROSEN: So, for that reason, Your Honor, we would seek to have those three claims reclassified as we have laid them out.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, the -- the next objection is the 10th omnibus objection. And, this was what we refer to as a substantive objection, and it was several bases. One was for municipal services and other claims.

So, the claims filed against the debtors on account of what we were -- what we believe were municipal services

provided to WMB or fines assessed against WMB and not WMI, vendor claims for claims filed against the debtors on account of either WMB contracts or goods or services provided solely to WMB, and various miscellaneous claims filed against the debtors for which we believe we have no liability.

We did receive, Your Honor, one request and several
-- and two responses. One request was from Mann Realty, LLC to
adjourn with respect to their claim because they needed an
opportunity to review the situation. That was claim 2911, and
we agreed to that adjournment.

THE COURT: What was the name of the claimant?

MR. ROSEN: M-A-N-N Realty, LLC, claim number 2911.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSEN: A response was provided by Greenspoon Marder, P.A., which is a law firm, alleging that they had provided services to the debtor. We believed it was to Washington Mutual Bank. Upon consultation with Greenspoon, Greenspoon has agreed that they have no further response and that they are okay with the objection going through with respect to their claim.

And, that claim, I believe, was 572 -- (Pause). Just to be clear, Your Honor, -- I apologize, you were right -- \$14,002.70. They do have no objection with respect to the -- they do have no response now, after further discussion, to the objection that was interposed.

THE COURT: Well, part of their response simply says they -- they don't think that they would have gotten a proof of claim if they hadn't been a creditor. So, without anything further, I will sus -- overrule that objection.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. The other response that we did receive was from a Ms. Joanne Taylor. Ms. Taylor asserts a claim for \$14,000. And, this was on account of trading losses that she incurred during the period of 1991 to 1995 as a result of investment advice that she received from a broker at a group called Murphy Favre, Inc.

The attachments to the proof of claim, however, indicate that her original claim was investigated by Murphy Favre, and it was concluded that the investment vehicle in which she had invested was appropriate for a portfolio and that the losses were a result of market fluctuations. She has given us nothing further in her proof of claim other than what she included in that handwritten letter that was attached.

Your Honor, we have looked at this situation.

Obviously it was over 13 years ago, and presumably whatever statute of limitations existed probably has passed. But, we also looked at it from the context of Murphy Favre and tried to figure out what Murphy Favre is.

In actuality, it is an indirect subsidiary of Washington Mutual Bank and, through several names changes, is now referred to as WaMu Investments, Inc. Thus, Your Honor, we

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Rosen - Argument / The Court - Ruling do not believe that there is an objection -- excuse me -- a claim that would exist against the debtor's estates. Rather, if one does exist, it would solely be against Washington Mutual Bank indirectly through its subsidiary. So, we would ask the Court to grant the objection that we have interposed to Ms. Taylor's claim.

THE COURT: All right. I will sustain the debtor's objection.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Lastly, Your Honor, we have the 12th omnibus objection, and this was a nonsubstantive one. We were objecting to amended and superceded claims, unsupported claims, and duplicate claims.

We received two responses. One was from Ben Shiriak -- and, this was the lawyer -- in the amount of \$527. We did speak with Mr. Shiriak. And, after discussion with him, he has agreed that he has no opposition to the claim objection.

The other objection -- or response that was -- that was interposed was by Mr. Geoffrey Olsen. You may recall he appeared before us with respect to the deferred comp plan. was mostly concerned that he had filed multiple claims against the estate. And, while he didn't have a problem with us with wiping out or expunging one of the earlier filed claims, he just wanted to be clear that his other claim still had some vitality.

We contacted Mr. Olsen, explained that we were not

25

24

25

Rosen / Landis - Argument / The Court - Ruling 11 objecting to that supplemental claim that he had filed, just merely getting the original claim out of the way. And, he said he had no further objections to the relief being sought.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSEN: So, with that, Your Honor, I believe those are the four items which are on today's agenda.

THE COURT: Okay. I have no further comments with respect to that. So, I'll sustain the objection.

MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, just -- Mr. Landis asked that we just state for the record what we've done previously. is a reservation of rights in these with respect to J.P. Morgan. The language is in here. It's the same language that we've used in prior claims orders.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSEN: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may. Thank you. (Pause). right. I'll enter those orders then.

MR. ROSEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. LANDIS: Your Honor, as you're doing so -- Adam Landis for the record approaching on behalf of J.P. Morgan Chase. The language with respect to the 10th omnibus claim objection -- I just -- not to belabor it or burden the record

Mr. Rosen did speak to one of the claims potentially being a claim against Washington Mutual Bank. Just to clarify

for the record, the language that reserves rights sets forth and is clear that nothing in the order disallowing the claim finds any liability on behalf of Washington Mutual Bank. THE COURT: Understood. MR. LANDIS: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. ROSEN: Your Honor, that concludes the Washington Mutual calendar. THE COURT: All right. We'll stand adjourned then. MR. ROSEN: Thank you. <u>CERTIFICATION</u> I, Frances L. Maristch, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. FRANCES L. MARISTCH DATE

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT District of Delaware

In Re:

Washington Mutual, Inc. 1301 Second Avenue Seattle, WA 98101

EIN: 91–1653725

Chapter: 11

Case No.: 08-12229-MFW

NOTICE OF FILING OF TRANSCRIPT AND OF DEADLINES RELATED TO RESTRICTION AND REDACTION

A transcript of the proceeding held on 10/28/2009 was filed on 11/9/2009. The following deadlines apply:

The parties have 7 days to file with the court a *Notice of Intent to Request Redaction* of this transcript. The deadline for filing a *request for redaction* is 11/30/2009.

If a request for redaction is filed, the redacted transcript is due 12/10/2009.

If no such notice is filed, the transcript may be made available for remote electronic access upon expiration of the restriction period, which is 2/8/2010 unless extended by court order.

To review the transcript for redaction purposes, you may purchase a copy from the transcriber (see docket for Transcriber's information) or you may view the document at the clerk's office public terminal.

Clerk of Court

Date: 11/9/09

(ntc)

Notice Recipients

District/Off: 0311–1 User: Brandon Date Created: 11/9/2009

Case: 08–12229–MFW Form ID: ntcBK Total: 17

Recipients of Notice of Electronic Filing:

ust	United States Truste	e USTPREGION03.WL.ECF@USDOJ.GOV
aty	Andrew C. Irgens	irgens@rlf.com, rbgroup@rlf.com
aty	Andrew C. Irgens	irgens@rlf.com, rbgroup@rlf.com
aty	Andrew C. Irgens	irgens@rlf.com, rbgroup@rlf.com
aty	Chun I. Jang	jang@rlf.com, rbgroup@rlf.com
aty	Lee E. Kaufman	kaufman@rlf.com, rbgrooup@rlf.com
aty	Lee E. Kaufman	kaufman@rlf.com, rbgroup@rlf.com

TOTAL: 7

D	3 944 3	4 4	DATO	(T) 1 4	NT 49 9 4	` `
Recipients	submitted	to the	BNC	Bankruntev	Noticing Cent	er):

Tree-press	submitted to the Bive (Bulling beef i totaling center).		
db	Washington Mutual, Inc. 1301 Second Avenue	Seattle, WA 98101	
aty	Andrew C. Irgens Richards, Layton & Finger	920 N. King Street	Wilmington, DE 19801
aty	Chun I Jang Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. 551 Wilmington, DE 19899	920 North King Street	P.O. Box
aty	Chun I. Jang Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. 551 Wilmington, DE 19899	920 North King Street	P.O. Box
aty	Cory D. Kandestin Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A Square Wilmington, DE 19801	920 North King S	treet, One Rodney
aty	Lee E. Kaufman Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.	920 North King Stre	eet One Rodney
	Square Wilmington, DE 19801	020 North Vine Stre	One Deduce
aty	Lee E. Kaufman Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. Square Wilmington, DE 19801	920 North King Stre	eet One Rodney
aty		One Rodney Square	PO Box 551 Wilmington, DE
aty	Neil Raymond Lapinski 1105 North Market Street	Suite 1700 P	CO. Box
	2327 Wilmington DE, 19899 U.S.A.		
aty	Rafael Xavier Zahralddin—Aravena Elliott Greenle 1700 P.O. Box 2327 Wilmington, DE 19801		ket Street Suite

TOTAL: 10