1 2 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 3 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA** 4 5 6 In Chapter 11 proceedings CA-TEL TELECOMMUNICATIONS. 7 INC. **Debtor** Case No. 2-08-bk-1089-RTBP 8 9 CA-TEL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, 10 Plaintiff, 11 Adv. No. 2-08-ap-00837-RTBP vs. 12 **QWEST CORPORATION**, et al. UNDER ADVISEMENT DECISION 13 RE MOTION FOR SUMMARY Defendants. **JUDGMENT** 14 15 16 17 I. Introduction The Debtor and Owest have been locked in a bitter, and from this Court's perspective, often 18 unnecessary battle over the payment of third party subcontractors. The parties are in the final stages 19 20 of their dispute – subcontractors have been paid and the Debtor has converted to a Chapter 7. The Court must decide the amount of attorney fees Qwest is entitled to based on its contracts with the 21 22 Debtor. The Court concludes that Qwest is entitled to \$72,669.50 in fees and \$1,844.25 in costs. Background 23 Before the Court is Qwest's application for attorney fees filed on August 24, 2009 2.4 ("Application"). Qwest filed the Application based on the Court's directive in its August 4, 2009 25 26 27 28

1 C

Order ("Order"). The Debtor timely filed a response ("Response") to the Application and Qwest filed a reply ("Reply").¹

In the Order, the Court determined as a matter of law that attorney fees may be awarded, but only if they are allowed under the three contracts (collectively "Contracts") that govern the relationship between the parties.² However, the Court could not determine factually whether attorney fees could be awarded because no application had been submitted to the Court and therefore denied the Debtor's Motion for Partial Summary judgment. Accordingly the Court directed Qwest to file a fee application and "identify whether the fee can be approved under Section 13.5, Section 19.2, or both, and provide supporting documentation as necessary. To the extent Qwest claims attorneys fees related to the administration of the bankruptcy that are not related to a specific claim, Owest must justify why the claimed fees can be awarded under the Contracts."

The Application makes it clear that Qwest views Sections 13.5 and 19.2 of the Contracts as expansive stating, "the Contracts explicitly provide that Qwest is entitled to recover its attorneys' fees and costs incurred by it for all but a very limited range of services performed by its attorneys." Based on this view, Qwest claims that it incurred \$156,450 in fees and costs of which \$138,789.50 is recoverable under the Contracts. In other words, according to Qwest almost 90% of its attorney fees and costs are awardable under the Contracts.

Unsurprisingly, the Debtor objects to the award of most of Qwest's claimed fees. It claims that, at most, \$32,504 in fees and \$750 in costs are allowable. In its Response, the Debtor claims that attorney fees in the following categories are not awardable under the Contracts:

| Category | Amount |
|-----------|-------------|
| Insurance | \$ 2,787.00 |
| Financing | 7,716.50 |

¹ The Court directed Qwest to notify the Court's staff when the parties completed briefing. Qwest did not notify the Court's staff. Instead, the Court learned that briefing was completed when it reviewed the docket in early February based upon a notice of appearance from the Chapter 7 Trustee.

² The three Contracts are:

i. General Construction and Maintenance Agreement, effective May 1, 2005, to April 30, 2008 ("General Agreement");

ii. Buried Service Wire Work Agreement effective May 1, 2006, to April 30, 2009; and

iii. Specific Bid General Construction and Maintenance Agreement, effective May 1, 2006 to October 31, 2007.

For ease of reference, the Court will refer to the provision in the General Agreement.

| Secured Creditor Reviews | 612.00 |
|--|--------------|
| General Bankruptcy Issues | 33,094.50 |
| Motion prep, Reviews, Internal Communication | 10,239.50 |
| Contact Reviews | 5,311.00 |
| Ca-Tel License Reviews | 3,058.00 |
| Rule 2004 Examination | 20,372.50 |
| Tax Issues | 225.00 |
| Legal Fee Support Preparation | 15,254.50 |
| Disgorement | 4,006.50 |
| Damage Claim | 1,890.00 |
| Miscellaneous | 5,997.50 |
| Total | \$110,564.50 |
| | |

The Debtor lists the following categories as allowable under the Contracts:

| Category | Amount |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Sub Contractor [sic] Lien | \$27,659.00 |
| Vendor Settlement | 4,845.00 |
| Total | \$32,504.00 |

The Debtor lists the following as questionable under the Contracts:

Qwest Motion to Fully Pay Sub Contractors [sic] \$9,615.00

In other words, The Debtor concedes that just over 20% of Qwest's fees are recoverable, but challenges the rest.

Qwest, in it Reply, defends its Application. Qwest does not take issue with how the Debtor has categorized the fees or the amount placed in each category. Instead, Qwest defends the Application claiming that it is entitled to recover fees under each category listed by the Debtor. Qwest's overarching theme in its Application and Reply is that the requested attorneys fees were incurred because the Debtor refused to timely pay subcontractors. Thus, Qwest argues, it was forced to incur substantial attorneys fees to force the Debtor to pay the subcontractors

III. Analysis

In the Order the Court set forth the parameters of recovering attorney fees:

Under *Travelers* "state law determines rights and obligations when the Code is silent." *In re Rodriguez*, 375. B.R. 535 (9th Cir. BAP 2007). As such, "[p]roperty interests are created and defined by state law," and '[u]nless some federal interest requires a different result, there is no reason why such interests should be analyzed differently simply because an interested party is involved in a bankruptcy proceeding." *Travelers* at 451 (quoting *Butner v. United States*, 440 U.S. 48, 57 (1979)). In Arizona, parties can contractually shift attorneys' fees. *See Cortaro Water Users's Ass'n v. Steiner*, 148 Ariz. 314, 316 (Ariz. 1986) ("[i]n Arizona we follow the general American rule that attorneys' fees are not recoverable unless they are expressly provided for either by statute or contract.") Hence, Qwest can recover

attorneys' fees if allowed under the Contracts.

In short, fees are awardable under the Contracts as allowed under state law.

The ability to contractually shift attorneys fees is governed by A.R.S. §12-341.01. Under subsection §12-341.01(A), "[i]n any contested action arising out of a contract, express or implied, the court may award the successful party reasonable attorney fees." However, under §12-341.01(B), "[t]he award of reasonable attorney fees pursuant to subsection A should be made to mitigate the burden of the expense of litigation to establish a just claim or a just defense. It need not equal or relate to the attorney fees actually paid or contracted, but the award may not exceed the amount paid or agreed to be paid." The party requesting attorney fees under A.R.S. § 12-3431.01(A) bears the burden of proof. *Woerth v. City of Flagstaff*, 808 P.2d 297, 304 (Ariz. App. 1990).

Though the parties disagree on the amount of fees that the Court should award, they implicitly agree on the broad categories on which the Court should analyze the fees³: 1) Insurance, 2) Financing, 3) Secured Creditor Reviews, 4) General Bankruptcy Issues, 5) Motion Prep, Reviews, Internal Communication, 6) Contract Reviews, 7) Ca-Tel License Reviews, 8) Rule 2004 Examination, 9) Tax Issues, 10) Legal Fee Support Preparation, 11) Disgorement, 12) Damage Claim, 13) Miscellaneous and 14) Qwest's Motion to Fully Pay Subcontractors.

Before beginning the analysis of each category, it is important to define the parameters under which fees can be awarded - namely Sections 13.5⁴ and 19.2⁵ of the Contracts. Under 13.5 Qwest

³ The Debtor defined the categories in its Response. Qwest directly addressed each category in its Reply, except for Qwest's Motion to Fully Pay Subcontractors. Qwest did not object to the categorization or dollar amounts calculated by the Debtor.

⁴ Section 13.5 reads in part:

Contractor warrants that no mechanics' liens or other claims or demands, including but not limited to personal injury, death, property damage or other liability claims (collectively "Payment Claims") will be filed or maintained by it, Subcontractors or any other third party against any Qwest equipment, real estate or other property on account of the Work. . . . Contractor agrees to hold Qwest free and harmless from and against any and all Payment Claims with respect to the value of labor or materials included in the Job or otherwise relating to Contractor's performance of the Work and from and against all expenses and liability in connection therewith (including without limitation any court costs and attorneys' fees and expense resulting or arising there from) . . . Qwest will have the right, but not the obligation, to pay, settle or discharge such Payment Claims and recover the amount paid, including all reasonable costs and attorney's fees and a twenty (20) percent handling fee.

⁵Section 19.2 reads:

In addition to Contractor's obligation to obtain and keep insurance as set forth elsewhere in this Agreement, Contractor will indemnify, defend and hold harmless each Indemnified Party from and against all suits, losses,

must show that the claimed attorney fees are associated with "Payment Claims." Payment Claims include "mechanics' lines or other claims or demands, including but not limited to personal injury, death property damage or other liability claims." Accordingly, to be entitled to attorney fees under 13.5, Qwest must show that the fees relate to a claim by the third party.

Under 19.2 attorney fees must be a Claim incurred in association with the Work as defined in Paragraph 2 of the Contracts or must be a Claim associated with a breach of the Contacts. "Work" is a defined term relating to contracting work performed by the Debtor for Qwest.

In short, to award attorneys fees under the Contracts Qwest must show that the fees incurred were due to third party claims, claims arising via the work done by the Debtor or for a breach of contract.

A. Awardable Fees

Qwest's claims for Contract Review and Damage Claims are recoverable under the Contracts. A review of the Contracts is necessary to determine if the Contracts were breached under 19.2. The Damage Claim fees are based on a tort committed by The Debtor that was allegedly covered by insurance. This is exactly the type of claim for which fees are awardable under both 13.5 and 19.2 as they relate to liability claims by a third party.

The Debtor argues that there was no need for Qwest to review the Debtor's licenses as it had operated under the same licences for Qwest for many years. Qwest counters that due to the Debtor's breach of contract a review of the Debtor's licenses with its subcontractors was necessary. The Debtor is required to maintain proper licenses under Section 7.3 of the Contracts - a failure to do so

costs, lawsuits, judgments, orders, awards, fines, penalties, expenses, liabilities, actions, damages or claims of any character (each a "Claim") arising from or in connection with (a) any personal injuries or property damage received or sustained by any person or property arising in whole or in part from the acts or omissions of Contractor, its Subcontractors and their respective officers, employees, agents or Affiliates in the performance of the Work; (b) any actual or alleged act or omission, neglect, negligence, gross negligence or willfull misconduct of Contractor, its Subcontractors and their respective officers, employees, agents or Affiliates in connection with the Work; (c) assertions under workers' compensation or similar employee benefit laws made by Contractor, its Subcontractors and/or their respective officers, employees, agents or Affiliates in connection with the Work, (d) any breach by Contractor of the Contract Documents, regardless of whether such injuries or damages are caused in part by the negligence of any Indemnified Party and (e) the furnishing or use of any materials by Contractor in connection with the Work or any product liability claims relating to the materials.. Contractor will reimburse Qwest or any other Indemnified Party for any and all costs, settlements, judgments, or expenses incurred by them in defending or investigating any Claim, including attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, investigative and court costs.

is a breach of the Contracts. It follows that, under the circumstances, it was reasonable for Qwest to review and investigate whether the Debtor was maintaining the proper licences. Fees are awardable under Section 19.2.

The Debtor challenges the amount of fees incurred for the Rule 2004 Examination because the amount, \$20,372.50, is "outrageous and unsupportable." Qwest justifies the fees because the examination sought information regarding the financial condition of the Debtor. Before the examination, according to Qwest, it was discovered that the financial statement prepared by the Debtor contained serious errors - errors that constituted a breach of the Contracts. Further, argues Qwest, the purpose of the 2004 exam was to determine the Debtor's ability to pay third parties that had filed claims, such as mechanic's liens, against Qwest and thus attorney fees are justified under the Contracts. Under Section 19.2 Qwest allows recovery of attorney fees for investigating a claim. Here, Qwest used the 2004 Exam as an opportunity to investigate the misconduct of the Debtor related to the work. The fees are awardable under 19.2.

B. Partially Awardable Fees

The Debtor argues that fees related to Insurance are not awardable because Qwest's fees were incurred opposing the Debtor's insurance financing motion in which the Debtor eventually prevailed. Qwest counters that the Insurance fees were incurred under 19.2 on two fronts: 1) The Debtor claimed that its damage liability was covered by insurance, but Qwest had not received confirmation that the Debtor's insurance would provide coverage. Thus Qwest was forced to find replacement insurance; and 2) Qwest learned that the Debtor did not maintain proper insurance as required under the Contract.

Here, the question is why were the fees incurred? On the one hand, if the fees were incurred opposing the Debtor's obtaining insurance, it does not appear that the fees are awardable under the Contracts because the issue at hand was regarding the super priority status of the financing, not the amount, type or extent of the insurance. On the other hand, the Debtor is required to maintain proper insurance under Section 19.2; Section 13.7 requires maintenance of driver's insurance; Section 16 requires maintenance of disability insurance; 17.2 requires maintenance of subcontractor insurance

1

3 4 5

> 6 7 8

10 11

9

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 2.3

2.4

25 26

27

and Sections 21.1 through 21.5 require a variety of insurances. If these sections were breached, the fees incurred are awardable.

A review of the record shows that \$753 in fees were incurred opposing the Debtor's insurance financing motion. These are not awardable. The Court concludes that the remainder of the fees were incurred in investigating insurance claims and are thus awardable.

Debtor believes that the amount of fees incurred to prepare the Application are inappropriately claimed and are unreasonable. Owest counters that under Section 13.5 fees must be documented and therefore the fees are awardable. "Arizona law supports the recovery of attorneys' fees incurred in preparing a fee application." Gamtech Intern., Inc. v. Trend Gaming Systems, L.L.C., 380 F.Supp.2d 1084, 1101 (D.Ariz. 2005) (citing to China Doll). Accordingly, fees are awardable. However, the fees requested must be reasonable. *Id.* Qwest requests \$15,254.50 for the preparation of its fee application, almost 10% of the total fees incurred. Even though the fees in this case have been hotly contested – involving a motion for summary judgment and detailed post hearing briefings – the amount incurred is unreasonable. Under the circumstances the Court awards \$7,500 in fees.

C. Not Awardable Fees

Owest argues that Financing, Secured Creditor Review, General Bankruptcy Issues and Motion Preparation fees are awardable because work on these issues effects Qwest's ultimate ability to recoup funds from the Debtor. While this may be true, Qwest must show that the fees are awardable under 13.5 and 19.2 of the Contracts. Qwest has not done so. These are the types of issues that would arise regardless of the Contracts and are not specifically related to a breach of the Contracts, a third party claim or work done by Ca-Tel. Accordingly, theses fees are not awardable.

Qwest claims that Tax Claims fall under 13.5 because they are "payment claims" under Section 13.5. However, these claims are not a catch-all category, instead payment claims are "mechanics' liens or other claims or demands, including but not limited to personal injury, death, property damage or other liability claims." Tax claims against Ca-Tel do not fall into this definition and are therefore not awardable.

9 10

8

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

Qwest justifies an award related to Disgorgement under 19.2(b) because "the postpetition payment of a professional, who is also an insider, without court authority is an 'actual or alleged act or omission, neglect, negligence, gross negligence or willful misconduct of' the Debtor." Qwest does not claim Disgorgement was a breach of the Contract. Owest misses the mark. An award under 19.2(b), unless it's related to a breach of contract, must be related to "Work." "Work" is a defined term relating to contracting work performed by Ca-Tel for Qwest. As presented by Qwest, the "negligence" does not relate to Work or a breach of the Contracts and therefore attorneys' fees are not awardable.

Qwest states that the Miscellaneous fees all relate to attempt to recover under the Contracts. This justification is insufficient to award fees. In the Order the Court required ruled, "[t]o the extent Qwest claims attorneys's fees related to the administration of the bankruptcy that are not related to a specific claim, Qwest must justify why the claimed fees can be awarded under the Contracts." It has not done so. Accordingly, the fees are not awardable.

Qwest justifies an award for the Motion to Fully Pay Subcontractors under Section 13.5. Though the Court stated in its decision, "[t]here is a lot of merit to Owest's motion," the Court ultimately denied Qwest's Motion. Qwest was clearly unsuccessful in its Motion to Fully Pay Subcontractors. The Court can only award fees if the party is successful. A.R.S. 12-341.01(A). Accordingly, the fees for this category are not awardable.

D. Costs

Uncontested Fees

As the Court has awarded approximately half the total fees incurred by Qwest, the Court will award half the costs incurred.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing the Court makes the following attorney fees calculations:

| Category | Fees Requested | Fees Awarded |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Sub Contractor Lien | \$27,659.00 | \$27,659.00 |
| Vendor Settlement | \$4,845.00 | \$4,845.00 |
| Sub-Total | \$32,504.00 | \$32,504.00 |

| 1 | | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------------|---------------|--|
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | Contested Fee | | | |
| 3 | <u>Category</u> Insurance | \$2,787.00 | \$2,034.00 | |
| 4 | Financing | \$7,716.50 | \$0.00 | |
| 5 | Secured Creditor Reviews | \$612.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | General Bankruptcy Issues | \$33,094.50 | \$0.00 | |
| 6 | Motion prep, Reviews, Internal Communication | \$10,239.50 | \$0.00 | |
| 7 | Contract Reviews | \$5,311.00 | \$5,311.00 | |
| | Ca-Tel License Reviews | \$3,058.00 | \$3,058.00 | |
| 8 | Rule 2004 Examination | \$20,372.50 | \$20,372.50 | |
| 9 | Tax Issues | \$225.00 | \$0.00 | |
| | Legal Fee Support Preparation | \$15,254.50 | \$7,500.00 | |
| 10 | Disgorement | \$4,006.50 | \$0.00 | |
| 11 | Damage Claim | \$1,890.00 | \$1,890.00 | |
| | Miscellaneous | \$5,997.50 | \$0.00 | |
| 12 | Qwest Motion to Fully Pay Subcontractors | \$9,615.00 | <u>\$0.00</u> | |
| 13 | Sub-Total | \$110,564.50 | \$40,165.50 | |
| | Total Award | | \$72,669.50 | |
| 14 | Additionally, the Court awards \$1,844.25 in costs. The motion for summary judgment is granted | | | |
| 15 | | | <i>J</i> | |
| 16 | in part and denied in part. Counsel for Qwest is to uple | oad a form of order. | | |
| | | | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | | | |
| 19 | DATED : March 26, 2009 | | | |
| 20 | | 1 - | | |
| 21 | Olia | need lan | | |
| 22 | CHARLI UNITED | ES G. GASE II OSTATES BANKRUP' | TCY JUDGE | |
| 23 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | COPY of the foregoing mailed by the BNC and/or | | | |

sent by auto-generated mail to: JAMES F KAHN JAMES F. KAHN, P.C. 301 E. BETHANY HOME RD., #C-195 PHOENIX, AZ 85012, Attorneys for Debtor CHRISTOPHER R. KAUP TIFFANY & BOSCO, P.A. 2525 E CAMELBACK RD STE 300 PHOENIX, AZ 85016, Attorneys for Qwest