

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

In re

**JOINTLY ADMINISTERED UNDER  
CASE NO. 08-46617:**

POLAROID CORPORATION, ET AL.,

08-46617 (GFK)

Debtors.

(includes:

Polaroid Holding Company;

08-46621 (GFK)

Polaroid Consumer Electronics, LLC;

08-46620 (GFK)

Polaroid Capital, LLC;

08-46623 (GFK)

Polaroid Latin America I Corporation;

08-46624 (GFK)

Polaroid Asia Pacific LLC;

08-46625 (GFK)

Polaroid International Holding LLC;

08-46626 (GFK)

Polaroid New Bedford Real Estate, LLC;

08-46627 (GFK)

Polaroid Norwood Real Estate, LLC;

08-46628 (GFK)

Polaroid Waltham Real Estate, LLC)

08-46629 (GFK)

Chapter 11 Cases  
Judge Gregory F. Kishel

---

**LINDQUIST & VENNUM P.L.L.P. AND DEBTORS' RESPONSE TO OBJECTION  
TO APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THEM TO EMPLOY  
THE LAW FIRM OF LINDQUIST & VENNUM P.L.L.P.**

---

Lindquist & Vennum P.L.L.P. (“Lindquist & Vennum”) and the above-captioned administratively consolidated debtors (the “Polaroid Debtors”), file this Response to the objection by Ritchie Special Credit Investments, Ltd., Rhone Holdings II, Ltd., Yorkville Investments I, L.L.C., Ritchie Capital Structure Arbitrage Trading, Ltd., and Ritchie Capital Management, Ltd. (collectively, “Ritchie”) to the Application of Debtors for an Order Authorizing the Employment of the Law Firm of Lindquist & Vennum P.L.L.P. (the “Polaroid Application”). Through the Polaroid Application the Polaroid Debtors seek to employ and retain

Lindquist & Vennum as their counsel in the above-captioned bankruptcy cases, *nunc pro tunc* to December 18, 2008.

## INTRODUCTION

On October 6, 2008, Douglas A. Kelley (“Kelley”) was appointed as the receiver for the Petters Company, Inc. (“PCI”) and Petters Group Worldwide, LLC (“PGW”), and for certain affiliates, including the Polaroid Debtors. On December 18, 2008, the Polaroid Debtors filed voluntary petitions under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code (the “Polaroid Petition Date”) and on January 12, 2009 promptly submitted their Application seeking to employ Lindquist & Vennum. Ritchie has filed the sole objection to the Polaroid Application.

As the Court is well aware, PCI and PGW, along with affiliate companies, are debtors in the jointly-administered Chapter 11 proceedings (the “Petters Cases”) and Kelley was appointed as the Chapter 11 Trustee in the Petters Cases. Ritchie also lodged an objection to the appointment of Kelley in the Petters Cases. The Appointed Trustee’s Response to Objection to Appointment of Douglas A. Kelley as Trustee for All of the Debtors in These Jointly Administered Proceedings filed in that case on January 21, 2009, Docket No. 132, is incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein. On February 26, 2009, this Court entered its Order Overruling Objection of [Ritchie] to Appointment of Trustee in Chapter 11 Cases, and Approving Appointment in the Petters Cases (the “Appointment Order”). Ritchie appealed the Appointment Order on March 9, 2009. The Appointment Order settled the status of the Trustee in the Petters Cases and leads to the need to determine the status of Lindquist & Vennum as Debtor’s counsel in the Polaroid cases. Ritchie’s objection to the Polaroid Application puts forward the same arguments regarding the allegedly conflicted status of Lindquist & Vennum in these cases as were made by Ritchie with respect to the Trustee’s appointment. While the legal requirements applicable to Lindquist & Vennum’s eligibility for

employment differ slightly from those applicable to the Trustee's appointment, that employment should be approved for substantially the same reasons the Trustee's appointment was approved. No actual conflicts have ripened. If and when they do, appropriate notice will be given and appropriate steps will be taken to ensure that neither the Trustee nor Lindquist & Vennum run afoul of Bankruptcy Code or Bankruptcy Rule proscriptions. Further, Kelley's responsibilities and duties on behalf of the Polaroid Debtors are far more limited than as the Chapter 11 trustee in the Petters Cases because the Polaroid Debtors continue to operate with its pre-petition management as a debtor-in-possession with Kelley's role as receiver essentially limited to holding the stock of Polaroid. Kelley has no management responsibilities for the Polaroid Debtors.

Ritchie, with respect to the Polaroid Application, re-asserts the same "external conflict" and "internal conflict" objections that were overruled in the Appointment Order. The "external conflict" objection, hinged on the Trustee's role as Receiver, should be rejected for exactly the same reasons they were overruled in the Appointment Order. The "internal conflict" objection, hinged on potential inter-company claims between and among various debtors, should be overruled for the reasons given in the Appointment Order, even though a slightly different legal standard applies in the context of the Application.

### **ARGUMENT**

To be employed, Lindquist & Vennum must "not hold or represent an interest adverse to the estate" and must be "disinterested." 11 U.S.C. Section 327(a). To be disinterested, the firm must "not have an interest materially adverse to the interest of the estate or of any class of creditors ... by reason of any direct or indirect relationship to, connection with, or interest in the debtor, or for any other reason." 11 U.S.C. Section 101(14)(C). Despite these strictures, Lindquist & Vennum is not disqualified from employment based upon its representation of both

the Polaroid Debtors and an affiliate creditor. *See In re BH & P Inc.*, 949 F.2d 1300, 1314 (3d Cir. 1991) (citing 11 U.S.C. Section 327(c)). Under Section 327(c), in such situation, “if there is an actual conflict of interest” the firm cannot be employed. Many courts have held that it is not sufficient to merely identify a conflict of interest arising from prior representation but the moving party must demonstrate that the conflict must be materially adverse to the estate, its creditors or security holders. *See In re Quakertown Glass Co.*, 73 B.R. 468, 469 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1987) (citing *Cle-Ware Industries, Inc. v. Sokolsky*, 493 F. 2d 863 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1974)); *In re Guy-Apple Masonry Contractor, Inc.*, 45 B.R. 160, 165 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 1984).

The panel in *BH & P* affirmed the dismissal of Trustee’s counsel in two of three jointly-administered cases, on the basis of an actual conflict after the Trustee filed claims on behalf of one estate against the other two. 949 F.2d at 1314-17. Subsequently, the Third Circuit “clarified” its ruling in *BH & P* and reiterated its holding as follows:

- (1) Section 327(a), as well as § 327(c), imposes a per se disqualification as trustee’s counsel of any attorney who has an actual conflict of interest;
- (2) the district court may within its discretion—pursuant to § 327(a) and consistent with § 327(c)—disqualify an attorney who has a potential conflict of interest and
- (3) the district court may not disqualify an attorney on the appearance of conflict alone.

*In re Marvel Entertainment Group, Inc.*, 140 F.3d 463, 476 (3d Cir. 1998) (lower court abused its discretion in disqualifying law firm in absence of potential or actual conflict; firm terminated representation of creditor when retained by the trustee).

In its disclosures in connection with the Polaroid Application and its filings on behalf of the Trustee with respect to his disputed appointment, Lindquist & Vennum has been completely candid regarding the debtors’ tangled affairs, inter-company obligations, inter-company transfers, transfers to third parties for the sole apparent benefit of affiliates, questionable business practices, and the large sums of money involved. Further, the Trustee, the Polaroid Debtors and

the firm have represented to this Court that they expect to focus for an extended period of time on untangling the debtors' messy financial dealings, liquidating assets, recovering assets, and pursuing avoidance actions against non-affiliated entities. They intend to defer resolution of inter-company claims until such time, if ever, that such resolution ripens (for example, if it is determined after the initial focus that it is in the estates' best interests not to seek substantive consolidation) and makes sense for the complete administration of these cases. And if, at that future date and endowed with better knowledge and a handle on assets available for distribution to creditors, it appears that there exist direct conflicts between debtor entities or affiliates, steps will be take with the input of parties in interest, including the creditors' committees and United States Trustee, to determine an appropriate manner to deal with these issues and seek the approval of this Court for the steps chosen.

The issue of a direct conflict may be triggered at some point following the claims bar date in the Polaroid cases that has been set for May 20, 2009. The Petters estates may assert claims in all or some of the Polaroid Debtors' bankruptcy estates. At this juncture, the Polaroid Debtors assert that filing a claim to preserve the rights of the debtors in the Petters Cases should not disqualify Lindquist & Vennum from representing the Polaroid Debtors. As has been stated above, the day may never come when these inter-company claims need to be resolved through litigation. Until the determination that the inter-company claims will be prosecuted, the disqualifying direct and actual conflict does not exist. At present, the Polaroid Debtors and the interest of the creditors of the Polaroid Debtors are best served to retain Lindquist & Vennum as its counsel, especially in light of the pending sale of the assets of the Polaroid Debtors' estates that is set to close in April.

The Appointment Order fully acknowledged the possibility of inter-debtor conflicts down the road (“[a]t this early stage of the cases at bar, one cannot deny any of these possibilities out of hand”) but also determined that in these complex cases that the Trustee’s plan of action, “administrative in nature or legally-oriented” throughout the first phase would not present him “with cross-running allegiances.” The issue of potential conflicts will not ripen to actuality until, at the earliest, the recovery and asset assemblage stage of these cases is over. Appointment Order at 31, 32. With respect to the appointment of the Trustee in this context, this Court held that at present there is no disqualifying prejudice to the interests of creditors arising out of potential inter-debtor conflicts. *Id.* at 33-34. The question now is whether in such context multiple representation rises to the level of “actual conflict” that would disqualify Lindquist & Vennum under Section 327.

Because possible or alleged conflicts are at this stage of the cases merely potential, and will not ripen until at the earliest the completion of the Trustee’s recovery and assemblage phase of administration, the Debtors’ should be allowed to employ Lindquist & Vennum to assist them in carrying out these duties. Until and unless an actual conflict manifests itself, this Court has complete discretion to allow that employment under Section 327, despite the potential that such manifestation could possibly occur. *Marvel Entertainment*, 140 F.3d at 476, (*quoting BH & P*, 949 F.2d at 1316-17). These Polaroid bankruptcy cases, at least at this stage and for the foreseeable future, are thus distinguishable from the manifest conflicts in *BH & P*, where claims were on file and litigation had commenced between the estates, and those in *In re Big Mac Marine, Inc.*, 326 B.R. 150, 152-53 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. B.A.P. 2005) where counsel who represented shareholders in their personal bankruptcies was disqualified as counsel in the bankruptcy of their

company due to the shareholders' substantial claims asserted against the company and claims by a bank against all the debtors that put them in conflicting positions.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, the Ritchie objection divines two alleged actual conflicts arising from Lindquist & Vennum's representation of the Trustee. The first, the same "external conflict" asserted with respect to the Trustee's appointment, supposedly flows from the Trustee's status and duties as court-appointed receiver. But the Appointment Order found that purported "external conflict" to have been "vitiating or extinguished" via the Trustee's appointment, his formal turnover of receivership assets to the Debtors in the above-captioned cases, and the commitments he made to the Court with respect to the bankruptcy process, its values, and its priorities. Appointment Order at 25-26. Since the firm's client holds no adverse interest due to the purported "external conflict", it follows that Lindquist & Vennum in representing the Trustee does not represent an adverse interest and is disinterested. Moreover, because the issue has been "vitiating or extinguished" there can be no actual conflict.

Next, the objection asserts an actual "internal conflict" with respect to the representation of the Trustee in the several bankruptcy cases in which he has been appointed, and in these related Polaroid bankruptcy cases. Ritchie interposed the objection to the Trustee's appointment. But the Appointment Order, overruling that objection, found at this stage of these cases that there is no prejudice by conflicts of interest of Mr. Kelley in being appointed as Trustee in these

---

<sup>1</sup> The other authorities cited in Ritchie's Objection likewise involved adversity or representations that had crystallized into actual conflicts through pending or prior litigation, the filing and assertion of claims, or both. See *Southern Kitchens, Inc. v. TransAmerica Investment Corp.* (*In re Southern Kitchens, Inc.*), 216 B.R. 819, 829 (Bankr. D. Minn. 1998) (Kishel, J.) (former client possibly liable for damage that trustee's § 327(e) counsel attributed to others in his complaint), and *In re J & M Development of Cass County*, Bky. No. 04-41065, 2004 WL 1146451 (Bankr. W.D. Mo. May 19, 2004) (concurrent representation of debtor's owners in state court litigation with one of debtor's creditors, and owners asserting claims against debtor).

multiple related cases. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2009(d). The reason that there is no prejudice is that no actual conflicts yet exist.

The Trustee's plan of administration, as conducted thus far and as to be conducted as represented to the Court, "does not entail any action or process that would pit the distribution rights of PGW's creditors directly against those of the creditors of any of the other Debtors, until most or all recoverable assets have been garnered in." Appointment Order at 32. Furthermore, that plan of administration leads to a focal point, well down the road, where any inter-debtor claims cross-running between the estates, and the advisability of substantive consolidation, will be addressed. *Id.* That point will focus the attention of all interested parties on the need, if any at that juncture, of prophylactic action to protect the rights of all constituents and continue the administration of the estates in accordance with Bankruptcy Code requirements including Section 327 and Rue 2009.<sup>2</sup> For now, and well into the future, in assisting the Polaroid Debtors in carrying out their duties in these cases and completing the recovery and assemblage phase of his plan of administration, Lindquist & Vennum is and will remain disinterested, does not and will not hold or represent an interest adverse to an estate, and will not be involved in any actual conflict of interest. Its representation of the Polaroid Debtors and the Trustee "does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by [it] in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal." Minn. R. Prof. Cond. 1.7(b)(3).

---

<sup>2</sup> In numerous large cases a commonly used procedure to address conflicts issues is the employment of Conflicts Counsel with appropriate safeguard procedures and ethical walls that place limitations upon the representation by professionals employed by the estate. *See, e.g., In re Enron Corp.*, 2002 WL 32034346 at pg.15 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002); *In re Rockway Bedding, Inc.*, 2007 WL 1461319 at pg. 2 (Bankr. D.N.J. 2007).



Such a finding is completely consistent with the Appointment Order and the “flexible approach” adopted in *BH & P* to guide a bankruptcy court’s discretion in reviewing an application to employ a professional.

This flexible approach will require the bankruptcy courts to analyze the factors present in any given case in order to determine whether the efficiency and economy which may favor multiple representation must yield to competing concerns affecting fairness to all parties involved and the protection of the integrity of the bankruptcy process. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, the nature of disclosure of the conflict made at the time of the appointment, whether the interests of the related estates are parallel or conflicting, and the nature of the interdebtor claims made.

*BH & P*, 949 F.2d at 1316. The efficiency and economy favoring multiple representation of these estates has been well-chronicled. Separate Unsecured Creditors’ Committees are active in these cases and in the Petters Cases, and each has retained counsel. Disclosure has been full and candid. At least through the recovery and assemblage phase of administration, the interests of the related estates are parallel rather than conflicting. No inter-debtor claims have yet been made, and the forensic process to even properly and soberly assess those issues remains months from completion. Accordingly, the Polaroid Application should be approved.

Respectfully submitted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of March 2009.

**LINDQUIST & VENNUM P.L.L.P.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_ e/ James A. Lodoen

James A. Lodoen (#173605)

George H. Singer (#262043)

4200 IDS Center

80 South Eighth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402-2274

(612) 371-3211

(612) 371-3207 (facsimile)

[www.lindquist.com](http://www.lindquist.com)

**FOR ITSELF AND AS ATTORNEYS FOR  
POLAROID CORPORATION, ET AL.**

**NITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

In re

**JOINTLY ADMINISTERED UNDER  
CASE NO. 08-46617:**

POLAROID CORPORATION, ET AL.,

08-46617 (GFK)

Debtors.

(includes:

Polaroid Holding Company;	08-46621 (GFK)
Polaroid Consumer Electronics, LLC;	08-46620 (GFK)
Polaroid Capital, LLC;	08-46623 (GFK)
Polaroid Latin America I Corporation;	08-46624 (GFK)
Polaroid Asia Pacific LLC;	08-46625 (GFK)
Polaroid International Holding LLC;	08-46626 (GFK)
Polaroid New Bedford Real Estate, LLC;	08-46627 (GFK)
Polaroid Norwood Real Estate, LLC;	08-46628 (GFK)
Polaroid Waltham Real Estate, LLC)	08-46629 (GFK)

Chapter 11 Cases  
Judge Gregory F. Kishel

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Gretchen Luessenheide of the City of New Hope, County of Hennepin, State of Minnesota, being first duly sworn on oath, states that on March 16, 2009 she served the following document:

Lindquist & Venum P.L.L.P. and Debtors' Response to Objection to Application for an Order Authorizing Them to Employ the Law Firm of Lindquist & Venum P.L.L.P.

upon

Chad Cooley WCD Property LLC 60 Columbus Circle 18 <sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10023	Richard Chesley Greg Otsuka Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, LLP 191 N. Wacker Drive, 30 <sup>th</sup> Floor Chicago, IL 60606
Data Exchange Corporation William E. Winfield, Esq. Nordman, Cormany, Hair & Compton, LLP 1000 Town Center Drive, 6 <sup>th</sup> Floor PO Box 9100 Oxnard, CA 93031-9100	Faegre & Benson LLP 90 South Seventh Street 2200 Wells Fargo Center Minneapolis, MN 55402-3901
Houlihan, Lokey Howard & Zukin Capital, Inc. 225 S. 6 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4950 Minneapolis, MN 55402	E. J. Harris Marketstar Corporation 2475 Washington Blvd. Ogden, UT 84401

IKON Financial Services Bky Administration 1738 Bass Road PO Box 13708 Macon, GA 31208-3708	Justin D. Leonard Ball Janik LLP 101 SW Main St., Ste. 1100 Portland, OR 97204
Masatoshi Maeda OS Electronics Company, Ltd 3-16-8 Sotokanda Chiyoda-ku, 1010021	Ray Mai Proview Technology (Shenzhen) Company North Block 23# Shatoukok Free Trade Zone Shenzhen, 518081
PHC Acquisitions, LLC Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP Attn: Rachel C. Strickland, Esq. 787 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10019	Daniel Phipps Axis Design 106 West Bagdad Avenue Round Rock, TX 78664
Martin Croyle Croyle & Associates PC 220 Broadway Suite 204 Lynnfield, MA 01940	Alps Electric Co., Ltd. Attn: Junichi Umehara 1-7, Yukigay-otsukamachi Ota-ku, 145-8501 Tokyo, Japan
TW Telecom, Inc. c/o Linda Boyle 10475 Park Meadows Dr. Ste. 400 Littleton, CO 80124	Kelly Mundorff Thule Organization Solutions, Inc. 6303 Dry Creek Pkwy Longmont, CO 80503
Iron Mountain Information Management, Inc. c/o Frank F. McGinn, Esq. Bartlett Hackett Feinberg P.C. 155 Federal Street, 9th Floor Boston, MA 02110	Bryan Krakauer on Behalf of Rhone Holdings II, Ltd. Sidley Austin LLP One South Dearborn Chicago, IL 60603
Covington & Burling, LLP Diane Coffino The New York Times Building 620 Eighth Avenue New York, NY 10018	Sotheby's, Inc. 1334 York Ave. New York NY 10021

via U.S. Mail to the addresses listed above, and electronically by Notice of Electronic Filing upon all parties who have requested electronic service in these cases by filing the same via ECF with the Bankruptcy Court in the District of Minnesota.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/e/Gretchen Luessenheide  
Gretchen Luessenheide