Page 1 1 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 Case No. 12-11076(SHL) 3 4 5 In the Matter of: 6 7 ARCAPITA BANK B.S.C. (C), ET AL., 8 9 Debtors. 10 11 12 13 U.S. Bankruptcy Court 14 One Bowling Green 15 New York, New York 16 17 August 16, 2012 18 2:13 PM 19 20 BEFORE: 21 HON SEAN H. LANE 22 U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE 23 24 25

Page 2 1 Hearing re: Doc. # 351 Motion to File Under Seal Debtors 2 Motion for Order Authorizing the Debtors to File Unredacted 3 EuroLog IPO Term Sheets Under Seal 4 5 Hearing re: Doc. #350 Motion to Authorize Debtors Motion for an Order Pursuant to Sections 105(a) and 363(b) of the 6 7 Bankruptcy Code Authorizing the Debtors to Launch the 8 EuroLog IPO 9 10 Hearing re: Doc. #365 Debtor's Motion For Authorization for 11 Arcapita to Fund Lusail Joint Venture Lease Payment 12 13 Hearing re: Doc. #377 Motion to Authorize - Debtors Motion for Order Confirming the Debtors Authority to Pay Certain 14 15 Transaction Expenses Incurred in Connection With the EuroLog 16 Initial Public Offering (related document(s) 351, 350) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Transcribed by: Jamie Gallagher

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
3	Attorneys for the Arcapita Debtors
4	200 Park Avenue
5	New York, NY 10166
6	
7	BY: MICHAEL A. ROSENTHAL, ESQ.
8	JOSH WEISSER, ESQ.
9	
10	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
11	Attorney for the Arcapita Debtors
12	3161 Michelson Drive
13	Irvine, CA 92612
14	
15	BY: CRAIG H. MILLET, ESQ.
16	
17	DECHERT LLP
18	Attorneys for Standard Chartered Bank
19	1095 Avenue of the Americas
20	New York, NY 10036
21	
22	BY: NICOLE B. HERTHER-SPIRO, ESQ.
23	BRIAN E. GREER, ESQ.
24	
25	

Page 4 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY, LLP Attorneys for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors One Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, NY 10005 BY: EVAN R. FLECK, ESQ. DENNIS DUNN, ESQ. Also Appeared Telephonically: BENJAMIN CHAPMAN, ESQ.

Page 5 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. 3 All right, we're here this afternoon for Arcapita Bank. Good afternoon. 4 5 MR. ROSENTHAL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 6 Michael Rosenthal with Craiq Millet and Josh Weisser on 7 behalf of the Arcapita debtors. Also here, Your Honor, are 8 some various representatives of the IPO deal team for 9 Arcapita and several Linklater's lawyers. 10 THE COURT: All right. Begin appearances from 11 everybody else who intends to speak. 12 MR. DUNN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Dennis 13 Dunn from Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy on behalf of the official committee of unsecured creditors. And I'm here 14 15 with my partner, Evan Fleck. 16 MR. GREER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brian 17 Greer of Dechert LLP for Standard Chartered. 18 MR. ROSENTHAL: Your Honor, I'd like to start with 19 two thank you's and an apology. 20 The first thank you is to Mr. Millet who held down 21 the fort at last -- at the last hearing and he tells me that 22 I wasn't missed a bit. 23 (Laughter) 24 THE COURT: I didn't say that but I think 25 everything went exceedingly smoothly.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Second, Your Honor, thanks for scheduling this hearing. We know it's not an omnibus hearing date. These are very important matters that we need to get resolved today.

THE COURT: Well, you had given me a preview that there were certain deals and certain assets that were going to require special treatment and decisions as to how to deal with them, and that that was -- that was coming, so I had gotten a preview that we were going to end up needing to chat about some of these.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay, now the apology. You know, we are -- we're very sorry that we cannot give you something meaty to rule on and have argument about.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I have plenty of other things that will keep me busy, so no apology required.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yeah. I'm happy to report, Your Honor, that as a result of the hard work of everybody in this room, we have built a consensus and we're here to get today once again on an uncontested basis and --

THE COURT: Well, I -- you know, folks call chambers to let us know that. I appreciate the heads up because it allowed me to read all the papers in a very different light, but as I was reading the papers before I knew that, I was struck by that the parties are obviously in the best position to figure out the appropriate way to

Page 7 1 resolve this kind of dispute. So, I'm very happy to hear 2 that you reached that conclusion. 3 MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay. Can I give you just a brief 4 update about the case? 5 THE COURT: Sure. 6 MR. ROSENTHAL: One matter that will be coming to 7 your attention is a matter involving the Cayman protocol. 8 The JPL's and the debtors entered into a procedural protocol 9 regarding the Cayman proceeding and it has some impact on -on this proceeding. It's procedural -- it was required by 10 11 the Cayman order appointing the JPL's. 12 Yesterday the JPL's filed that -- that protocol 13 with a -- an -- you know, an approval request in the Cayman 14 Court, and we intend to file a motion in this Court for 15 approval of that. So that will be up, I believe it will be 16 up on the September 5 --17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. ROSENTHAL: September 5 hearing. We continue to work with the JPL's on a settlement 19 20 between the AIHL estate and the Arcapita Bank estate. We're 21 not there yet, but we're getting close, Your Honor. We've 22 involved the committee. I can't tell you we're going to 23 have a fully consensual deal, but in any event, I want the 24 Court to know that that's coming down the pipe. 25 We have -- as you know, we had committed to

provide valuation information, business plan information to the committee as part of the exclusivity motions. KPMG was doing the various valuation reports on the debtors' principal assets.

I'm happy to report that all of the valuation reports have been made available and uploaded to the data room, with the exception of one which should be uploaded today. And discussions have begun -- follow-up discussions have begun between KPMG, the company, and the financial advisors for the -- the various interested parties. And for this purpose, Your Honor, it's the committee advisors, Standard Chartered and the JPL's, that we're trying to bring along. They are the ones who -- the only ones who've been, you know, active -- active in the case.

There's still a lot of information to be provided and a lot of work between -- between the committee, the JPL's, Standard Chartered, and the debtors, and the various teams that the debtors and our professional advisors to make sure that everybody understands the KPMG report.

We still expect to be able to circulate a business plan by the end of August, which is something that we had mentioned to the Court. And this would be followed by discussions in earnest on the terms of the plan.

We had previously talked about the DIP. We have initiated a rigorous DIP marketing effort and have received

several proposals. Our current time table is to present the financing to the Court at the October 2nd hearing.

And finally, we continue to be careful about the use of our cash. Our cash position as of mid-August is about \$71 million. We are tracking better than budget by about \$32.5 million.

So, let's get down to what's -- what's on the agenda. First matter, Your Honor, is the Lusail funding. This Court knows this is the second motion we filed with respect to authorizing the debtors to fund obligations related to the Lusail Joint Venture.

As you will recall, the Lusail Joint Venture owns a large, valuable piece of property in Lusail Qatar, which is -- just happens to be adjacent to where the World Cup Stadium for the 2022 World Cup will be.

Earlier in the case, we filed a motion for approval of -- to authorize us to pay about \$30.4 million to make an underlying land payment. We presented that to the Court ultimately on an unopposed basis and the Court approved the order and that payment was made.

There's now a \$10 million lease payment due on September 5, and that's the subject of the second motion, the motion up today. All of the parties have agreed this payment should be made. It will ensure that the debtors continue to receive the benefit of the repurchase option for

Page 10 1 the Lusail land. 2 And just to -- I'm sure you may -- you've read it 3 in the papers, Your Honor, but as the Court will recall, this was a form of Islamic financing. The property was sold 4 to Qatar Islamic Bank. In return there was a lease -- there 5 6 was a lease back, it was actually the shares that were sold. 7 The shares were leased back to us. The lease had 8 obligations, one of which is payment of this \$10 million on 9 a semi-annual basis, and there was also a repurchase option. 10 And it's the repurchase option that allows us to protect the 11 underlying value of the land and preserve it for the benefit 12 of the estate. 13 Your Honor, payment of this semi-annual payment is 14 necessary to prevent a default in the lease, and we would 15 ask the Court to approve the debtors making this \$10 million 16 payment on the same terms as were approved in the initial 17 order. 18 THE COURT: All right. Anyone want to be heard? MR. DUNN: Your Honor, if I may be heard --19 20 THE COURT: Sure. 21 MR. DUNN: -- just briefly. 22 For the record, Dennis Dunn from Milbank Tweed on 23 behalf of the creditors' committee. 24 The committee supports the payment today. I 25 wanted to note a couple of things for the Court. You'll

recall that last time we discussed Lusail, it was critically important that the committee had comfort that the call right, the ability to buy back the underlying property, was still viable. And we had a -- an admission and a recognition by QIB, the bank, that they -- that there was no default at the time. They brought down that no default statement as part of this deal, as well, recognizing that the parties reserve all of their respective litigation and other rights, including as to the propriety of the sale, the appropriate characterization of the transaction, all of which I think are -- are properly the subject of discussions when we get into September on the plan and maybe they'll be resolved and we all hope that we can reach a settlement as part of the plan.

And the committee ultimately concluded, based on its own financial advisor's review, that the potential value of this property justified today's payment.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone else?

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to grant the debtors' motion. I believe it's appropriate under Section 365 and 363, and given the value -- potential value here and the way the repurchase option works.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

The next matter, Your Honor, relates to -- we have

several matters, obviously relating to the EuroLog IPO. I would like to take up the approval motion itself.

Your Honor, by the IPO -- EuroLog IPO motion, we seek to obtain authority to engage in what will be the single largest monetization transaction that has occurred or will occur at least in the near future with respect to these debtors. We seek authority to enter into this transaction pursuant to Section 105 and 363 of the Bankruptcy Code.

In the EuroLog IPO, the debtors are offering for sale their interest in a variety of warehousing assets located in several countries in Europe. These assets are intended to be transferred to a new entity that we've called Lisco(ph) in the motion that will be listed on the London Stock Exchange.

The debtors believe that the EuroLog IPO maximizes the value of these assets. As the listed company, Lisco will be a leading pan-European provider of warehouse facilities from -- from the get-go.

Notably, all of the entities that are actually sellers or transferees -- transferors in the IPO are non-debtor subsidiaries. They're not -- they're not debtors.

We're seeking Court approval of the transaction,
Your Honor, even though these are non-debtors because
debtors, most notably AIHL will be asked to sign various
agreements, including the underwriting agreement to make

certain representations and warranties to give certain indemnities. That's typical in an IPO transaction. We are considered the sponsor of the properties that are being —that are being sold.

We did receive, Your Honor, one objection to the motion from Standard Chartered Bank that's been resolved.

And I'm going to talk about that. And a statement with respect to the motion from the committee and it -- I'm going to talk about that as well.

Your Honor, as a result of discussions with Standard Chartered, we believe that Standard Chartered will either withdraw, or has withdrawn its objection, or certainly will not pursue it and it is -- it is in agreement with the order to be entered today.

The committee statement was focused to some extent on the IPO transaction. More importantly, I think the committee's primary focus was on having sufficient information to evaluate the IPO and wanting to be involved in the process of the final documentation with respect to the IPO. And we're prepared to address that and I'll talk about that again.

THE JPL's are -- the joint provisional liquidators are fully supportive of the order that the Court's asked to enter today, as is the United States' Trustee.

Your Honor, the way we've set up this motion is

rather unique but we think it's -- it's absolutely necessary in the context of the IPO. We're asking the Court to approve -- authorize the debtors to enter into the IPO based on the term sheets. Now, those term sheets have been heavily negotiated, contain the principal economic terms of the transaction. The committee and the joint provisional liquidators, and to some extent Standard Chartered have been involved in the negotiation of the term sheets. So, they've had -- they've had involvement as well.

But as you know, you don't close a transaction on term sheets. So, you close a transaction on definitive documentation. For timing reasons, we believe and what we have asked for in this motion is that the Court should approve the transaction based on the term sheets, and then leave the debtors with the interested parties, who I would define as the committee, the joint provisional liquidators, and Standard Chartered, to negotiate with the underwriters the terms of the definitive documents.

Now, obviously the debtors are the ones doing the negotiations, but what we have provided in the order is that only if the underlying final documentation is acceptable to Standard Chartered, the Joint Provisional Liquidators, and the committee, can we go forward without coming back to this Court. So, that is the safeguard, we believe, that protects the interest of -- of these interested parties. And at the

same time, meets the time table that is required for an IPO.

When I say meets the time table, you know, this proceeds very quickly. You often times have a very narrow window for the marketing of an IPO. And it's also often the case that the final documents aren't completed until shortly -- shortly before the window -- you know, shortly before you -- you go to market. So, this puts us in a position where we have Court authority, we have the Court process out of the way, if you will, and then we have a process that doesn't require Court involvement unless we hit a glitch. And that's where we are.

Now, based on the way we've set this up, Your

Honor, we fully understand that if we want to avoid coming

back to Court, we have to have sign-off from all the

interested parties on the documents. And we also understand

that in order to do that, we have to provide them with

enough information to make the decision and evaluate these

documents.

So, what I can say about that is the IPO is a very complex transaction. The companies that are the subject of it are complex. The distribution of proceeds is complex.

And we understand that -- that we have to share sufficient information with the interested parties and we are, in fact, committed to do that.

We acknowledge that they have, in various

occasions, made requests for information from us. We are setting up a process so that we can consolidate all of those information requests and respond to them in a timely manner, recognizing that what keeps us on track is that we want to do this in the most efficient way, and we want to do it without having to come back to Court.

So, if I can hand up the -- a red-line of the order, I can walk you through the changes that we have made.

THE COURT: That would be helpful. Thank you.

MR. ROSENTHAL: All right, Your Honor.

If you'd look at the top, paragraph 2 on page 2, we have clarified that all of the debtors are authorized to execute the documents needed to consummate the IPO. We had -- had AIHL previously, but it may be that -- that authorizations will be required from others of the -- of the debtors.

Then if you go down to paragraph 4, I guess paragraph 4, page 3, we have added in Standard Chartered as a party whose approval would be necessary for the -- for the documents to avoid a further hearing. We've provided that if we cannot get the approval of all of the interested parties, we can come back to Court, but we have to do it upon at least seven business days' notice, and an opportunity to be heard, obviously.

And then we've added a -- a lengthy sentence that

starts with for the avoidance of doubt. And this -- this does nothing more than clarify what I just described to the Court, that if everyone agrees with the provisions of the IPO documentation, we can enter into it without any further order of Court. If the interested parties do not agree, we cannot enter into the documents or consummate the transactions without coming back to the Court.

And then the final sentence, Your Honor, was added at the request of Standard Chartered to confirm what we had intended all along. Frankly, that we are -- everyone is reserving the rights with respect to priority of proceeds, pledge of collateral, and the like.

As you know, Standard Chartered is our only secured creditor and has a pledge of some interest that -- that are involved in this transaction.

THE COURT: Yeah, I -- I saw that in their objection.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.

And then the -- the final -- the final sentence that we added, again, something that we emphasized in my opening that we will cooperate with the interested parties regarding the IPO and provide them with the documentation that -- and information they need in a timely manner.

Those are the changes, Your Honor. With those, we -- as I stated, all of the objections we believe have been -

- have been resolved and we would ask the Court to approve the IPO. We think it is a -- is a valuable transaction for these estates.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone want to be heard?

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, briefly. Dennis Dunn for the committee again.

We understand the need for the authority today.

We support it. We support the debtors' attempt to monetize this asset at this time.

I think, in essence, as Mr. Rosenthal was saying, basically the nature of IPO's is that the market window to close may be of a short duration and we may all -- all the reviewing parties may be in agreement to kind of lock down a price and we need to do so quickly. And so that's the reason to come to Your Honor in advance. But if we are not satisfied with the price or the documentation, we'll be back before Your Honor on an expedited basis, not less than 7 days.

Quickly, we did detail in our pleadings the need to receive and review certain information in order to be in a position to make an educated decision. The debtors have not disputed the propriety or the relevance of our request. We expect that the information will be forthcoming shortly because I think we all share the objective that we want to avoid a situation where we're back in front of Your Honor,

solely due to the lack of sufficient transparency into the underlying data.

And with that, Your Honor, we support entering the motion.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GREER: Your Honor, Brian Greer of Dechert LLP for Standard Chartered Bank.

We are supportive of the debtors' motion at this point in time with the safeguards that have been put in place in the order. I'll second the committee statement that, you know, we also did highlight the various issues of concern for us and we anticipate working in good faith with the debtors, and if we cannot reach agreement, we'll be back before Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else?

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. I'm happy to grant the motion consistent with the agreement that the parties have worked out and Section 363(b) and 105(a) of the Code, it's clear that there's a need for authority to -- to seek the opportunity to monetize these assets through this IPO and it sounds like everyone agrees that it's appropriate to use these term sheets as a basis subject to further agreement on the final documentation by the interested parties as defined in the papers, and also consistent with the needs of

transparency on that documentation, as well as on matters such as price.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, Your Honor, and you know the -- with respect to Mr. Dunn's statement, I mean we -- we -- obviously as we said in our -- in our pleadings with the Court, it's in our interest to make sure that everybody -- everybody gets sign off. You know, to the extent that there are -- there are price discussions, those will be discussions that take place, not at the final minute because that's not the way -- we can't have a committee negotiating price, but we will -- we will have discussions with the committee in advance so we know -- we know the minimum price that we're -- that all of us would be prepared to sell these assets.

Your Honor, the next motion is the -- the motion to seal. We've asked for very limited relief. I know the Court's position on this, but we've asked for very limited relief. One is to seal the indemnity provisions of the term sheets. And the second is the names of the non-debtor entities.

And I -- our basis for this, Your Honor, is that it constitutes confidential commercial information. Let's talk about the indemnity provisions. They were heavily negotiated. And both the banks and the debtors -- the underwriters and the debtors, have an interest in not making

those public. They may -- that we want to avoid any precedential impact from something like that.

This is -- this is confidential commercial information. And the way we were able to negotiate these provisions was by agreeing to -- to keep them confidential. The interested parties, as I defined them, the United States' Trustee, the Court, have all been the recipient of the information on the indemnity provisions.

To the identity of the non-debtor entities, similarly, this is a pre-IPO process. And what we do not want to do is undermine marketing efforts with respect to the -- the entities that will be the subject of the IPO. We don't want to give third parties an opportunity to lure customers away. We don't want to give contract counterparties the opportunity to exercise leverage because of the proposed transaction. We don't want to give competitors the opportunity to poach our employees. And it is for that reason that we, at this point, believe that the identity of the non-debtor -- non-debtor entities should be sealed as well.

As we said in our motion, anyone who can demonstrate a need to have access to this information has an ability to come before the Court. The four parties who have appeared in this case -- the only four parties that have really appeared in this case since the first hearing, have

] 22 01 29 Page 22

access to this information. We do not think there are any
-- we believe that there are commercial advantages to
sealing this information and that no party would be harmed.

We ask the Court to enter the order.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone want to be heard in connection with this motion?

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. I will grant that motion.

I think we've laid -- laid out a basis for treating the subject information as confidential business information and there's no objection to the treatment of that information as such.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Your Honor. Now the final matter relates to the application that was filed with respect to Linklater's fees, and I'd like to turn that over to my partner, Mr. Millet.

MR. MILLET: Good afternoon again, Your Honor.

Craig Millet on behalf of the debtors.

Now that we have an IPO that is ready to go down the tracks, we need our IPO lawyers to drive that train and get it done. Without the engineers, we really wouldn't have much of a prospect of delivering the IPO. That led us to the dispute with respect to the Linklater's fees. When I was here last time before the Court, I explained that there was a budget item in our last budget of \$2.35 million.

There was in the nature of (indiscernible - 00:25:42) --

THE COURT: Excuse me.

MR. MILLET: Bless you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. MILLET: -- that was to be used as deal funding, for the debtors to provide funds to the EuroLog non-debtors, as they're phrased in the motion, which then in turn would be used to pay the expenses of the IPO, and in this specific case it was to be the Linklater's fees.

We, of course -- we had the dispute that we discussed at the last hearing that led to this motion. The budget item at that time was \$2.35 million that was to be funded down to the EuroLog non-debtors. Through considerable discussions and the very hard work of Mr. Fleck, who aided us in these discussions with his constituents, we've reached an agreement as to how the fees for Linklater should be handled, and I'll just briefly go through those terms if I may. We will have an order for the Court to consider at the end of all this, of course.

Right now, there is approximately \$4.7 million in fees and expenses that are owed Linklater for the work done thus far. And whether -- and we had requested permission to pay about 2.35 of that. Instead of doing that, the terms are now going to be that there will be a payment upon entry of the order of 1.5 million to be applied against the fees

due for work performed through August 1 of this year.

Now, if the IPO is successful, of course, all fees are paid through the proceeds of the IPO. The further fees of Linklater will be paid using IPO proceeds and this \$1.5 million will be reimbursed to the debtor.

If we get into the situation, though, where the IPO is not successful and aborts, then we have the situation where there won't be any IPO proceeds. So, what do we do then? The parties have agreed that in addition to the \$1.5 million payment I just mentioned to get paid now, that upon the IPO abort, which is defined in the order as either the IPO being decided it just can't go forward or November 12th, the sooner of those two events, that an additional \$1.5 million will then be paid. That again is applied to the outstanding fees.

Now with respect to fees, the -- the third component -- with respect to fees that are incurred from August 1 going forward, to the extent those fees exceed \$1 million, then to the part that's in excess of \$1 million, 50% of that excess will be added to that last payment.

So, for example, if the fees proved to be \$1.5 million for the going forward period, we had \$500,000 over the 1 million, 50% of that, \$250,000 that would be added to the \$1.5 million piece.

And then that's going to obviously leave us with a

agreed that they would address that at that time and that the JPL's, as well as the committee and Linklater, would engage in good faith negotiations to discuss how much of that remaining part should be funded such that Linklater can be reasonably expect to be paid, what would be paid normally or typically in an aborted IPO situation of this nature, and also that would take into account and the discounts and such that are already in the engagement letter would still apply. So, in other words, we're not going back and adding those back in. They would still apply. And if the parties cannot reach agreement, then the parties can bring it before the Court and the Court could seek resolution.

Hopefully if the track record we've established so far works, we may have to have a hearing set to get us there, but we get things worked out.

And with that then, we've agreed to resolve this matter at this point. We have quickly here this morning exchanged forms of an order. The JPL has agreed to the form of the order. I talked to Mr. Morrissey(ph), he's fine. He has no objection to what's going on here. And we did get a couple of comments back from the committee when we were on the way here. We've looked at those quickly. We don't see any problem with those, so we may have a tiny amount of word-smithing to do, but the concepts are all — all agreed

Page 26 1 upon. 2 So with that, we believe that we'll -- we have an agreement we'll -- it will (indiscernible - 00:29:29) an 3 4 order shortly. 5 THE COURT: All right. Anyone want to be heard as 6 to this motion? 7 MR. DUNN: Just to say, Your Honor, that that's accurate. I think all of our hermeneutical issues have been 8 9 resolved for the moment. 10 THE COURT: All right. That -- that's good to 11 hear. You hate to have any of those still hanging around. 12 All right. With that said, I'm happy to grant 13 that motion. It sounds like an eminently sensible way to 14 proceed, protecting everybody's rights, but also making sure 15 that the path forward can continue. 16 So, what I will do is if you would send me an 17 electronic copy of all of the orders. It sounds like I may 18 have to wait a little bit for that last one, but that's --19 that's fine. You can either send the first -- first couple 20 first, and then send the last one, or you can wait and send 21 them all together, whatever works for you. 22 Anything else we need to chat about this 23 afternoon? 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nothing else, Your Honor. 25 Thank you.

Page 27 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much and again I appreciate everybody's efforts to work these --these things out as to these transactions which are really the central part of the case. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 2:44 PM)

	Pg 28 of 29		
			Page 28
1	INDEX		
2			
3	RULINGS		
4		Page	Line
5	Debtor's Motion For Authorization for	11	20
6	Arcapita to Fund Lusail Joint Venture		
7	Lease Payment		
8			
9	Motion to Authorize Debtors Motion for	19	17
10	an Order Pursuant to Sections 105(a) and		
11	363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code Authorizing		
12	the Debtors to Launch the EuroLog IPO		
13			
14	Motion to File Under Seal Debtors Motion	22	8
15	for Order Authorizing the Debtors to File		
16	Unredacted EuroLog IPO Term Sheets Under		
17	Seal		
18			
19	Motion to Authorize - Debtors Motion for	26	12
20	Order Confirming the Debtors Authority to		
21	Pay Certain Transaction Expenses Incurred		
22	in Connection With the EuroLog Initial		
23	Public Offering		
24			
25			

Page 29 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Jamie Gallagher, certify that the foregoing transcript is 4 a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Digitally signed by Jamie **Jamie** 6 Gallagher
DN: cn=Jamie Gallagher, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, 7 Gallagher c=US Date: 2012.08.20 14:34:56 -04'00' 8 Veritext 9 200 Old Country Road 10 Suite 580 11 Mineola, NY 11501 12 13 Date: August 20, 2012 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25