

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:

WOODBRIIDGE GROUP OF COMPANIES, LLC,
et al.,¹

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 17-12560 (KJC)

(Jointly Administered)

Ref. Docket Nos. 1834, 1839

**THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS'
JOINDER TO DEBTORS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF LISE LA ROCHELLE,
ET AL. NOTEHOLDERS TO SHORTEN NOTICE WITH RESPECT TO MOTION
TO TERMINATE EXCLUSIVITY**

The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee") appointed in the above-captioned cases, through the Committee's undersigned counsel, hereby joins and files this statement in support of the *Debtors' Opposition to Motion of Lise La Rochelle, et al. Noteholders to Shorten Notice with Respect to Motion to Terminate Exclusivity* [Docket No. 1839] (the "Objection").² The Committee joins in the Objection for the reasons set forth therein, and for the reasons set forth below.

Background

1. On May 18, 2018, Lise La Rochelle, *et al.* Noteholders ("La Rochelle Noteholders") filed the *Motion of Lise La Rochelle, et al. Noteholders to Terminate Exclusivity* [Docket No. 1833] (the "Termination Motion").

¹ The last four digits of Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC's federal tax identification number are 3603. The mailing address for Woodbridge Group of Companies, LLC is 14140 Ventura Boulevard #302, Sherman Oaks, California 91423. Due to the large number of debtors in these cases, which are being jointly administered for procedural purposes only, a complete list of the Debtors, the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers, and their addresses are not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the Debtors' noticing and claims agent at www.gardencitygroup.com/cases/WGC, or by contacting counsel for the Debtors.

² Capitalized terms not defined herein shall have the meaning as provided by the Objection.

2. Contemporaneously therewith, the La Rochelle Noteholders filed the *Motion to Shorten Notice with Respect to Motion to Terminate Exclusivity* [Docket No. 1834] (the “Motion to Shorten”) seeking to schedule the Termination Motion to be heard during the previously scheduled omnibus hearing on June 5, 2018, at 11:00 a.m., and to shorten the period for notice of the hearing, with objections, if any, to be filed by 4:00 p.m. on May 29, 2018, and any reply to be filed by June 1, 2018 at 12:00 p.m.

3. On May 21, 2018, the Debtors filed the Objection.

Joinder

4. The Committee joins in the Objection and agrees that the Motion to Shorten should be denied.

5. Local Rule 9006-1(e) provides that the regular notice period may be shortened by order of the Court upon written motion specifying the exigencies supporting shortened notice. *See* Del. Bankr. L.R. 9006-1(e) (the “Local Rule”). The movants have failed to demonstrate any exigencies supporting shortened notice.³

6. Moreover, the issues that the movants contend will be addressed by the proposed plan of reorganization they are supposedly exploring⁴ will, in fact, all be addressed in conjunction with the plan and disclosure statement process being developed by the Debtors, with

³ The only justification the La Rochelle Noteholders offer for the Motion to Shorten is that a June 5, 2018, hearing date will supposedly “provide[] the maximum options to the Secured Noteholders and noteholders generally, [and] . . . it will help to avoid further expense.” Termination Motion ¶ 8. No change in circumstances, emergency, or other “exigencies” are identified, as is specifically required by the Local Rule.

⁴ The movants contend that the plan they are “explor[ing]” will (a) resolve issues of priority; (b) provide for a “lump sum payout to creditors” and (c) “encourage[] third party investors to develop the Debtors [sic] existing properities and thereby increase the recovery to creditors.” Termination Motion ¶ 8. As the Court is aware from the Debtors’ prior motions, the Debtors and their advisors have already successfully sold a substantial number of properties, and considerable effort has been made to market and/or develop much of the remaining real estate for the express purpose of maximizing recoveries for all stakeholders.

the cooperation of the Committee and the noteholder and unitholder committees. There is no justification for a parallel plan process, let alone one that requires termination of exclusivity on shortened notice after the movants failed to oppose the Debtors' motion to extend exclusivity last month.

7. Accordingly, the Committee requests that the Court: (i) deny the Motion to Shorten; and (ii) grant such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Dated: May 21, 2018

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

/s/ Colin R. Robinson

Richard M. Pachulski (CA Bar No. 90073)
James I. Stang (CA Bar No. 94435)
Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No. 143717)
Bradford J. Sandler (DE Bar No. 4142)
Colin R. Robinson (DE Bar No. 5524)
919 North Market Street, 17th Floor
P.O. Box 8705
Wilmington, DE 19899 (Courier 19801)
Telephone: 302-652-4100
Facsimile: 302-652-4400
E-mail: rpachulski@pszjlaw.com
jstang@pszjlaw.com
jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
bsandler@pszjlaw.com
crobinson@pszjlaw.com

*Counsel for the Official Committee of Unsecured
Creditors*