1 2 3 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 SACRAMENTO DIVISION 6 7 8 Case No. 06-20046-A-11 9 In re 10 LARGE SCALE BIOLOGY Docket Control No. FWP-6 CORPORATION, 11 Date: February 3, 2006 Time: 10:00 a.m. 12 Debtor. 13 14 On February 3, 2006 at 10:00 a.m., the court considered the motion of the debtor in possession to determine that its 15 agreement with P.G.&E. provided P.G.&E. with adequate assurance of payment for future utility service. The text of the final 16 ruling appended to the minutes of the hearing follows below. This final ruling constitutes a "reasoned explanation" for the 17 court's decision and accordingly is posted to the court's Internet site, www.caeb.uscourts.gov, in a text-searchable format 18 as required by the E-Government Act of 2002. The official record of this ruling remains the ruling appended to the minutes of the 19 hearing. 20 FINAL RULING 21 The motion will be granted in part and denied in part. 22 The debtor-in-possession seeks an order approving agreement 23 with PG&E concerning the debtor's assurance of payment for future 24 utility service. The debtor also seeks to prohibit PG&E from 25 altering, refusing, or discontinuing utility service, as long as 26 this assurance of payment is performed.

Under the agreement, the debtor has agreed to pay \$35,945

deposit to PG&E as an assurance of payment for future utility

27

28

services. This deposit is approximately twice the debtor's monthly utility bill. The deposit will be paid in three installments of \$11,981.67. The installments are due on February 10, 2006, March 10, 2006, and April 10, 2006.

Except as permitted by 11 U.S.C. §§ 366(b) & 366(c), 11 U.S.C. § 366(a) bars a utility for refusing, altering, or discontinuing utility service to a debtor on the basis that a bankruptcy petition has been filed or the existence of a debt to the utility for prepetition utility services.

A utility may alter, refuse, or discontinue service if a debtor or trustee fails to furnish the utility with assurance of payment. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 366(b) & 366(c)(2). 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(1)(A) defines what is an acceptable assurance of payment for future utility service. It may take the form of a cash deposit, letter or credit, certificate of deposit, surety bond, prepayment, or any other form of security that the trustee/debtor and the utility may agree upon.

In cases under any chapter except chapter 11, the debtor or trustee must offer the utility assurance of payment within 20 days of the order for relief. See 11 U.S.C. § 366(b). If no assurance of payment is given, the utility may refuse, alter, or discontinue utility service. When a timely offer of assurance of payment is made, section 366(b) does not permit the utility to reject the assurance of payment as unsatisfactory and then refuse, alter, or discontinue utility service. Instead, if the utility does not believe the offered assurance of payment is adequate, the utility must request that the court make reasonable modifications to the assurance of payment offered by the debtor.

See 11 U.S.C. § 366(b).

Section 366(b), however, does not apply in chapter 11 cases. Section 366(c)(2) is applicable. Section 366(c)(2) requires that a chapter 11 debtor offer a utility assurance of payment within 30 days of the filing of the petition. As under section 366(b), if adequate assurance is not timely offered, the utility may alter, refuse, or discontinue utility service. Unlike section 366(b), however, section 366(c)(3) permits a utility to reject the assurance of payment offered by a chapter 11 debtor and then unilaterally refuse, alter, or discontinue utility service. When a chapter 11 debtor is unable to satisfy the utility, the debtor must seek a court order determining that the offered assurance of payment, or some modified version of it, is adequate. See 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(3).

In this case, the debtor and the utility have agreed on the appropriate assurance of payment. While section 366(c)(3)(A) provides that the court may order "modification of the amount of an assurance [payment]," it makes no provision for the court to approve such agreements regarding assurance of payments.

Nevertheless, under section 366(c)(3)(B), the court has the authority to make a finding regarding the adequacy of the debtor's assurance of payment. That section outlines the factors the court may not consider when determining "whether an assurance of payment is adequate." Because the court may approve the adequacy of the assurance of payment, it may also approve, i.e., determine as adequate, the agreement of the parties on this issue.

///

In fact, the assurance of payment agreed to by the parties is adequate. It is taking the form of a cash deposit that appears sufficient to guarantee that the debtor will pay for future utility services.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

However, approval of their agreement does not mean that the court may issue a blanket prohibition barring the utility from altering, refusing, or discontinuing service to the debtor in the future. In a chapter 11 case, section 366(a) prohibits a utility from discontinuing service unless the discontinuance is pursuant to sections 366(c). As discussed above, both the debtor and the utility may seek modification of the assurance payment at any time. See 11 U.S.C. § 366(c)(3). In the face of this right to seek the modification of the assurance of payment, the court cannot perpetually bar the utility from altering, refusing, or discontinuing service. Instead, the court will order, in light of the agreement of the parties, that in the event the utility later determines the assurance of payment approved today is no longer adequate, the utility shall not refuse, alter, or discontinue utility service until it has first requested that the court modify the debtor's assurance of payment and the debtor has failed to provide such modified assurance of payment.

Therefore, the court finds that the assurance of payment is adequate for purposes of section 366(c) and the agreement will be approved. This does not prevent, however, any party in interest from seeking a modification of the assurance payment at some time in the future. The motion will be denied to the extent it seeks a blanket prohibition barring PG&E from altering, refusing, or discontinuing service, but the court will curtail PG&E's right to

unilaterally refuse, alter, or discontinue utility service as outlined immediately above.