

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

LEXISNEXIS® A.S. PRATT®

JULY/AUGUST 2021

**EDITOR'S NOTE: THE SUMMER READING ISSUE**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**THE NEED FOR CLARITY REGARDING THE CLASSIFICATION AND VALUATION OF CRYPTOCURRENCY IN BANKRUPTCY CASES**

Brad M. Kahn, Rachel Biblo Block, and Joseph E. Szydlo

**SOVEREIGN DEBT EVOLUTION: THE NATURAL DISASTER CLAUSE**

Sui-Jim Ho and Stephanie Fontana

**THIRD CIRCUIT DEFINITELY REJECTS TRIANGULAR SETOFF**

Jacob A. Adlerstein, Robert Britton, John Weber, and Alice Nofzinger

**THE *HUNSTEIN* EFFECT: EXAMINING THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT'S RULING AND WHAT'S NEXT FOR DEBT COLLECTORS AND THEIR THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS**

Wayne Streibich, Nicole R. Topper, Scott E. Wortman, and Anthony Richard Yanez

**TO VOTE OR NOT TO VOTE: COURT HOLDS THAT "OUT OF MONEY" JUNIOR CREDITOR IS BARRED FROM OBJECTING TO PLAN**

Ingrid Bagby, Michele C. Maman, and Thomas J. Curtin

**TO FORGIVE OR NOT TO FORGIVE A N.Y. CPLR 3215(c) VIOLATION IN A RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE**

Andrew B. Messite and Kerren B. Zinner

**ANTICIPATED REFORM OF THE RUSSIAN INSOLVENCY SYSTEM**

Polina Lyadnova and Ksenia Obidina



LexisNexis

# Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law

---

VOLUME 17

NUMBER 5

July/August 2021

---

<b>Editor's Note: The Summer Reading Issue</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	225
<b>The Need for Clarity Regarding the Classification and Valuation of Cryptocurrency in Bankruptcy Cases</b> Brad M. Kahn, Rachel Biblo Block, and Joseph E. Szydlo	228
<b>Sovereign Debt Evolution: The Natural Disaster Clause</b> Sui-Jim Ho and Stephanie Fontana	246
<b>Third Circuit Definitely Rejects Triangular Setoff</b> Jacob A. Adlerstein, Robert Britton, John Weber, and Alice Nofzinger	257
<b>The <i>Hunstein</i> Effect: Examining the Eleventh Circuit's Ruling and What's Next for Debt Collectors and Their Third-Party Service Providers the Reach of Its Creditors</b> Wayne Streibich, Nicole R. Topper, Scott E. Wortman, and Anthony Richard Yanez	260
<b>To Vote or Not to Vote: Court Holds That "Out of Money" Junior Creditor Is Barred from Objecting to Plan</b> Ingrid Bagby, Michele C. Maman, and Thomas J. Curtin	263
<b>To Forgive or Not to Forgive a N.Y. CPLR 3215(c) Violation in a Residential Mortgage Foreclosure</b> Andrew B. Messite and Kerren B. Zinner	270
<b>Anticipated Reform of the Russian Insolvency System</b> Polina Lyadnova and Ksenia Obidina	274

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Kent K. B. Hanson, J.D., at ..... 415-908-3207  
Email: ..... kent.hanson@lexisnexis.com  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

---

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7846-1 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7988-8 (eBook)

ISSN: 1931-6992

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW [page number] ([year])

**Example:** Patrick E. Mears, *The Winds of Change Intensify over Europe: Recent European Union Actions Firmly Embrace the “Rescue and Recovery” Culture for Business Recovery*, 10 PRATT’S JOURNAL OF BANKRUPTCY LAW 349 (2014)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2021 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**SCOTT L. BAENA**

*Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP*

**ANDREW P. BROZMAN**

*Clifford Chance US LLP*

**MICHAEL L. COOK**

*Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP*

**MARK G. DOUGLAS**

*Jones Day*

**MARK J. FRIEDMAN**

*DLA Piper*

**STUART I. GORDON**

*Rivkin Radler LLP*

**PATRICK E. MEARS**

*Barnes & Thornburg LLP*

*Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law* is published eight times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2021 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Journal of Bankruptcy Law*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

# The *Hunstein* Effect: Examining the Eleventh Circuit’s Ruling and What’s Next for Debt Collectors and Their Third-Party Service Providers

*By Wayne Streibich, Nicole R. Topper, Scott E. Wortman,  
and Anthony Richard Yanez\**

*The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit has delivered a novel and highly consequential interpretation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act that is potentially transformative for debt collectors and their third-party service providers.*

In *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection and Management Services, Inc.*,<sup>1</sup> the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit issued a decision on a case of first impression, finding that a debt collector’s transmittal of a consumer’s personal information to its letter vendor constituted a prohibited third-party communication “in connection with the collection of any debt” within the meaning of Section 1692c(b) of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”).

As discussed below, this ruling has broad ranging ramifications for the accounts receivable management industry and will likely foster a new wave of litigation under the FDCPA.

## **BACKGROUND**

By way of background, this lawsuit originated from unpaid bills for medical treatment at a hospital. The hospital assigned the unpaid bills to a debt collector that had contracted with a third-party vendor for printing and mailing its collection letters. The collector electronically transmitted to its vendor certain information about the plaintiff/debtor such as:

- (1) His status as a debtor;
- (2) The exact balance of his debt;
- (3) The entity to which he owed the debt;
- (4) That the debt concerned his son’s medical treatment; and

---

\* Wayne Streibich (wstreibich@blankrome.com), Nicole R. Topper (ntopper@blankrome.com), and Scott E. Wortman (swortman@blankrome.com) are partners at Blank Rome LLP. Anthony Richard Yanez (ayanez@blankrome.com) is an associate at the firm. Messrs Streibich, Wortman, and Yanez practice in the firm’s Financial Services Litigation & Compliance. Ms. Topper is a member of the firm’s Litigation group.

<sup>1</sup> 994 F.3d 1341 (11th Cir. 2021).

(5) His son's name.

The vendor then used that information to generate and send a dunning letter to the debtor.

The debtor received the dunning letter and then filed a lawsuit in the Middle District of Florida alleging violations of both the FDCPA and the Florida Consumer Collection Practices Act.

The district court dismissed the lawsuit for failure to state a claim by concluding that the debtor had not sufficiently alleged that the collector's transmittal of information to the letter vendor was a communication "in connection with the collection of a debt." The debtor then appealed to the Eleventh Circuit.

### THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT RULING

Before addressing the merits of the claim, the Eleventh Circuit concluded that a violation of Section 1692c(b) gives rise to a concrete injury under Article III of the Constitution, thus finding that the plaintiff had standing to bring this lawsuit. The Eleventh Circuit then turned its focus onto whether the alleged communication was "in connection with the collection of a debt" such that it violated section 1692c(b). Notably, the parties agreed that the collector's transmittal of information to the letter vendor constituted a "communication" within the meaning of the FDCPA.

Other than referring to the parties' agreeability as "helpful," the decision does not provide insight into the context nor explicate the specific definition and application agreed upon. In conjunction with this agreed upon interpretation of "communication," the Eleventh Circuit deployed a quiescent textual view of the Section 1692c(b) phrase, "in connection with the collection of any debt" finding that the phrase "has a discernible ordinary meaning" that "must mean something more than a mere demand for payment."

Consequently, because the defendant's transmittal of the plaintiff's personal debt-related information to a letter vendor constituted a communication "in connection with the collection of any debt" the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the plaintiff adequately stated a claim under Section 1692c(b).

In its decision, the Eleventh Circuit acknowledged the gravity of its ruling and that it "runs the risk of upsetting the status quo in the debt-collection industry."

We presume that, in the ordinary course of business, debt collectors share information about consumers not only with dunning vendors like Compumail, but also with other third-party entities. Our reading

of § 1692c(b) may well require debt collectors (at least in the short term) to in-source many of the services that they had previously outsourced, potentially at great cost. We recognize, as well, that those costs may not purchase much in the way of “real” consumer privacy, as we doubt that the Compumails of the world routinely read, care about, or abuse the information that debt collectors transmit to them. Even so, our obligation is to interpret the law as written, whether or not we think the resulting consequences are particularly sensible or desirable.<sup>2</sup>

Notwithstanding its recognition that the results from this decision will not be “sensible” or “desirable” the Eleventh Circuit deferred to Congress as to whether Section 1692c(b) should be amended.

## CONCLUSION

Going forward, this case will likely lead to a significant increase in FDCPA litigation and cause debt collectors to reexamine their operations to minimize liability in light of this decision. Along these lines, as an interpretative determination of first impression, this holding will likely have implications within the retroactive one-year limitation period for filing suit. Although the decision is only precedential for the Eleventh Circuit, it may be used elsewhere as persuasive authority. It should be noted that this decision may apply to a broad range of third-party providers.<sup>3</sup>

Also, note there are interpretative regulatory interpretations, including from the Federal Trade Commission,<sup>4</sup> and analogous opinions<sup>5</sup> that may be helpful in reassessing compliance and distinguishing this highly consequential decision.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 1352.

<sup>3</sup> On May 25, 2021, Preferred Collection filed a petition for rehearing en banc, requesting the full panel of Eleventh Circuit judges to rehear the appeal.

<sup>4</sup> Statements of General Policy or Interpretation Staff Commentary on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 53 FR 50097-02 (Dec. 13, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> See *Davis v. Phelan Hallinan & Diamond PC*, 687 Fed. Appx. 140, 144 (3d Cir. 2017); *Zortman v. J.C. Christensen & Assocs., Inc.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 694, 707 (D. Minn. 2012).