

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE: . Chapter 11  
The SCO GROUP, INC., et al., .  
. Case No. 07-11337(KG)  
. (Jointly Administered)  
. **Related Docket No. 673**  
.   
. January 29, 2009  
. 2:00 p.m.  
Debtors. . (Wilmington)  
.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE KEVIN GROSS  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: Kathleen Makowski, Esq.  
Pachulski, Stang, Ziehl & Jones

VIA TELEPHONE:

For the Debtors: Grace Robson, Esq.  
Berger Singerman

Pro Se: Alan P. Petrofsky

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;  
transcript produced by transcription service.

1 THE CLERK: Please rise.

2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated.  
3 Thank you.

4 MS. MAKOWSKI: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Ms. Makowski, good afternoon to you.

6 MS. MAKOWSKI: Good afternoon.

7 THE COURT: We have some people on the telephone  
8 with us as well. We have Ms. Robson, Mr. Robinson, and Mr.  
9 Petrofsky on the telephone.

10 MS. MAKOWSKI: Your Honor, I don't believe Mr.  
11 Robinson dialed in. Since Your Honor was kind enough to  
12 enter the order expanding his, his firm's retention - -

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. MAKOWSKI: - - I think he's okay.

15 THE COURT: That makes sense.

16 MS. MAKOWSKI: For today.

17 THE COURT: Good.

18 MS. MAKOWSKI: Your Honor, with respect to the  
19 amended agenda that was filed, for the record I note that  
20 Your Honor did enter orders on no. 1, which is the expansion  
21 of the Tanner retention - -

22 THE COURT: Correct.

23 MS. MAKOWSKI: - - as well as the last item on the  
24 amended agenda, which is the quarterly fee application  
25 matters. Thank you, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: My pleasure.

2 MS. MAKOWSKI: So today we're going forward with  
3 matters on the agenda, items no. 2 and no. 3.

4 THE COURT: Yes.

5 MS. MAKOWSKI: And Your Honor, item no. 2 is the  
6 Debtors' fourth motion for a very short extension of the  
7 exclusivity deadlines. I'm not sure if Your Honor had a  
8 chance to review that.

9 THE COURT: I did.

10 MS. MAKOWSKI: Your Honor might be also aware that  
11 we did file our plan and disclosure statement prior to our  
12 expected deadline.

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 MS. MAKOWSKI: So I think at this point, Your Honor,  
15 we would stand on our motion and continue to assert that we  
16 should solicit it as we determined. But Ms. Robson is on the  
17 phone, and I believe she has some comments to make to the  
18 Court.

19 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Robson, good afternoon.

20 MS. ROBSON (Telephonic): Good afternoon, Your  
21 Honor. Thank you for letting me appear by phone.

22 THE COURT: Yes. It's a pleasure.

23 MS. ROBSON (Telephonic): Thank you. I do have a  
24 proposal which I would hope might alleviate Mr. Petrofsky's  
25 concerns expressed in his objection. What we would propose

1 is we're willing to continue the hearing on our motion for  
2 the extension of exclusivity as it relates to the  
3 solicitation period to the February 25<sup>th</sup> omnibus hearing. But  
4 we would, in that vein, also modify our request such that  
5 presuming Your Honor approves the form of the disclosure  
6 statement for solicitation, we would also request a expansion  
7 of the extension of exclusivity for solicitation purposes  
8 through the confirmation hearing. And to the extent that  
9 Your Honor, if in the even Your Honor does not approve the  
10 disclosure statement for solicitation, we would file a motion  
11 to extend exclusivity, you know, at that time. If Your Honor  
12 did not approve it, and if we could show cause. So with that  
13 being said, it would carry over today's hearing on the  
14 exclusivity motion to the February 25<sup>th</sup> date, and depending on  
15 the outcome of whether the form of disclosure statement is  
16 approved, would either extend the solicitation period without  
17 us having to file another motion, or if Your Honor did not  
18 approve the disclosure statement, we'd file another motion at  
19 that time.

20 THE COURT: All right. Does, Mr. Petrofsky, do you  
21 wish to be heard on the subject?

22 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): Yes. Thank you. This  
23 is Al Petrofsky, pro se. That's the first I've heard of that  
24 proposal, and it sounds pretty good to me. My only question  
25 is I wasn't quite clear on the details with - - so, if the

1 disclosure statement is approved on February 25<sup>th</sup>, then the  
2 solicitation period would be extended to, to when exactly?

3 MS. ROBSON (Telephonic): My, well, the proposal  
4 that the Debtors are requesting that the Court approve is  
5 that depending on the date the Court set the confirmation  
6 hearing, we would request exclusivity to extend through that  
7 date.

8 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): Okay. Yes. That  
9 sounds reasonable to me.

10 THE COURT: All right. And it certainly sounds  
11 reasonable to the Court.

12 MS. MAKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

13 MS. ROBSON (Telephonic): Thank you.

14 MS. MAKOWSKI: So we'll mark that on the record as  
15 continued to the February 25<sup>th</sup> date.

16 THE COURT: Exactly.

17 MS. MAKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Makowski.

19 MS. MAKOWSKI: Your Honor, the next matter on the  
20 agenda is Mr. Petrofsky's motion to compel electronic text  
21 requirements. And I would defer the microphone to Mr.  
22 Petrofsky to present his motion.

23 THE COURT: That's fine. Thank you. Mr. Petrofsky,  
24 it's your turn.

25 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): Thank you. Well I put

1 it all in the papers. One thing I didn't go into on the  
2 papers was, you know, the numerous benefits to converting  
3 documents directly to PDF. (Microphone not recording). . .  
4 you know, efficiency and readability, and searchability, and  
5 being able to copy and paste. And I didn't go into that a  
6 lot, because I mean, the Local Rules Committee already  
7 determined that this is a good thing to do. And that's why  
8 they wrote the requirement into the rules three years ago.  
9 Now one thing I wasn't really anticipating when I filed it  
10 was I mean, the rule states that, you know, that documents  
11 should be converted directly to PDF electronically where  
12 practicable, and there's obviously a lot of room for debate  
13 on what is practicable. But it seems like we, we have a  
14 dispute regardless of whether, regardless of whether it's  
15 practicable or not, there's also the dispute as to what  
16 actually constitutes electronically converting it to PDF.  
17 And it seems fair to me, and I tried to lay out the evidence  
18 as best I could in the papers, that doing a scan and then  
19 doing OCR of the text, you know, doesn't give you the actual  
20 text. It gives you an approximation which is not very good.  
21 And that's why the requirement in the rules specifically  
22 says, you know, that this is supposed to be done  
23 electronically, as opposed to using the scan, which is what  
24 the Debtors have been doing. So I don't really have much  
25 else to add to the papers, and I would like to hear the

1 Debtors response. I would like to reserve the right to reply  
2 to anything that they bring up that wasn't in their written  
3 objection.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I will turn it over to the  
5 Debtors, then, Mr. Petrofsky. Thank you, because I did read  
6 your papers carefully. And Ms. Makowski, are you going to  
7 address this?

8 MS. MAKOWSKI: Yes, Your Honor. Your Honor, first  
9 and foremost, the Debtors, and in particular our firm, has  
10 always and is always in compliance with the Local Rules. I  
11 think the, and I've spoken to Mr. Petrofsky on a couple of  
12 occasions last, earlier this week. And what the issue, I  
13 believe, is is, and Mr. Petrofsky can certainly correct me if  
14 I mis-speak. But my understanding is what Mr. Petrofsky is  
15 trying to do is when you pull up the docket, and you click on  
16 a particular docket item - -

17 THE COURT: Yes.

18 MS. MAKOWSKI: - - and the PDF comes up - -

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 MS. MAKOWSKI: - - Mr. Petrofsky's goal is to be  
21 able to copy and paste certain information from that PDF and  
22 paste it into, say, a word processing document. When you do  
23 that, the text that was copied and pulled over is not  
24 pristine when you go to save it.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 MS. MAKOWSKI: There's many errors. As Mr.  
2 Petrofsky set forth in his papers.

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 MS. MAKOWSKI: And I think Mr. Petrofsky is correct  
5 that that's where our primary dispute lies. I don't believe  
6 the Local Rule requires us to enable our documents that way.  
7 Where we do, and for Your Honor's information, where we do  
8 have original source documents from our firm, Your Honor, we  
9 do our best, and it is our practice to convert those original  
10 source documents to PDF and file them. When we receive  
11 documents from outside our firm, say for example, from the  
12 company - - for example, one of, a few of the documents that  
13 Mr. Petrofsky has an issue with the way that are filed are  
14 the monthly operating reports.

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 MS. MAKOWSKI: We receive those directly from the  
17 company in PDF's. We then print those PDF's. We do not  
18 receive original source documents from the company for  
19 monthly operating reports. And from, sometimes from certain  
20 outside counsel. And the reason for that is many times  
21 there's metadata that needs to be protected. We certainly  
22 don't want to, you know, put something on a public docket  
23 that has metadata that needs to be protected. But what we do  
24 when we have those PDF's that come from outside of our firm,  
25 is that we do print them, we then scan them on a PDF scanner,

1    which has a soft, it's an Adobe software program that creates  
2    a searchable PDF.  That searchable PDF is then filed on the  
3    docket.  So that when you pull up the docket, and you open a  
4    particular docket item, you can actually, it's searchable.

5           THE COURT: Yes.

6           MS. MAKOWSKI: So - -

7           THE COURT: I've done that myself.

8           MS. MAKOWSKI: Yes.  With that, Your Honor, we  
9    believe we are in full compliance with the Local Rule.  But  
10   in any event, Your Honor, to the extent there are any  
11   original source documents that we did not file, convert  
12   directly to PDF, and file that way, we have provided those  
13   documents to Mr. Petrofsky.  In particular, he wanted the  
14   plan, the disclosure statement, and the notice of hearing on  
15   the disclosure statement, and we provided those to him in a  
16   form that I believe was acceptable to him.  The monthly  
17   operating reports he is still not happy with the form that is  
18   filed on the docket.  To that extent, Your Honor, again, we  
19   believe we are in full compliance with the Local Rule, and we  
20   don't believe we should have to file original source  
21   documents with respect to the monthly operating reports.

22           THE COURT: Okay.

23           MS. MAKOWSKI: We do not believe that is  
24   practicable.

25           THE COURT: Now, Mr. Petrofsky, any reply?

1 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): Well, I disagree.

2 THE COURT: Yes.

3 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): I will confirm two  
4 things she said at the end there. That yes, they did provide  
5 the plan and the form that it was provided to me in was  
6 entirely acceptable. And that's the form I would like them  
7 to file things on the docket. And I still, as she said, am  
8 not happy with the form of the monthly operating reports.  
9 And as I pointed out in the reply, they did file them, you  
10 know, electronically converted versions of the operating  
11 reports back in October, 2007, so it does seem like it should  
12 be possible. That's all I have to say.

13 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let me say this. I, it so  
14 happens that I serve on the Local Rules Committee for the  
15 court, along with Judge Walrath. And this has been a topic  
16 of discussion. And the proposal that Mr. Petrofsky makes,  
17 and by the way, Mr. Petrofsky, you've certainly filed a very  
18 fine set of papers. Very cogent, and very, very readable,  
19 and persuasive. But the fact of the matter is that our Local  
20 Rules Committee has had these discussions, and has elected  
21 not to require the filing of documents in the manner in which  
22 you are requesting. And indeed, I can tell you that, for  
23 example when I sign an order and send it down to our Clerk's  
24 Office, they scan it. And just as, just as the Debtors'  
25 counsel is doing here. So I'm, I find that the Debtors are

1 in compliance with our Local Rules, and I obviously am  
2 appreciative of the fact that they have been cooperative with  
3 you here, and I would hope that they would continue to be  
4 cooperative when it's convenient for them to do so. But on  
5 the basis of my understanding of the Local Rules, I do find  
6 that the Debtors are in compliance, and accordingly, I will  
7 deny your motion.

8 MR. PETROFSKY (Telephonic): Okay. Thank you, Your  
9 Honor.

10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Petrofsky.

11 MS. MAKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. And just for  
12 the record, Debtors' counsel, and particularly our firm in  
13 particular, and me in particular, I'm always happy to provide  
14 any documents to anyone who sends me a request, to the extent  
15 that they're publicly filed documents. Mr. Petrofsky has my  
16 direct dial, he also has my email address. I'm happy to work  
17 with him on an ongoing basis if there are documents that we  
18 can provide him in another format.

19 THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll appreciate that,  
20 that type of attitude very much, Ms. Makowski. And I  
21 certainly know it from experience that that does reflect the  
22 way your firm, and you in particular, practice. So it's much  
23 appreciated.

24 MS. MAKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Was there anything further, Ms.

1 Makowski?

2 MS. MAKOWSKI: Your Honor, I believe that's all for  
3 today.

4 THE COURT: All right. Counsel and Mr. Petrofsky, I  
5 appreciate your participation. And we will stand in recess.

6 MS. MAKOWSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Good day everyone.

8 (Whereupon at 2:16 p.m. the hearing in this matter was  
9 concluded for this date.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 I, Jennifer Ryan Enslin, approved transcriber for  
19 the United States Courts, certify that the foregoing is a  
20 correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the  
21 proceedings in the above entitled matter.

22

23 /s/Jennifer Ryan Enslin  
24 Jennifer Ryan Enslin  
25 43 Bay Boulevard  
Newark, DE 19702  
(302) 836-1905

February 2, 2009