## TRANSCRIPT OF

## INTERVIEW OF

WILLIAM E. BREWER, JR. (Janvier Law Firm PLLC)

Place: U.S. Bankruptcy Court

Raleigh, NC (Heard via Zoom

Date: February 12, 2021

## TRANSCRIPT ORDERED BY:

DAWN R. WRIGHT, CASE ADMINISTRATOR (U.S. Bankruptcy Court)

## ATTENDEES:

TRAVIS SASSER, ESQ. (Sasser Law Firm)
CINDY OLIVER, ESQ. (Longleaf Law Partners)
CHRISTINE CASTELLOE, CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK (U.S. Bankruptcy
Court)

Transcriber, Kelli R. Philburn J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, NJ 08619

(609) 586-2311

FAX NO. (609) 587-3599

E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com Website: www.jjcourt.com

Audio Recorded

MS. CASTELLOE: Okay. I'm Christine

Castelloe, the Chief Deputy of the Eastern District of

North Carolina Bankruptcy Court and today we are

interviewing William Brewer. We also have interviewing

Mr. Brewer Cindy Oliver and Travis Sasser. And we'll

go ahead and get started. Thank you.

MS. OLIVER: Billy, where are you right now?

MR. BREWER: Well, I'm at 470 Redd Banks

Lane, Hampstead, North Carolina which is on Virginia

Creek down in Pender County. I'm looking out at

Virginia Creek which is very pretty. My wife just told

me she's been counting birds this morning. So, it's

lovely down here. It's a good place to social distance

from other people.

MS. OLIVER: Have you been spending most of your time down there during the pandemic?

MR. BREWER: Yeah, probably 75 percent of the time. You know, as we're meeting on this Zoom call, you know, it's apparent you can do a lot of things we do in our offices from -- away from the office actually. You know, this pandemic proved to me I could do that. So, it's been -- it's -- if there's a silver lining on this pandemic cloud, that's it.

MR. SASSER: Thank you for doing this, Billy. Tell us all about your upbringing.

MR. BREWER: Well, I was born in Lenoir
County, a little town of Pink Hill, population 600.
You know, I guess I look back on it, it was a fairly
idyllic childhood. My mother was a pharmacist in the
one little drug store in Pink Hill, North Carolina. My
dad was an accountant. And I grew up with my three
sisters and brother, working in the summers for farmers
in tobacco fields, and other times of the year working
as a soda jerk in my parents' drug store.

You know, I was raised a diehard Tar Heel in the sense of not the State of North Carolina, that too, but the University of North Carolina where both of my parents went. So, you know, Christine knows a little bit about that. So -- and, you know, well it was kind of preordained that that's where I would go to college and I went to undergrad and law school in Chapel Hill.

MS. OLIVER: Was it always your plan to go to law school?

MR. BREWER: You know, I went off to undergraduate. I guess I had in the back of my mind that maybe I would come back to Lenoir County as a coach of athletics, but quickly dropped that. Started off majoring in accounting looking to follow in my father's footsteps, but at some point that was the, you know, the late sixties, early seventies with a lot of

activism and, you know, that kind of -- if people don't laugh, if I'm going to change the world, I need to be a lawyer. So, by my sophomore year in college, I decided I wanted to go to law school, switched from taking accounting classes to more general classes and ended up applying and going to law school.

Obviously, I have, like most of us who went to law school, we turn our attention more from changing the world to making a living and, you know, that's what I've done since getting out of law school. I did help feel like in the area I finally chosen that I've certainly helped change the world for the better for my clients.

MS. OLIVER: What year did you graduate from law school?

MR. BREWER: '76. Undergrad '73, law school '76.

MR. SASSER: Did you take a bankruptcy course in law school?

MR. BREWER: I did. I was lucky in that I went to summer school. I don't know if it's been my 1L and 2L or 2L and 3L, but David Epstein who wrote the, you know, the Hornbook, probably the most preeminent bankruptcy professor around unless you want to put Elizabeth Warren in front of him, he had been visiting

professor at Texas during the regular school year, but came back to teach bankruptcy law during the summer.

So I had him in the summer school class. Again, I can't remember exactly when it was, but one of the summer school sessions.

And as luck would have it, I later got to argue in the Fourth Circuit with him on the other side of the argument. This didn't have a happy ending.

He -- I did not take my mentor to school. He beat me in that case. That's the Wells Fargo v. Price case.

MR. SASSER: Are there any other bankruptcy attorneys that you went to law school with at Chapel Hill?

MR. BREWER: I'm trying to see. In my class, you know, I don't know of any -- I'm sure there are some, but right off the top of my head I'm not recalling any that were in my class or ahead or behind me one or two years. Someone give me a list of them, I could probably say, yeah, you know, but right now I don't think of any.

MR. SASSER: What did you do after law school?

MR. BREWER: My first job was clerking for

Judge Fred Hedrick on the North Carolina Court of

Appeals. That brought me to Raleigh and after clerking

for him for a year, which was a very interesting experience, Judge Hedrick is blind, was a very, very good judge and I hung up my shingle after that.

Decided to stay in Raleigh for various reasons and the job market was not very good in 1977 when I was looking for work. That was in kind of the height of the Arab oil embargo and interest rates of 21 percent. Economy was not very good.

After attempting to send out resume after resume, I just tried to -- I decided to hang out my shingle. Through an acquaintance, I was introduced to a fellow named Harold Buzzy Russell who agreed to allow me to work out of his office and share space for a very gracious amount of rent or lack thereof. So I just kind of hung out my shingle and started practicing law. And I look on -- back on now and I wonder how in the world I had the nerve to do that, but I just did.

And as luck would have it, in my opinion, doing that provided me with kind of general knowledge of the law that helps you be a consumer bankruptcy lawyer. Anybody practicing consumer bankruptcy law, you know this, Travis, you too, Cindy, that you touch on so many areas of the law, criminal, domestic, personal injury, probably real estate law more than anything else. I certified lots of titles, did a lot

of loan closings, you have to learn to see is there a judgment lien out there, is there a tax lien and you're going to certify a piece of title to property for someone borrowing money or selling, you know, you better learn about secured debts and that kind of thing. So it was good preparation for later becoming specializing in bankruptcy law.

MR. SASSER: Did you and Buzzy Russell eventually have an actual partnership or was it just purely an office share arrangement?

MR. BREWER: We did -- we formed a partner. When did that start? Started in '77 when we started practicing law when I hung out my shingle. Eventually, we formed a partnership, Russell and Brewer, in about '83, I believe, and we parted ways at the end of '86. So we were in partnership for a while. Buzzy taught me a -- he did some bankruptcy law.

Interesting enough, he had been general counsel for Cameron-Brown Mortgage Company which later got bought up by First Union and one of his subordinates at that part of the time that he was at Cameron-Brown was a young lawyer named A. Thomas Small. So Buzzy taught me, I was more into the law, you know, what does the law provide. He taught me a very valuable lesson that many legal problems have a

financial solution, you know, just find the bottom line where people can -- can everybody get on the same page and he solved many a legal problem in that fashion. And that's valuable, I think, for every lawyer even though you don't, you know, everything doesn't have to be determined by the letter of the law. It can be resolved by finding the common ground.

MR. SASSER: What was your first exposure to the bankruptcy system?

MR. BREWER: You know, when I hung out my shingle, I asserted that I could do about any area of the law, you know, domestic case, criminal case. I remember early on I had to borrow some files from some of the other lawyers put on my desk so it didn't look so clean. That hadn't been a problem in the recent years.

And I remember this lady. She had, I think it was a child support custody fight. That was one area you get lots of referrals as a young lawyer because a lot of lawyers don't want to do the domestic cases. And the lady looked me and said, Mr. Brewer, have you handled many cases like this. And I says, ma'am, I've been handling as many cases like this as I have any other which was the truth. I hadn't tried much of anything. She says, okay.

So, you know, bankruptcy was another area where you could get referrals and that was back in the day. I don't -- you're too young, both -- everybody else on there is too young to remember back when the bankruptcy forms before we had this software was this six-plied type forms that you had to physically type in like this electric typewriter with carbon paper that cut all the way through so you could have the copies you needed. And if the secretary made a mistake, she had to then try to go through each one of the copies to make, correct the typographical error.

2.0

I'm a firm believer that any increase in filings of bankruptcy have to do with the technological advances because if you would have handed one of your employees a bankruptcy petition to type, you always gave it to them right before you were going to leave the office for lunch because you didn't want to deal with the ire of that clerical person having to type up a bankruptcy petition.

So, yeah, I, you know, I think I did -- I'm one of those folks who can claim I did a bankruptcy petition under the Act of 1898 before the 1978 Act went into effect sometime in 1979. And they were pretty -- I don't think I had any cases that were very -- of any consequence. That was back when the exemptions were

almost nothing in North Carolina. I remember when I first filed and we had \$500 worth of household furnishings and a \$1,000 homestead, so it wasn't long after that for the law I think changed in 1981 to finally increase the exemptions in North Carolina.

MR. SASSER: The first reported case that you were involved in is the <u>Smith</u> case. That was a Judge Small case on October 10th, 1984. Do you recall that case?

MR. BREWER: I recall it well. That's when maybe a lightbulb went off, maybe, hey, Billy, you might be able to do this. Mr. Smith, his name was Ulysses S. Smith. He had been a Vietnam War veteran and I think had filed two previous bankruptcies in an effort to save his home from foreclosure. Both had been unsuccessful, so when he came to me and I took his case, probably wasn't as aware as I should have been at that time how controversial it was going to be.

The mortgage company was represented by this wonderful lawyer from Charlotte named Jim Morton, quite a gentleman. And I was able to put on evidence that Mr. Smith had suffered from post-traumatic stress syndrome, but had -- was -- had gotten therapy, had his act together and convinced Judge Small that the Chapter 13 filing was not in bad faith because he had the

problems he'd had in the previous cases were -- had been fixed. You know, it would be similar to us now, you know, filing a motion to extend the stay or to impose a stay and presenting those kind of facts.

I also remember it well because of the timing of it. You said I think it was October 10th the opinion came out. The case was probably argued October 2nd, 3rd, 4th, along in that time frame and my daughter was born October 5th of that time period and when they were trying to set the hearing, I knew that was about the time she was born. So, when we were scheduling the hearing around -- I warned the Court that, you know, I might have to leave at any point in time if my wife went into labor. And but, as it turned out, she delayed her appearance into the world until we had tried the case.

And I normally remember Judge Small's birthday. I think it's October 4th because he had said, well, you know, if your -- she can deliver on October 4th, we'll have the same birthday. She -- my wife went into labor on the 4th, but my daughter has always never been quick to do anything, so this thing is being recorded. I might have to deny I said this, but she delayed coming in this world until early the next morning. So, hers is the 5th, not the 4th. So,

that's kind of, you know, is why partly I remember that case as well as I do.

MS. OLIVER: Did you appear much before Judge Moore?

MR. BREWER: I did appear a couple times before Judge Moore. That was back when everything, the bankruptcy world revolved around Wilson, North Carolina which was -- and, again, that was in the days before electronic filing, of course, so there was a courier that came through Raleigh most every day and you -- it come through about two to three o'clock. Anything you need to file with the Bankruptcy Court he would pick up and take down to Wilson to court.

I actually had a hearing or two I think with Judge Moore back when the Bankruptcy Court was not in that new building they built out on Parkwood Avenue, but there was actually a post office built in downtown Wilson where they held the court and the stories about Judge Moore and his chain smoking I can attest to.

Going back in his chambers, you know, secondhand smoke was pretty bad, but --

MS. OLIVER: I can attest to that, too.

MR. BREWER: Yeah, he was, I mean, we have been lucky in Eastern District of North Carolina where we've had good judges.

MR. SASSER: When did you -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. BREWER: Go ahead.

MR. SASSER: When did you start to concentrate your practice more on bankruptcy law?

MR. BREWER: To concentrate it more, as I said, Buzzy Russell and I, we practiced together through '86. He had primarily a real estate closing practice, a lot of residential closings, and I had observed how he leveraged, if you will, building kind of a volume practice and using paralegals to do the -- a lot of the work preparing closing statements, helping do title searches.

And I did not like doing real estate for a number of reasons. One is it can get pretty boring. Number two, if it's not boring, that means you are resolving a very complicated title issue on a piece of property, but you quoted a flat fee and nobody wants to pay you for all that extra time you spent. You have to deal with realtors who in my opinion's main focus is with a closing is to find out when the closing is and when they can show up to pick up their real estate commission check.

So, I had enjoyed what bankruptcy practice I had done. Like I say, that <u>Smith</u> case I think was a '84, obviously it was an '84 case. So, I decided that

when we split ways at the end of 1986 that I would try to build a bankruptcy practice. Also needed to have an area in which you could generate, you know, you got to -- you can't do a bankruptcy practice unless you got bankruptcy clients and a Yellow Page ad and ads in the Southside Shopper were a way to generate a practice.

I came to the conclusion that in the bankruptcy world people if they get a speeding ticket, they don't mind asking their neighbor, I got a speeding ticket, do you know someone to help me with a traffic ticket. But people don't tend to go to their neighbor and say, look, I got more debt than I can pay, do you know a bankruptcy lawyer. They'd look for more anonymous sources to find out where to get legal help and that generally comes from either, you know -- and they would turn to Yellow Pages and that kind of thing or call a lawyer they know.

Other thing I did was send out Rolodex cards. A lot of folks who probably will listen to this won't know what the hell is a Rolodex card, but that was before people went to Google to find out, find a lawyer. And I sent it to every law firm in town with a Rolodex card, bankruptcy up at the top, requested that the receptionist should stick that in the Rolodex so if somebody called a law firm that didn't do bankruptcy

and they say can you refer me to a bankruptcy lawyer, I want her to have that bankruptcy tab right there and she'd flip to it and she'd give them my name.

So, that's how I kind of got enough of a practice to do enough of it to make a living. Probably the fees back then for bankruptcy Chapter 7 were \$500, 750 at the most. And Chapter 13's were, oh, I can't remember, probably 750 flat fee type thing. We finally got it up to about 950. Thought we were doing well. You know, we've obviously -- still not sure we're getting paid enough for Chapter 13's, but we finally got it up where it's worthwhile.

MS. OLIVER: How do you differentiate the flat fee of a real estate closing and the flat fee of a bankruptcy case?

MR. BREWER: Well, I think it has to do with what the market allows. When I say that, I mean with real estate closings in my opinion they are -- if it's a sale, you know, realtors want to be able to tell their clients what it's going to cost them to, you know, buy a house and, therefore, they go to lawyers and say what will you do closings for and I do -- if you do enough of a volume, you know, you can make a living doing the real estate closings for flat fees and, yeah, the market kind of beats it down.

I will say this. If I kept up with it, I think the flat fee for real estate closings have not increased a great deal over the years. I don't know how lawyers make a living doing real estate closings myself. And then the refinancings, again, a lot of that comes referrals from the banks doing the refinancing and they can quote what that fee is.

And then for the bankruptcies, people kind of want to know, you know, what is this going to cost me and I think you quote the flat fees, I mean, I think a good lawyer is going to set that flat fee based on having done a good job of interviewing the client in the first place knowing well, gee, this is going to be a case in which I'm filing for one spouse. The other one makes good money, so I'm going to be in a food fight with Rick Hinson, Tanya Aycock and the BA's office about my marital adjustments, so I better quote a fee that covers that.

You know, if you see it's a very, very simple case, then you quote a fairly low flat fee. So you make a prediction on what it's going to cost to do the basics of the case. I think most every lawyer will -- should have in their contract a provision that identifies the routine services versus non-routine. I think you could always have a provision that allows to

charge extra for the actual motion defending a motion to dismiss or discharge complaint and that kind of thing. I don't know if that answered your question or not, but --

MS. OLIVER: No, that was a good answer.

MR. SASSER: What's the first EBI that you attended?

MR. BREWER: You know, I don't know. I think the very first one at one point I think they did some of them at the Blockade Runner in Wilmington. That may be the first one. I'm not sure. I know it turned out the Blockade Runner wasn't -- kind of didn't have enough facilities for us and then it started going to Myrtle Beach. But probably early nineties.

MR. SASSER: It seems like there was a -- you were active by the time 1993 came around, you were involved in the <u>Sears</u> case that came out or at least an opinion. I realize that went on quite awhile. That was like June of '93. And then <u>In re Kidd</u> was October 15th of '93. Tell us a little bit about maybe those cases.

MR. BREWER: Okay. The -- yeah, I looked. You sent me that list of cases. I thought I was one litigious lawyer.

MS. OLIVER: It took that list for you to

realize that?

2 MR. BREWER: Well --

MS. OLIVER: We all know that.

MR. BREWER: Well, you know, an imagination is a terrible thing to waste. So, the <u>Sears</u> case, you know, this is going to be a longer answer than you may anticipate, but if we're doing a history project here, there was a time in which at every 341 Sears sent this very nice lady. I cannot remember her name.

MR. SASSER: Bisley (phonetic).

MR. BREWER: Bisley, there you go, who would show up and say, you know, and you had your clients prepared to answer her questions. But, you know, if you bought things from Sears, they claimed to have a security interest in whatever you bought based on a little -- where you sign your name underneath it, Sears retains the security interest of items you purchased. That was kind of the contract. Did you want to reaffirm that debt or surrender?

I had a client on one occasion actually bring, Sears had a pet department, bring her German Schnauzer to court and says it's out there in the hall, you can take it home with you. He didn't know quite what to do. But so that was kind of a juggling act.

Well, there was a case written by Judge

Moore. I've got the -- I do not remember all this stuff in my head. I went back and when you -- I knew you were going to ask about this, so I did some studying. It was <a href="Dossenbach's of Clinton v. Bartlet">Dossenbach's of Clinton v. Bartlet</a> which is an opinion written in 1982 by Judge Moore, 23 B.R. 404. In that case, Bill Bacon from Clinton represented the debtors. Ted Nodell, who had carved out a niche practice in representing furniture stores throughout the state, represented the Dossenbach's of Clinton. And these people had bought kind of on a revolving charge account various items from this department store.

The issue came down to whether they had -- I think there was a motion for relief from stay which both Bill and the Trustee, which was the -- that was the department person, opposed saying you really don't have a good security interest because you violated the North Carolina Retail Installment Sales Act. I won't get into the legal gymnastics of Judge Moore's opinion, but in general the North Carolina Statute required certain application of payments.

If I've got different items I've purchased at different times, how do you apply the payments that you're making on the account, how do you apply it to the washing machine you may have bought two years ago

and the air conditioner you bought six months ago?

When do you determine what has been paid for? And the law said you have to apply it in a certain way.

Well, this creditor had not done that and he says since you haven't complied with the statute that allows you to have a security interest in the revolving charge account, you lose the benefit of having a security interest. Therefore, there's none. And I got to look at the way Sears did it and that statute requires that you apply the payments on a pro rata base. Sears' contracts provide that you apply the payments first bought, first pay for which is probably a fair way to do it, frankly. But I thought, gee, I can — I might be able to use that statute to knock out Sears' security programs.

So, I had a client, his name was Stephen Edge (phonetic). Forget what they bought from Sears, some of kind of -- several things, one thing including, I think, a treadmill, but I objected when Sears filed a motion for relief from stay. I think that's the way it came about. I objected, argued this <a href="Dossenbach's">Dossenbach's</a> case and Judge Small ruled that that, in fact, was correct. That -- it was <a href="Van Dusen">Van Dusen</a> -- no, I'm sorry. <a href="Edge">Edge</a> is 91-05055-5-ATS.

So, March 27th of '92, Judge Small said, you

don't have a security interest. But on that being the case, I was of opinion Sears should not be claiming to have security interest anymore with that ruling. But they kept sending this lady to court to ask the questions and observe that.

Interestingly enough, they didn't claim to have security interest in any of my clients' cases during that period of time, but at some point they messed up and they claimed to have a security interest in titles that my clients, Mr. and Mrs. Coggin. I think Mr. Coggin's first name was Oscar as I remember. I remember they lived in Rocky Mount. So I says, all right, so here's my attempt to go after Sears to make them stop doing this and that's when I brought a class action which was Coggin v. Sears and Roebuck (92-00256-8-ATS) and Judge Small did allow this class action.

In the meantime, there was another client who was named Van Dusen who Sears decided they wanted to kind of re-litigate the issue I think and I remember when we argued that case, it must have been in the period of time I'm thinking because — the judge that handled the case was Judge Wolfe who was sitting by designation in the Eastern District. I don't remember. It was during that period of time — I don't know why Judge Wolfe was sitting. May have been —

MR. SASSER: After Judge Moore died.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BREWER: After Judge Moore died, I believe. And Judge Wolfe agreed with Judge Small's I remember that somewhat because I've had a opinion. conversation with I think Alice Stubbs who is Buzzy's daughter was clerking for Judge Wolfe at the time. appealed that case to the District Court. Judge Boyle upheld Judge Wolfe's decision and so when I asked for my class action, I asked for the class action to cover the entire State of North Carolina. In the Western District, a judge, I don't remember which judge, maybe Judge Whitley, I think had rendered an opinion that disagreed with the decisions made by Judges Moore, Small, Wolfe and Boyle and said the creditor still had good security interest.

So, when I argued for the class action, I asked for the whole state. Sears said well this is just Eastern District. I said, well, Your Honor, we know what's going to happen in the Middle District. A judge there in the Middle District has said that, so Judge Small kind of says I'm going to make class cover all debtors in the Eastern and the Middle Districts, but not the Western District, so that's how that class wound up. And then there were years trying to unravel the remedies for those folks that Sears had claimed to

have security interest trying to recover from those monies that they had paid in and pursuant to claims of security interest that didn't exactly exist.

This Sears class action should not be confused with what I call the big one that I think rose out of Massachusetts that was really a pro se debtor in which Sears was not filing the -- they can get reaffirmation of things, but they weren't filing them. This was the days before electronic filing, so the only way to know they weren't filing them was to go down to the clerk's office and ask for the file to see if they were being filed. But, in that case, a judge pulled the file and saw that they weren't filing them, so Sears got hit throughout the entire country for enforcing security agreements that had not been filed with the court.

Had I figured that out, my class action, I may have made some money doing it. But my class action was kind for the honor of doing it than making much of any money representing these folks. I think in the end, most of them got the settlement, final settlement with Sears is they got gift cards or, you know, that they could go to Sears and buy stuff with. So, it was a victory, but not one that was hugely beneficial to the debtors.

MR. SASSER: Thank you for that.

MR. BREWER: And then you asked me about the <a href="Middle-Kidd">Kidd</a> case. Kidd was a fellow named Clark Kidd. He lived down in Harnett County, I believe. He had four daughters between the ages of 13 and 18, as I recall. So, poor fellow needed all the help he could get. And he had a second mortgage. I believe it was Commercial Credit.

And prior to the, I think it was the <u>Nobleman</u> case, it was standard in most parts of (indiscernible) in the Eastern District that you could if you had a second mortgage for \$20,000 but there was only \$10,000 or \$5,000 worth of equity over and above the first, you could strip it down under the Bankruptcy Section 506(a) to that \$5,000 and that's all you had to pay. But the <u>Nobleman</u> opinion said, no, you can't do that. If it's partially unsecured, you got then the proper way to construe the statute is it's fully secured.

I, to this day, think that's bad law, but the Supreme Court says it's the law, it's the law. But its interesting the way the Supreme Court came to that conclusion says it is a secured. So, if it's secured by any amount that might give the creditors a holder of a secured claim, that's how they -- was the toehold on which they based its opinion.

Well, in <u>Clark Kidd</u> case, the property I think we could prove was worth less than the amount of the first. So, my argument became they're not the holder of a secured claim. Their claim was totally unsecured. So, I came up with the idea to claim that they could, you know, I guess we call it strip it now. I don't know what word I used then, but they were wholly unsecured. And Judge Small bought that opinion.

I remember the lawyer on the other side. She worked with Hunter Wyche's firm. She was very, very nice lady. First name's Colleen. For the life of me, I can't remember her last name. I guess if I pulled the <u>Kidd</u> opinion, her name will be there on the attorneys. But when we argued the case, Judge Small says I'm going to take it under advisement.

And I had a habit back then of as I would normally walk to court from my office there on Person Street and on my way was the Supreme Court Library and I stopped. I would stop sometimes back and forth to court to read the advance sheets there in the Supreme Court Library and I stopped and pulled advance sheets and low and behold came across a case, I think it's -- I don't know how you -- it was Plouffe or Plouffe, P-1-o-u-f-f-e, out of Connecticut and when some other lawyer had made that same argument and the Court had

agreed with the argument that I made to Judge Small.

So, I immediately got back to the office, called Colleen and says I'd like permission to make some -- to send some authority to the Court. Of course, she said, sure, you may if you've got some case law. And so I sent that to Judge Small. And I think he cites that in the <u>Kidd</u> opinion. So, I think <u>Kidd</u> was the second Court in the country to rule that wholly unsecured seconds can be stripped.

And, as we know, that's kind of the law pretty much throughout the country now and it was 100 percent there. But it is certainly the law and I don't think any Circuit Court that has considered the issue ruled otherwise. So, that's where the <u>In re Kidd</u> motions come from.

MR. SASSER: Just for sake of posterity, your name is actually not on that opinion, the 161 B.R. 769, so they don't have the counsel listed on there. It doesn't show up under a search for your name. We're pretty much going through this chronologically, but if we could talk about it topically because then later on you successfully were able to argue and I think this all went all the way to the Court of Appeals relative to stripping off unsecured homeowners association, can you tell us about that?

MR. BREWER: Yeah. The opponent in that case is Nelson Harris. Nelson is a dogged opponent and zealous advocate for his homeowners association clients. That tends to run through the attorneys who represent those homeowners folks, right, Cindy? So, in any event, you know, the -- it seemed to me the same strategy that will work if you had a homeowners association with a lien, statutory lien that was not -- had no value there, you could strip it.

The interesting thing was that was I think

Haywood v. Widewaters Community Homeowners Association

that when I -- when Judge Small ruled that you could

strip it and then the District Court affirmed when it

went up to the Fourth Circuit, it became clear to me

the Fourth Circuit had never considered that issue.

But -- and in the meantime, I think there was a case

involving a pro se debtor who had that issue before the

Fourth Circuit and I was very careful that the Fourth

Circuit might end up deciding that issue unfavorably to

the debtor before I got there with Widewaters, but it

did not. And so, again, that's the case law here in

the whole Fourth Circuit that you can strip fully

unsecured security interests or deeds of trust.

MR. SASSER: Still focusing on 1993, I believe, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the

first time that you were involved in an appeal in the Fourth Circuit was the <u>United Carolina Bank v. Hall</u> case, is that right?

MR. BREWER: Yes, yes. That one doesn't have a very happy ending from my standpoint. I remember well going up there to argue that case. I was nervous as a long-tailed cat on a porch full of rocking chairs. Who was my opponent is from Wallace, Richard Burrows, I think, who represented United Carolina Bank. The issue was, as we all know in the Rash decision that you -- if you strip down a secured debt like a car loan to the value of the collateral, I think this case involved a mobile home, as I recall, you then have to pay the present value of that claim which means you have to come up with the appropriate discount rate to pay the claim.

Well, case law was all over the ballpark throughout the country on that issue and when we went up there, I forget the panel, but one of them was a judge out of Maryland named Niemeyer, I think,

N-i-e-m-e-y-e-r. He had come up with a theory that nobody else had ever come up with which is the way they ruled which was not favorable to the debtor. And but he did rule that under his theory that the rate was capped by the contract rate that the loan was.

And that remained the law in the Fourth Circuit until the <u>Till</u> decision by the Supreme Court which now we know is basically prime rate plus a reasonable list factor which I will say to those listening is the fact when you use two percent for car loans does not mean <u>Till</u> is prime plus two for all types of debts. So, if you got a property like real estate that's not depreciating, you probably should not use two percent, but something less like a no percent, one percent, half percent.

MR. SASSER: When did you get involved with the National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys?

MR. BREWER: I got involved with that at the invitation and urging of Elizabeth Peterson who was both a debtor's attorney and Chapter 7 Trustee over in the Middle District. She was -- Elizabeth was a very, very good attorney and I guess Elizabeth having -- I think this was, all this was happening around about the time of the Sears cases. So, again, Liz has figured out, you know, I was somewhat zealous in representing debtors, so she urged me to go to its second convention which was in San Francisco.

Ironically, the first one was in Asheville, North Carolina. I didn't know anything about that at

the time, so the one in North Carolina I did not attend. But I've been to -- I went out to San Francisco I think it was in '94. I'm not sure, '93, '94, I think '94 and been active ever since.

And then when Elizabeth, she was on the original board of directors, was original secretary of the board, when she decided not to run for reelection her board seat, she encouraged me to run for hers and I was lucky enough to get elected to the board in '97 and was on the board all the way through 2015, was president 2011 and '12, they're two-year presidency shifts.

So -- NACBA -- well, how do I put this? I've been going to the North Carolina Annual Institute since I really started getting involved in bankruptcy in the late eighties and to EBI. At that point in time, the power structure primarily of Annual Institute was revolved around creditor practice and Chapter 11 practice. And this may be my own bias, but I felt like debtors' attorneys were treated like the red-headed stepchildren of the bankruptcy bar.

And so I was very pleased when I went out to San Francisco and saw that there were attorneys like me throughout the country that took great pride in representing debtors and meeting people like Henry

Sommer and John Rao and other folks. There was a lawyer with NCLC named Gary Klein. It was inspiring. And so I've been involved since then. I'm still on the board as an ex-president, though I don't have any voting power on anything they do.

MR. SASSER: Has your role in that, but did that give you a -- was that a context in which you then were testifying in front of the Congress about bankruptcy matters?

MR. BREWER: Yes. It was through I guess each time I appeared, I kind of appeared as representing the debtors and the debtors' bar, primarily debtors. But, yeah, it was under the auspices of being a member of or on the board of directors. That first time I appeared was before Judge -- not Judge -- Lauch Faircloth who was senator from North Carolina from Clinton. So, yeah, that was -- it was always appearing kind of -- and I think NACBA sent me to that first one with Judge Faircloth because he was from North Carolina and I was from North Carolina.

MR. SASSER: NACBA waged a kind of a long battle against the law that eventually became the 2005 BAPCPA law, is that right?

MR. BREWER: Yes. That law arose out of

Congress passed some bankruptcy legislation in 1994.

Most of that legislation was more debtor friendly, but they created a bankruptcy, national bankruptcy review commission to propose changes in the bankruptcy law.

And that commission held hearings throughout the country. I've testified at a couple of those hearings. I think the official term as a reporter for that commission was a bankruptcy professor from Harvard Law School named Elizabeth Warren. We all know Elizabeth Warren has gone onto bigger and I don't know if greater, but bigger things since then and when I first got to meet her, she wouldn't know me from Adam.

So, yeah, so that's my opportunities to testify before Congress. Each time I've done it would be as a representative of National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys.

MR. SASSER: Billy, as you evaluate the changes in the laws of '84, '94, '98, 2005, since you've been practicing, if you were to look at those as sort of a vintage of wine, which of those laws did you like and which of them did you not care for?

MR. BREWER: Well, again, I think '94 would be the <u>Rothschild</u>. It was by far the best amendments in the law that were debtor friendly, you know. You know, I'll leave it to other policy folks to decide

whether, you know, looking at bankruptcy law as a composite, you know, whether it's better or not than others. I think it was also well drafted. You know, if I can be a little biased here, it was clear to me that the '78 Act, the '84 and the '94 amendments were written by people who understood the Bankruptcy Code, understood how this section related to that other section. And so they made sense from a just a logistical standpoint.

The 2005 Act was written mostly by lobbyists and in many respects they didn't know what the hell they were doing. And I think the bench, the bankruptcy benches in the early cases construing that the law, the judges have reflected their frustration in that. I know Judge Small, who normally wasn't given to much flamboyancy in his opinion, you know, in phrasing one of the cases said this law is like a Rubik's Cube with a manufacturer's defect, however we twisted and turned it and some patterns of color have emerged. You know, that's the kind of law it was.

In another place, he talked about proceeding into the thicket of the law with shears in hand. So, you know, they -- so I believe that, you know, the 2005 Act, well, we know how much litigation has come about because of it. We're still trying to sort out some of

the provisions. But I will say this, you asked me about NACBA. I think it was clear that when the 2005 Act passed in April to go in effect in October, I'm very proud of what the National Association of Consumer Bankruptcy Attorneys did.

We had a -- our convention was in May. We on the fly kind of changed all of our presentations and revamped them to work in issues related to what had happened with BAPCPA. We then had a workshop, if you will, in Chicago in July, then a second one in Orlando in September or October in Florida in the middle of hurricane season to show you how bold we were. And I think in total the number of attendees, again, some of these attendees may have gone to one or two or all three of the, we had more than 5,000 attendees to go to these workshops.

And I think probably in the history of the world, no organization has provided more continuing legal education to a number of lawyers in one year than what we did in 2005. And I think it was pretty clear that through the leadership of people like Henry Sommer and John Rao and other folks, Tara Twomey, that the debtors' lawyers came out of the chute in applying this law kind of way ahead of the creditor bar. The early decisions, we did very well and I think what creditor's

(indiscernible) didn't understand the law. They just
-- you know, their mantra was, well, this law is
supposed to screw the debtor, and it did not screw the
debtor. And we prevailed early on.

Appellate Courts tend to follow that mantra that the law was designed to, what did the Supreme Court say in Rapson to -- for creditors to collect as much as they can and, therefore, take every ambiguity in the law. When there's not an ambiguity, we got to construe the law that's most favorable to the creditors because they paid for this law. They need to get what they paid for. So I'm somewhat hopeful that there is -- the tide may turn somewhat in legislation, especially with respect to student loan provisions in the law.

MS. OLIVER: So, Billy, I was going to ask you if you could change one provision in the current Code, what would it be?

MR. BREWER: One provision.

MS. OLIVER: Or (indiscernible).

MR. BREWER: Yeah, wow. If I guess the one provision would be to -- I mean, if I can get whatever I want, I would eliminate 523(a)(8) from the Bankruptcy Code, exception to discharge of student loans. You know, if you said, well, you might imagine one isn't

that powerful. I would take it back to, you know, to the waiting periods that were put into the law, you know, if a loan, student loan was so old it could be discharged. You know, and then -- so that's -- I think the situation with student loans in this country is pretty horrible.

And if you look at the reason for bankruptcy laws, the idea is to take people who are overburdened in debt and to help them get out of debt for purposes of stimulating the economy. That's part of the idea. I think the student loan I think is well over a trillion dollars now. You got young folks who are putting off getting married, they're putting off starting families, they're putting off trying to get into, you know, buy homes because they can't get approved for loans because of their student loan debt. If there's any one thing that could help boost the economy, relief from student loans is -- would help.

Now, you know, there's some talk about just a blanket reduction of student loans in total or by a certain amount. There's a term out there called moral imperative. You know, I guess I'm not so liberal that I think that's the right thing to do. Maybe as a bankruptcy lawyer I like the idea of how much more business I might get if it changed, but I think only

those people who really can't pay their student loans ought to get relief from it, and I think letting people turn the gauntlet of the bankruptcy law to get relief from student loans is probably as good a mechanism as any to relieve only those folks who need to be relieved from student loans.

You know, if somebody went to East Carolina Medical School and got \$100,000 worth of student loan debt, but just got a job, you know, with a medical facility making \$250,000 a year, that person can pay his or her student loans and is not going to file bankruptcy. Or somebody, you know, has been out of medical school for a number of years and as a result has accumulated monies in the stock market worth \$100,000 while still paying student loans, that person is not going to file bankruptcy because they're not going to give up that stock account. Or if they do, you know, a big chunk of it is going to go to pay student loans.

So, probably that would be my one area. If you could ask if I could change any one judicial theory, it would be to take the <u>Brunner</u> decision and throw it in the trash can. I think that use of the <u>Brunner</u> decision in undue hardship is one of the most ill applied judicial theories ever devised by the

courts. It was advised in a period in which if you wait I think at the time <u>Brunner</u> came out, it was a five-year period of time you could discharge student loans, you know, that were five years old and so to say that if you hadn't had that five-year period yet, you had to -- you need to have the, what did they say, the certainty of hopelessness, you know, made a certain amount of sense.

But now with the time periods completely eradicated, we can thank Massachusetts Senator Ed Kennedy for those -- for the erosion of those provisions. Then, you know, to still apply the certainly of hopelessness for somebody who is 15 years out of school and still just eking by, can't get rid of student loans, is just nonsensical.

MR. SASSER: Billy, a couple of important things happened at the end of the aughts. One is that there was a mortgage crisis, a housing crisis, the economy went into recession, and also sort of in the middle of that, Judge Small retired. I wonder if you might reflect on those items?

MR. BREWER: Well, gee -- well, I'll probably use that as a jumping off place to -- by these folks on TV, or ask the question and they don't exactly ask the question to riff on Judge Small -- I think was one

very, very great judge. He's probably one of the main reasons you kind of asked how I got into bankruptcy. Part of that was my admiration not only Judge Small, but Judge Moore and the way they conducted their courts.

Since I was in Raleigh, I was -- appeared before Judge Small much more often than Judge Moore, but, you know, you could always -- knew that you were going to get to argue your case. He wouldn't always necessarily agree with you, but you wouldn't be -- you'd be -- you'd have the opportunity to make your case and he was always very cordial to the attorneys, especially if you were prepared. And even when if you weren't exactly prepared, he never went out of his way to embarrass you.

So, you know, his retirement was, you know, it's kind of like one of the greats stepping off the bench. You know, the mortgage crisis, gee, I don't -- you know, to me, that -- I'm getting away from bankruptcy law, but now that kind of to me reflected the flaws in the financial services industry on how they operate. And that was the opportunity, you know, which I thought they might finally get the right to modify mortgages in bankruptcy. But we didn't get there.

I'm thinking I don't know if when I said, you know, you asked me about legislation, I don't know that this pandemic and what's going to go on will provide another opportunity. I have to believe the makeup of the House and the Senate and in the presidency, probably provides greater opportunity than we have had in some time.

MR. SASSER: Billy, you as you reflect on your, at this point, over I guess you're in your fifth decade of practicing bankruptcy law and during this interview you talked about some of your opposing counsel. Who are some of the contemporaries that you have or people that you think were very influential in the way that bankruptcy law was practiced in the Eastern District?

MR. BREWER: Well, Travis, you're up there on that list, I don't know, you're not nearly as old as I am, but you've been doing this a while. You're trying to make me feel old, but -- and I am. But, you know, you've certainly been influential. You, obviously, can't talk about the practice of bankruptcy law in the Eastern District or maybe anywhere in the state, Eastern or Middle, without making reference to John Orcutt and his marketing programs and the way he has impacted not just the law, but the way we all practice.

I mean, John's been very influential. You know, those probably, you know, Ed Boltz is I think is a very fine lawyer and I admire him the way he practices quite a bit, his intellect, his stamina.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, gee, and then, you know, jumping off of that to kind of, you know, the lawyers I've practiced with, I think Bill Janvier is one hell of a lawyer. I've been certainly enjoying practicing with him the last four, five years or so. And, you know, obviously, Buzzy Stubbs with what, you know, he's probably still considered, he and his firm, preeminent Chapter 11 attorneys in the Eastern District and what he's done with respect to shepherding the Eastern Bankruptcy Institute and whatnot from a -- you know, dealing with other lawyers, you know, though we haven't had to butt heads much recently, I've always enjoyed dealing with Frank Drake even though we're probably on the polar opposites of our view of people getting relief, debt relief in bankruptcy. Frank and I are very good friends. Enjoy spending time with him.

I like Ted Nodell a lot. Can I tell one quick funny story about Ted Nodell? It comes back to the <u>Sears</u> cases. By the time that was going on, Ted had been the attorney I said in the original Judge Moore opinion that kind of was the seed case that led

to <u>Stephen Edge</u> case, <u>Van Dusen</u>, <u>Coggin</u>. Well, I had a client who had bought some series of items from a furniture store on South Saunders Street called Caraleigh, C-a-r-a-l-e-i-g-h, Caraleigh Furniture. And she'd bought a rug, I think some lamps. Last item she purchased was a mattress and box springs.

I had filed I think I'm not sure how it came about, I think maybe Ted filed a motion for relief from stay and I opposed it saying going to argue like in that <a href="Dossenbach's">Dossenbach's</a> case and my <a href="Sears">Sears</a> cases that Caraleigh had not applied the payments appropriately and they didn't have a security interest, though there was some issues about that. We're sitting in court ready to argue the case.

And the way they did it Caraleigh, you'd come in and you'd sign a contract for one item like a rug and a lamp. You came back a month later, you do a new contact, but they check up in the box, they would add that to your account and check in the box that they retained a security interest in all previous items.

Well, when she bought the mattress and box springs, someone failed to check the box and it just happened to be sitting there in court that I, for the first time, realized that they hadn't checked the box. So, as I stood up to argue the case, I told the Court I

change my argument to -- from the very fairly complicated analysis of Retail Installment Sales Act to they didn't check the box check argument which was pretty solid.

Judge Small looked down at Ted and says, Mr. Nodell, it looks like Mr. Brewer's, pardon me, is right. Looks like your client didn't retain it, security interest on those other items, they didn't check the box. What do you got to say about that? Ted, being always kind of quick on his feet, says, well, Your Honor, but we do have a secured interest in the mattress and box springs and we would like a turnover order on the mattress and box springs and to order the client to turn over the mattress and box springs. Ted like a fisherman had set the hook, was ready to reel in.

So, I jump up all aflame and say, Your Honor, this is ridiculous. You can't even resell a mattress and box springs under North Carolina health regulations without fumigating. It would cost more to fumigate that mattress and box springs than what it, you know, than what they can get on a resale. Mr. Nodell is just trying to harass my poor client.

I sat down and Ted stood up and says, oh,
Your Honor, Mr. Brewer misunderstands. If we can get a

turnover on that mattress and box springs, we're not going to resell them. We're going to dump them in Brewer's front yard to which I damn near fell out of my chair. Rick McElroy, who can attest to this, was sitting in -- sitting ready to make some kind of argument on the next case, you know, right behind us as we sit there at the tables. I know Rick almost fell out.

Judge Small did not even crack a smile. I couldn't -- I decided I will never play poker with Thomas Small if he could keep a straight face with that. But we did turn over the mattress and box springs and they never did show up in my front yard. I wrote Ted a letter later saying I was a little disappointed that I had told my daughter she was going to get her trampoline for Christmas and I was planning to use the mattress and box springs, claim it's a trampoline, and I was certainly disappointed that it never showed up.

He never (indiscernible). Ted Nodell has to be -- has a dry sense of humor than anybody in the Bankruptcy Bar.

MR. SASSER: Billy, it seems like to me from my perspective one of your legacy is your giving back and even as you were describing, you know, handling the

<u>Sears</u> class action without a tremendous amount of financial reward, your involvement in that, just representing, just doing the hard cases, but also your -- the way that you've been so helpful to younger attorneys like myself, but many others, as well. This is not necessarily a -- it's a question, but a statement. You don't disagree that actually you do still have some of that idealism that led you to law school in the first place, do you?

MR. BREWER: No, I do not. You know, I -and I feel like part of what I've done, you know,
what's the phrase, pay it forward. You know, I got
help from folks when I was a young lawyer. During that
period of time in which I was doing mostly State Court
stuff, I would the sixth floor of the Wake County
Courthouse where the snack bar was I would go there
most every morning and sit around tables with people
like Robert McMillan, Wade Smith, Roger Smith, Russell
DeMent, Philip Redwine and, you know, very often I
didn't know what the heck I was doing, was very nervous
about what I was doing and could ask them questions and
they friendly, you know, gave advice to help me decide
what to do, how to do it.

And so, you know, today that help tends to take place more kind of through Listservs and that kind

of thing, but I'm always happy to, you know, to help other folks as I got help early in my career. And I think that's one -- I think the -- there's certain areas of the law in which attorneys do not tend to cooperate as much with each other as they do in the bankruptcy bar, but we tend to do so. And I think it's not just debtors' attorneys, debtor's attorney, but, you know, even though we all represent our client zealously, I think debtors' and creditors' attorneys tend to work pretty well together.

So, I encourage anybody who happened to be looking at this who's trying to decide whether to be a lawyer or what kind of law to practice to think seriously about bankruptcy as a way of, you know, whether it's debtor practice or creditor practice that if you want to go to heaven, promise you'll concentrate more on debtor practice, consider bankruptcy law. And I realize good works don't get you there alone, but it can't hurt.

MR. SASSER: For the sake of posterity, this interview is occurring during a global pandemic and bankruptcy filings are at a very low level right now. Where do you see the future of bankruptcy? Is this just a blip or are we going to -- is this sort of a permanent decline that we'll never come out of really?

MR. BREWER: You know, I don't know. You sent me those statistics. I was somewhat surprised at how much they have dipped. I mean, like they peaked in about 2010 or '11 and been going down every since. You know, this may be, you know, what is -- what's the lawyer's prayer, "Lord, bring strife upon us, sir" -- I mean, "Upon thy people unless they servant perish."

You know, I mean, us Bankruptcy lawyers kind of live in a backwards world from the standpoint of, you know, financial crisis and people having debts they can't pay is good for us. But I can't see how this pandemic is not going to result in a substantial increase in filings in 2021. Maybe more toward the latter half of the year and in years to come, you know, few years.

I've often found that bankruptcy is kind of a trailing economic indicator and what I mean by that is I majored in economics at Carolina. But it is — the bankruptcy filings do not go up at the bottom of the economic or financial cycle. They tend to increase as things start to get better. And why is that? I think, you know, and I don't have any studies or any evidence to support this, just my own theory that the people file bankruptcy to protect income, to protect assets, whether it's assets they have now, they hope to

acquire in the future. And, therefore, at the very bottom I think what the hell do I need to file bankruptcy. I don't have anything to protect right now. But you, you know, you get back to work, you get a job, you got debts you owe and you think, gee, are creditors going to come garnish my wages.

I realize North Carolina doesn't have wage garnishment, but people don't necessarily know that.

And -- or if I can save up to buy a car, I don't want to lose my car. So. it's when they -- I guess when they become optimistic about the future, bankruptcy they want to do to protect that future. So. I think as the economy starts to turn around, I think you'll see bankruptcy filings go up.

And the same can be with businesses, you know, we have a term feasibility with filing bankruptcies for, you know, Chapter 11's. You got to have a clear path forward to try to file a Chapter 11 and make it work. You know, that would be -- there will be sevens where people just shut the doors and move on, but I do see filings increasing.

The -- it may have been my wishful thinking.

You asked me which law that I will change, but -- and I said student loans, a change in the student loan discharge provisions would create a huge increase in

filings. I think you got folks who so much of their debt is student loans. If they saw a path forward to discharging student loans even if it weren't through a Chapter 13 in which they had to pay some portion of their student loans over a three-to-five-year period of time would -- but they knew at the end of that period they're out of debt, you know, it would increase filings.

MS. CASTELLOE: We've been going for over an hour and a half now. Were there any questions that were on this list that we didn't get to that you wanted to make sure we covered?

MR. BREWER: You didn't ask me about the red tie.

MR. CASTELLOE: We can certainly talk about the red tie. I will say that I am in full compliance today with our original bet.

MR. BREWER: Well, that's good. I will have to say the bad news was earlier this year, you know, to put myself in ability to comply with this ongoing bet, I bought -- actually bought an NC State tie. The bad news was I had to, you know, I needed to wear it. The good news was it'd been so long since I'd had to wear it for this bet that it took me a while to find it. So do you want to tell the story or you want me to tell

it? You want --

MS. CASTELLOE: I'll let you tell it. This is your interview. We'll let you tell it.

MR. BREWER: All right. So it was not unknown in chatting before court and that kind of thing when Christine was the courtroom clerk for Judge Small that she had -- I had an allegiance to the University of North Carolina having gone to school there seven years and both my parents having gone there. And Christine had a quite puzzled allegiance to NC State University.

So. we made a bet on the NC State Carolina basketball game. I think it was basketball. And the bet was that if Carolina won, Christine had to wear an outfit that included Carolina blue and if State won I had to wear a red tie. This had to be many years ago because I remember my daughter who is now 34 years old, no, 36 years old, excuse me, was still in high school taking United States History. And I know it was a long time ago because it was a basketball game and State won. Must have been before Roy Williams became the coach.

So. I get up that morning says, shoot, I got to wear a red tie. But I've got this black and gold, it's my Abraham Lincoln tie. And it's got Lincoln's

face on it with the Gettysburg Address kind of in script written all along the tie. So I hand it to my daughter that morning and say, honey, look at this tie. She says, yeah, daddy. I says, read that to me. So she read, you know, four score and seven years ago. So I show up at court that morning with my Abraham Lincoln black and gold tie.

And Christine says that's not a red tie. I says, yes, it is. My daughter read it this morning. So, she asked Judge Small to rule on whether I had complied with the bet. I think there was an ex parte communication between Christine and Judge because I wasn't present when it was so asked.

(Off the record telephone discussion)

MR. BREWER: So, he wanted to know if the bet was in writing or verbal to which it was verbal. So, it was just a red, you know, was it r-e-d, or r-e-a-d. So, Judge Small being the seasoned jurist that he was ruled that I had complied, perhaps complied with the literal ambiguous terms of the bet, but I'd clearly violated the spirit of the bet and I was ordered to wear a tie with some red in it for an entire year which can have some sort of, you know, chilling effect on exactly what your attire is. Every time you put on something if you got to court it's got to have red in

it.

So, at some point along, there was a date in which there was a hearing that had not got put on the calendar and I had to jump and run to court. And I grabbed, I kept a tie in the office, but this tie didn't have any red on the front it. So, I put it on and I run to court. I'm there arguing in court and I said, shit, this tie ain't got any red on it all day. This tie ain't got any red on it. Sorry for the bad word there. But I looked on the back and it had a red label.

So, I'm sitting there arguing and Christine's looking at me like that tie ain't got any red on it. I don't see it. And so I just without even saying anything, I flipped the tie around and show her that red tag and flip it back. But that's the unvarnished truth as to the red ties. Christine, do you have any rebuttal?

MS. CASTELLOE: No. I would say, that, you know, I had to purchase a lot blue clothing just, so I had a Carolina blue blouse. I even had a Carolina blue suit. At one time, I think I was trying to get away with earrings and you didn't feel like that was really in the spirit, but even the year that I was in Washington D.C. on a temporary duty assignment when

Carolina beat State, one of our former law clerks,

Meredith Mathis, was also up there. She was a Carolina

fan and she was able to verify for Mr. Brewer that I -
in the spirit of the bet, was wearing blue to work in

D.C. the day after the game. So --

MR. BREWER: Yup, yup. And I think like on these random things, I got a picture of Christine wearing the blue with a Washington Post newspaper showing it was that date, the date after showing me that it wasn't, you know, that it was timely.

MS. CASTELLOE: Yup.

MR. BREWER: Judge Small would have ruled that your earrings are okay because he's the one that held that on a challenge to exempting a jury that it includes it's wearing apparel.

MS. CASTELLOE: There we go.

MR. BREWER: There's an opinion out there that North Carolina does not have a specific exemption for jewelry, but under the Eastern District of North Carolina jury if it was purchased, you know, not for investment, but to wear, that it's wearing apparel. Kind of stretches the word apparel, but, you know.

MS. CASTELLOE: (Indiscernible).

MR. BREWER: You know, for someone who went to NC State, you know, apparel to me would be more

1	textile, but in any event, I liked his ruling.
2	All right. So, this has been enjoyable,
3	folks.
4	MS. OLIVER: Thank you, so much.
5	MR. SASSER: Yeah, thanks, Billy. We really
6	appreciate it.
7	MR. BREWER: Yeah, Travis, thank you and
8	Cindy for doing what you're doing. You know, this is
9	important. This kind of thing, people often say we
10	ought to do, but never but don't do and you all are
11	being highly commended for doing it. Thank you, too,
12	Christine.
13	MS. CASTELLOE: You're welcome.
14	MR. BREWER: All right.
15	MR. SASSER: Thank you. Have a good weekend.
16	MR. BREWER: You all, too.
17	UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: (Indiscernible).
18	MR. BREWER: Bye-bye.
19	* * * *
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## CERTIFICATION

I, KELLI R. PHILBURN, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability.

/s/ Kelli Philburn

KELLI R. PHILBURN

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: May 17, 2021