

APPENDICES

1a

APPENDIX A

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST CIRCUIT**

879 F.3d 389
No. 16-9016

IN RE TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, N/K/A OLD COLD LLC,
Debtor,

MISSION PRODUCT HOLDINGS, INC.,
Appellant,

v.

TEMPNOLOGY, LLC, N/K/A OLD COLD LLC,
Appellee.

January 12, 2018

Before Torruella, Lynch, and Kayatta, Circuit Judges.

OPINION

KAYATTA, Circuit Judge.

Generally speaking, when a company files for protection under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, the trustee or the debtor-in-possession may secure court approval to “reject” any executory contract of the debtor, meaning that the other party to the contract is left with a damages claim for breach, but not the ability to compel further performance. 11 U.S.C. §§ 365(a),

1107(a); see *NLRB v. Bildisco & Bildisco*, 465 U.S. 513, 531–32, 104 S.Ct. 1188, 79 L.Ed.2d 482 (1984); *Mason v. Official Comm. of Unsecured Creditors, for FBI Distrib. Corp. & FBC Distrib. Corp. (In re FBI Distrib. Corp.)*, 330 F.3d 36, 43–44 (1st Cir. 2003). When the rejected contract, however, is one “under which the debtor is a licensor of a right to intellectual property,” the licensee may elect to “retain its rights ... to such intellectual property,” thereby continuing the debtor’s duty to license the intellectual property. 11 U.S.C. § 365(n)(1). In this case, Tempnology, LLC (“Debtor”)—a debtor-in-possession seeking to reorganize under Chapter 11—rejected an agreement giving certain marketing and distribution rights to Mission Product Holdings, Inc. The parties agree that Mission can insist that the rejection not apply to nonexclusive patent licenses contained in the rejected agreement. They disagree as to whether the rejection applies to the agreement’s grants of a trademark license and of exclusive rights to sell certain of Debtor’s goods. In the case of the trademark license, resolving that disagreement poses for this circuit an issue of first impression concerning which other circuits are split. For the following reasons, we agree with the bankruptcy court that the rejection left Mission with only a pre-petition damages claim in lieu of any obligation by Debtor to further perform under either the trademark license or the grant of exclusive distribution rights.

I.

Debtor made specialized products—such as towels, socks, headbands, and other accessories—designed to remain at low temperatures even when used during exercise, which it marketed under the “Coolcore” and “Dr. Cool” brands. A significant intellectual property

portfolio supported Debtor's products. This portfolio consisted of two issued patents, four pending patents, research studies, and a multitude of registered and pending trademarks.

On November 21, 2012, Mission and Debtor executed a Co-Marketing and Distribution Agreement, which serves as the focal point of this appeal. The Agreement provided Mission with three relevant categories of rights.

First, Debtor granted Mission distribution rights to certain of its manufactured products within the United States.¹ These products, called "Cooling Accessories," were defined in the Agreement as "products of the specific types listed on Exhibit A" and "manufactured by or on behalf of [Debtor]." They also included "additional products that are hereafter developed by [Debtor]." Exhibit A broke down the thirteen listed products into two categories: "Exclusive" and "Non-Exclusive" Cooling Accessories. For "Exclusive Cooling Accessories"—comprised of towels, wraps, hoodies, bandanas, multi-chills, and doo rags—Debtor agreed that "it will not license or sell" the products "to anyone other than [Mission] during the Term." Mission's rights with respect to the remaining Cooling Accessories—comprised of socks, headbands, wristbands, sleeves, skullcaps, yoga mats, and baselayers—were nonexclusive because Debtor reserved for itself the "right to sell ... to vertically integrated companies as well as customers that are not Sports Distributors or retailers in the Sporting Channel."

¹ In addition to the United States, the exclusive geographic territory also included "other countries and territories that [Mission] acquires exclusive distribution rights to pursuant to its first rights of refusal and notice."

Second, Debtor granted Mission a nonexclusive license to Debtor's intellectual property. This "non-exclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, fully paid-up, perpetual, worldwide, fully-transferable license" granted Mission the right "to sublicense (through multiple tiers), use, reproduce, modify, and create derivative work based on and otherwise freely exploit" Debtor's products—including Cooling Accessories—and its intellectual property. This irrevocable license, however, expressly excluded any rights to Debtor's trademarks.

Trademarks were the subject of the third bucket of rights. Section 15(d) of the Agreement granted Mission a "nonexclusive, non-transferable, limited license" for the term of the Agreement "to use [Debtor's] trademark and logo (as well as any other Marks licensed hereunder) for the limited purpose of performing its obligations hereunder, exercising its rights and promoting the purposes of this Agreement." This license came with limitations. Mission was forbidden from using the trademarks in a manner that was disparaging, inaccurate, or otherwise inconsistent with the terms of the Agreement. Further, Mission was required to "comply with any written trademark guidelines" and Debtor had "the right to review and approve all uses of its Marks," except for certain pre-approved uses.

The Agreement also included a provision permitting either party to terminate the Agreement without cause. On June 30, 2014, Mission exercised this option, triggering a "Wind-Down Period" of approximately two years. Debtor, in turn, issued a notice of immediate termination for cause on July 22, 2014, claiming that Mission's hiring of Debtor's former president violated the Agreement's restrictive covenants. Pursuant to the Agreement's terms, Mission's challenge to Debtor's immediate termination for cause went before an arbi-

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.