

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

In re:)	Judge Deborah L. Thorne
)	
Ford City Condominium Association,)	Case No. 21-05193
)	Chapter 11
)	
<hr/>)	
City of Chicago, Illinois,)	Adv. Proc. No. 23-201
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
Ford City Condominium Association, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The City of Chicago filed this proceeding seeking relief under the Illinois Condominium Property Act, 765 ILCS § 605/14.5. Specifically, the City seeks to have the court (1) declare the property managed by the Debtor Ford City Condominium Association a “distressed condominium property,” (2) appoint a receiver, and (3) deconvert the property from a condominium to property owned in common by the over 300 unit owners.

The court abstains under 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c) from hearing this adversary proceeding, as it is merely “related to” the underlying chapter 11 case¹ and the matter can be heard more

¹ The City’s complaint alleges that the matter is a core proceeding “because it concerns the administration of the Debtor’s bankruptcy estate and it affects the liquidation of assets of the estate or the adjustment of the debtor-creditor relationship.” (Am. Compl. ¶ 3, Adv. Dkt. No. 21.) Yet the complaint asks for relief related to the condominium property, which belongs to the unit owners. In its filing dated August 16, 2023, the City seems to concede that this proceeding is merely “related to” the Ford City chapter 11 case. (See Adv. Dkt. No. 40.)

efficiently in the Circuit Court of Cook County. To the extent necessary, the court modifies the automatic stay to allow the City to proceed in the Circuit Court of Cook County.

I. Background

A. Bankruptcy Proceeding and the Property

On April 20, 2021, Debtor Ford City Condominium Association filed a petition under subchapter V of chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. The Debtor is the governing body for a condominium project located at 4300 W. Ford City Drive in Chicago, Illinois (the “Property”). (Am. Compl. ¶ 6, Adv. Dkt. No. 21.) The Property consists of seven residential buildings with a total of 319 units. (*Id.* ¶ 7.)

For many years prepetition, the Debtor struggled to pay its debts and maintain the Property in a safe and secure condition. (*Id.* ¶ 13.) Although no bar date has been set, there are proofs of claim on file for \$1.3 million in overdue water bills, \$129,612 for elevator services, and \$219,085 for masonry work. (*Id.* ¶¶ 16, 23, 24.) The City of Chicago has filed a significant number of cases against the Debtor for building code violations. An inspection in May 2023 found 115 violations, including: “large cracks and bulging in foundations with imminent risk of failure, failure to maintain elevators in multiple buildings, failing roofs, failing exterior walls, broken windows, ripped screens, missing smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors, missing emergency exit signs, expired fire extinguishers.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 17, 44.)

As a result of serious allegations of mismanagement by the Debtor’s board, the previous bankruptcy judge entered an order on September 2, 2021, removing the debtor-in-possession and, under 11 U.S.C. § 1183(b)(5), placing Subchapter V Trustee William Avellone in possession of the Property. (Bankr. Dkt. No. 129).² Since that date, Mr. Avellone has employed a management

² In a separate adversary proceeding pending before this court, the Trustee alleges mismanagement by the Debtor’s board of directors.

company, collected assessments from unit owners, and done his best to prevent further deterioration to the Property. (Bankr. Dkt. No. 149.) Despite this effort, the building code violations continue and the future of the Property as a viable condominium remains in doubt. (Am. Compl. ¶¶ 43, 44.) Almost \$1.5 million is owed in past-due condominium assessments, and at least \$50 million is needed to bring the Property up to code.³ (Monthly Operating Rep. for Small Bus. ¶ 25, Bankr. Dkt. No. 261.) The court fears imminent damage or injury to the unit owners or the public.

B. Adversary Proceeding and the Illinois Condominium Property Act

As a result of the significant building code violations as well as the threats to the health and safety of the unit owners and the public, the City filed this adversary proceeding seeking an order to “deconvert” the Debtor’s property under the Illinois Condominium Property Act, 765 ILCS § 605/14.5 (the “Act”). The Act defines “distressed condominium property” as units that are “operated in a manner or have conditions which may constitute a danger, blight, or nuisance to the surrounding community or to the general public.” *Id.* § 14.5(a)(1).⁴ A municipality shall initiate a proceeding under the Act by “filing a verified petition or verified complaint in the circuit court in the county in which the property is located.” *Id.* § 14.5(b). Once the circuit court finds that the property is a distressed condominium property, the court may order the appointment of a receiver. *Id.* § 14.5(c). The circuit court may go a step further and declare that the property is no longer a condominium, that it will now be owned in common by the unit owners, that each owner will receive an undivided interest in the property based on the interest

³ The Trustee stated in open court that at least \$25 million is needed for common areas and another \$25 million is needed to repair individual units.

⁴ To meet this definition, the property must have two of six conditions listed in the Act, such as “serious violations” of zoning or building codes, delinquent property taxes, and potential (or successful) termination of essential utilities. *Id.*

previously owned in the common elements, and liens affecting any unit will be attached to the undivided interest of the unit owner. *Id.* § 14.5(c)(2). The receiver may then be able to sell the property and distribute funds based on the undivided interests of each owner. *Id.* § 14.5 (d).

The City's complaint asks this court to find, among other things, that the Property is a distressed condominium property and that it is owned in common by each of the unit owners. The City also seeks an order appointing Mr. Avellone as receiver under the Act.

II. Discussion

The court believes that it should sua sponte permissively abstain, as this adversary proceeding is best heard by the Circuit Court. The Circuit Court holds the proper judicial tools to hear this state law matter efficiently, and it routinely appoints receivers in cases of this nature.

A. Permissive Abstention

Permissive abstention is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c)(1), which provides:

- (1) Nothing in this section prevents a district court in the interest of justice, or in the interest of comity with State courts or respect for State law, from abstaining from hearing a particular proceeding arising under title 11 or arising in or related to a case under title 11.

In addition to the considerations listed in this statute—the interest of justice and comity with state courts—courts look to a variety of factors to determine whether permissive abstention is appropriate. The court might consider the potential effect (or lack thereof) of abstention on the bankruptcy estate, the extent to which state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues, the degree of relatedness or remoteness of the proceeding to the main bankruptcy case, and the likelihood of forum shopping. *See In re Chi., Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R.R. Co.*, 6 F.3d 1184, 1189 (7th Cir. 1993) (identifying twelve total factors that the Ninth Circuit considers for permissive abstention (quoting *In re Eastport Assocs.*, 935 F.2d 1071, 1075–76 (9th Cir. 1991)); *In re L & S Indus., Inc.*, 989 F.2d 929, 935 (7th Cir. 1993) (stating that the “presence of a state

law issue is not enough to warrant permissive abstention, but it nevertheless is a significant consideration” (collecting cases)). The Seventh Circuit has instructed that courts “should apply these factors flexibly” and that “no one factor is necessarily determinative.” *Chi., Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pac. R.R. Co.*, 6 F.3d at 1189.

Because a court may raise the issue of abstention sua sponte, *see In re Repurchase Corp.*, 329 B.R. 832, 835 n.2 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2005) (citing *Belotti v. Baird*, 428 U.S. 132, 143 n.10 (1976)), the court now considers this issue on its own motion.

B. Abstention is Prudent in this Case

A number of factors convince this court that it should abstain from the adversary proceeding. First, abstention from the adversary proceeding will not impact the bankruptcy estate. Under the Act, the Debtor does not own the units or the common areas—they belong to the unit owners. 765 ILCS § 605/6. No evidence has been provided that the Debtor owns any of the real property; in fact, the Debtor’s schedules state that it does not have any ownership in real property. (Schedule A/B at 6, Bankr. Dkt. No. 1.) According to the Debtor’s schedules, its only assets include cash, desks, and laundry equipment. (*Id.*) The court believes that, since Mr. Avellone became trustee-in-possession, the Debtor has collected assessments and now holds more cash. But this fact should not impact the City’s complaint seeking to determine that the Property is no longer a condominium; the cash would remain an asset of the Debtor’s estate subject to an adjudication of claims against the estate.

Second, the complaint and the relief sought are based entirely on Illinois law and not on any portion of the Bankruptcy Code. At most, the complaint is only “related to” the bankruptcy because the Debtor is a named party. Even though the Debtor is named, a resolution of whether

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.