

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
District of New Mexico**

**Document Verification**

**Case Title:** New Mexico Motor Speedway, Inc.  
**Case Number:** 05-14845  
**Chapter :** 11  
**Judge Code:** SA  
**First Meeting Location:** Albuquerque  
**Reference Number:** 11 - 05-14845 - SA

Document Information			
<b>Number:</b>	72		
<b>Description:</b>	Minutes of Final Hearing Held On 9/19/05 Re: [6-1] Application To Employ Brian E. Rowe, CPA by New Mexico Motor Speedway, Inc. .		
<b>Size:</b>	2 pages (8k)		
<b>Date Received:</b>	09/20/2005 03:09:32 PM	<b>Date Filed:</b>	09/20/2005
		<b>Date Entered On Docket:</b>	09/21/2005
Court Digital Signature			<a href="#">View History</a>
<pre> 9e 22 55 93 2c 7d b5 76 21 7b eb ac b5 83 90 ed a2 91 f1 a2 6b 27 55 78 8a 95 20 39 47 ea a7 2a d6 d1 14 e2 3f 17 d1 7a 75 f3 53 d0 01 6b fe 78 f1 f2 31 0f 04 64 ba 7e b5 8a 5b c0 80 9c 13 0d 52 c4 38 7a fc 2e 6c 1f 4a 73 82 78 7d 68 8e 02 02 9c 92 18 18 f6 68 1c de 54 b3 9c 57 f6 92 39 2e a1 d3 09 f3 04 39 aa 5a ac b8 8a 5a c4 45 16 13 0f e4 39 fa e7 56 87 54 f9 c1 3c 21 07 bd ef           </pre>			
Filer Information			
<b>Submitted By:</b>	Mary B. Anderson		
<b>Comments:</b>	Minutes of Hearing Held on September 19, 2005		

**Digital Signature:** The Court's digital signature is a verifiable mathematical computation unique to this document and the Court's private encryption key. This signature assures that any change to the document can be detected.

**Verification:** This form is verification of the status of the document identified above as of *Tuesday, October 4, 2005*. If this form is attached to the document identified above, it serves as an endorsed copy of the document.

**Note:** Any date shown above is current as of the date of this verification. Users are urged to review the official court docket for a specific event to confirm information, such as entered on docket date for purposes of appeal. Any element of information on this form, except for the digital signature and the received date, is subject to change as changes may be entered on the Court's official docket.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

**Clerk's Minutes**

Before the Honorable James Starzynski

James Burke, Law Clerk  
Jill Peterson, Courtroom Deputy

**\*\*Hearing was Digitally Recorded**

**Date:**

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

**In Re:**

NEW MEXICO MOTOR SPEEDWAY

No. 11-05-14845 SA

FH on Motion to Employ Accountant by Debtor  
(applic. #6, affdt #7, obj. #24 & 28)

Attorney for Debtor: Dave Giddens

Attorney for Richards Parking, Inc., et al.: William Chappel and Robert  
Jacobvitz

Attorney for UST: Leonard Martinez-Metzgar

Attorney for Madison, Harbour Law Firm: Gregory Steinman and Marisol Garcia

---

TIME STARTED: 2:18 pm

TIME ENDED: 4:18 pm

Summary of Proceedings:

Exhibits \_\_\_\_\_

Testimony \_\_\_\_\_

MOTION DENIED. Mr. Jacobvitz to do order.

Ruling:

1334 and 157; core; 7052

The application of the estate to hire Mr. Rowe is denied.

Possible 547 and 548 actions. And the corporation and Mr. Shakra sort of acknowledged that (re 547) by paying Mr. Rowe beforehand so he would not be a creditor. I am aware of the distinctions that courts make between actual and potential conflicts, but there is no bright line that I have been able to determine, and this situation looks too much like an actual conflict.

Mr. Rowe did work for Mr. Shakra et al. prepetition, and helped determine what the numbers are for the corporation that the DIP has now put in its schedules, etc. - it would be difficult for an ordinary human being to go back and seriously re-examine and challenge those numbers to the extent that the estate on the one hand and the Mr. Shakra et al. on the other hand (esp. Mr. Shakra) had a difference of opinion and the estate (or creditors of the estate) wanted that issue raised. I don't know where this leaves the average professional that has worked for a corporation (or partnership, etc.) and all its owners, directors, officers, family members, etc. when the corporation becomes a DIP, but it does not work in this case.

By this I mean no attack on Mr. Rowe's integrity at all; if anyone could pull off being completely objective and loyal to the estate, it would be Mr. Rowe, but I am not going to put him in that position.

There is also the issue of a potential claim against the estate and Mr. Rowe for interference with contractual relations. I have a question about how solid that is, in law and in fact, but it is not an empty threat with nothing offered to back it up, and so that is an additional reason to not permit the employment, although whether it would be so on its own is not something I need to decide.