



---

# PERSPECTIVES

## THE CASE FOR OUT-OF-COURT WIND-DOWNS

---

Our perspectives feature the viewpoints of our subject matter experts on current topics and emerging trends.

Copyright © 2025 J.S. Held LLC, All rights reserved.

## Introduction

When a business faces insolvency, the path forward is rarely straightforward. Should the company file Chapter 11 in hopes of reorganizing? Should it liquidate under Chapter 7? Would an assignment for the benefit of creditors (ABC) or a court-appointed [receivership](#) make more sense?

These options dominate conversations around distressed businesses—but they are not the only choices.

For many companies, including those with [private equity](#) backing, an out-of-court wind-down provides a compelling alternative. Done properly, it offers speed, discretion, control, and the potential for higher recoveries than formal bankruptcy proceedings. This article examines the reasons why out-of-court wind-downs may be a preferred alternative over bankruptcy for private equity sponsors, lenders, and boards of directors.

### Key Takeaways for Sponsors & Lenders

Why consider an out-of-court wind-down?

- » Preserve control.
- » Maintain privacy and protect reputation.
- » Deliver equal or better creditor recoveries compared to bankruptcy.
- » Ensure faster resolutions with lower costs.
- » Reduce personal liability risks through careful planning.

## The Glass Box Problem: Why Bankruptcy Carries Stigma

Bankruptcy is often described as a “glass box.” Once filed, the company’s financial state becomes public record. Creditors, competitors, suppliers, and the media gain immediate visibility into the extent of distress.

For stakeholders, this transparency has costs, especially as it pertains to reputational risk:

- » For public companies, bankruptcy can significantly depress share value and brand perception.
- » For [private equity sponsors](#), it can impact fundraising and investor relationships.

By contrast, an out-of-court wind-down offers privacy. Creditors, vendors, and employees are engaged directly, but the process can remain outside the headlines. For many boards and sponsors, this discretion is as valuable as the financial outcomes.

## Why Out-of-Court Wind-downs Are Gaining Attention

Market volatility, rising interest rates, and tighter credit conditions have made refinancing or restructuring debt more difficult. [Private equity firms](#), in particular, face mounting pressure to manage underperforming portfolio companies efficiently.

Out-of-court wind-downs are gaining traction because they:

- » Protect reputations in industries where bankruptcy headlines can damage other holdings.
- » Offer lenders an alternative to expensive, drawn-out court-supervised liquidations.
- » Provide boards with autonomy to manage the closure rather than ceding authority to the court.

As economic conditions remain challenging, these practical benefits are likely to make out-of-court wind-downs a viable consideration.

## How Out-of-Court Wind-downs Stack Up Against Other Options

To understand why out-of-court solutions matter, it helps to compare them against traditional paths:

### Chapter 11 Reorganization

- » **Pros:** Provides breathing room, automatic stay, and potential to restructure.
- » **Cons:** Costly, public, often fails (many Chapter 11s convert to Chapter 7).

### Chapter 7 Liquidation

- » **Pros:** Court-supervised liquidation of assets, creditor distribution.
- » **Cons:** Loss of control, limited recoveries, slow process.

### Assignment for the Benefit of Creditors (ABC)

- » **Pros:** Faster and less expensive than bankruptcy.
- » **Cons:** Still a legal process, limited flexibility, may not protect officers.

### Receivership

- » **Pros:** Court-appointed receiver manages business and liquidation.
- » **Cons:** Removes board control, may reduce creditor cooperation.

### Out-of-Court Wind-down

- » **Pros:** Retains board authority, private, flexible, and can improve recoveries.
- » **Cons:** Requires skilled negotiation, not always suitable for highly litigious creditor groups.

This comparison underscores why out-of-court approaches resonate with boards, lenders, and sponsors who value discretion and control.

## Core Advantages of Out-of-Court Wind-downs for Boards, Sponsors, and Creditors

Handled correctly, out-of-court wind-downs can deliver superior results equal to bankruptcy. Key advantages include:

- » **Control** – The company's existing Board of Directors (or a newly appointed one) retains control over the Company.
- » **Flexibility** – Management can choose whether to finish projects or selectively liquidate assets, generally with more flexibility than a bankruptcy affords.
- » **Efficiency** – Avoids prolonged court procedures and reduces legal fees.
- » **Creditor outcomes** – Creditors often receive faster, larger recoveries than they would in bankruptcy.
- » **Stakeholder dignity** – Preserves relationships and minimizes reputational fallout.

For landlords, vendors, and lenders—groups that often face capped or diluted claims in bankruptcy—the flexibility of an out-of-court solution can result in significantly higher recoveries in a quicker timeframe.

# Step-By-Step Guidance to the Out-of-Court Wind- downs Process

An out-of-court wind-down is not an ad hoc exercise. Advisors typically follow a structured approach to maximize value and reduce risk.

## 1. Assessing Cash and Obligations

The first step is to understand available cash and, separately, outstanding liabilities. Advisors attempt to follow creditor priority rules where possible, but with flexibility to strike settlements.

## 2. Strategically Marshaling Assets

Assets must be identified, marshaled, valued, and liquidated strategically. This may include:

- » Selling inventory to existing customers at discounted rates.
- » Monetizing intellectual property, licenses, or brand assets.

### 3. Negotiating Settlements

Advisors often present vendors with structured options:

- » **Immediate settlement:** In exchange for a release, accept a percentage of what is owed today as full payment.
- » **Deferred, risk-based settlement:** Accept less upfront but retain a contingent right to further repayment if funds remain.

## 4. Making Strategic Project Decisions

Companies must determine whether to complete or halt projects:

- » This requires a “cash-on-cash” analysis – how much does the company need to spend, and how much will it collect?
- » It generally also requires negotiation with the customer to ensure advance payment.

## Stakeholder Perspectives

## Private Equity Sponsors

Out-of-court wind-downs allow [PE funds](#) to manage portfolio exits discreetly, avoiding headlines that could complicate future fundraising.

## Lenders' priorities in alternative resolutions.

Lenders often prefer out-of-court solutions that minimize administrative costs and deliver faster recoveries. When handled transparently, these processes can preserve collateral value more effectively than bankruptcy.

## Boards and Management

Retaining control over the wind-down allows boards to retain control, manage reputational risk, and minimize personal liability.

## Employees and Workforce Considerations

Employees face uncertainty in any wind-down, but transparent communication and timely payment of wages and benefits (and vacation and contractual severance) reduce the risk of litigation.

## Vendors and Landlords

It is often possible to demonstrate superior and quicker recovery to vendors and landlords in an out-of-court process.

## Legal and Liability Considerations

An out-of-court wind-down requires careful legal navigation. Key considerations include:

- » **Employee obligations** – Unpaid wages, accrued vacation, and healthcare costs may create personal liability for officers and directors.
- » **Contractual obligations** – Breaches typically result in company-level claims, not personal exposure.
- » **Fiduciary duties** – Boards must demonstrate that they acted in good faith to maximize value for creditors.
- » **State law variations** – Employment laws, notice requirements, and creditor remedies differ by jurisdiction.

Working closely with experienced advisors and legal counsel ensures that the process is both defensible and effective.

## Best Practices for Boards and Sponsors in Out-of-Court Wind-downs

For boards and sponsors considering this path, several best practices stand out:

- » **Engage advisors early** – Delays reduce cash and optionality.
- » **Prioritize communication** – Transparency builds creditor trust.
- » **Model scenarios** – Understand the risks and cash requirements of finishing versus halting projects and other scenario planning.
- » **Be realistic** – Overpromising undermines credibility.
- » **Document decisions** – A clear record protects directors from later claims.

## The Advisor's Role in Guiding Boards and Sponsors

Why don't more companies pursue out-of-court wind-downs? In part, because it is uncharted territory that does not have established or uniform "rules."

[Restructuring advisors](#), by contrast, specialize in guiding companies through out-of-court options. They bring:

- » **Credibility with creditors** – Advisors can negotiate settlements more effectively than management, which has often exhausted the patience and trust of creditors
- » **Technical expertise** – From asset sales to creditor negotiations, advisors manage the complex details.
- » **Objectivity** – They help boards balance competing interests and make defensible decisions.

In short, the right advisor can mean the difference between a chaotic shutdown and a controlled, value-preserving wind-down.

## Conclusion

Out-of-court wind-downs are not a cure-all. Some companies, particularly those with litigious creditor bases or highly complex debt structures, may still require court-supervised solutions.

But for many boards, lenders, and [private equity sponsors](#), the out-of-court path offers an elegant alternative to the rigid, costly, and public nature of bankruptcy.

When facing the inevitability of closure, discretion, control, and efficiency matter. Out-of-court wind-downs provide all three.



Consider engaging experienced advisors to evaluate whether this approach is right for your situation—and to guide the process toward a dignified, value-maximizing conclusion.

## About the Author

[Michael E. Jacoby](#), CTP, is a Senior Managing Director and the [Strategic Advisory Practice](#) Lead at J.S. Held. He joined J.S. Held in October of 2023 as part of J.S. Held's acquisition of [Phoenix Management Services](#). Michael is a skilled executive with extensive operating, turnaround, restructuring, and M&A experience. He has served in advisory capacities as well as an independent director, Chief Restructuring Officer (CRO), and interim manager for more than 400 Phoenix Management Services clients in various industries.

Michael has been instrumental in assisting numerous clients with their financing and divestiture needs. His areas of expertise include crisis management, business strategy, cash flow management, control, and forecasting, workflow and project management, business wind-downs, customer service improvement, inventory management, business and collateral valuations, and sales/marketing reinvigoration.

Michael can be reached at [michael.jacoby@jsheld.com](mailto:michael.jacoby@jsheld.com) or +1 610 888 9704.



This publication is for educational and general information purposes only. It may contain errors and is provided as is. It is not intended as specific advice, legal, or otherwise. Opinions and views are not necessarily those of J.S. Held or its affiliates and it should not be presumed that J.S. Held subscribes to any particular method, interpretation, or analysis merely because it appears in this publication. We disclaim any representation and/or warranty regarding the accuracy, timeliness, quality, or applicability of any of the contents. You should not act, or fail to act, in reliance on this publication and we disclaim all liability in respect to such actions or failure to act. We assume no responsibility for information contained in this publication and disclaim all liability and damages in respect to such information. This publication is not a substitute for competent legal advice. The content herein may be updated or otherwise modified without notice.

J.S. Held, its affiliates and subsidiaries are not certified public accounting firm(s) and do not provide audit, attest, or any other public accounting services. J.S. Held is not a law firm and does not provide legal advice. Securities offered through PM Securities, LLC, d/b/a Phoenix IB or Ocean Tomo Investments, a part of J.S. Held, member FINRA/SIPC. All rights reserved.