

This matter came before the court on June 21, 2006, at the hour of 2:30 p.m., for hearing 1 on confirmation of the First Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization for Bjurob, L.L.C., NCD, 2 Inc. and Bjurlin Associates II, Inc. dated May 12, 2006 (the "Joint Plan"). Proponent Mark A. 3 Roberts, as Chapter 11 Trustee (the "Trustee") for the estates of Bjurob, LLC ("Bjurob"), NCD, 4 Inc. ("NCD") and Bjurlin Associates II, Inc. ("BAII") appeared through counsel S. Cary 5 Forrester. Other appearances are as noted on the record. Based upon the arguments and 6 representations of counsel and the evidence adduced at the hearing, together with the entire 7 record before the court, and good cause appearing therefor, 8

9

THE COURT HEREBY MAKES THE FOLLOWING FLEDDINGS OF FACT:

Pursuant to the court's order of May 17, 2006 (the "Qrder") and Bankruptcy Rule 10 A. 3017(d), the Order, Joint Plan, First Amended Joint Disclosure Statement (the "Disclosure 11 12 Statement"), and a form of Ballot were timely served upon all creditors, equity security holders and parties in interest (with the exception noted below) and the United States Trustee, as 13 evidenced by the Certificate of Service filed on May 19, 2006 (Dkt. No. 424) and the Amended 14 15 Certificate of Service filed on June 2, 2006 (Dkt. No. 434);

B. 16 Twenty-eight parties were inadvertently omitted from the foregoing mailings. When the oversight was discovered, copies of the Order, Joint Plan, Disclosure Statement, and a 17 form of Ballot were mailed to these parties on June 7, 2006, with an explanatory letter. The 18 19 Trustee then filed a motion to shorten the notice period for these twenty-eight parties from 20twenty-five days) to fourteen days, pursuant to Bankruptcy Rules 2002 and 9006(c), which the court granted at the confirmation hearing; 21

With the exception of the twenty-eight parties noted above, written objections to 22 the Joint Plan were required to be filed on or before June 14, 2006, with copies served upon counsel for the Trustee. As to the twenty-eight parties noted above, written objections were <u>8</u>4 25 required to be filed on or before June 20, 2006. Two objections were filed, one by Washington County Bank ("WCB") and one by the Arizona Department of Revenue ("ADOR"). WCB's objection was withdrawn at the confirmation hearing and ADOR's objection was resolved through the stipulated confirmation order;

3 4

5

6

1

2

D. Voting on the Joint Plan by creditors and parties in interest is summarized in the report on balloting filed on June 15, 2006 (Dkt. No. 438) and the supplemental report on balloting filed on June 21, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference;

7E.The Joint Plan has been accepted by all creditors and equity security holders8whose acceptances are required by law;

9 F. With the exception of the Class 13 Secured Claim of Washington County Bank,
10 each impaired class of claims has accepted the Joint Plan,

G. Each holder of a claim or interest has accepted the Joint Plan or will receive or retain under the Joint Plan property of a value, as of the Effective Date of the Joint Plan, that is not less than the amount such holder would receive or retain if the Debtors were liquidated under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code on such date;

H. As to the holders of secured claims, the Joint Plan provides that they will retain
their liens to the extent of their allowed secured claims and receive on account of their claims
deferred cash payments totaling at least the amount of their allowed secured claims, as of the
Effective Date;

19 I. The Joint Plan does not discriminate unfairly and is fair and equitable with 20 respect to each class of claims and interests that is impaired under the Joint Plan and has not 21 accepted it;

J. All payments made or promised by the Debtors and/or the Trustee for services, costs or expenses in or in connection with these cases, or in connection with the Joint Plan and incident to these cases, have been fully disclosed and approved or, if to be fixed after confirmation of the Joint Plan, will be subject to the approval of the court; K. The continued employment of Chapter 11 Trustee Mark A. Roberts and his
professionals after confirmation of the Joint Plan to provide the services specified in the Joint
Plan is equitable and consistent with the interests of creditors and equity security holders, and
with public policy;

L. The employment of Christopher Bjurlin as CEO of NCD and BAII and as manager of Bjurob after confirmation of the Joint Plan is equitable and consistent with the interests of creditors and equity security holders, and with public policy:

8 M. The employment of Laurence Luke as Plan Administrator commencing on the 9 Effective Date, and as Disbursing Agent commencing twelve months after the Effective Date, is 10 equitable and consistent with the interests of creditors and equity security holders and with 11 public policy;

- N. The Joint Plan is feasible, and confirmation is not likely to be followed by
 liquidation or by the further reorganization of the Debtors;
- 14 O. The principal purpose of the Joint Plan is not the avoidance of taxes or the 15 avoidance of the application of section 5 of the Securities Act of 1933;
- P. All fees payable under 28 U.S.C. § 1930 have been paid, or the Joint Plan
 provides for their payment on the Effective pare;

Q. The Joint Plan provides for the payment, on the Effective Date, of all administrative and priority claims and expenses, except as the holders of such claims and expenses may have otherwise agreed; and,

21
 21
 22
 22
 23
 24
 25
 27
 28
 29
 21
 21
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 22
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 24
 25
 26
 27
 27
 28
 29
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 27
 28
 29
 29
 20
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 21
 2

25

1 2 3

4

5

6

THE COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

1. The classification of claims and interests in the Joint Plan is proper, complies with applicable law, and satisfies the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code, including, but not limited to, 11 U.S.C. §§ 1122 and 1123.

2. The Joint Plan complies with the applicable requirements of the Bankruptcy Code including, without limitation, 11 U.S.C. §§ 1122, 1123 and 1129.

7
8
8
8 the best interests of creditors and the estates;

9 4. The notice provided to creditors and interested parties in regard to approval of the
 10 Disclosure Statement and confirmation of the Joint Plan was adequate under the circumstances
 11 and satisfies the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code and Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure,
 12 including, without limitation, Rules 2002(b) and 3017.

The proponent of the Joint Rlan has complied with the provisions of the
 Bankruptcy Code and the Joint Plan has been proposed in good faith and not by any means
 forbidden by law.

All members of classes designated as unimpaired in the Joint Plan are
 conclusively presumed to have accepted the Joint Plan, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1126(f).

7. With the exception of the Class 13 Secured Claim of Washington County Bank,
 all classes designated as impaired in the Joint Plan have accepted the Joint Plan. As to the non accepting impaired class, the Joint Plan provides that the sole member of such class will retain
 its lien to the extent of its allowed secured claim and receive on account of such claim deferred
 cash payments totaling at least the amount of its allowed secured claim, as of the Effective Date.
 To the extent that any provision designated herein as a finding of fact should properly be
 characterized as a conclusion of law, it is adopted as such. To the extent that any provision

