

1 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
2 FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

3 August Term, 2002

4 (Argued: December 4, 2031) (Decided: December 20, 2002)

5 Docket #Jo. 01-5048

6 -----  
7  
8 In re: LAURA STOLTZ,

9 Debtor.

10 -----  
11 LAURA STOLTZ,

12 Debtor-Appellee,

13 v.

14 BRATTLEBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY,

15 Creditor-Appellant,

16 UNITED STATES TRUSTEE and RAYMOND J. OBUCHOWSKI, Chapter 7  
17 Trustee,

18 Trustees

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 BEFORE: WALKER, Chief Judge, NEWMAN and F.I. PARKER, Circuit  
21 Judges.

22 Appeal from the judgment of the United States District Court  
23 for the District of Vermont (J. Garvan Murtha, Chief Judge)  
24 entered February 14, 2001, reversing the judgment of the United  
25 States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Vermont (Colleen A.  
26 Brown, Judge) entered September 18, 2000, which had granted  
27 creditor-appellant Brattleboro Housing Authority's motion for

1 relief from automatic stay. The district court reversed on the  
2 ground that 11 U.S.C. § 525(a) of the Bankruptcy Code precludes a  
3 public housing authority from evicting a debtor-tenant from  
4 public housing based on her nonpayment of discharged, prepetition  
5 rent.

6 AFFIRMED.

7 Chief Judge Walker dissents in a separate opinion.

8 GEOFFRY WALSH, Vermont Legal Aid,  
9 Springfield, Vermont, for Appellee.

10 REBECCA A. RICE, Cohen & Rice, Rutland,  
11 Vermont, for Aouellant.

12 JONATHAN H. LEVY, Department of Justice,  
13 Washington, D.C., for Amicus Curiae, United  
14 States of America.

15 F.I. PARKER, Circuit Judge:

16 Creditor-appellant Brattleboro Housing Authority appeals  
17 from the judgment of the United States District Court for the  
18 District of Vermont (J. Garvan Murtha, Chief Judge) entered  
19 February 14, 2001, reversing the judgment of the United States  
20 Bankruptcy Court for the District of Vermont (Colleen A. Brown,  
21 Judge) entered September 18, 2300, which had granted creditor-  
22 appellant Brattleboro Housing Authority's motion for relief from  
23 automatic stay. Granting the motion for relief from automatic  
24 stay permitted Brattleboro Housing Authority to proceed with the  
25 eviction of debtor-appellee Laura Stoltz. The bankruptcy court  
26 narrow y construed 11 U.S.C. § 525(a), the antidiscrimination

1 provision of the Bankruptcy Code that protects debtors from  
2 discrimination by governmental units with regard to certain  
3 grants, concluding that section 525(a) does not protect debtor-  
4 tenants from eviction by public housing authorities for  
5 nonpayment of prepetition rent. By narrowly construing Section  
6 525 (a), the bankruptcy court sidestepped a potential conflict  
7 between section 525(a) and 11 U.S.C. 5 365, the executory  
8 contracts provision of the Bankruptcy Code that equates rejection  
9 of an unexpired lease with prepetition breach of the lease, thus  
10 enabling creditors to pursue state law remedies, including  
11 eviction, for prepetition breach of rejected leases. The  
12 district court reversed and reinstated the automatic stay,  
13 thereby preventing the eviction, on the ground that the  
14 antidiscrimination provision precludes a public housing authority  
15 from evicting a debtor-tenant from public housing based on  
16 nonpayment of discharged, prepetition rent. We agree that the  
17 bankruptcy court construed section 525(a) too narrowly. We are  
18 therefore faced with a conflict between Bankruptcy Code sections  
19 525(a) and 365 reminiscent of Dr. Seuss's intractable North-Going  
20 and South-Going Zax.

21 And it happened that both of them came to a place.  
22 Where they bumped. There they stood.  
23 Foot to foot. Face to face.

24 Dr. Seuss, The Sneetches and Other Stories 26 (1961, renewed  
25 1989). For the reasons set forth herein, we conclude that

1 section 525(a) controls over section 365 and precludes the  
2 Brattleboro Housing Authority from evicting debtor-appellee Laura  
3 stoltz. We therefore affirm the judgment of the district court.

4 I. BACKGROUND

5 Debtor-appellee Laura Stoltz ("Stoltz") and her three  
6 dependants have resided since 1993 in a Brattleboro, Vermont  
7 apartment that is part of a government subsidized housing  
8 development owned and managed by the Brattleboro Housing  
9 Authority ("BHA") . The most recent lease agreement between  
10 Stoltz and BHA was executed on August 1, 1996. The month-to-  
11 month lease stipulated a rent of \$560.00 per month, payment of  
12 which on the first of each month would trigger automatic renewal  
13 of the lease, so long as Stoltz also complied with the enumerated  
14 tenant duties.

15 The tenant-landlord relationship between Stoltz and BHA was  
16 subsequently strained due to Stoltz's occasional failure to make  
17 monthly rent payments during times of financial hardship. In  
18 1997, Stoltz failed to pay rent for July and August. As a  
19 result, BHA notified Stoltz on August 1, 1997, that it would  
20 terminate the lease on September 1, 1997, if she failed to redeem  
21 and reinstate the lease by then.

22 BHA commenced an eviction proceeding against Stoltz in  
23 Windham County Superior Court in October 1997. On December 18,  
24 1997, the superior court granted judgment to BHA in the amount of

1       \$4,838.73 and awarded BHA possession of the apartment. The  
2       superior court's judgment was entered on December 23, 1997, by  
3       order indicating that a writ of possession would issue on  
4       December 31, 1997. Stoltz filed a Chapter 13 bankruptcy petition  
5       and reorganization plan on December 26, 1997. Stoltz's  
6       bankruptcy filing triggered an automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. s  
7       362(a), staying the issuance of the writ of possession.

8             In her reorganization plan, Stoltz proposed to cure her  
9       default by paying all backrent and to assume the lease. BHA  
10      opposed Stoltz's motion to assume the lease and moved for relief  
11      from the automatic stay. The bankruptcy court issued an order on  
12      June 3, 1998, denying Stoltz's motion to assume the lease and  
13      granting BHA's motion for relief from stay. The bankruptcy court  
14      concluded that Stoltz's lease had expired according to its own  
15      terms upon Stoltz's failure to make the 1997 rent payments, a  
16      conclusion that required the denial of Stoltz's motion to assume  
17      the lease, as only unexpired leases may be assumed by Chapter 13  
18      debtors. 11 U.S.C. 5 365(a) (2331). The bankruptcy court lifted  
19      the automatic stay on the grounds that Stoltz had no equity in  
20      the apartment and the apartment was not necessary to an effective  
21      reorganization. The bankruptcy court also denied confirmation of  
22      the reorganization plan, as its sole purpose was the assumption  
23      of the lease.

24             On appeal by Stoltz, the district court concluded that

1 Stoltz's lease had not expired under Vermont state law because  
2 the writ of possession had not issued. Because Stoltz therefore  
3 retained a possessory interest in the lease, the district court  
4 reversed the bankruptcy court's denial of Stoltz's motion to  
5 assume the lease, to the extent it was based on the erroneous  
6 conclusion that the lease had expired prepetition. The district  
7 court remanded the case to the bankruptcy court for determination  
8 of whether Stoltz's motion to assume the lease should nonetheless  
9 be denied on alternative grounds. The district court's judgment  
10 implicitly reversed the bankruptcy court's decision to lift the  
11 automatic stay.

12 BHA appealed to this Court, and the bankruptcy court  
13 postponed its hearing regarding Stoltz's Chapter 13  
14 reorganization plan pending the appeal. By judgment entered on  
15 November 29, 1999, this Court affirmed the district court's  
16 decision, similarly concluding that Stoltz's lease had not  
17 expired under Vermont law. Brattleboro Hous. Auth. v. Stoltz,  
18 (In re Stoltz), 197 F.3d 625, 631 (2d Cir. 1999) ("[U]nder  
19 Vermont law, a debtor who retains a possessory interest in a  
20 residential tenancy has an 'unexpired' lease at least until the  
21 writ of possession is issued.") This Court did not reach the  
22 central issue in this opinion, i.e., the interplay of section  
23 525 (a), the antidiscrimination provision of the Bankruptcy Code  
24 which may, under certain circumstances, prohibit eviction of a

1 debtor-tenant for nonpayment of prepetition rent, and section  
2 365, the executory contract provision of the Bankruptcy Code  
3 which may, under certain circumstances, permit eviction of a  
4 debtor-tenant for nonpayment of prepetition rent.

5 In light of this Court's decision, the bankruptcy court  
6 subsequently accepted Stoltz's Chapter 13 reorganization plan.  
7 Stoltz thereafter made payments of \$1,433.63 toward her past due  
8 rent of approximately \$3,400.33.

9 Stoltz remained current on her rent for the majority of the  
10 two-year period following her Chapter 13 bankruptcy filing, but  
11 she again faltered while experiencing financial difficulties at  
12 the end of 1999. Stoltz did not pay rent in October, November,  
13 and December 1999, or in January 2000. As a result of this  
14 nonpayment of rent, BHA filed a new motion for relief from stay  
15 on January 20, 2000, in order to commence eviction proceedings

16 The bankruptcy court granted Stoltz's request to convert her  
17 Chapter 13 case to a Chapter 7 case in February 2000. By order  
18 dated February 11, 2000, Stoltz's prepetition debts were  
19 discharged with an effective conversion date of February 7, 2000.  
20 The conversion to Chapter 7 mooted Stoltz's motion to assume the  
21 lease.<sup>1</sup> In September 2000, the bankruptcy court granted BHA's

---

1 'Whereas the Bankruptcy Code specifically gives a Chapter 11  
2 debtor the authority to assume an unexpired lease, see 11 U.S.C.  
3 5 1107(a), "there is no corresponding provision in the code for a  
4 chapter 7 debtor." In re Rodall, 165 B.R. 506, 507 (Bankr. M.D.  
(continued...)

1 motion to modify the automatic stay, thereby permitting BHA to  
2 proceed with the eviction proceeding against Stoltz, on the  
3 ground that "11 U.S.C. § 525(a) does not protect the debtor from  
4 eviction where there is a payment default which would otherwise  
5 entitle a non-government landlord to relief from stay." In re  
6 Stoltz, No. 97-11879, 2000 WL 33667824, at \*7 (Bankr. D. Vt.  
Sept. 18, 2000).

8 On appeal by Stoltz, the district court reversed the  
9 bankruptcy court's decision and reinstated the automatic stay,  
10 concluding that section 525 prohibits a public housing authority  
11 from evicting a tenant, even though section 365 requires a debtor  
12 or bankruptcy trustee to cure defaults in order to assume an  
13 unexpired lease. This appeal followed.

---

(. . . continued)

1 Fla. 1994). Under Chapter 7, only the bankruptcy trustee may  
2 exercise the option to assume or reject a lease. See In re  
3 Knight, 211 B.R. 747, 748 (Bankr. D. Or. 1997). Stoltz's public  
4 housing lease was deemed rejected by the trustee by operation of  
5 law under 11 U.S.C. § 365(d) (1). See In re Sheard, 1999 WL  
6 454260, at \*3 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. June 24, 1999) ("[I]n virtually  
8 every Chapter 7 no-asset case the trustee realizes no benefit  
9 from assuming the debtor's residential lease, and thus in  
10 virtually every Chapter 7 no-asset case, the residential lease is  
11 deemed rejected . . ."). A rejected lease is abandoned and no  
12 longer property of the estate. Rejection, however, is not the  
13 same as termination. In re Blackburn, 88 B.R. 273 (Bankr. S.D.  
14 Cal. 1988). A rejected lease is treated as if the debtor  
15 breached it immediately prior to the petition date, 11 U.S.C. §  
16 365 (9), and the parties are generally left with the rights and  
17 remedies available outside of bankruptcy law, Rodail, 165 B.R. at  
508.

1 II. DISCUSSION

2 This appeal presents an internal Bankruptcy Code conflict  
3 that has divided the bankruptcy courts and district courts that  
4 have considered it. Section 525(a), also known as the  
5 antidiscrimination provision of the Code,' provides that a  
6 governmental unit may not discriminate against a person with  
7 respect to certain grants solely because that person, inter alia,  
8 has had a debt discharged under the Bankruptcy Act. Section  
9 365(b) of the executory contracts section of the Code requires a  
10 debtor to cure prepetition defaults as a precondition of assuming  
11 an executory contract. If a Chapter 7 trustee does not assume or  
12 reject an unexpired lease within sixty days of the order for  
13 relief, then the lease is deemed rejected under section  
14 365(d) (1). Upon rejection, the lease is no longer part of the  
15 bankruptcy estate, and the non-debtor party to the contract may  
16 generally pursue state law remedies for breach of contract,

---

1 'Although courts and commentators generally refer to section  
2 525(a) as the antidiscrimination provision, section 525 contains  
3 two additional antidiscrimination provisions, which were added  
4 after the 1978 enactment of section 525(a). Section 525(b),  
5 enacted in 1984, prohibits discrimination against debtors by  
6 private employers. 11 U.S.C. 3 525(b)(1999). Section 525(c),  
7 enacted in 1994, prohibits discrimination against debtor-  
8 borrowers on the basis of discharged, unrepaid loans by  
9 governmental units operating a student loan or grant program. 11  
10 U.S.C. s 525(c) (2001). Section 525(c) signaled congressional  
11 disapproval of Goldrich v. New York State Higher Educ. Servs.  
12 Corp., 771 F.2d 28 (2d Cir. 1985), in which this Court had  
13 narrowly construed section 525(a)'s "other similar grant"  
14 language to not include extensions of credit. Neither section  
15 525(b) nor section 525(c) is implicated by this appeal.

:

1 including eviction for breach of lease. See supra note 1

2 Depending on the breadth attributed to section 525(a), a  
3 conflict between sections 525(a) and 365 may arise in situations,  
4 like Stoltz's, where a debtor seeks to retain an executory  
5 contract or unexpired lease with a governmental unit after having  
6 her debt discharged in bankruptcy, but without curing the related  
7 prepetition defaults. If the public housing grant protected  
\* under section 525(a) includes the public housing lease itself,  
8 or, put another way, includes the debtor-tenant's current right  
9 to participate in the public housing program, then the  
10 antidiscrimination provision is at odds with the executory  
11 contract provision, which would require Stoltz to cure, not  
12 simply have discharged, her debt to BHA as a precondition of  
13 assuming the public housing lease. If, on the other hand,  
14 section 525(a) is construed to only protect the debtor-tenant's  
15 future right to participate in the public housing program, then  
16 there is no conflict between sections 525(a) and 365, and BHA may  
17 proceed with the eviction.  
18

19 A. Standard of Review

20 The rulings of a district court acting as an appellate court  
21 in a bankruptcy case are subject to plenary review. In e  
22 Mazzeo, 167 F.3d 139, 142 (2d Cir. 1999). Accordingly, this  
23 Court reviews the bankruptcy court's conclusions of law de novo  
24 and its findings of fact for clear error. McCord v. Agard, 252

1 F.3d 113, 116 (2d Cir. 2001).

2 B. Development of the Antidiscrimination Provision

3 1. Codification of Perez v. Camobell

4 Section 525(a) evolved from Perez v. Campbell, 402 U.S. 637,  
5 91 s. ct. 1704 (1971), a seminal bankruptcy case in which the  
6 Supreme Court struck down a state statute that withheld driving  
7 privileges from debtors who failed to satisfy motor-vehicle-  
8 related tort judgments against them, even if the judgments were  
9 discharged under bankruptcy law. The Supreme Court used the  
10 Supremacy Clause to invalidate the state statute, finding that it  
11 discriminated against debtors in a manner that frustrated and was  
12 contrary to the fresh start principles of the Bankruptcy Act.  
13 *Id.* at 649-52, 1711-13. Congress thereafter signaled its  
14 approval of the Perez holding by enacting section 525(a), which  
15 prohibits bankruptcy-based discrimination by governmental units  
16 against debtors. Section 525(a) states, in relevant part, that:

17 [A] governmental unit may not deny, revoke, suspend, or  
18 refuse to renew a license, permit, charter, franchise,  
19 or other similar grant to, condition such a grant to,  
20 discriminate with respect to such a grant against, den\  
21 employment to, terminate the employment of, or  
22 discriminate with respect to employment against, a  
23 person that is or has been a debtor under this title or  
24 a bankrupt or a debtor under the Bankruptcy Act, or  
25 another person with whom such bankrupt or debtor has  
26 been associated, solely because such bankrupt or debtor  
27 is or has been a debtor under this title or a bankrupt  
28 or debtor under the Bankruptcy Act, has been insolvent  
29 before the commencement of the case under this title,  
30 or during the case but before the debtor is granted or  
31 denied a discharge, or ~~has not paid a debt~~ that is  
32 dischargeable in the case under this title or ~~that was~~  
33 discharged under the Bankruptcy Act.

1 11 U.S.C. 5 525(a) (2001) (emphasis added). Notably, the text of  
2 Section 525(a) does not limit its scope to the facts presented in  
3 Perez. Section 525(a) applies to any governmental unit, not just  
4 a State agency or department; it covers not only licenses, but  
5 also permits, charters, franchises, and other similar grants; and  
6 it applies regardless of whether the governmental unit involved  
7 is the creditor whom the debtor failed to pay, or is simply a  
8 grantor conditioning a grant on the debtor's satisfaction of a  
9 discharged debt owed to a third party.

10 2. Case Law Development of Section 525(a)

11 In the nearly twenty-four years that have passed since its  
12 enactment, section 525(a) has been interpreted by the courts to  
13 protect debtors from discrimination in a wide variety of  
14 contexts, including a debtor's right to operate a motor vehicle,  
15 see, e.g., In re Adler, 47 B.R. 554 (Bankr. S.D. Fla. 1985)  
16 (holding section 525(a) prohibits enforcement of statute that  
17 allows state department of motor vehicles to suspend licenses and  
18 registrations of judgment debtors, even if motor-vehicle-related  
19 judgments against them were discharged in bankruptcy); ability to  
20 engage in a trade or business, see, e.g., In re Walker, 927 F.2d  
21 1138 (10th Cir. 1991) (finding statute, which automatically  
22 revokes real estate license of any licensee for whom payment was  
23 made from real estate recovery fund, contravenes section 525(a));  
24 and ability to obtain essential goods and services, In re Heath,

1 3 Bankr. 351 (N.D. Ill. 1980) (holding state university's refusal  
2 to release student-debtor's transcript until he paid prepetition  
3 debt in full violated section 525(a)).

4 Despite more than twenty years of judicial consideration,  
5 however, the scope of Section 525(a)'s protection in the context  
6 of public housing is still unsettled. No circuit court has yet  
7 spoken on the issue, and the bankruptcy courts and district  
8 courts that have done so have done so inharmoniously. It is  
9 undisputed that a public housing authority is a governmental unit  
10 within the meaning of 525(a)." See 11 U.S.C. s 101(27); see also  
11 In re Robinson, 169 B.R. 171, 176 (N.D. Ill. 1994), In re  
12 Szvmeccki, 87 B.R. 14, 16 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1988). BHA has  
13 conceded as much in this appeal. Instead, the debate over

---

1 <sup>3</sup>The Bankruptcy Code defines "governmental unit" to include:  
2 "United States; State; Commonwealth; District; Territory;  
3 municipality; foreign state; department, agency, or  
4 instrumentality of the United States (but not a United States  
5 trustee while serving as trustee in a case under this title), a  
6 State, a Commonwealth, a District, a Territory, a municipality,  
7 or a foreign state; or other foreign or domestic government." 11  
8 U.S.C. 5 101(27).

9 Paragraph 27's legislative history indicates that  
10 "governmental unit" is defined "in the broadest sense. The  
11 definition encompasses the United States, a State, Commonwealth,  
12 District, Territory, municipality, or foreign state, and a  
13 department, agency or instrumentality of any of these entities.  
14 'Department, agency, or instrumentality' does not include an  
15 entity that owes its existence to State action, such as the  
16 granting of a charter or a license but that has no other  
17 connection with a State or local government or the Federal  
18 Government. The relationship must be an active one in which the  
19 department, agency, or instrumentality is actually carrying out  
20 some governmental function." S. Rep. No. 95-989, at 24 (1978),  
21 reprinted in 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5787, 5810; see also H. Rep. No.  
22 95-595, at 311 (1977), reprinted in 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5963, 6268.

1 section 525(a) in the public housing context has centered on (1)  
2 the precise contours of the "other similar grant" <sup>U</sup> at stake,  
3 compare Johnson v. Chester Hous. Auth. (In re Johnson), 250 B.R.  
4 521, 530 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2009) (determining that the "other  
5 similar grant[]" protected by section 525(a) was the public  
6 housing tenant's inseparable rights to lease a residence and to  
7 be charged rent reductions established for public housing  
8 residents), and In re Curry, 148 B.R. 966, 972 (Bankr. S.D. Fla.  
9 1992) (finding eviction would violate section 525(a) because it  
10 would revoke the governmental grant of a rent subsidy), with In  
11 re Bacon, 212 B.R. 66, 74-75 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1997) (finding  
12 eviction permissible because section 525(a) protects only debtor-  
13 tenant's future right to participate in public housing program),  
14 and (2) whether a public housing authority in this situation  
15 seeks to evict the public housing tenant "solely because" of the  
16 discharge of prepetition defaults, compare Robinson v. Chicago  
17 Hous. Auth. (In re Robinson), 169 B.R. 171, 176 (Bankr. N.D. 111.  
18 1994) (distinguishing between eviction solely because debtor-  
19 tenant failed to pay dischargeable debt and eviction because  
20 debtor-tenant stopped paying rent), and Hous. Auth. of Pittsburgh  
21 v. James (In re James), 198 B.R. 885, 888 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1996)  
22 (distinguishing between eviction solely because of the failure to  
23 pay dischargeable debt and eviction (1) because the lease is no  
24 longer in effect because it was deemed rejected, (2) because of  
25 housing authority's duty to taxpayers to ensure that tenants pay

1 rent, and (3) because of housing authority's obligation to other  
2 applicants to make housing available to them), with Bacon, 212  
3 B.R. 66, 75 (disagreeing with "[t]he illusory distinction between  
4 seeking eviction for not paying a dischargeable debt as opposed  
5 to eviction for stopping the payment of rent").

6 C. The Public Housing Grant Protected Under Section 525(a)

7 In addition to its concession that it falls within section  
8 525(a)'s definition of a "governmental unit," BHA also concedes  
9 that Stoltz's prepetition defaults have been discharged, and that  
10 it may not discriminate against Stoltz with regard to a section  
11 525(a) grant because of her prepetition defaults. Nonetheless,  
12 BHA argues that the eviction it seeks is not proscribed by  
13 section 525(a) because a public housing lease is not an "other  
14 similar grant[]" within the meaning of section 525(a). BHA  
15 appears to argue that a public housing tenant's future right to  
16 participate in the public housing program is the only protected  
17 public housing grant under section 525(a). In this scenario,  
18 Stoltz's protected public housing grant would not be disturbed by  
19 eviction because eviction would not limit her right to  
20 participate in the public housing program in the future. If this  
21 line of thinking were correct, section 525(a) would prohibit BHA  
22 only from denying Stoltz, upon reapplication, a future lease  
23 because of her prepetition defaults.

24 We reject this artificially narrow construction of section  
25 525(a) because the plain language of the provision indicates that

1 eviction would revoke a protected grant, i.e., the lease, in  
2 violation of section 525(a). "[W]e begin [statutory  
3 interpretation] with the understanding that Congress says in a  
4 statute what it means and means in a statute what it says."  
5 Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Union Planters Bank, 530 U.S.  
6 1, 6, 120 s. ct. 1942, 1947 (2330) (internal quotation marks and  
7 citation omitted). "The plain meaning of legislation should be  
8 conclusive, except in the rare cases in which the literal  
9 application of a statute will produce a result demonstrably at  
10 odds with the intentions of its drafters." United States v. Ron  
11 Pair Enter., 489 U.S. 235, 242, 109 S. Ct. 1026, 1031 (1989)  
12 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

13 The text of section 525(a) states that it protects a  
14 debtor's interest in a "license, permit, charter, franchise, or  
15 other similar grant" provided by a governmental unit. The term  
16 "other similar grant" is not defined by the code.' In common  
17 parlance, a grant is "a transfer of property by deed or writing."  
ia Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 507 (10th ed. 2000). As  
19 a legal term, a grant is "[a]n agreement that creates a right of

---

1 <sup>4</sup>The omission of a statutory definition for the term "other  
2 similar grant" is unsurprising in light of the antidiscrimination  
3 provision's legislative history, which indicates that "... the  
4 section is not exhaustive. The enumeration of various forms of  
5 discrimination against former bankrupts is not intended to permit  
6 other forms of discrimination . . ." and delegates to the judiciary  
7 the responsibility "to mark the contours of the anti-  
8 discrimination provision in pursuit of sound bankruptcy policy."  
9 H. Rep. No. 95-595, at 366-67 (1977), reprinted in 1978  
10 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5787, 6323.

1 any description other than the one held by the grantor. Examples  
2 include leases, easements, charges, patents, franchises, powers,  
3 and licenses." Black's Law Dictionary 707 (7th ed. 1999)  
4 (emphasis added). Similarly, a lease is "[a] contract by which a  
5 rightful possessor of real property conveys the right to use and  
6 occupy that property in exchange for consideration." Id. at 898.  
7 Thus, a public housing lease is a grant by which a public housing  
8 authority conveys to a public housing tenant the right to use and  
9 occupy public housing in exchange for rent. The only question  
10 that remains is whether a public housing lease is a grant  
11 "similar" to a -license, permit, charter, [or] franchise."

12 The common qualities of the property interests protected  
13 under section 525(a), i.e., "license[s], permit[s], charter[s],  
14 franchise[s], and other similar grants," are that these property  
15 interests are unobtainable from the private sector and essential  
16 to a debtor's fresh start. For instance, a real estate license,  
17 state university transcript, or driver's license may only be  
18 obtained from a particular governmental unit. A debtor who  
19 cannot obtain her real estate license will be unable to pursue  
20 her chosen profession; a debtor who cannot obtain his transcript  
21 will be unable to apply for certain jobs or further schooling; a  
22 debtor who cannot obtain a driver's license will be unable to  
23 commute to many jobs or school.

24 Public housing leases, too, are property interests  
25 unobtainable from the private sector and essential to a debtor's

1 fresh start. Public housing leases are, by definition,  
2 obtainable only from governmental entities.' Furthermore, a  
3 public housing lease is essential to a debtor's fresh start. An  
4 individual qualifies for public housing because he or she cannot  
5 afford housing at prevailing market rates. In light of the  
6 notoriously lengthy waiting lists that may exist for public  
7 housing, see, e.g., Housing Auth. Of Pittsburgh v. Collins (In re  
a Collins), 199 B.R. 561, 568 n.13 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1996), an  
9 evicted debtor-tenant, along with any dependants, would quite  
10 possibly become homeless - a status not conducive to economic  
11 survival. A debtor-tenant's future right to participate in  
12 public housing programs - on a space available basis - would  
13 therefore be of little or no practical value upon eviction. A  
14 debtor-tenant's "entire economic status [therefore] is dependent  
15 on" his or her current public housing lease, In re Dav, 238 B.R.  
16 358, 367 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1997), which is his or her "single most  
17 significant material possession," In re Whitsett, 163 B.R. 752,  
18 755 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1994). Eviction-induced homelessness would  
19 "seriously affect the debtors' livelihood [and] fresh start." H.  
20 Rep. No. 95-595, at 367 (1977), reprinted in 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N.  
21 5963, 6268. Conversely, preventing homelessness promotes the

---

1 'Section 8 leases, on the other hand, arguably do not fall  
2 within the protection of section 525(a) because they are  
3 government-subsidized leases for privately owned housing units  
4 between a qualifying tenant and a private landlord. See In re  
5 Rosemond, 105 B.R. 8, 9 (W.D. Pa. 1989).

1 Code's fresh start policy by helping debtors maintain steady  
2 employment and self-sufficiency.

3 BHA urges us to follow, as did the bankruptcy court below,  
4 the reasoning of In re Bacon, 212 B.R. 66 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2000).  
5 The Bacon analysis bifurcated the public housing authority into  
6 separate creditor and grantor roles, finding that a public  
7 housing authority is constrained by section 525(a) only in its  
a role as a grantor of a public benefit, but remains unconstrained  
9 in its role as a creditor, "so long as [the debtor-creditor  
10 relationship] is not being utilized to deprive the [debtor of a  
11 protected grant." Id. at 75-76. The Bacon court then defined  
12 the protected grant as "the [future] right to participate in  
13 public housing," id. at 15, and it expressly declined to include  
14 the public housing lease itself in its definition of the  
15 protected grant, id. at 75, n.17. Bacon then concluded that a  
16 public housing authority, in its creditor role, may evict a  
17 debtor-tenant for nonpayment of discharged, prepetition rent  
la because such eviction would not deprive the debtor of his or her  
19 future right to participate in the public housing program, even  
20 though it would result in "temporary loss of a public housing  
21 unit for the Debtor as she awaits the assignment of a new unit."  
22 Id. at 76. Thus, Bacon's holding results in a strained temporal  
23 separation of the public housing grant into a current,  
24 unprotected right to participate in public housing and a future,  
25 protected right to participate in public housing.

1           We see two serious errors with this approach. First, the  
2           Bacon court's interpretation of section 525(a)'s protected grant  
3           in the public housing context is not based on the text of section  
4           525(a). Bacon constructed its interpretation of a protected  
5           public housing grant based on its belief that it need not  
6           preserve the debtor-tenant's right to fully participate in the  
7           government program, but instead need only preserve the debtor-  
8           tenant's right to participate in the public housing program to  
9           some degree. Bacon, 212 B.R. at 75, n.17. Nothing in section  
10          525(a)'s text or legislative history, however, indicates that the  
11          protected grant should be defined as anything less than the grant  
12          in its entirety, let alone as the debtor's smallest discernable  
13          interest in the benefit at issue.

14          Second, the text of section 525(a) expressly proscribes  
15          revocation and suspension of a protected grant, not just denial  
16          of or refusal to renew a grant upon application. Because  
17          eviction results in revocation of the debtor-tenant's current  
18          participation in the public housing program, eviction revokes the  
19          protected grant in violation of 525(a). Permitting the debtor  
20          only to reapply to receive future housing benefits does not  
21          ameliorate the discriminatory revocation of the debtor-tenant's  
22          protected public housing lease.

23          Beyond its incompatibility with the text of section 525(a),  
24          Bacon's holding is also problematic because it does not comport  
25          with the congressional intent underlying section 525. Section

1 525(a) was enacted to protect debtors from bankruptcy-based  
2 discrimination by governmental units that provide essential  
3 services. Yet, Bacon's holding would effectively protect the  
4 debtor's interest in essential services only where the  
5 governmental unit is a non-creditor. Where the governmental unit  
6 is a grantor and a creditor - that is, where the governmental  
7 unit is even more involved, and private actors are not involved -  
8 the debtor would effectively receive no protection from section  
9 525(a) against the governmental unit's bankruptcy-based  
10 discrimination. This incongruous result cannot be what Congress  
11 intended.

12 D. Whether Eviction is "[Solely [Because] of Discharged  
13 Prepetition Rent

14 Alternatively, BHA focuses on section 525(a)'s "solely  
15 because" language and argues that it desires to evict Stoltz only  
16 because she breached her public housing lease, not because she  
17 failed to pay prepetition rent that was discharged in bankruptcy.  
18 This unpersuasive argument is premised on an "illusory  
19 distinction" between the breach of the lease and the nonpayment  
20 of the discharged prepetition rent. Bacon, 212 B.R. at 75. The  
21 breach is not an additional basis for eviction beyond that  
22 prohibited by section 525(a); it is the very basis for  
23 discrimination prohibited by 525(a). Had Stoltz breached the  
24 lease by failing to comply with an enumerated tenant duty other  
25 than the duty to pay prepetition rent, BHA might have a

1 permissible basis for eviction under section 525(a). That  
2 factual scenario is not before us. Stoltz breached the lease  
because she failed to pay prepetition rent, which was later  
4 discharged in bankruptcy. Therefore, saying that BHA desires to  
5 evict Stoltz for breach of the lease is the equivalent of saying  
6 BHA desires to evict her "solely because . . . [she] has not paid  
7 a debt that was discharged under the Bankruptcy Act." 11 U.S.C.  
8 525(a) (2001). Evicting Stoltz under these circumstances would  
9 constitute discrimination against her in violation of section  
10 525(a).

11 Because we have discerned from the plain text of section  
12 525(a) that a public housing lease, and therefore the debtor-  
13 tenant's current right to participate in the public housing  
14 program, is a protected grant, it is unnecessary to delve into  
15 section 525(a)'s legislative history. We note briefly, however,  
16 that the legislative history fully supports our interpretation of  
17 "other similar grants" as inclusive of public housing leases."

---

1 "The legislative history specifically rejects a narrow  
2 construction of the antidiscrimination provision and makes clear  
3 that 525(a) protects the debtor's fresh start.

4 [Section [525(a)] is not exhaustive. The enumeration of  
5 various forms of discrimination against former bankrupts is  
6 not intended to permit other forms of discrimination. The  
7 courts have been developing the Perez rule. This section  
8 permits further development to prohibit actions by  
9 governmental or quasi-governmental organizations that  
10 perform licensing functions, such as a state bar  
11 association or a medical society, or by other organizations  
12 that can seriously affect the debtors' livelihood or fresh  
(continued...)

1 E. Resolving the Conflict Between Sections 525(a) and 365

2 Because section 525(a) protects debtor-tenants like Stoltz  
3 from eviction for nonpayment of discharged prepetition rent,  
4 section 525(a) conflicts with section 365. The bankruptcy  
5 trustee did not assume the lease under section 365(b) (1);  
6 accordingly, Stoltz's public housing lease has been deemed  
7 rejected under section 365(d) (1), thus permitting BHA to pursue  
8 state law remedies on the ground that Stoltz breached the lease  
9 prepetition, see section 365(g).' Sections 525(a) and 365

---

1 (...continued)

2 start, such as exclusion from a union on the basis of  
3 discharge of a debt to the union's credit union. The  
4 effect of the section, and of further interpretations of  
5 the Perez rule, is to strengthen the anti-reaffirmation  
6 policy found in section 524(b). Discrimination based solely  
7 on nonpayment could encourage reaffirmations, contrary to  
8 the expressed policy.

8 H. Rep. No. 95-595, at 367 (1977), reprinted in 1978  
9 U.S.C.C.A.N. 5787, 6323.

1 'Section 365(b) (1) states, in relevant part, that:

2 If there has been a default in an . . . unexpired lease  
3 of the debtor, the trustee may not assume such . . .  
4 lease unless, at the time of assumption of such . . .  
5 lease, the trustee - (A) cures, or provides adequate  
6 assurance that the trustee will promptly cure, such  
7 default; (B) compensates, or provides adequate  
8 assurance that the trustee will promptly compensate, a  
9 party other than the debtor to such . . . lease, for  
10 any actual pecuniary loss to such party resulting from  
11 such default; and (C) provides adequate assurance of  
12 future performance under such . . . lease.

13 11 U.S.C. §3 365(b) (1) (A)-(C). Section 365(d) (1) states, in  
14 relevant part, that:

(continued...)

1 therefore cannot simultaneously be given their full effect. If  
2 we protect Stoltz from bankruptcy-based discrimination under  
3 section 525(a), we cannot allow BHA to evict her. If we do not  
4 allow BHA to evict Stoltz, however, then we cannot enforce the  
5 executory contract assumption requirements or the implications of  
6 rejection under section 365. Thus, we face a conflict between  
7 sections 525(a) and 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. Unlike the Zax  
8 in the prairie of Prax, however, these important Bankruptcy Code  
9 provisions cannot be left in conflict, unbudged in their tracks.

10 1. Specificity Analysis

11 Many courts have resolved this impasse by concluding that  
12 either section 525(a) or section 365<sup>a</sup> is the more specific

---

(. . . continued)

1 In a case under chapter 7 of this title, if the trustee  
2 does not assume or reject an . . . unexpired lease of  
3 residential real property . . . of the debtor within 60  
4 days after the order for relief, . . . then such . . .  
5 lease is deemed rejected.

6 11 U.S.C. S 365(d)(1). Section 365(g) (1) states, in relevant  
7 part, that:

8 [R]ejection of an . . . unexpired lease of the debtor  
9 constitutes a breach of such . . . lease . . .  
10 immediately before the date of the filing of the  
11 petition . . . .

12 11 U.S.C. §3 365(g) (1).

1 "Some courts argue that section 365(b)(1), which sets forth  
2 the requirements for assumption of an unexpired lease, is more  
3 specific than section 525(a). Others refer to 365(d) (1), which  
4 states that an unexpired lease that has not been assumed or  
5 rejected by the bankruptcy estate within sixty days of the  
6 bankruptcy filing will be deemed rejected, as the more specific

(continued...)

1 provision and therefore trumps the other, more general provision.  
2 Compare Curry, 148 B.R. at 972 (finding section 525(a) more  
3 specific than section 365(b) (1) (A) because section 525(a)  
4 addresses a specific type of creditor and creditor behavior),  
5 with In re Collins, 199 B.R. 561, 567 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1996)  
6 (finding section 365 more specific than section 525(a) because  
7 section 365 is "about as specific as it can be about what it  
8 takes to assume a lease and section 525(a) does not even mention  
9 leases"), In re James, 198 B.R. 885, 890 (Bankr. W.D. Pa. 1996)  
10 (same), In re Caldwell, 174 B.R. 650, 654 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 1994)  
11 (same). The bankruptcy court in this case, for instance, ruled  
12 that "the more specific language of §? 365(d)(1) must be read to  
13 trump the general provisions of 5 525(a)." The district court  
14 determined that section 525(a) is more specific, even though  
15 "'specificity' is not easily measured, because Congress acted to  
16 codify a judicial holding that addressed a specific set of facts  
17 and because it fashioned the provision to compel only  
18 'governmental units' to take measures to prevent interference  
19 with a debtor's fresh start." stoltz, 259 B.R. at 260-61.

20 It is a "basic principle of statutory construction that a  
21 specific statute . . . controls over a general provision," HCSC-  
22 Laundry v. United States, 450 U.S. 1, 6, 101 S. Ct. 836, 839  
23 (1981). Based on the text alone, without regard to each

---

1 "(...continued)  
provision. We consider both sections, alone and in combination.

1 provision's meaning, section 365's claim to greater specificity,  
2 based on the invocation of the more specific word "lease" instead  
3 of the more general term "grant," seems no more compelling than  
4 section 525(a)'s claim to greater specificity, based on its use  
5 of the specific term "governmental unit," as compared to section  
6 365's failure to discuss the public or private status of the  
7 grantor. Focusing on the meaning of sections 525(a) and 365 in  
8 the housing context, however, makes plain that section 525(a) is  
9 the more specific provision. As discussed above, section 365  
10 indicates that landlords (in general) may evict debtor-tenants  
11 for nonpayment of discharged prepetition rent. Section 525(a),  
12 on the other hand, specifically prohibits landlords who are also  
13 governmental units from evicting debtor-tenants solely because of  
14 nonpayment of discharged prepetition rent. Thus, these two  
15 sections dictate precisely opposite outcomes - except that  
16 section 365 applies to all landlords, whereas section 525(a)  
17 applies only to landlords which are also governmental units.  
18 Coupled with the district court's persuasive reasoning, our  
19 specificity analysis convinces us that section 525(a) is the more  
20 specific provision."

---

1 'In its amicus curiae brief, the United States contends that  
2 section 525(a) should be construed narrowly to avoid  
3 "undermin[ing] . . . important housing statutes" that provide for  
4 eviction of public housing tenants for nonpayment of rent.  
5 Section 525(a) specifically exempts three federal statutes from  
6 its scope, and no federal housing statutes are among them. If,  
7 as amicus curiae suggests, Congress clearly intended for these

(continued...)

2. Sound Bankruptcy Policy

Our determination that section 525(a) should control on the basis of specificity is supported by sound public policy and the overarching goals of the Bankruptcy Code. The Code seeks to give debtors like Stoltz a fresh start.- "Congress made it a central purpose of the bankruptcy code to give debtors a fresh start in life and a clear field for future effort unburdened by the existence of old debts." In re Boadanovich, 292 F.3d 104, 107 (2d Cir. 2002). Similarly, section 525(a) was enacted to ensure that governmental units do not deprive debtors of grants that are essential to a debtor's fresh start. "This section permits further development [of the Perez rule] to prohibit actions by governmental or quasi-governmental organizations . . . that can seriously affect the debtors' livelihood or fresh start . . . ." H. Rep. No. 95-595, at 367 (1977), reprinted in 1978 U.S.C.C.A.N.. 5963, 6268. As already discussed, Stoltz's fresh start would be thwarted if we were to permit BHA to evict her on the basis of nonpayment of debts discharged in bankruptcy.

Of course, creditors also receive protection from the Bankruptcy Code. In order to assume an unexpired lease, the executory contract provision requires the bankruptcy trustee to cure defaults, 11 U.S.C. 5 365(b)(1) (A), compensate for losses,

---

'(...continued)

federal housing statutes to trump section 525(a), then Congress could have specifically excluded them in the text of section 525(a).

1 11 U.S.C. § 365(b)(1)(B), and provide adequate assurance, 11  
2 U.S.C. § 365(b) (1) (C), thereby protecting the creditor's  
3 pecuniary interests before requiring a creditor to continue a  
4 contractual relationship with a debtor. If a debtor or trustee  
5 does not assume an unexpired lease under section 365(b)(1), then  
6 the lease is deemed rejected under section 365(d)(1). The  
7 landlord may then pursue state law remedies for breach, so long  
8 as the landlord does not attempt to reaffirm the debt in  
9 violation of section 524.

10 Giving section 525(a) its full effect, however, will only  
11 marginally abbreviate the benefit BHA receives under section 365.  
12 It is undisputed that BHA, as a governmental unit, may not deny  
13 Stoltz a future public housing lease on the basis of the  
14 discharged prepetition rent. The only benefit BHA seeks,  
15 therefore, is eviction. Whether Stoltz remains in her apartment  
16 or is evicted and later readmitted to BHA's public housing, she  
17 is obligated to pay all postpetition rent. Neither Stoltz's  
18 discharge nor section 525(a) diminishes her obligation to pay  
19 postpetition rent, and the Code expressly prohibits Stoltz from  
20 receiving another discharge under bankruptcy for at least six  
21 years. 11 U.S.C. 5 727(a) (8). In the interim, Stoltz may be  
22 evicted if she breaches her lease by postpetition default.

---

1 "Eviction would not run afoul of section 524's  
2 antireaffirmation policy, which prohibits public and private  
3 creditors from seeking to reaffirm prepetition debt discharged in  
4 bankruptcy. 11 U.S.C. § 524.

1 Therefore, all of BHA's creditor-interests are protected,  
2 regardless of whether Stoltz is evicted or not-1<sup>1</sup>

3 Given the serious harm posed to Stoltz's fresh start, and  
4 the minimal benefit BHA would receive, curtailment of BHA's state  
5 law remedy of eviction serves the sound public policy of granting  
6 debtors a fresh start and does the least mischief to the purposes  
7 underlying sections 525(a) and 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. We  
8 therefore conclude that, when sections 365(b) and 525(a) come  
9 "foot to foot" in the public housing context, section 365(b) must  
10 step aside and let section 525(a) pass.

### 11 III. CONCLUSION

12 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the district court's  
13 reversal of the bankruptcy's court's order to lift the automatic  
14 stay. Section 525(a) protects debtor-tenants like Stoltz from  
15 eviction on the basis of nonpayment of discharged prepetition  
16 rent. To the extent sections 525(a) and 365 of the Bankruptcy  
17 Code conflict, the rules of statutory construction and sound  
18 bankruptcy policy dictate that section 525(a) must prevail. BHA  
19 is therefore permanently enjoined from enforcing its judgment for  
20 possession against Stoltz.

21 Accordingly, we AFFIRM the judgment of the district court.

---

1 <sup>1</sup>Perhaps BHA seeks the benefit of the lengthy public  
2 housing waiting lists, a "benefit" not contemplated by the text  
3 of section 365, that would enable it to evict Stoltz and then  
4 deny her public housing for years on the basis of the waiting  
5 list.



1 Docket No. 01-5048

2 JOHN M. WALKER, JR., Chief Judge, dissenting:

3 Because I believe that 11 U.S.C. '3 525(a) of the Bankruptcy  
4 Code does not apply to residential leases and that 11 U.S.C. 5  
5 365 does apply to public housing leases, I respectfully dissent.

6 Like the Majority, I start with the text of s 525(a). "[A]  
7 governmental unit may not deny, revoke, suspend, or refuse to  
8 renew a license, permit, charter, franchise, or other similar  
9 grant . . . solely because" a person is or has been bankrupt. 11  
10 U.S.C. § 525(a). Because a residential lease is not included  
11 among the four enumerated governmental grants to which 5 525  
12 applies, the question is whether a residential lease is a  
13 "\\similar grant."

14 The Majority states that the common quality connecting  
15 "\\license, permit, charter [and] franchise" is "that these  
16 property interests are unobtainable from the private sector and  
17 essential to a debtor's fresh start." Maj. Op., suora, at 17.  
18 But the fact that these interests are unobtainable from the  
19 private sector derives from the fact that § 525(a) is directed to  
20 "government unit[s]" and not to the particular character of  
21 licenses, permits, charters and franchises, as these interests  
22 can also be obtained from the private sector. Nor does the  
23 quality of being "essential to the debtor's fresh start" plainly  
24 derive from "license, permit, charter, [and] franchise."

1 Although some interests such as a vendor license, may be  
2 essential to a bankrupt's fresh start, others, such as a  
3 recreational fishing license, are not. The Majority seems to  
4 have read "similar" out of the statute because its definition of  
5 nsimilar grantll is likely to encompass all possible government  
6 grants to individuals.

7 The specified grants -- license, permit, charter, and  
8 franchise -- share a more definite similarity: Each allows the  
9 grant-holder to engage in certain regulated conduct. The  
10 government grants real estate, drivers, liquor, or medical  
11 licenses; building or emissions permits; bank or corporate  
12 charters; and cable television or electricity distribution  
13 franchises. As the Sixth Circuit recently stated, the common  
14 thread is the "government's role as a gatekeeper in determining  
15 who may pursue certain livelihoods." Toth v. Mich. State Hous.  
16 Auth., 136 F.3d 477, 480 (6th Cir. 1998) (holding that s 525(a)  
17 does not apply to an extension of a home improvement loan).  
18 Thus, I believe that a "similar grant" is a grant relating to  
19 authorization to engage in income-generating conduct. This  
20 interpretation of "similar grant" is supported by the focus on  
21 employment in the remainder of s 525(a) and in s 525(b), each of  
22 which forbids the firing of bankrupt employees. 11 U.S.C. s  
23 525(a) and (b). Because education is often critical to getting a  
24 job, s 525(c)'s prohibition of discrimination against bankrupts

1 in the granting of student loans is also consistent with the goal  
2 of allowing bankrupts to earn a living. 11 U.S.C. § 525(c).

3 Therefore, I read § 525(a) not to apply to a residential  
4 lease. Such leases do not directly enable their holders to  
5 engage in the kind of an income-generating activity as do  
6 licenses, permits, charters, and franchises. This reading finds  
7 additional support from the fact that Congress specifically  
8 refers to leases elsewhere in the Bankruptcy Code, see, e.g., 11  
9 U.S.C. s§!G 363, 365, 929, and 1169, but failed to include leases  
10 among § 525(a)'s enumerated interests.

11 Any lingering uncertainty about this interpretation  
12 evaporates when one considers 5 525(a) in the context of the  
13 entire Bankruptcy Code. "[Elvery part of a statute must be  
14 construed in connection with the whole, so as to make all the  
15 parts harmonize . . . ." Market Co. v. Hoffman, 101 U.S. 112,  
16 116 (1879). In particular, "where possible, provisions of a  
17 statute should be read so as net to create a conflict." La. Pub.  
18 Serv. Comm'n v. FCC, 476 U.S. 355, 370 (1986).

19 Thus, the potential conflict between 5 365 and 5 525(a) is  
20 properly considered when interpreting s 525(a). As the Majority  
21 recognizes, if we read 5 525(a) to apply to residential leases,  
22 it is placed in direct conflict with s 365 of the Bankruptcy  
23 Code. Maj. Op., supra, at [23]. Thus, as a matter of sound  
24 statutory construction, if it is reasonable to construe "similar

1 grants<sup>v</sup> as not including residential leases, that course is  
2 preferable if it will avoid creating a conflict.

3 Finally, construing 5 525(a) to not include leases makes  
4 sense as a matter of public housing policy. It is important to  
5 recognize that Stoltz is not simply asking to be allowed to keep  
6 her lease; she is asking for a preference over other families  
7 waiting for public housing whose need for housing is as great as  
8 hers. Moreover, governments depend on the rent received on  
9 public housing leases to sustain the viability of the entire  
10 program. Congress emphasized the importance of requiring prompt  
11 rental payments from public housing tenants when it conditioned  
12 contributions to public housing agencies on "the establishment of  
13 satisfactory procedures designed to assure the prompt payment and  
14 collection of rents and the prompt processing of evictions in the  
15 case of nonpayment of rent." 42 U.S.C. 5 1437d(c)(4) (B). The  
16 Majority's interpretation will remove the incentive for bankrupt  
17 public housing tenants to assume the lease and cure pre-petition  
18 debts to the public housing authority as is required by 5 365.  
19 See 11 U.S.C. § 365(b) (1) (A). My interpretation will better  
20 enable public housing systems to remain viable through a regime  
21 of prompt rental receipts. Replacing delinquent tenants who have  
22 rejected their lease during bankruptcy with the next needy family  
23 in line will encourage assumption of residential leases during  
24 bankruptcy and enhance the system as a whole.

I respectfully dissent.