



and suggested amendments to it, which were incorporated by the Debtor before its submission to the court. Moreover, recognizing that the time to comment was short, the Debtor assured CMHC that if additional errors were found, the parties could submit an amended order by consent. CMHC did, indeed, find additional errors, and an amended sale order was entered on August 21, 2015 (DE #313) by consent of the parties.

CMHC also argues that certain findings of fact and conclusions of law contained within the Sale Order are unsupported by the record and must be removed. I disagree. After reviewing the record, including the August 19, 2015 recording of the hearing, I conclude that all findings and conclusions were adequately supported by evidence presented at trial and reasonable inferences therefrom. The process by which the sale occurred was admittedly truncated but all parties, including CMHC, agreed to the process and had the opportunity to challenge the introduction of evidence and to present countervailing evidence.

A separate order shall enter.

Dated: December 14, 2015

/s/ Peter G. Cary \_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Peter G. Cary  
Judge, U.S. Bankruptcy Court  
District of Maine