

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM  
**2:00-00000**

**Chapter**

**#0.00 All hearings scheduled for today are now simultaneously 1) In person in Courtroom 1539; 2) Via ZoomGov Video; 3) Via ZoomGov Audio. Parties are free to choose any of these options, unless otherwise ordered by the Court. Parties electing to appear in person shall comply with all requirements regarding social distancing, use of face masks, etc. that are in effect at the time of the hearing.**

Parties in interest may connect to the video and audio feeds, free of charge, using the connection information provided below. **MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ONLY CONNECT TO THE AUDIO FEED USING THE TELEPHONE NUMBERS PROVIDED BELOW AND ARE NOT PERMITTED TO CONNECT TO THE VIDEO FEED.**

Individuals may participate by ZoomGov video and audio using a personal computer (equipped with camera, microphone and speaker), or a handheld mobile device (such as an iPhone or Android phone). Individuals may opt to participate by audio only using a telephone (standard telephone charges may apply).

Neither a Zoom nor a ZoomGov account is necessary to participate and no pre-registration is required **but you must still notify Chambers at [Chambers SBluebond@cacb.uscourts.gov](mailto:SBluebond@cacb.uscourts.gov) of your appearance.** The audio portion of each hearing will be recorded electronically by the Court and constitutes its official record.

For more information on appearing before Judge Bluebond by ZoomGov, please see the information on the Court's website at:  
<https://www.cacb.uscourts.gov/judges/honorable-sheri-bluebond> under the tab, **"Phone/Video Appearances."**

**Hearing conducted by ZOOMGov.**

**Video/audio web address: <https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/16161090855>**

**ZoomGov meeting number: 161 6109 0855**

**Password: 148508**

**Telephone conference lines: 1 (669) 254 5252 or 1 (646) 828 7666**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT...**

**Chapter**

(when prompted, enter meeting number and password shown above)

**Judge Bluebond seeks to maintain a courtroom environment (both online and in person) in which all persons are treated with dignity and respect, irrespective of their gender identity, expression or preference. To that end, individuals appearing before the Court are invited to identify their preferred pronouns (e.g., he, she, they, etc.) and their preferred honorific (e.g., Mr., Miss, Ms., Mrs., Mx, M, etc.). Individuals may do so by advising the Courtroom Deputy or Judge prior to any appearance and/or, in the case of remote hearings, by providing this information in the person's screen name in ZoomGov.**

Docket 0

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:15-12721 Damien Stephen Navarro**

**Chapter 7**

**#100.00** Trustees Motion To Approve Compromise With Roman Catholic Archbishop Of Los Angeles

Docket 100

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: GRANTED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Grant motion. Approve compromise and authorize trustee to pay contingency fee to special counsel and co-counsel and out of pocket costs. WAIVE APPEARANCES. Trustee is authorized to upload order consistent with tentative ruling.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Damien Stephen Navarro

Represented By  
Johnny White

**Movant(s):**

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Represented By  
Eric P Israel  
Zev Shechtman

**Trustee(s):**

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Represented By  
Eric P Israel  
Zev Shechtman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:19-13033 Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

**#101.00** Objection to Claim #11 by Claimant JAVIER PEREZ. in the amount of \$ 679,922.26

Docket 54

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Overrule objection on both procedural and substantive grounds.

The relief that movant seeks -- cancellation of Rivera's deed of trust or a declaration that his lien is invalid -- must be sought by adversary proceeding under FRBP 7001(b) (which requires an adversary proceeding "to determine the validity, priority, or extent of a lien or other interest in property") and FRBP 7001(i) (which requires an adversary proceeding to obtain a declaratory judgment related to a type of proceeding described in rules 7001(a) through (h)). A mere objection to claim will not do. See FRBP 3007(b) -- "In objecting to a claim, a party in interest must not include a demand for a type of relief specified in Rule 7001 but may include the objection in an adversary proceeding."

The state court judgment on which movant attempts to rely was reversed on appeal (on standing grounds, because Lilia's chapter 7 trustee was the only party with standing to prosecute the claim on her behalf). Movant claims to be the beneficial owner of the property located at 13147 Gladstone Street in Sylmar based on findings made by the state court, but she is judicially estopped to make this argument. The state court found that the property was acquired as part of a joint venture in 2005 and that movant and the debtor asserted that the property was held in trust for movant. However, the Court takes judicial notice of the fact that, when movant filed her own chapter 7 bankruptcy on April 20, 2011 (case no. 2:11-bk-27178-RN), her schedules did not reflect an interest of any kind in this property.

Lastly, if court approves settlement with Perez, trustee has advised the he

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT...**

**Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

intends to abandon the property to the debtor. If the debtor and/or movant wish to continue litigating with Perez to avoid his deed of trust against the property, the settlement will not preclude them from doing so.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Liria M Melendez

Represented By  
James D. Hornbuckle  
Onyinye N Anyama

**Movant(s):**

ROSA COJULUN

Represented By  
Alfred O Anyia

**Trustee(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Represented By  
Christian T Kim  
James A Dumas Jr

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:19-13033 Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

**#102.00** Motion to Approve Compromise Under Rule 9019 with Javier Perez

Docket 62

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/4/25 - Sedoo Manu**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Oppositions to motion were late-filed. Continue hearing to give trustee an opportunity to file reply and court an opportunity to review both oppositions and reply. Motion provides only limited detail to support the trustee's business judgment that the proposed compromise is fair and equitable and satisfies the relevant standards. (Court recognizes that it is problematic for the trustee to reveal in detail the holes/problems that she anticipates may arise were she required to litigate the appeal of the judgment against Perez. It might be more appropriate, therefore, for Perez to file a reply to the objections.)

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Liria M Melendez

Represented By  
James D. Hornbuckle  
Onyinye N Anyama

**Movant(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Represented By  
Christian T Kim  
James A Dumas Jr

**Trustee(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Represented By  
Christian T Kim

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT...**

**Liria M Melendez**

James A Dumas Jr

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:19-13033 Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

**#103.00** Chapter 7 Trustee's Motion for Order Modifying Claim No. 10 of Ivy Crest Attorneys APC., and Christian Oronsaye, Esq.

fr: 7-9-25; 8-20-25

Docket 45

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/4/25 - Sedoo Manu**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative Ruling for July 9, 2025:

Court agrees with claimant that the engagement letter need not discuss a charging lien when what the attorney is seeking to enforce is a contingency fee arrangement. Court agrees further that the late-filing of a secured claim should not bar the secured creditor from asserting its security interest. However, if the attorney is relying on this reasoning to assert a secured lien, the attorney is only entitled to recover a percentage of what is actually and eventually recovered (here, 40 percent of the gross proceeds). There is no blanket lien on assets of the estate generally to pay a contingency fee. At best, the claimant is entitled to recovery 40 percent of whatever the trustee is able to obtain through a settlement of the claim.

However, the Court notes that this lawsuit existed prior to the bankruptcy filing and that the claim is an asset of the estate that was not disclosed on the debtor's schedules. Therefore, even after the case was closed, it remained an asset of the estate and the lien notice could not create any rights that did not otherwise exist under the original engagement letter. Moreover, the docket in this chapter 7 case does not reflect the filing of an application by the trustee to employ the claimant to prosecute this claim.



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

Continue hearing to give the parties an opportunity to brief whether a contingency fee attorney prosecuting a claim that is an asset of the bankruptcy estate is entitled to any fees at all if his/her employment was never approved.

-----  
Final Ruling for July 9, 2025:

Continue hearing to August 20, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. Parties are to submit simultaneous briefs not later than August 6 and replies not later than August 13, 2025 on issue raised in last paragraph of tentative ruling.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for August 20, 2025:

The Court is not writing on a blank slate here and does not have the power to craft an equitable solution in the face of statutory authority (or binding caselaw) to the contrary. The Supreme Court made this clear in Law v. Siegel, 571 U.S. 415 (2014) (a bankruptcy court has authority to issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the Bankruptcy Code under section 105(a), but may not contravene specific statutory provisions in so doing).

The Supreme Court also made crystal clear in Lamie v. United States, 540 U.S. 536 (2003), that the Bankruptcy Code does not authorize compensation awards to debtors' attorneys in chapter 7 cases for post-petition services unless their employment was approved by the bankruptcy court at the request of the chapter 7 trustee. There is no exception to this rule for contingency fee attorneys.

And the Court cannot simply award fees to avoid unjust enrichment on the theory that the attorneys conferred a substantial benefit on the estate. There is ample authority for the proposition that the Bankruptcy Code means what it says, and that professionals may only be compensated for benefits conferred on the estate when they fit within one of the categories outlined in Bankruptcy Code section 503(b).

Subsections 503(b)(1) and (2) and subsections 503(b)(3)(A), (B), (C), (E) and (F) bear no resemblance to this fact pattern. Section 503(b)(3)(D) is the only section that comes close to applying here. That section authorizes "a

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

CONT... Liria M Melendez

Chapter 7

**creditor, an indenture trustee, an equity security holder, or a committee representing creditors or equity security holders"** to receive compensation for making a substantial contribution **"in a case under chapter 9 or 11 of this title."** Section 503(b)(4) authorizes reasonable compensation for professional services rendered by an attorney or an accountant for someone who is eligible for compensation under one of the subsections of 503(b)(3). The claimant here is not a creditor, an indenture trustee, an equity security holder or a committee representing one of these persons, and this is not a chapter 9 or 11 case. Thus, no matter how much of a benefit the claimant provided, or how valuable its services may have been to the estate, compensation is not available under section 503(b) (and, therefore, under Law v. Siegel, is not available under section 105).

The Court cannot use general equitable principles to override or disregard these very specific statutory limitations. If the Court cannot make a compensation award for someone who conferred a substantial benefit on the estate but isn't otherwise eligible for compensation, it cannot achieve the same result by saying that it must do so in order to avoid unjust enrichment. The avoidance of unjust enrichment is why compensation is permitted in the instances specified for a creditor who conferred a substantial benefit on the estate.

So it is clear, therefore, that there can be no compensation for services rendered post-petition, as claimant was never employed by the trustee. This is true regardless of whose fault it was and regardless of whether this result would create (additional) incentives for debtors to behave badly. The question remains, however, as to the extent to which the claimant may receive compensation for services rendered **prepetition** and whether that compensation should be treated as a secured claim or as a general unsecured claim.

The Court rejects claimant's suggestion that it adopt a "hybrid" approach and give the claimant 40 percent of the eventual recovery for its prepetition services and compensation for post-petition services on a quantum meruit basis. As discussed above, there can be no compensation for post-petition services on a quantum meruit basis or otherwise, as the firm was never employed, but, even more significantly, this would result in a fee award that

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

would be even larger than the one for which the claimant originally contracted -- giving it BOTH a 40 percent contingency fee and an hourly rate for post-petition services.

It is true that the Bankruptcy Code ordinarily leaves undisturbed prepetition security interests, but, under California law, where a contingency fee attorney has been discharged (with or without cause), upon the occurrence of the contingency, the attorney is limited to a quantum meruit recovery for the reasonable value of his services rendered to the time of discharge. See, e.g., Weiss v. Marcus, 51 Cal. App. 3d 590, 594 (1975).

It is also true that the retention agreement was rejected by operation of law 60 days after the petition date and that the rejection relates back to the petition date. However, the rejection of a contract does not void the contract. It is merely a breach of the contract that is deemed to have occurred immediately prior to the bankruptcy, and the nondebtor party retains its breach of contract claims and, in an appropriate instance, may retain such remedies as a right to specific performance.

Putting all of these principles together, therefore, the Court finds that, if and when the trustee obtains a recovery, the claimant should be entitled to receive such portion of the 40 percent contingency fee as should be considered attributable to its prepetition services. This portion could be calculated as a fraction represented by the total number of hours of work performed by the claimant before the bankruptcy divided by the total number of hours performed through the completion of their services. This fraction would then be multiplied against 40 percent of the trustee's recovery to determine the amount of the claimant's prepetition contingency fee.

By way of example, if the trustee were to recover \$100,000, and the claimant performed a total of 800 hours of services -- 200 before the petition date and 600 after the petition date -- the claimant would be entitled to 200/800 or 1/4 of the \$40,000 contingency fee, which would be \$10,000. This recovery should be paid out of the proceeds recovered by the trustee and not merely allowed as a general unsecured claim.

-----  
Final Ruling for August 20, 2025:

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Liria M Melendez**

**Chapter 7**

Court granted the motion in part and denied motion in part. The tentative ruling became the final ruling. (Court also discussed how to calculate fees for paralegal services -- as the hourly rate adopted by the state court was half that of the attorneys' hourly rate, each paralegal hour should be treated as 1/2 an hour.) Court continued hearing to September 10, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. as a status conference and directed the parties to meet and confer to see if they can resolve the matter or at least agree on the figure that would be produced by the formula utilized by the Court. If parties cannot agree on the calculations, court will set a briefing schedule for the parties to set forth their calculations in accordance with the court's formula.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

Revisit status of this matter after conclusion of related matters on calendar.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Liria M Melendez

Represented By  
James D. Hornbuckle  
Onyinye N Anyama

**Movant(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Represented By  
Christian T Kim  
James A Dumas Jr

**Trustee(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Represented By  
Christian T Kim  
James A Dumas Jr

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-12899 Lisett Caridad Gonzalez**

**Chapter 7**

**#104.00** Motion of Immigrant Rights Defense Council, LLC for an Order that Counsel for Debtor Lisett Caridad Gonzalez Comply with FRBP 2016, for Disgorgement of Fees Paid that were not Timely Disclosed, and for Monetary Sanctions

Docket 85

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Sebastian M Medvei**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Grant in part and deny in part. The rules upon which movant relies are far from clear as applied to the facts of this case. Therefore, although the Court agrees that disclosures should be made now, the Court is not inclined to punish counsel retained and paid post-petition in a chapter 7 case for failing to make these disclosures before, either by requiring disgorgement or imposing sanctions, as it is apparent that they believed in good faith (and not unreasonably) that such disclosures were not required. (And court agrees that there is no authority cited in the motion or that the court has been able to locate that would support the imposition of sanctions as distinguished from disgorgement.)

Respondent firm was paid after one year before the date of the filing of the petition for services to be rendered in connection with the case. Under Rule 2016(b), every attorney for a debtor should file a statement of the kind described in section 329 that sets forth how much the firm was paid, how much the debtor has agreed to pay and the source of the compensation. Rule 2016(b) permits the Court to establish a deadline for the firm to provide this information.

Therefore, grant motion insofar as it seeks an order compelling these disclosures by a date certain to be set by the Court. Deny balance of relief requested.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Lisett Caridad Gonzalez**

**Chapter 7**

**Debtor(s):**

Lisett Caridad Gonzalez

Represented By  
Jisoo Hwang  
Rosendo Gonzalez

**Movant(s):**

Immigrant Rights Defense Council,

Represented By  
Sebastian M Medvei

**Trustee(s):**

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-13838 Ashot Gevork Egiazarian**

**Chapter 7**

**#105.00** Application for Order Authorizing Employment of Genga & Associates, P.C. as Special Litigation Counsel to Chapter 7 Trustee, John J. Menchaca

Docket 49

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Cynthia Cohen**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Nothing contained in the opposition explains why the proposed professional holds or represents an interest adverse to that of the estate. The professional will be employed to continue his prepetition efforts to recover assets for the benefit of the estate, now taking direction from the debtor's successor -- the trustee -- rather than the debtor. There is no evidence to support the conclusion that the proposed professional would take instruction from the debtor in lieu of instructions given by the trustee.

Overrule objection. Approve proposed employment.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Ashot Gevork Egiazarian

Represented By  
David B Golubchik

**Movant(s):**

John J Menchaca (TR)

Represented By  
Aaron J Malo  
Hamid R Rafatjoo

John J Menchaca (TR)

Represented By  
Aaron J Malo  
Hamid R Rafatjoo

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Ashot Gevork Egiazarian**

**Chapter 7**

**Trustee(s):**

John J Menchaca (TR)

Represented By  
Aaron J Malo  
Hamid R Rafatjoo



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:22-10994 Better 4 You Breakfast, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#106.00** Motion to Compel Revolution Foods, PBC to Pay Assumed Trade Payable  
Owed to Southern California Pizza Company, LLC

fr: 8-6-25

Docket 940

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: 9/9/25 -ORDER APPROVING  
STIPULATION RESOLVING MOTION ENTERED. OFF CALENDAR.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Vanessa Rodriguez**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative Ruling for August 6, 2025:

Creditor is seeking to recover money from a nondebtor as a third-party beneficiary of the APA. If the Court has jurisdiction over this dispute at all, it should have been brought as an adversary proceeding. However, does the Court actually have jurisdiction over this dispute between two nondebtors? The caselaw has made clear that reservations of jurisdiction do not actually create jurisdiction where none exists.

If movant wants to proceed in this forum, continue the hearing to give movant an opportunity to brief whether the bankruptcy court can exercise jurisdiction over this dispute. If court concludes that it has jurisdiction, it will require movant to commence an adversary proceeding.

-----  
Final Ruling for August 6, 2025:

Continue hearing to September 10, 2025 at 1:00 a.m. Rev Foods will have until 15 days before continued hearing to file any opposition. Replies will be due 7 days before continued hearing.

-----

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Better 4 You Breakfast, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

The docket does not reflect any additional filings since the last hearing. No one has briefed whether this court has jurisdiction to adjudicate this matter if an adversary proceeding were filed. Deny motion for lack of jurisdiction and under FRBP 7001.

-----  
9/9/2025 -- Court approved stipulation resolving motion. OFF CALENDAR.  
NO APPEARANCE REQUIRED.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Better 4 You Breakfast, Inc.

Represented By  
Kerri A Lyman  
Jeffrey M. Reisner  
Allen B Felahy  
Randy S Snyder

**Movant(s):**

Southern California Pizza Company,

Represented By  
Daren Brinkman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:23-11291 Jae Paul Pak**

**Chapter 11**

**#107.00 Post Confirmation Status Conference in a Chapter 11 Subchapter V Case**

fr: 10-18-23; 10-26-23; 11-15-23; 12-13-23; 1-9-24; 2-14-24; 3-12-24; 4-2-24;  
6-6-24; 10-30-24; 5-27-25; 6-11-25

Docket 1

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Susan Seflin**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**9/8/25 - Jeffrey Golden**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative Ruling for October 26, 2023:

The Court has a series of questions and comments concerning the form of the plan that will be discussed on the record at the time of hearing. Set deadline for filing amended plan and confirmation related deadlines.

-----  
Final Ruling for October 26, 2023:

Debtor should lodge an order setting the deadline for making 1111(b) elections, which will be two weeks after the debtor serves the plan and ballots. The notice of plan related deadlines should include a reference to this deadline. Parties are scheduled for another mediation session on November 2, 2023 and anticipate filing an amended plan with amended projections. Court continued hearing to November 15, 2023 at 2:00 p.m. and waived the requirement of a status report.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for November 15, 2023:

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Jae Paul Pak**

**Chapter 11**

Court has entered order setting deadline for 1111(b) elections. Did parties participate in another day of mediation on November 2, 2023? If so, what was the outcome? Hearing required.

-----  
12/12/23 -- Court approved stipulation continuing case status conference to January 9, 2024 at 2:00 p.m. Debtor shall file a further amended plan (if there are further amendments to make) not later than January 4, 2024. OFF CALENDAR FOR DECEMBER 13, 2023.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for January 9, 2024:

The parties report that mediation was unsuccessful and that there are no further mediations scheduled at this time.

Has the debtor filed a motion or an adversary proceeding seeking to avoid any of Rassman's liens? If not, why not? Can the plan be confirmed in its present form before the appeal is resolved? Hearing required.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for February 14, 2024:

Court has reviewed latest version of debtor's plan. This version contains a claim reserve, so it appears that the *amount* of Rassman's claim does not need to be resolved before confirmation, but inasmuch as the plan does not provide for the payment of interest and treats Rassman's claim as an unsecured claim, success in the debtor's efforts to avoid any liens that Rassman asserts appears to be a condition precedent to confirmation. Either the plan should so state or the court should not move forward with confirmation unless and until that has occurred.

Court has a number of small stylistic changes to propose with regard to the plan, but, more fundamentally, how much does the debtor intend to pay on account of unsecured claims? The plan neither promises a set dollar amount (or at least a minimum) monthly payment or a set percentage. How would the court ever determine whether the debtor is in compliance? The Class 4 treatment is vague, to say the least. It says, "From the funds remaining to be paid through the Plan [is this amount even disclosed anywhere?], Class 4

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT...**

**Jae Paul Pak**

**Chapter 11**

Claimants will be paid their pro rata share of those funds monthly over five years starting in year three (3) of the Plan." Huh? True, the subchapter V trustee is supposed to assist in determining the amount of the 50 percent of net income that the debtor's company will have to contribute, but that is not the entirety of the amounts to be paid to Class 4 creditors, is it? Doesn't the debtor intend to pay additional amounts from other sources?

Debtor is planning to reject the Porsche lease and sets a deadline for the filing of any rejection claim. Will there be one? Is an estimated amount of this claim included in the plan's estimates of general unsecured claims?

-----  
Final Ruling for February 14, 2024:

Debtor will be filing 522(f) motion. If that motion does not resolve issues, debtor will either create an alternate plan structure that can be confirmed whether lien is avoided or not or insert condition precedent to confirmation. Court continued hearing to March 12, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. Debtor may use this date as hearing date for 522(f) motion. Debtor should file amended plan by March 1, 2024.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for March 12, 2024:

Court has one or two comments on the form of the amended plan. Continue case status conference to date of continued hearing on 522(f) motion.

-----  
Final Ruling for March 12, 2024:

Continue case status conference to same date and time as continued hearing on motion to avoid lien.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for April 2, 2024:

Court has now granted motion to avoid lien against debtor's interest in residence, but does court have to resolve adversary proceedings before plan in its current form may be confirmed? (Adv. No. 24-01011 is about to be resolved, but another adversary proceeding remains.) Hearing required.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Jae Paul Pak**

**Chapter 11**

Tentative Ruling for June 6, 2024:

Revisit status of case after conclusion of confirmation hearing.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for October 18, 2024:

The status reports filed by the debtor and the subchapter V trustee identify 3 issues:

1. When first quarterly report should be due. There is no need to specify a date certain for the first report. The deadline should track from the date on which the plan becomes effective and say something like, the first quarterly report should be filed not later than 30 days after the end of the first full calendar quarter after the plan has become effective.
2. Dr. Rassman has requested additional language that appears consistent with directions given by the Court at the October 1 status conference on the form of the confirmation order. Neither the trustee nor the debtor appear to have any problems with this new language, so what is the issue?
3. The debtor and JPMD were to have filed their 2023 tax returns by October 15, 2024. Did this occur and have copies been provided to the subchapter V trustee?

Hearing required.

-----  
5/22/25 -- Court approved stipulation continuing conference to June 11, 2025 at **2:00**. The Debtor's reports will be filed not later than May 27, 2025 and Rassman's and Trustee's will be filed not later than June 3, 2025. APPEARANCES WAIVED ON MAY 27, 2025.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for June 11, 2025:

**[NOTE: ALL HEARINGS FOR THIS WEEK WILL BE BY ZOOM ONLY]**

Have there been any developments since the status reports were filed that the parties would like to share with the Court? Hearing required.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Jae Paul Pak**

**Chapter 11**

-----  
Final Ruling for June 11, 2025:

Continue case status conference to September 10, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. Reorganized debtor (and anyone else who would like to report anything) should file updated status report(s) not later than August 29, 2025.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

Has any progress been made with regard to the resolution of special counsel's fees?  
Has oral argument been scheduled for the appeal of Dr. Rassman's judgment?

Hearing required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Jae Paul Pak

Represented By  
Jeffrey I Golden  
Beth Gaschen

**Trustee(s):**

Susan K Seflin (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-11354 The Nuno Mansion LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#108.00** Objection to Claim #3 by Claimant MOR Investment Fund, LLC. in the amount of \$1587935.01

fr: 8-20-25

Docket 47

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Maureen Shanahan**

**Tentative Ruling:**

8/16/2025 -- Court approved stipulation continuing hearing to September 10, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. OFF CALENDAR FOR AUGUST 20, 2025.

Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

Deem claim objection to be an adversary proceeding for procedural purposes and discuss with parties whether there is a need for the equivalent of amended pleadings, how much time they need for discovery and when it would be appropriate to send this matter to mediation.

Hearing required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

The Nuno Mansion LLC

Represented By  
Maureen J Shanahan

**Movant(s):**

The Nuno Mansion LLC

Represented By  
Maureen J Shanahan



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-11354 The Nuno Mansion LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#109.00** Scheduling and Case Management Conference in a Chapter 11 Case

fr: 4-16-25; 6-25-25

Docket 1

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Set bar date and deadline for serving notice of bar date. Continue case status conference until a date that is shortly after the bar date.

6/9/2025 -- Court approved scheduling order with following dates:

L/D to serve notice of bar date -- April 21, 2025

Bar date -- May 30, 2025

L/D to file updated status report -- June 13, 2025

Cont'd status conference -- June 25, 2025 at 11:00 a.m.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for June 25, 2025:

Has debtor received documents it has requested from lender? If not, set deadline for debtor to file motion for 2004 examination to obtain the information that it needs to make a decision as to how it intends to proceed with regard to the secured loan.

6/26/25 -- Court approved scheduling order with following dates:

Cont'd status conference -- September 10, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

L/D for debtor to file application to employ special litigation counsel -- July 31, 2025

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... The Nuno Mansion LLC**

**Chapter 11**

L/D for debtor to apply for 2004 examination (if still needs documents/info) --  
July 31, 2025.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

Debtor has moved for and obtained approval of special litigation counsel.  
Revisit status of case after conclusion of hearing on claim objection.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

The Nuno Mansion LLC

Represented By  
Maureen J Shanahan

**Movant(s):**

The Nuno Mansion LLC

Represented By  
Maureen J Shanahan

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-12827 CPIX LA Arts District LLC, a Washington limited li**

**Chapter 11**

**#110.00** Motion For Order (i) Setting Hearing On Confirmation Of Plan Under Which There Are No Impaired Classes; And (ii) Dispensing With A Disclosure Statement

Docket 45

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Carmela Pagay**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**9/8/25 - Matthew Pham**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Unsecured creditors are not unimpaired under the debtor's plan as it does not appear that the debtor intends to pay them post-petition interest. Further, although creditors need not vote if they are truly unimpaired, the Court still needs information in order to make the findings necessary to confirm the plan, including whether the debtor is acting in good faith. Although the debtor stated that it wanted to keep the name of the buyer confidential, its name does appear in the motion. However, no information has been provided as to the nature or creditworthiness of the entity that will purchase the property and the extent to which there are any connections between the debtor and the proposed purchaser.

Hearing required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

CPIX LA Arts District LLC, a

Represented By  
David B Golubchik  
Carmela Pagay

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... CPIF LA Arts District LLC, a Washington limited li**

**Chapter 11**

**Movant(s):**

CPIF LA Arts District LLC, a

Represented By  
David B Golubchik  
Carmela Pagay

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-12827 CIPF LA Arts District LLC, a Washington limited li**

**Chapter 11**

**#111.00 Scheduling and Case Management Conference in a Chapter 11 Case**

fr: 6-4-25; 8-20-25

Docket 1

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/8/25 - Carmela Pagay**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**9/8/25 - Matthew Pham**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Set deadline for debtor to serve notice of bar date and bar date. Continue case status conference to date shortly after bar date.

6/9/25 -- Court signed scheduling order setting following dates:

L/D for debtor to serve notice of bar date -- June 6, 2025

Bar date -- July 31, 2025

L/D for debtor to file updated status report -- August 8, 2025

Cont'd status conference -- August 20, 2025 at 11:00 a.m.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for August 20, 2025:

Why does the debtor want to sell its property under a plan rather than through a 363 motion? (Debtor anticipates paying claims in full, does not want to have a disclosure statement and won't be able to obtain a discharge.)

When does the debtor believe it will have finalized the form of a sale agreement?

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... CPIF LA Arts District LLC, a Washington limited li**

**Chapter 11**

Set a deadline for debtor to file plan of reorganization.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

Revisit status of case after conclusion of hearing on related motion on calendar.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

CPIF LA Arts District LLC, a

Represented By  
David B Golubchik

**Movant(s):**

CPIF LA Arts District LLC, a

Represented By  
David B Golubchik

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-16451 OWL Venice LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#112.00** Emergency Motion for Order Authorizing use of Cash Collateral

fr: 8-19-25

Docket 13

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/3/25 - Raffi Khatchadourian**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**9/8/25 - Arturo Cisneros**

**Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative Ruling for August 19, 2025:

Supplemental declaration explaining questionable items on the budget was helpful. Authorize debtor to use only so much cash collateral as is necessary between date of emergency hearing and hearing on a fully-noticed basis in accordance with the budget, plus a 10 percent variance. (Debtor can exceed these amounts with the prior written consent of known secured creditors.) All lenders shall receive replacement lien on post-petition receipts to secure the diminution in value of their prepetition collateral. Post-petition liens shall have the same validity and priority as prepetition liens. Authorize use for interim period, pending hearing on a fully-noticed basis. Set final hearing on motion.

-----  
Final Ruling for August 19, 2025:

Grant on an interim basis to the extent necessary to pay expenses that need to be paid before continued hearing on terms set forth in tentative, except that

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**CONT... OWL Venice LLC**

**Chapter 11**

variance will be 15 percent per line item and 10 percent in the aggregate and that replacement liens should not encumber avoiding power actions/recoveries.

Debtor should serve notice of final hearing not later than August 20, 2025. Final hearing will be September 10, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. Oppositions will be due on August 27, 2025. Replies will be due on September 3, 2025. Debtor should file and serve a report comparing actual expenses to budget not later than September 5, 2025.

-----  
Tentative Ruling for September 10, 2025:

The Wilson declaration discusses changes/corrections that will be made to the budget/projections. Have those changes been made in the budget that was attached to the declaration as Exhibit 1 or do those changes still need to be made? Court needs to be able to see a document that reflects the debtor's most accurate projections -- i.e., the budget for which the debtor would like approval.

Hearing required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

OWL Venice LLC

Represented By  
Giovanni Orantes

**Movant(s):**

OWL Venice LLC

Represented By  
Giovanni Orantes

**Trustee(s):**

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Pro Se



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

1:00 PM

**2:25-16451 OWL Venice LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#113.00** Scheduling and Case Management Conference in a Chapter 11 Subchapter V Case

Docket 1

**Courtroom Deputy:**

**ZoomGov Appearance by:**

**9/3/25 - Raffi Khatchadourian**

**9/8/25 - David Shevitz**

**9/8/25 - Arturo Cisneros**

**Tentative Ruling:**

What if anything has the subchapter V trustee done in this case so far? Debtor reported at the hearing on its emergency motion for use of cash collateral that it has succeeded in getting its funds at Shopify unfrozen. Was this an accurate representation?

Hearing required.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

OWL Venice LLC

Represented By  
Giovanni Orantes

**Movant(s):**

OWL Venice LLC

Represented By  
Giovanni Orantes

**Trustee(s):**

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

2:00 PM

**2:18-22731 ERIN JEON and Jong Kim**

**Chapter 7**

**#200.00** Trustee's Final Report and Applications for Compensation

Docket 137

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: APPROVED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Approve trustee's final report in full. APPEARANCES WAIVED. TRUSTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO UPLOAD ORDER CONSISTENT WITH TENTATIVE.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

ERIN JEON

Represented By  
Jaenam J Coe  
Gilad Berkowitz

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Jong Kim

Represented By  
Jaenam J Coe  
Gilad Berkowitz

**Trustee(s):**

Rosendo Gonzalez (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

2:00 PM

**2:24-14762 Joshua Peter Otten and Donna Marie Otten**

**Chapter 7**

**#201.00** Trustee's Final Report and Applications for Compensation

Docket 32

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: APPROVED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Approve trustee's final report in full. APPEARANCES WAIVED. TRUSTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO UPLOAD ORDER CONSISTENT WITH TENTATIVE.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Joshua Peter Otten

Represented By  
Peter M Lively

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Donna Marie Otten

Represented By  
Peter M Lively

**Trustee(s):**

John P Pringle (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

2:00 PM

**2:24-20118 Jaime Roberto Ortega Escobar**

**Chapter 7**

**#202.00** Trustee's Final Report and Applications for Compensation

Docket 26

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: APPROVED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Approve trustee's final report in full. APPEARANCES WAIVED. TRUSTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO UPLOAD ORDER CONSISTENT WITH TENTATIVE.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Jaime Roberto Ortega Escobar

Represented By  
Daniel King

**Trustee(s):**

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

2:00 PM

**2:24-20218 Crystal Guadalupe Nevarez**

**Chapter 7**

**#203.00** Trustee's Final Report and Applications for Compensation

Docket 29

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: APPROVED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Approve trustee's final report in full. APPEARANCES WAIVED. TRUSTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO UPLOAD ORDER CONSISTENT WITH TENTATIVE.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Crystal Guadalupe Nevarez

Represented By  
Miguel A Manzo

**Trustee(s):**

Jason M Rund (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Sheri Bluebond, Presiding  
Courtroom 1539 Calendar**

**Wednesday, September 10, 2025**

**Hearing Room 1539**

2:00 PM

**2:25-10479 Gustavo Mena and Maria Victoria Alarcon Mena**

**Chapter 7**

**#204.00** Trustee's Final Report and Applications for Compensation

Docket 21

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: APPROVED. APPEARANCES WAIVED.**

**Courtroom Deputy:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Tentative Ruling:**

Approve trustee's final report in full. APPEARANCES WAIVED. TRUSTEE IS AUTHORIZED TO UPLOAD ORDER CONSISTENT WITH TENTATIVE.

<b>Party Information</b>
--------------------------

**Debtor(s):**

Gustavo Mena

Represented By  
Juan Castillo-Onofre

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Maria Victoria Alarcon Mena

Represented By  
Juan Castillo-Onofre

**Trustee(s):**

Elissa Miller (TR)

Pro Se