

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

2: -

**ZOOM INFORMATION**

**Chapter**

**#0.00** Hearings before Judge Saltzman may be made in person or by remote or phone connection through ZoomGov.  
**ALL ATTORNEYS AND PARTIES MUST REGISTER APPEARANCES NO LATER THAN 12:00 NOON THE DAY BEFORE THE HEARING BY EMAIL AS FOLLOWS:**

To: [Chambers\\_DSaltzman@cacb.uscourts.gov](mailto:Chambers_DSaltzman@cacb.uscourts.gov)  
Subject: Registration – [Zoom or Phone or In Person]  
Body: Hearing date and time  
Calendar number on which you are appearing  
Debtor name and case number  
Adversary proceeding name and number (if applicable)  
Name of the party/client appearing  
Attorney's full name and SBN  
Phone number (if participating by phone, the number from which you will call)  
If any client or non-attorney representative will be observing, that person's full name, role, and phone number

IF YOU DO NOT REGISTER, YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO ATTEND THE HEARING

Registered parties in interest may connect to the ZoomGov video and audio feeds, free of charge. Participation by ZoomGov video and audio may be via personal computer (equipped with camera, microphone and speaker), a handheld mobile device (such as a tablet, iPhone, or Android phone), or by audio only using a telephone (standard telephone charges may apply).

Registered observers and members of the public may connect remotely by telephone to the audio feed only (standard telephone charges may apply).

Neither a Zoom nor a ZoomGov account is necessary to participate. The audio portion of each hearing will be recorded electronically by the court and constitutes its official record.

**Zoomgov Connection Info:**

**Video/audio web address: <https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/1605621606>**

**ZoomGov meeting number: 160 562 1606**

**Password: 956807**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

CONT...

**ZOOM INFORMATION**

**Chapter**

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

For more information on appearing before Judge Saltzman by ZoomGov, please see the information entitled "Tips for a Successful ZoomGov Court Experience" on the court's website at: <https://www.cacb.uscourts.gov/judges/honorable-deborah-j-saltzman> under the tab "Phone/Video Appearances."

Docket 0

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-21402 Charles Won Jang Lee

Chapter 7

#1.00 Hearing RE: [8] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations UNLAWFUL DETAINER RE: 801 S. Olive St., #1111, Los Angeles, CA 90014

Docket 8

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule (“LBR”) 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

As to Debtor:

DENY as moot; discharge was entered on 3/30/26.

As to Estate:

GRANT under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).

GRANT as binding despite conversion.

GRANT waiver of FRBP 4001(a)(3) stay.

Deny additional requested relief; no cause has been shown.

MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.

**Party Information**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Charles Won Jang Lee**

**Chapter 7**

**Debtor(s):**

Charles Won Jang Lee

Represented By  
Mark T Young

**Trustee(s):**

John J Menchaca (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-11203 Charles Edward Norwood**

**Chapter 13**

**#2.00** Hearing RE: [19] Motion for Relief from Stay FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 362.

Docket 19

**Tentative Ruling:**

Continue for proper service. The motion was not served on the debtor, as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 4001-1(c)(1)(C)(i), or on senior lienholder Compulink Corp., as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 4001-1(c)(1)(C)(iv).

First available hearing date to allow for sufficient notice is 5/7/26 at 1:00 pm. No appearances unless movant would like to request a later hearing date.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Charles Edward Norwood

Represented By  
Dana M Douglas

**Movant(s):**

Fan Li

Represented By  
John P. Ward

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-10314 Kenneth Leon Smith

Chapter 13

#3.00 Hearing RE: [20] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations PERSONAL PROPERTY RE: 2023 Chevrolet Silverado 1500 .

Docket 20

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

GRANT under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).  
GRANT as binding despite conversion.  
GRANT waiver of FRBP 4001(a)(3) stay.  
Deny co-debtor relief; this is inapplicable here.

MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Kenneth Leon Smith

Represented By  
Barry E Borowitz

**Movant(s):**

ACAR Leasing LTD d/b/a GM

Represented By  
Merdaud Jafarnia

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Kenneth Leon Smith**

**Chapter 13**

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-21471 Aaron Osvaldo Bernal, Sr

Chapter 13

#4.00 Hearing RE: [37] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations PERSONAL PROPERTY RE: 2024 Tesla Model 3, VIN: 5YJ3E1EA0RF863725 .

Docket 37

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

GRANT under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).  
GRANT as binding despite conversion.  
GRANT waiver of FRBP 4001(a)(3) stay.

MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Aaron Osvaldo Bernal Sr

Pro Se

**Movant(s):**

TD Bank, N.A.

Represented By  
Sheryl K Ith

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Aaron Osvaldo Bernal, Sr**

**Chapter 13**

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-16153 Richard Pacheco and Maria Concepcion Pacheco

Chapter 13

#5.00 Hearing RE: [44] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations PERSONAL PROPERTY RE: 2024 Chevrolet Blazer EV .

Docket 44

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

GRANT under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) and (d)(2).

GRANT as binding despite conversion.

GRANT waiver of FRBP 4001(a)(3) stay.

MOVANT TO LODGE ORDER WITHIN 7 DAYS.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Richard Pacheco

Represented By  
Barry E Borowitz

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Maria Concepcion Pacheco

Represented By  
Barry E Borowitz

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Richard Pacheco and Maria Concepcion Pacheco**

**Chapter 13**

**Movant(s):**

ACAR Leasing LTD d/b/a GM

Represented By  
Merdaud Jafarnia

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-14427 Johanna Lisbeth Charley

Chapter 13

#6.00 Hearing RE: [55] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations PERSONAL PROPERTY RE: 2022 Chevrolet Silverado 1500, VIN: 1GCPWBEK4NZ168939 .

Docket 55

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

GRANT under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).  
GRANT as binding despite conversion.  
GRANT waiver of FRBP 4001(a)(3) stay.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Johanna Lisbeth Charley

Represented By  
Tyson Takeuchi

**Movant(s):**

Exeter Finance LLC

Represented By  
Sheryl K Ith

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Johanna Lisbeth Charley**

**Chapter 13**

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-14046 Darlene Denise Avila**

**Chapter 13**

**#7.00** Hearing RE: [39] Notice of motion and motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 2521 and 2521 1/2 Ganahl St Los Angeles, CA 90033 . Related document(s) [46] Amended Motion (related document(s): 39 Notice of motion and motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 2521 and 2521 1/2 Ganahl St Los Angeles, CA 90033 . filed by Creditor filed by Creditor U.S. Bank National Association, not in its individual capacity but solely as trustee for RMTP Trust, Series 2021 Cottage-TT-V.

Docket 39

**Tentative Ruling:**

Please update the court regarding payments made and APO discussions.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Darlene Denise Avila

Represented By  
Cynthia Grande

**Movant(s):**

U.S. Bank National Association, not

Represented By  
Shannon A Doyle

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-12249 Elya Mirzoyan**

**Chapter 13**

**#8.00** Hearing RE: [11] Motion in Individual Case for Order Imposing a Stay or Continuing the Automatic Stay as the Court Deems Appropriate 17719 Hillside Way, Santa Clarita, CA 91350 .

Docket 11

**Tentative Ruling:**

All secured creditors were served with the motion; however, service is improper because the service was not made on an officer of any of the secured creditors (FRBP 7004(b)(3) requires service on an officer of a domestic or foreign corporation, or a partnership or other unincorporated association). The court notes that the debtor did not serve attorney Kristin Schuler-Hintz of McCarthy & Holthus, LLP, who represented second lienholder Central Loan Administration and Reporting (known as Cenlar FSB) in obtaining relief from stay in the debtor's chapter 7 case.

The court also has concerns regarding whether the motion adequately rebuts the presumption of bad faith by clear and convincing evidence.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Elya Mirzoyan

Represented By  
Aris Artounians

**Movant(s):**

Elya Mirzoyan

Represented By  
Aris Artounians

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-12190 Vicente Santiago Baetiong III and Josephine Ocampo

Chapter 13

#9.00 Hearing RE: [9] Motion in Individual Case for Order Imposing a Stay or Continuing the Automatic Stay as the Court Deems Appropriate Real Property; Relates to # [10] Amended Motion in Individual Case for Order Imposing a Stay or Continuing the Automatic Stay as the Court Deems Appropriate Real Property

Docket 9

**Tentative Ruling:**

No tentative ruling. This is a **FINAL RULING**. This motion was set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. *Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Their defaults are entered and the court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). **NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.**

Grant as to all creditors served with the motion.

Movant to lodge order within seven days.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Vicente Santiago Baetiong III

Represented By  
H. Jasmine Papian

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Josephine Ocampo Baetiong

Represented By  
H. Jasmine Papian

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Vicente Santiago Baetiong III and Josephine Ocampo**

**Chapter 13**

**Movant(s):**

Vicente Santiago Baetiong III

Represented By  
H. Jasmine Papian

Josephine Ocampo Baetiong

Represented By  
H. Jasmine Papian

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:23-13127 Vicki Valrita Ivery**

**Chapter 13**

**#10.00** Hearing RE: [44] motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 1627 Norval Street, Pomona, CA 91766 .

Docket 44

**Tentative Ruling:**

Please update the court. Is the debtor current?

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Vicki Valrita Ivery

Represented By  
Steven A Alpert

**Movant(s):**

Carrington Mortgage Services, LLC

Represented By  
Nichole Glowin  
Tawakoni C Hill

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-16689 Jose De Jesus Ramos and Guadalupe Steger

Chapter 13

#11.00 CONT'D Hearing RE: [37] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 5326 Hooper Ave, Los Angeles, California 90011-4809 fr. 3-12-26

Docket 37

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Order entered on 3/24/26, settled by stipulation.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Jose De Jesus Ramos

Represented By  
Jaime A Cuevas Jr.

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Guadalupe Steger

Represented By  
Jaime A Cuevas Jr.

**Movant(s):**

Rocket Mortgage, LLC f/k/a

Represented By  
Chad L Butler

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-16509 Anisha LaFaye LeShaw**

**Chapter 13**

**#12.00** CON'T Hearing RE: [66] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations PERSONAL PROPERTY RE: 2018 Audi Q3 Sport Premium Sport Utility 4D VIN: WA1BCCFS5JR033660 .  
fr. 2-24-26

Docket 66

**Tentative Ruling:**

Please update the court.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Anisha LaFaye LeShaw

Represented By  
Onyinye N Anyama

**Movant(s):**

Ally Bank

Represented By  
Kristin A Schuler-Hintz

**Trustee(s):**

Kathy A Dockery (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-14146 Esperanza Vanessa Martinez

Chapter 7

#13.00 Chapter 7 Trustee's Final Report, Application for Compensation and Application(s) for Compensation of Professionals filed on behalf of Trustee Jason M. Rund

Docket 27

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Trustee's final report and applications for compensation were properly noticed in accordance with FRBP 2002 and set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the Court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. The Court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.

GRANT all relief requested. The final report and proposed distributions, compensation and reimbursement are approved.

Trustee to submit order within seven days.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Esperanza Vanessa Martinez

Represented By  
Gregory M Shanfeld

**Trustee(s):**

Jason M Rund (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:24-17685 Ana Francisca Pulido and Adrian Pulido Lucas

Chapter 7

#14.00 Chapter 7 Trustee's Final Report, Application for Compensation and Application(s) for Compensation of Professionals filed on behalf of Trustee Peter J. Mastan

Docket 29

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Trustee's final report and applications for compensation were properly noticed in accordance with FRBP 2002 and set for hearing in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule ("LBR") 9013-1(d). The failure of any party to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing pursuant to LBR 9013-1(f) is deemed consent to the granting of the motion. LBR 9013-1(h); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the Court is granting the relief that the moving party requested and for which a *prima facie* case has been established, an actual hearing is not necessary. The Court will resolve the matter without oral argument. LBR 9013-1(j)(3). NO APPEARANCE IS NECESSARY.

GRANT all relief requested. The final report and proposed distributions, compensation and reimbursement are approved.

Trustee to submit order within seven days.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Ana Francisca Pulido

Represented By  
David H Chung

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Adrian Pulido Lucas

Represented By  
David H Chung

**Trustee(s):**

Peter J Mastan (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Ana Francisca Pulido and Adrian Pulido Lucas**

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-20838 Ruben Reyes**

**Chapter 7**

**#15.00** Order to show cause why case should not be dismissed for failure to pay filing fee in installments as ordered by court (3rd installment of \$75 due on 2/10/26, was paid on 3/10/26; 4th installment of \$70 due by 3/10/26 + \$25 conversion fee (from ch 13 to 7)).

Docket 17

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Ruben Reyes

Pro Se

**Trustee(s):**

Sam S Leslie (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-20319 Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#16.00** Hearing RE: [33] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 3317 London St., Los Angeles, CA 90026.

Docket 33

**Tentative Ruling:**

The court first rules on the evidentiary objection (Docket No. 46) to the declaration of Luis Carmona (Docket No. 45). The objection is sustained. First, the declaration was filed late and can be disregarded for that reason alone. Second, every individual evidentiary objection is sustained, so even if the declaration had been timely, it would be almost entirely inadmissible for the reasons set forth in the evidentiary objection.

As to the merits, this is the motion of 1Sharpe Opportunity Intermediate Trust (the "Movant") for relief from stay with respect to real property located at 3317 London St., Los Angeles, CA 90026 (the "Property"). The debtor also owns an adjacent, virtually identical property located at 3321 London St., which is the subject of a separate relief from stay motion (Calendar No. 17)—the analysis for both motions is the same.

Because the Movant's appraisal of \$2 million is supported by a declaration and is credible, and because the \$3.25 million appraisal submitted by the debtor is late, is not supported by a declaration, and is speculative because it apparently relies on hypothetical DIP financing, the court has to conclude based on the evidence that the value of the Property is \$2 million. At that valuation, the debt exceeds the value of the collateral, so there is no equity cushion. Accordingly, there is cause to grant under (d)(1).

With regard to (d)(2), the debt exceeds the value of the collateral, so there is no equity in the property. Further, the debtor's proposed chapter 11 plan depends entirely on the debtor obtaining \$500,000 in DIP financing. But this case is four and a half months old, and the debtor has neither filed a DIP financing motion nor presented evidence of a binding DIP financing commitment. Given the speculative nature of the plan, there is no "effective reorganization *that is in prospect.*" *United Sav. Ass'n of Texas v. Timbers of*

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Hollymont Capital, LLC Chapter 11**  
*Inwood Forest Assocs., Ltd.*, 484 US 365, 375-376 (1988) (emphasis in the original). Accordingly, (d)(2) relief is appropriate.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Hollymont Capital, LLC

Represented By  
Laura J Portillo

**Movant(s):**

1 Sharpe Opportunity Intermediate

Represented By  
Mitchell B Ludwig

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-20319 Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#17.00** Hearing RE: [34] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 3321 London Street, Los Angeles, CA 90026 .

Docket 34

**Tentative Ruling:**

The court first rules on the evidentiary objection (Docket No. 46) to the declaration of Luis Carmona (Docket No. 45). The objection is sustained. First, the declaration was filed late and can be disregarded for that reason alone. Second, every individual evidentiary objection is sustained, so even if the declaration had been timely, it would be almost entirely inadmissible for the reasons set forth in the evidentiary objection.

As for the merits, This is the motion of 1 Sharpe Opportunity Intermediate Trust (the "Movant") for relief from stay with respect to real property located at 3321 London St., Los Angeles, CA 90026 (the "Property").

The Property is virtually identical to the property located at 3317 London St., which is the subject of a separate relief from stay motion (Calendar No. 16), though the amount owed to the Movant is slightly different (\$2,528,341.20 for the 3321 property vs. \$2,511,662.44 for the 3317 property). The analysis for both motions is the same.

Because the Movant's appraisal of \$2 million is supported by a declaration and is credible, and because the \$3.25 million appraisal submitted by the debtor is late, is not supported by a declaration, and is speculative because it apparently relies on hypothetical DIP financing, the court has to conclude based on the evidence that the value of the Property is \$2 million. At that valuation, the debt exceeds the value of the collateral, so there is no equity cushion. Accordingly, there is cause to grant under (d)(1).

With regard to (d)(2), the debt exceeds the value of the collateral, so there is no equity in the property. Further, the debtor's proposed chapter 11 plan depends entirely on the debtor obtaining \$500,000 in DIP financing. But this

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

case is four and a half months old, and the debtor has neither filed a DIP financing motion nor presented evidence of a binding DIP financing commitment. Given the speculative nature of the plan, there is no "effective reorganization *that is in prospect.*" *United Sav. Ass'n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs., Ltd.*, 484 US 365, 375-376 (1988) (emphasis in the original). Accordingly, (d)(2) relief is appropriate.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Hollymont Capital, LLC

Represented By  
Laura J Portillo

**Movant(s):**

1Sharpe Opportunity Intermediate

Represented By  
Mitchell B Ludwig

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-20319 Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#18.00** Hearing RE: [38] Motion to Allow Claim Numbers 3 and 4

Docket 38

**Tentative Ruling:**

The court first rules on the evidentiary objection (Docket No. 46) to the declaration of Luis Carmona (Docket No. 45). The objection is sustained. First, the declaration was filed late and can be disregarded for that reason alone. Second, every individual evidentiary objection is sustained, so even if the declaration had been timely, it would be almost entirely inadmissible for the reasons set forth in the evidentiary objection.

As to the merits of the motion, the record strongly supports granting the motion and deeming the claims timely filed.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("Rule") 3003(c)(2) states: "A creditor or equity security holder whose claim or interest is not scheduled—or is scheduled as disputed, contingent, or unliquidated—must file a proof of claim or interest. A creditor who fails to do so will not be treated as a creditor for that claim for voting and distribution."

With regard to the time to file, Rule 3003(c)(3) states: "The court must set the time to file a proof of claim or interest and may, for cause, extend the time. If the time has expired, the proof of claim or interest may be filed to the extent and under the conditions stated in Rule 3002(c)(2), (3), (4), and (7)."

Rule 3002(c)(7) states: "On a creditor's motion filed before or after the time to file a proof of claim has expired, the court may extend the time to file by no more than 60 days from the date of its order. The motion may be granted if the court finds that the notice was insufficient to give the creditor a reasonable time to file."

A motion to extend the deadline to file a claim that is not made until *after* the claims bar date has expired may only be granted on a finding of excusable neglect. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9006(b)(1)(B); *Pioneer Investment*

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

*Services Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. Partnership*, 507 US 380, 382 (1993);  
*In re Gordian Med., Inc.*, 499 B.R. 793, 797-798 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2013)  
(Wallace, J.).

Whether neglect is excusable calls for an equitable determination, taking into account all relevant circumstances. Factors considered include:

- danger of prejudice to the debtor;
- length of the delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings;
- reasons for the delay, including whether it was within the movant's reasonable control; and
- whether the movant acted in good faith.

*Pioneer*, 507 U.S. at 385; *In re Gorgian Med., Inc.*, 499 B.R. at 798.

Here, the undisputed evidence shows the following:

The Debtor filed bankruptcy on 11/19/25 -- the day of the Movant's scheduled foreclosure sale. The Debtor scheduled Movant's claim against the 3317 London St. property in the amount of \$2,442,279.20 and marked it "disputed." The Debtor scheduled Movant's claim against the 3321 London St. property in the amount of \$2,430,334.51 and marked it "disputed." The schedules state that the claims are cross-collateralized.

Movant's counsel attended the bankruptcy court's initial status conference on 1/8/26, where the court set a claims bar date of 2/13/26. However, Movant's counsel inadvertently failed to calendar that date. Movant's counsel first realized that the bar date passed after reviewing the Debtor's Disclosure Statement and Proposed Plan on February 24, 2026, which did not schedule Movant's claims for resolution in the proposed plan of reorganization. The holder of a secured claim need not file a proof of claim in order to preserve its lien. FRBP 3002(a) ("A lien that secures a claim is not void solely because an entity failed to file a proof of claim"). However,

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... **Hollymont Capital, LLC**

Chapter 11

secured creditor's failure to file a proof of claim may result in the creditor being barred from any distribution from a bankruptcy estate. See Rules 3002 and 3003.

The day he realized the error, 2/24/26, Movant's counsel reached out to Debtor's counsel about the issue, and also filed the Movant filed Claim No. 3 in the amount of \$2,422,954.86 with regard to the 3317 London St. property and Claim No. 4 in the amount of \$2,519,341.21 with regard to the 3324 London St. property.

Several days passed while Debtor's counsel attempted to confer with her client. On March 3, 2026, Debtor's counsel responded substantively and proposed that Debtor would stipulate to the late filing only if the parties were also able to resolve the amount of Movant's claim. Movant declined that proposal on the grounds that the late filing resulted from inadvertence, not bad faith, and conditioning a stipulation on resolution of the claim amount would effectively leverage an innocent calendaring error to obtain a substantive concession unrelated to the timeliness issue.

Because the *Pioneer* Factors Show Excusable Neglect, the Court  
Should Deem the Claims Timely Filed

With regard to the *Pioneer* factors for establishing excusable neglect, the first factor—danger of prejudice to the debtor—weighs in favor of deeming the claims timely filed because there is no prejudice to the Debtor. The Debtor was aware of the claims, having scheduled the claims and having filed bankruptcy on the day of the Movant's scheduled foreclosure sale. The Debtor expresses concern that deeming the claims timely filed will give the Movant a deficiency claim; however, the Movant responds that it is not asserting a deficiency claim and that California's anti-deficiency law prevent it from asserting a deficiency claim. Also, deeming the claims timely filed simply permits adjudication on the merits and does not impair any party's substantive rights. Accordingly, the Debtor is not prejudiced.

The second factor—length of the delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings—weighs in favor of deeming the claims timely filed. The delay was minimal (11 days) and will have no meaningful impact on judicial

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... **Hollymont Capital, LLC**  
proceedings.

Chapter 11

The third factor—reasons for the delay, including whether it was within the movant's reasonable control—weighs against deeming the claims timely filed because the delay resulted from a calendaring error that was within Movant's counsel's control. However, this is not fatal for the Movant, as it is only one factor among four. For example, In *In re Gordian Med., Inc.*, the bankruptcy court applied the *Pioneer* factors and held that although the federal government's delay in filing a proof of claim for Debtor's successor tax liability was due entirely to circumstances within the government's reasonable control, the fact the government had not acted in bad faith, coupled with lack of evidence of any prejudice to Debtor, warranted allowance of the Government's post-bar-date amendment of its proof of claim to include Debtor's substantial successor tax liability under the "excusable neglect" theory. *In re Gordian Med., Inc.*, 499 B.R. 793, 797-798 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2013) (Wallace, J.).

The fourth factor—whether the movant acted in good faith— weighs in favor of deeming the claims timely filed. Here, the Movant acted in good faith. Upon discovering the omission, Movant's counsel acted promptly to correct the error. He immediately notified counsel for the Debtor and, after waiting on Debtor's decision whether to stipulate to the relief sought, immediately prepared and sought seek relief from the court. There is no suggestion of bad faith, tactical delay, or attempt to gain unfair advantage.

Overall, the *Pioneer* factors weigh in favor concluding that there was excusable neglect on the part of Movants counsel and support a ruling deeming the claims timely filed.

Because Excusable Neglect Has Been Shown, the Court Need Not Determine Whether There Was an Informal Proof of Claim, but the Record Would Support Such a Finding

Because excusable neglect has been shown, the court need not make a determination regarding whether there was an informal proof of claim. However, if the court were to reach the issue, the record would support a finding that there was an informal proof of claim.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Hollymont Capital, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

The Ninth Circuit has long recognized the informal proof of claim doctrine whereby claims not filed in the proof of claim format have been deemed valid. See, e.g., *In re Sambo's Restaurants, Inc.*, 754 F2d 811, 815-817 (9th Cir. 1985) and *In re Fish*, 456 BR 413, 417 (9th Cir. BAP 2011) (collecting cases).

An informal, albeit valid, proof of claim, requires the following:

- presentment of a writing;
- within the claims-filing deadline;
- by or on behalf of the creditor;
- bringing to the attention of the court;
- the nature and amount of a claim asserted against the estate.

Here, the filing for non-judicial foreclosure, the identification of the claims in the Debtors' Schedules, and the Movant's appearance at the Status Conference constitute an informal proof of claim. These actions included the presentment of writings, occurred before the claims bar date, were made by or on behalf of the creditor, brought the claim to the attention to the court, and indicated the nature and approximate amount of the claim asserted against the estate. There is zero evidence that Movant was not seeking to hold the Debtor liable and zero evidence that the Debtor thought otherwise.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Hollymont Capital, LLC

Represented By  
Laura J Portillo

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-12011 Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta**

**Chapter 11**

**#19.00** Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Individual.

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Subchapter V bar date notice wasn't served.

The court will need to set a bar date and the Debtor will need to serve notice.

Does the Debtor need a claim objection deadline?

Plan deadline is 6/2/26 by statute.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta

Represented By  
Michael R Totaro

**Trustee(s):**

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-12011 Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta**

**Chapter 11**

**#19.10** Hearing RE: [25] Motion for Use of Cash Collateral

Docket 25

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta

Represented By  
Martha A. Warriner

**Trustee(s):**

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-11709 Covina Corral, Inc.,**

**Chapter 11**

**#20.00** Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Non-Individual. Inc.,

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Subchapter V bar date notice wasn't served.

The court will need to set a bar date and the Debtor will need to serve notice.

Does the Debtor need a claim objection deadline?

Plan deadline is 7/1/26.

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Covina Corral, Inc.,

Represented By  
Robert S Altagen

**Trustee(s):**

Mark M Sharf (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-11613 P Y T-Shirts Silk Screening Co. Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#21.00** Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Individual.

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Debtor did not serve its bar date notice until 4/1/26 (Docket No. 45, indicating that the claims bar date will be on 5/4/26). Per LBR 3003-1, the bar date notice in a Subchapter V case must be filed and served within seven days of the entry of the order for relief (here, the petition date was 2/22/26). Accordingly, the court will need to set a new bar date, and the Debtor will need to file and serve an amended bar date notice.

Does the Debtor need a claim objection deadline?

Plan and disclosure statement deadline is 5/26/26 (required by 11 U.S.C. § 1189(b)).

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

**Debtor(s):**

P Y T-Shirts Silk Screening Co. Inc.

Represented By  
Stella A Havkin

**Trustee(s):**

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-11613 P Y T-Shirts Silk Screening Co. Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#21.10** CONT'D Hearing RE: [32] Motion for an Order Authorizing Debtor (1) to Have Utilized its Per Petition Bank Account Through March 18, 2026 on A Nunc Pro Tunc Basis; (2) Granting Related Relief fr. 3-24-26

Docket 32

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

P Y T-Shirts Silk Screening Co. Inc.

Represented By  
Stella A Havkin

**Movant(s):**

P Y T-Shirts Silk Screening Co. Inc.

Represented By  
Stella A Havkin  
Stella A Havkin

**Trustee(s):**

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-16321 GRDN Hospitality, LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#22.00** Hearing RE: [126] Motion RE: Objection to Claim Number 26 by Claimant The California Dept. of Tax and Fee Administration.

Docket 126

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd from 4/7/26 to 5/7/26 at 1:00 p.m. per stip & order entered on 3/17/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

GRDN Hospitality, LLC

Represented By  
Gregory K Jones

**Trustee(s):**

Moriah Douglas Flahaut (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-21513 Kids First Pediatric Therapy, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#23.00** CONT'D Final Hearing RE: [2] Debtor's Motion for Order Authorizing Use of Cash Collateral To Confirm That Its Secured Credit is Adequately Protected fr. 12-29-25, 1-26-26, 1-27-26, 2-17-26

Docket 2

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Kids First Pediatric Therapy, Inc.

Represented By  
David Wood

**Trustee(s):**

Gregory Kent Jones (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:26-12045 Mazaia HB LLC**

**Chapter 11**

**#24.00** CONT'D Hearing RE: [16] Emergency motion for order authorizing use of cash collateral  
fr. 3-12-26, 3-19-26

Docket 16

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd from 4/7/26 to 4/14/26 at 1:00 p.m.  
per stip & order entered on 4/2/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Mazaia HB LLC

Represented By  
Robert S Altagen

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-12098 Paramount Intermodal Systems, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

**#25.00** Hearing RE: [139] Debtor's Motion For Entry Of An Order (1) Authorizing The Debtor To Sell Certain Assets Outside The Ordinary Course Of Business Free And Clear Of All Liens, Claims, Encumbrances And Interests; And (2) Approving Sale Procedures For Future Sales Of Assets

Docket 139

**Tentative Ruling:**

The court has some concerns.

FRBP 6004(c) requires notice of a motion for sale free and clear of liens and other interests to be served on the parties holding liens and interests under FRBP 9014 (so, as a summons and complaint under FRBP 7004). The Motion asserts that the IRS and GFP EverWest City of Industry, LLC hold secured claims, but they were served with the Motion only by NEF and U.S. Mail, not in the manner required for a U.S. Governmental agency and a domestic corporation under FRBP 7004. Creditor BZ 21, LLC also filed a proof of claim asserting a secured claim, but it isn't clear that it holds liens on the property to be sold here.

The court will not address the portions of the Motion relating to the withdrawn request that the court approve procedures for future sales.

A trustee or debtor in possession, after notice and a hearing, may sell, other than in the ordinary course of business, property of the estate. 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1). The sale must be in the best interests of the estate and the price must be fair and reasonable. *In re The Canyon P'ship*, 55 B.R. 520 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1985). In approving any sale outside the ordinary course of business, the court must not only articulate a sufficient business reason for the sale, it must further find it is in the best interest of the estate, i.e. it is fair and reasonable, that it has been given adequate marketing, that it has been negotiated and proposed in good faith, that the purchaser is proceeding in good faith, and that it is an arms-length transaction. *In re Wilde Horse Enterprises, Inc.*, 136 B.R. 830, 841 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1991).

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Paramount Intermodal Systems, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

A chapter 11 debtor in possession may sell property free and clear of any interest in such property other than the estate, only if – (1) applicable nonbankruptcy law permits sale of such property free and clear of such interest; (2) such entity consents; (3) such interest is a lien and the price at which such property is to be sold is greater than the aggregate value of all liens on such property; (4) such interest is in a bonafide dispute; or (5) such entity could be compelled in a legal or equitable proceeding, to accept a money satisfaction of such interest. 11 U.S.C. § 363(f).

There is a general assertion in the Motion that the Debtor has made it known since the petition date that it has chassis for sale, but nothing further about how it has tried to market its chassis, particularly the five chassis that are the subject of the Motion. The declaration of the Debtor's principal, Mr. Orellana, testifies to this general "made it known to the marketplace" assertion, but includes no further discussion of marketing of the Debtor's chassis.

As to the sale price, the Debtor notes that the chassis to be sold were purchased by the Debtor in 2018 for \$15,600 when new, but there is no further discussion of or evidence that the \$12,000 each/\$60,000 aggregate price is a fair and reasonable price for the Assets.

The proposed sale is not subject to overbid. For this reason, the Debtor was required by LBR 6004-1(c)(2)(B) to include a declaration with certification that the Debtor has not been contacted by any potential overbidder and that, in the Debtor's business judgment, there are no viable alternative purchasers. The fact that the Debtor does not describe active marketing procedures or potential alternative purchasers makes it difficult for the court to conclude that it is appropriate to approve a private sale not subject to overbid.

The Motion also fails to discuss whether there are any liens or interests of other parties in the Assets. The Motion states that the Debtor seeks approval of a free and clear sale, but there is no discussion of the requirements of § 363(f). Confusingly, the Debtor asserts in the Motion that the proposed sale will generate proceeds to pay "priority claims" of the IRS and GFP Everwest City of Industry, LLC (Motion, 10:13-15), and mentions

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

**CONT...**      **Paramount Intermodal Systems, Inc.**

**Chapter 11**

only in footnotes that both of those parties hold *liens*.

There is nothing in the Motion upon which the court could base a finding that the proposed sale can be free and clear of liens, interests, and encumbrances under § 363(f).

The Motion also refers to the proposed sale as being in good faith, but the Motion does not actually request a finding or ruling under § 363(m) as to the Buyer. It *does* request § 363(m) findings for the now-withdrawn proposed "Limited Sales," but does not include such a request or evidence in support thereof with respect to the sale of the five chassis to the Buyer. The Motion asserts that the proposed sale was negotiated at arms' length and without collusion, but this is not set forth in Mr. Orellana's declaration or any other evidence. There is no declaration from the Buyer.

The court needs additional information regarding marketing, the reasonableness of the sale price, whether the Assets can be sold free and clear of any encumbrances, and what the Debtor is seeking regarding 363(m) (and whether the court can make those findings).

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

**Debtor(s):**

Paramount Intermodal Systems, Inc.

Represented By  
Ron Bender  
John-Patrick M Fritz  
Robert Carrasco

**Movant(s):**

Paramount Intermodal Systems, Inc.

Represented By  
Ron Bender  
John-Patrick M Fritz  
Robert Carrasco

**Trustee(s):**

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-19538 R**Loom, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company **Chapter 7**  
Adv#: 2:26-01018 D. Masin Consulting, LLC, a California Limited Lia v. LIMELIGHT

**#26.00** Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:26-ap-01018. Complaint by D. Masin Consulting, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, D. Masin Consulting, LLC, as Assignee for the Benefit of Rloom LLC's Creditors against LIMELIGHT INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, a Foreign Corporation, SAM S LESLIE.

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Rloom, LLC, a Delaware limited	Represented By David B Golubchik
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Defendant(s):**

LIMELIGHT INTERNATIONAL	Pro Se
SAM S LESLIE	Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

D. Masin Consulting, LLC, a	Represented By Jeffrey I Golden
D. Masin Consulting, LLC, as	Represented By Jeffrey I Golden

**Trustee(s):**

Sam S Leslie (TR)	Represented By Eric P Israel
-------------------	---------------------------------

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-10240 Meiling Tong**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 2:25-01208 Askari v. Tong

**#27.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Complaint by Knicko Haider-Raza Askari against Meiling Tong. false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud)),(67 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(4), fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny)),(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury)) fr. 8-19-25, 11-13-25, 1-20-26

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

Set discovery cutoff and date for continued status conference before setting trial date.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Meiling Tong

Represented By  
Kevin Tang

**Defendant(s):**

Meiling Tong

Represented By  
Adam Apollo

**Plaintiff(s):**

Knicko Askari

Represented By  
Lazaro E Fernandez

**Trustee(s):**

Sam S Leslie (TR)

Represented By  
Elissa Miller

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-16132 Patricia Del Carmen Bravo**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 2:24-01277 Soracco v. Bravo

**#28.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:24-ap-01277. Complaint by Edmund Robert Soracco against Patricia Del Carmen Bravo . (67 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(4), fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny)) ,(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury)) fr. 3-4-25, 6-17-25, 1-13-26, 3-3-26

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

Please update the court. Is there a mediator selected? If not, the court will set a trial date.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Patricia Del Carmen Bravo

Represented By  
Gregory M Shanfeld

**Defendant(s):**

Patricia Del Carmen Bravo

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Edmund Robert Soracco

Pro Se

**Trustee(s):**

Elissa Miller (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-11660 Keith Wonki Bae**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 2:24-01169 Dye v. Bae et al

**#29.00** Order to Show Cause re: Dimissal for Failure to Prosecute

Docket 87

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Keith Wonki Bae

Represented By

Eric Bensamochan

Alejandro H Herrera

**Defendant(s):**

J & A Development, Inc. Pro Se

Studio City Valley FG Corp. Pro Se

Pink Panda Inc. Pro Se

Cali FG Corp. Pro Se

Birdies Norco Corp. Pro Se

I Savant Norco Corp. Pro Se

I Savant FG Pro Se

Olympic Kitchen Pro Se

Downtown Kitchen Pro Se

Wok N' Tenders Pro Se

Bae FG Corp. Pro Se

Birdies DTLA Pro Se

Birdies LA Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Keith Wonki Bae Chapter 7**

DTLA SOUTH PARK CORP.	Pro Se
Alejandro Herrera	Pro Se
Guillermo Chanchavac	Pro Se
Antonio Jones	Pro Se
Erick Gabriel	Pro Se
Adriana Ayala	Pro Se
Mariana Ayala	Pro Se
Danielle Heflin	Pro Se
James Bae	Pro Se
Vicky Lee	Pro Se
Esther Bae	Pro Se
Keith Wonki Bae	Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Carolyn Dye	Represented By Michael E Bubman
-------------	------------------------------------

**Trustee(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)	Represented By Michael E Bubman
--------------------	------------------------------------

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-11660 Keith Wonki Bae**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 2:24-01169 Dye v. Bae et al

**#30.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Complaint by Carolyn Dye against Keith Wonki Bae, Esther Bae, Vicky Lee, James Bae, Danielle Heflin, Mariana Ayala, Adriana Ayala, Erick Gabriel, Antonio Jones, Guillermo Chanchavac, Alejandro Herrera, DTLA SOUTH PARK CORP., Birdies LA, Birdies DTLA, Bae FG Corp., Wok N' Tenders, Downtown Kitchen, Olympic Kitchen, I Savant FG, I Savant Norco Corp., Birdies Norco Corp., Cali FG Corp., Pink Panda Inc., Studio City Valley FG Corp., J & A Development, Inc.. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Nature of Suit: (12 (Recovery of money/property - 547 preference)),(11 (Recovery of money/property - 542 turnover of property)),(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury)),(41 (Objection / revocation of discharge - 727(c),(d),(e)))  
fr. 9-12-24, 1-7-25, 4-17-25, 8-26-25, 9-4-25, 11-18-25, 2-24-26

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Keith Wonki Bae

Represented By  
Eric Bensamochan

**Defendant(s):**

J & A Development, Inc.	Pro Se
Studio City Valley FG Corp.	Pro Se
Pink Panda Inc.	Pro Se
Cali FG Corp.	Pro Se
Birdies Norco Corp.	Pro Se
I Savant Norco Corp.	Pro Se
I Savant FG	Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Keith Wonki Bae**

**Chapter 7**

Olympic Kitchen	Pro Se
Downtown Kitchen	Pro Se
Wok N' Tenders	Pro Se
Bae FG Corp.	Pro Se
Birdies DTLA	Pro Se
Birdies LA	Pro Se
DTLA SOUTH PARK CORP.	Pro Se
Alejandro Herrera	Pro Se
Guillermo Chanchavac	Pro Se
Antonio Jones	Pro Se
Erick Gabriel	Pro Se
Adriana Ayala	Pro Se
Mariana Ayala	Pro Se
Danielle Heflin	Pro Se
James Bae	Pro Se
Vicky Lee	Pro Se
Esther Bae	Pro Se
Keith Wonki Bae	Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Carolyn Dye

Represented By  
Michael E Bubman

**Trustee(s):**

Carolyn A Dye (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:23-12971 Michael Jerome Hicks**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 2:23-01383 Riley et al v. Hicks

**#31.00** Hearing RE: [35] Motion for Summary Judgment

Docket 35

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd from 4/7/26 to 5/28/26 at 1:00 p.m.  
by court.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Michael Jerome Hicks

Represented By  
Jill L Kim

**Defendant(s):**

Michael Jerome Hicks

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Willie Riley

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

Tim Varner

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

Tanfiru Leatherwood

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

**Trustee(s):**

Sam S Leslie (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:23-12971 Michael Jerome Hicks

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:23-01383 Riley et al v. Hicks

**#32.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:23-ap-01383. Complaint by Willie Riley, Tim Varner, Tanfiru Leatherwood against Michael Jerome Hicks. false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud),(67 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(4), fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny))  
fr. 9-28-23, 3-28-24, 9-26-24, 3-25-25, 9-9-25, 12-9-25, 3-12-26

Docket 1

\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Cont'd from 4/7/26 to 5/28/26 at 1:00 p.m.  
by court.

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Michael Jerome Hicks

Represented By  
Jill L Kim

**Defendant(s):**

Michael Jerome Hicks

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Willie Riley

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

Tim Varner

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

Tanfiru Leatherwood

Represented By  
Daren M Schlecter

**Trustee(s):**

Sam S Leslie (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:24-17511 Hasmik Yaghobyan**

**Chapter 11**

Adv#: 2:25-01075 Yaghobyan v. Nationstar aka Mr Cooper, a Texas Corporation et a

**#33.00** Hearing RE: [48] Motion to Compel Compliance with Deposition/Subpoena

Docket 48

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Denied per order entered on 3/25/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Hasmik Yaghobyan

Pro Se

**Defendant(s):**

Nationstar aka Mr Cooper, a Texas

Pro Se

Deutsche Bank Trust Company

Represented By  
Jennifer C Wong

**Plaintiff(s):**

Hasmik Yaghobyan

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-16367 Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

Adv#: 2:25-01408 Mance et al v. Zar et al

**#34.00** Hearing RE: [75] Motion for judgment on the pleadings

Docket 75

**Tentative Ruling:**

As a preliminary matter, the Plaintiffs' Request for Judicial Notice (the "RJN," Docket No. 78) asks the court to take judicial notice of public documents: the Plaintiffs' opposition to the Debtors' disclosure statement in the main bankruptcy case (Exhibit A to the RJN), as well as certified copies of statements of information for various defendant corporate entities that were filed with the state of California (Exhibits B-K to the RJN).

The court will take judicial notice of Exhibits B-K, as they are public documents in existence before the adversary complaint. The court will not take judicial notice of Exhibit A, the Plaintiffs' opposition to the Debtors' disclosure statement in the main bankruptcy case, because it was filed after the adversary complaint and because it includes a copy of transcript of the Rule 2004 exam of Debtor Parham Zar. While this is a public document because it was filed with the court, it is outside the pleadings and inappropriate for the court to consider in the context of a motion for judgment on the pleadings (as opposed to, for example, a motion for summary judgment). Accordingly, the court will disregard Exhibit A.

The Plaintiffs also filed a notice of lodging of transcript of the Rule 2004 examination of Mr. Zar (Docket No. 79). For the reasons stated immediately above, the court will disregard this transcript.

As to the merits of the motion, the court finds that there is no cause for the relief requested.

I. Relevant Law/Legal Standard

a. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT...

**Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c), as incorporated by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7012(b), states: "After the pleadings are closed—but early enough not to delay trial—a party may move for judgment on the pleadings."

b. Legal Standard

The standard applied on a Rule 12(c) motion is essentially the same as that applied on Rule 12(b)(6) motions—i.e., judgment on the pleadings is appropriate when, even if all material facts in the pleading under attack are true, the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Fleming v. Pickard*, 581 F3d 922, 925 (9th Cir. 2009). As with a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, most courts have held that, to survive a Rule 12(c) motion, the complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim that is plausible on its face. *Chavez v. United States*, 683 F3d 1102, 1108-1109 (9th Cir. 2012). Failure to plead with particularity as required by Rule 9(b) can be challenged by a Rule 12(c) motion. *Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. General Dynamics C4 Systems, Inc.*, 637 F3d at 1054-55 (9th Cir. 2011).

c. What Courts May Consider

Similar to a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, in resolving a Rule 12(c) motion, the court can consider (without converting the motion to a summary judgment): (a) the complaint and answer; (b) any documents attached to or mentioned in the pleadings; (c) documents not attached but "integral" to the claims; and (d) matters subject to judicial notice. *L-7 Designs, Inc. v. Old Navy, LLC*, 647 F3d 419, 422 (2nd Cir. 2011).

II. Analysis

a. The Complaint Pleads Fraud with Sufficient Particularity

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... Parham Zar

Chapter 11

The defendants assert that the complaint does not plead fraud with particularity. Rule 9(b) states, "[i]n alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake. Malice, intent, knowledge, and other conditions of a person's mind may be alleged generally." The Ninth Circuit has held Rule 9(b) pleadings are sufficient where allegations are "accompanied by 'the who, what, when, where and how' of the misconduct charged." *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1106 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, the complaint specifically states when the alleged fraud occurred -- on January 5, 2023 when Mr. Zar, through defendant Grow Escrow, Inc. ("Grow Escrow") entered into the California Residential Purchase Agreement and Joint Escrow Instructions (the "RPA") to act as the escrow agent, and again on the dates of January 14, 2023 and January 30, 2023, when the escrow instructions and amended instructions were given to the defendants, specifically constituting a writing satisfying the who, what, when, where, and how. (Complaint, Docket No. 1 at ¶¶ 25, 26, 28.)

The complaint sufficiently alleges that the defendants, through Grow Escrow, prepared a closing statement after the closing on February 17, 2023, affirming what would happen to the \$727,500 of the Plaintiffs' money withheld until the IRS cleared the sale of the property with the closing statement attached to the complaint—again alleging what represented, how it was represented, the date it was represented, and by whom. (Complaint at ¶ 29.) The complaint explicitly even names the witness, Dorothy Bright, who disclosed the fraudulent actions of the defendants' conversion of the withheld funds. (Complaint at ¶ 30.) The complaint even gives a specific defined term "December Misrepresentations" for an email sent by Grow Escrow at the direction of Mr. Zar on December 26, 2023. (Complaint at ¶ 31.) These allegations contain the who, what, when, where and how of the misconduct, alleging and stating with particularity the circumstances allegedly constituting fraud. Further, the complaint clearly alleges debtor Ms. Djavaheri's alter ego status and involvement (Complaint at ¶¶ 20 and 24).

b. The Complaint Sufficiently Pleads a Cause of Action for Breach of Fiduciary Relationship Under § 523(a)(4)

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT...

**Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

"To prevail on a nondischargeability claim under § 523(a)(4) the plaintiff must prove not only the debtor's fraud or defalcation, but also that the debtor was acting in a fiduciary capacity when the debtor committed the fraud or defalcation." *In re Honkanen*, 446 B.R. 373, 378 (9th Cir. 2011). "For a trust relationship under § 523(a)(4) to be established, the applicable state law must clearly define fiduciary duties and identify trust property." *Id.* at 379.

California Financial Code § 17409(a) states:

All moneys deposited in escrow to be delivered upon the close of the escrow or upon any other contingency shall be deposited and maintained in a noninterest-bearing demand or checking account in a bank, a state or federal savings bank, or a state or federal savings association or in a noninterest-bearing account subject to immediate withdrawal in an industrial loan company insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and approved to receive those moneys by the commissioner . . . . Those funds, when deposited, are to be designated as "trust funds," "escrow accounts," or under some other appropriate name indicating that the funds are not the funds of the escrow agent.

California Financial Code section 17409 establishes that escrow agents are fiduciaries and that they are to specifically hold escrowed funds, which the law even describes such funds as "trust funds." The complaint clearly alleges the relationship between Plaintiffs (the beneficiaries) and the defendants (the trustees/fiduciaries/escrow holders). (Complaint at ¶ 25 and also at Exhibits 1 and 5). Thus, the complaint sufficiently alleges a cause of action for breach of a fiduciary duty pursuant to section 523(a)(4). Accepting the Plaintiffs' factual allegations as true, the section 523(a)(4) claim is plausible on its face

c. The Complaint Sufficiently Pleads a Cause of Action for Willful and Malicious Injury Under § 523(a)(6)

Section 523(a)(6) involves "willful and malicious injury by the debtor to another entity or to the property of another entity." 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(6).

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... **Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

"[T]he willful injury requirement of § 523(a)(6) is met when it is shown either that the debtor had a subjective motive to inflict the injury or that the debtor believed that injury was substantially certain to occur as a result of his conduct. *In re Jercich*, 238 F.3d 1202, 1208 (9th Cir. 2001) (emphasis in the original). A "malicious" injury involves "(1) a wrongful act, (2) done intentionally, (3) which necessarily causes injury, and (4) is done without just cause or excuse." *Id.* at 1209 (internal quotations omitted).

Here, the complaint clearly alleges that the defendants engaged in wrongful acts of misrepresentation and conversion by diverting Plaintiffs' \$727,500 to other accounts in the defendants' control. The complaint states specifically in paragraph 48 that the defendants had no intention of performing their obligations, and the injury resulting from failing to release the \$727,500 to the Plaintiffs actually resulted in the Plaintiffs' being damaged and deprived of \$727,500. No just cause or excuse was ever given for the defendants' conduct.

Further, the alleged refusal to release the \$727,500 to the Plaintiffs and the alleged diversion out of the escrow account is an action from which malice may be inferred, resulting in alleged damages of \$727,500. Accordingly, the complaint sufficiently alleged a cause of action for willful and malicious conduct pursuant to section 523(a)(6). Accepting the Plaintiffs' factual allegations as true, the section 523(a)(6) claim is plausible on its face

d. The Complaint Sufficiently Pleads a Cause of Action for All Claims Made Against Shoshana Djavaheri

Ms. Djavaheri is the manager of EDSI, LLC (see Exhibit F to the Plaintiffs' RJN, Docket No. 78), and the Plaintiffs have alleged that Ms. Djavaheri is the alter ego of one or more of the defendants (Complaint at §§ 20 and 24). Thus, all claims are applicable to Ms. Djavaheri just as they are against Mr. Zar and the entity defendants.

Also, "where a debtor personally commits acts that constitute fraud related to a corporate debt, the debtor's liability arising from that fraud may still be held nondischargeable under section 523(a) without a finding that the debtor is liable for the underlying debt under an alter ego theory." *In re*

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT...

**Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

*Carroll*, 549 B.R. 375, 381 (N.D. Cal. 2016).

The complaint clearly puts Ms. Djavaheeri on notice of the factual allegations made against her, and the evidence of such factual allegations are shown in the docket of the bankruptcy case and the adversary proceeding.

e. The Complaint's Prayer for a Constructive Trust Is Supported by Law

Paragraph 51 of the complaint alleges that "Debtor gained by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, the violation of a trust and/or other wrongful acts, as described in this Complaint, money over which a constructive trust in favor of Plaintiff must be imposed pursuant to California Civil Code §2224."

California Civil Code section 2224 states, "[o]ne who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, the violation of a trust, or other wrongful act, is, unless he or she has some other and better right thereto, an involuntary trustee of the thing gained, for the benefit of the person who would otherwise have had it."

"The wrongful act giving rise to a constructive trust need not amount to fraud or intentional misrepresentation. All that must be shown is that the acquisition of the property was wrongful and that the defendant's keeping of the property would constitute unjust enrichment." *In re Goldberg*, 168 B.R. 382, 384 (9th Cir. 1994).

Here, the Plaintiffs have alleged the elements for a constructive trust to be applied and have alleged that such constructive trust is for property that was converted in connection with fraud perpetrated by the defendants.

Deny.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Parham Zar

Represented By  
Michael Jay Berger

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

**Defendant(s):**

Parham Zar	Pro Se
Shoshana Djavaheeri	Pro Se
EDSI, LLC	Pro Se
Grow Escrow, Inc.	Pro Se
Grow Escrow Holdings, Inc.	Pro Se
Egg Donor and Surrogacy Institute	Pro Se
Greenway Commercial Holdings,	Pro Se
Makini, LLC	Pro Se
Makini-2, LLC	Pro Se
Makini-4, LLC	Pro Se
DOES 1-50	Pro Se

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Shoshana Djavaheeri	Represented By Michael Jay Berger
---------------------	--------------------------------------

**Plaintiff(s):**

Craig Mance	Represented By Alexandre I Cornelius
Jane Mance	Represented By Alexandre I Cornelius

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**2:25-16367 Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

Adv#: 2:25-01408 Mance et al v. Zar et al

**#35.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:25-ap-01408. Complaint by Jane Mance, Craig Mance against Parham Zar, Shoshana Djavaheri, EDSI, LLC, Grow Escrow, Inc., Grow Escrow Holdings, Inc., Egg Donor and Surrogacy Institute, Greenway Commercial Holdings, LTD., Makini, LLC, Makini-2, LLC, Makini-4, LLC, DOES 1-50. false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud)),(67 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(4), fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny)),(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury)),(72 (Injunctive relief - other))  
fr. 2-24-26

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

Given the tentative ruling regarding the defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings, does the plaintiff intend to file its motion for summary judgment?

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Parham Zar

Represented By  
Michael Jay Berger

**Defendant(s):**

Parham Zar

Pro Se

Shoshana Djavaheri

Pro Se

EDSI, LLC

Pro Se

Grow Escrow, Inc.

Pro Se

Grow Escrow Holdings, Inc.

Pro Se

Egg Donor and Surrogacy Institute

Pro Se

Greenway Commercial Holdings,

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Parham Zar**

**Chapter 11**

Makini, LLC Pro Se

Makini-2, LLC Pro Se

Makini-4, LLC Pro Se

DOES 1-50 Pro Se

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Shoshana Djavaheri  
Represented By  
Michael Jay Berger

**Plaintiff(s):**

Craig Mance  
Represented By  
Alexandre I Cornelius

Jane Mance  
Represented By  
Alexandre I Cornelius

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01040      McBeth (TR) v. Sahani et al

**#36.00**    CONT'D Hearing RE: [461] Motion For Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Summary Adjudication

fr. 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25, 3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket      461

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Dismissed per stip & order entered on 2/17/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Gurpreet Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Rajinder Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Amarjit Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Shaheen Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Gurpreet Sahani as Trustee of The

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes  
Jeffrey I Golden

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01040      McBeth (TR) v. Sahani et al

**#37.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 9:18-ap-01040. Complaint by The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors against Gurpreet Sahani, Gurpreet Gurpreet Sahani as Trustee of The Green Acres Trust Dated May 10, 2017, Rajinder Sahani, Amarjit Sahani, Shaheen Sahani. Recovery, and Preservation of Preferential Transfers; (2) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Intentional Fraudulent Transfers; (3) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers; (4) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (5) Conversion/Misappropriation; (6) Civil Liability Under Penal Code § 496; (7) Unfair Business Practices (Business and Professions Code § 17200); (8) Misappropriation of Trade Secrets; (9) Declaratory Relief; (10) Quiet Title; and (11) Turnover (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (12 (Recovery of money/property - 547 preference)),(13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(11 (Recovery of money/property - 542 turnover of property)),(91 (Declaratory judgment)),(02 (Other (e.g. other actions that would have been brought in state court if unrelated to bankruptcy))) (Haes, Chad)

FR. 10-24-18, 4-16-19, 6-12-19, 7-23-19, 3-24-20, 6-23-20, 11-17-20, 9-14-20, 1-6-20, 2-10-21, 5-12-21, 5-18-21, 10-26-21, 2-8-22, 6-7-22, 6-14-22, 10-11-22, 2-14-23, 4-18-23, 4-11-23, 7-11-23, 10-10-23, 1-9-24, 4-9-24, 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25, 3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket      1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Dismissed per stip & order entered on 2/17/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**Defendant(s):**

Gurpreet Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Rajinder Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Amarjit Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Shaheen Sahani

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

Gurpreet Sahani as Trustee of The

Represented By  
Lewis R Landau  
Stephen E Hyam

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01049      McBeth (TR) v. Los Angeles County Treasurer and Tax Collector

**#38.00** CONT'D Hearing RE: [303] Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Summary Adjudication  
fr. 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25,  
3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket      303

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Dismissed per stip & order entered on  
2/10/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Los Angeles County Treasurer and

Represented By  
Jacquelyn H Choi

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes  
Jeffrey I Golden

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01049      McBeth (TR) v. Los Angeles County Treasurer and Tax Collector

**#39.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 9:18-ap-01049. Complaint by THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS of the bankruptcy estate of Rajysan, Inc., dba MMD Equipment, a California Corporation against Los Angeles County Treasurer and Tax Collector. Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548, 550, and 551; (2) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544, 550, and 551; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04, et seq.]; (3) Disallowance of Claims Held by Defendant [11 U.S.C. § 502(d)] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)) (Haes, Chad)

FR. 11-28-18, 6-12-19, 7-23-19, 3-24-20, 6-23-20, 11-17-20, 1-6-21, 2-1-21, 5-12-21, 5-18-21, 10-26-21, 2-8-22, 6-7-22, 6-14-22, 10-11-22, 2-14-23, 4-18-23, 4-11-23, 7-11-23, 10-10-23, 1-9-24, 4-9-24, 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25, 3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Dismissed per stip & order entered on 2/10/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Los Angeles County Treasurer and

Represented By  
Jacquelyn H Choi

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01052      McBeth (TR) v. Department of the Treasury et al

**#40.00**    CONT'D Hearing RE: [286] Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Summary Adjudication  
fr. 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25  
3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket      286

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\*    REASON: Settled by stipulation, adv. proceeding  
dismissed per order entered on 1/7/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Department of the Treasury

Pro Se

Internal Revenue Service

Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

---

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes  
Jeffrey I Golden

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

Tuesday, April 7, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01052      McBeth (TR) v. Department of the Treasury et al

**#41.00** CONT'D Hearing RE: [320] Motion to Strike Portions of United States' Opposition to the Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment or, Alternatively, Summary Adjudication  
fr. 6-24-14, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25, 3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket 320

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Settled by stipulation, adv. proceeding dismissed per order entered on 1/7/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Department of the Treasury

Pro Se

Internal Revenue Service

Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

**Movant(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes  
Jeffrey I Golden

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**9:17-11363 Rajysan, Inc.**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 9:18-01052      McBeth (TR) v. Department of the Treasury et al

**#42.00** CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 9:18-ap-01052. Complaint by THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS of the bankruptcy estate of Rajysan, Inc., dba MMD Equipment, a California Corporation against Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service. Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548, 550, and 551]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery, and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544, 550, and 551; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04, et seq.]; (3) Disallowance of Claims Held by Defendants [11 U.S.C. § 502(d)] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)) (Haes, Chad)

FR. 11-28-18, 1-9-19, 4-16-19, 6-12-19, 7-23-19, 3-24-20, 6-23-20, 11-17-20, 1-6-21, 2-10-21, 5-12-21, 5-18-21, 10-26-21, 2-8-22, 6-7-22, 6-14-22, 10-11-22, 2-14-23, 4-18-23, 4-11-23, 7-11-23, 10-10-23, 1-9-23, 4-9-24, 6-12-24, 6-24-24, 8-26-24, 10-2-24, 11-14-24, 2-20-25, 3-27-25, 3-28-25, 4-10-25, 5-1-25, 8-12-25, 10-14-25, 12-16-25

Docket      1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: Settled by stipulation, adv. proceeding dismissed per order entered on 1/7/26.**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Rajysan, Inc.

Represented By  
Andrew Goodman

**Defendant(s):**

Department of the Treasury  
Internal Revenue Service

Pro Se  
Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Los Angeles  
Deborah Saltzman, Presiding  
Courtroom 1639 Calendar**

**Tuesday, April 7, 2026**

**Hearing Room 1639**

1:00 PM

**CONT... Rajysan, Inc.**  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Represented By  
Najah J Shariff

**Chapter 7**

**Plaintiff(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Chad V Haes

**Trustee(s):**

Sandra McBeth (TR)

Represented By  
Timothy J Yoo  
Adam D Grant  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay  
Kurt Ramlo  
Chad V Haes