

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

Tuesday, June 9, 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
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/1652605845>

ZoomGov meeting number: 165 260 5845

Password: 220501

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

Tuesday, June 9, 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, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-10320 Umair Abubaker

Chapter 11

#1.00 CONT'D Hearing RE: [72] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 854 N. Stanley Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90046 .
fr. 5-12-26, 5-20-26

Docket 72

***** VACATED *** REASON: Case dismissed on 5/22/26.**

Tentative Ruling:

The court thanks the movant for the updated declaration re service.
The motion appears to have been served properly and is unopposed.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Umair Abubaker

Represented By
Matthew Abbasi

Movant(s):

Farmers & Merchants Bank

Represented By
Cheryl C. Rouse

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-20443 Orange Courier, Inc

Chapter 7

#2.00 CONT'D Hearing RE: [8] Debtor's Emergency Motion for Entry of Order (1) Authorizing Use of Cash Collateral on an Interim Basis and (2) Setting a Final Hearing on Use of Cash Collateral
fr. 11-26-25, 12-4-25, 12-16-25, 1-8-26, 2-24-26, 3-17-26, 3-24-26, 4-14-26, 4-21-26

Docket 8

Tentative Ruling:

The motion is unopposed.

Grant.

Does the trustee suggest a further hearing date on use of cash collateral?

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Orange Courier, Inc

Represented By
Eric Bensamochan

Movant(s):

Orange Courier, Inc

Represented By
Eric Bensamochan

Trustee(s):

CASE REOP/CONV/OR CLOSED

Pro Se

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-20443 Orange Courier, Inc

Chapter 7

#3.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition Non-Individual
(converted to chapter 7).
fr. 1-8-26, 3-17-26, 3-24-26

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

The court thanks the trustee for the status report.
Is a further status conference necessary or helpful?

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Orange Courier, Inc

Represented By
Eric Bensamochan

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR)

Represented By
Monica Y Kim
Ron Bender

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-12045 Mazaia HB LLC

Chapter 11

#4.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition Non-Individual.
fr. 4-14-26

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

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, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-10075 Edgardo Daniel Iorio

Chapter 11

#5.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Chapter 11 Voluntary Petition Individual
fr. 2-10-26

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Edgardo Daniel Iorio

Represented By
Matthew D. Resnik

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-10423 Iris Marie Mizell Sanders

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:26-01077 Sanders v. Levinson et al

#6.00 Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:26-ap-01077. Complaint by Iris Sanders against Ben Levinson, TOTAL LENDER SOLUTIONS, INC, Levinson law Apc, SCOTT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND 1 LLC. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Nature of Suit: (14 (Recovery of money/property - other)),(72 (Injunctive relief - other))

Docket 1

***** VACATED *** REASON: Cont'd from 6/9/26 to 6/18/26 at 1:00 p.m.
per order entered on 5/7/26.**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Iris Marie Mizell Sanders

Represented By
Michael D Kwasigroch

Defendant(s):

Ben Levinson

Pro Se

TOTAL LENDER SOLUTIONS,

Pro Se

Levinson law Apc

Pro Se

SCOTT CAPITAL

Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Iris Sanders

Represented By
Michael D Kwasigroch

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, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:25-11999 Alexander von Neitsch

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:26-01063 von Neitsch v. Daniel E Naysan, D.D.S. et al

#7.00 Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:26-ap-01063. Complaint by Elena von Neitsch against Daniel E. Naysan , M. Nayssan , dba Bedford Dental Group . (\$350.00 Fee Not Required). Nature of Suit: (65 (Dischargeability - other)), (72 (Injunctive relief - other)) ,(91 (Declaratory judgment)) fr. 5-26-26 (another summons)

Docket 1

***** VACATED *** REASON: Another Summons issued on 4/28/26, S/C reset to 6/30/26 at 1:00 p.m.**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Alexander von Neitsch	Pro Se
-----------------------	--------

Defendant(s):

Daniel E Naysan, D.D.S.	Pro Se
-------------------------	--------

M. Nayssan. D.D.S., Inc., a Ca	Pro Se
--------------------------------	--------

Joint Debtor(s):

Elena von Neitsch	Pro Se
-------------------	--------

Plaintiff(s):

Elena von Neitsch	Pro Se
-------------------	--------

Trustee(s):

Timothy Yoo (TR)	Pro Se
------------------	--------

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:24-18508 Hyun Kuk Shin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:25-01010 Timothy J. Yoo, Chapter 7 Trustee For The Bankrupt v. Shin et al

#8.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:25-ap-01010. Complaint by Timothy J. Yoo, Chapter 7 Trustee For The Bankruptcy Estate Of Hyun Kuk Shin And Jennifer Ae Shin against Charles Shin, Seung Ji Choi. (11 (Recovery of money/property - 542 turnover of property)),(91 (Declaratory judgment)) fr. 3-25-25, 5-1-25, 5-5-25, 10-7-25, 12-2-25, 2-10-26, 4-14-26

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

Continue to August 18. No appearances on June 9.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Hyun Kuk Shin

Represented By
Andrew S Cho

Defendant(s):

Charles Shin

Pro Se

Seung Ji Choi

Pro Se

Joint Debtor(s):

Jennifer Ae Shin

Represented By
Andrew S Cho

Plaintiff(s):

Timothy J. Yoo, Chapter 7 Trustee

Represented By
Anthony A. Friedman

Trustee(s):

Timothy Yoo (TR)

Pro Se

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:24-16259 Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:24-01256 Cota v. Martin

#9.00 CONT'D Hearing RE: [21] Motion For Summary Judgment
fr. 1-27-26, 4-14-26

Docket 21

Tentative Ruling:

Summary Judgment Standard

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, made applicable to bankruptcy proceedings by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7056, permits summary judgment if "the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(2).; see *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986).

Once the moving party's burden is met by presenting evidence which, if uncontroverted, would entitle the moving party to a directed verdict at trial, the burden then shifts to the responding party to set forth specific facts demonstrating that there is a genuine issue for trial. *Rudberg v. State of Nevada*, 896 F. Supp. 1017, 1020 (D. Nev. 1995). The respondent "will not be able to withstand a motion for summary judgment merely by making allegations; rather, the party opposing the motion must go beyond its pleadings and designate specific facts by use of affidavits, depositions, admissions, or answers to interrogatories showing there is a genuine issue for trial." *In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc.*, 277 F.3d 658, 666 (3d Cir. 2002). A mere "scintilla" of evidence supporting the respondent's position will not be sufficient. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 247-48. "Where the record taken as a whole could not lead a rational trier of fact to find for the non-moving party, there is no 'genuine' issue for trial." *Hawking v. Ford Motor Credit Co.*, 210 F.3d 540, 545 (5th Cir. 2000).

When deciding whether to grant summary judgment, the court must believe all evidence presented by the party opposing summary judgment and

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT...

Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

must draw all justifiable inferences from that evidence in favor of the opposing party. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). Circumstantial evidence is sufficient to create a triable issue of fact. *Hopkins v. Andaya*, 958 F.2d 881, 888 (9th Cir. 1992). Under Rule 56(c), the moving party bears the initial burden of establishing that there are no genuine issues of material fact to be decided at trial. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 322-23; *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248-50. "A 'material fact' is one that is relevant to an element of a claim or defense or whose existence might affect the outcome of the suit. The materiality of a fact is thus determined by the substantive law governing the claim or defense." *T.W. Elec. Serv. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors Ass'n*, 809 F.2d 626, 630 (9th Cir. 1987). Genuine issues of material fact are those "factual issues that make a difference to the potential outcome and 'that properly can be resolved only by a finder of fact because they may reasonably be resolved in favor of either party.'" *Svob. v. Bryan (In re Bryan)*, 261 B.R. 240, 243 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2001). In other words, a material fact is "genuine" if "the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248; see also *In re Hayes*, 315 B.R. 579 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004).

The Plaintiff's Motion was filed along with several supporting documents, including the statement of undisputed material facts (the "Separate Statement," Docket No. 25) which in turn relies on a declaration of the Plaintiff (the "Cota Declaration," Docket No. 27). The Motion lacks any citations to where in the documents the court might find any of the supporting evidence. The reliance on the Cota Declaration is confusing because that declaration includes testimony regarding the factual allegations of the State Court Action, incorporated by reference into her Complaint here, while the Motion is based solely on collateral estoppel. If the Plaintiff meant to make a Motion based both on collateral estoppel and on the factual allegations of the Complaint, she did not do so. Because the Motion is based on collateral estoppel and the Judgment entered in the State Court Action, the court has done its best to find the relevant court documents in the Complaint and the request for judicial notice filed by the Plaintiff with the Motion (the "RJN," Docket No. 24).

The Debtor also filed a statement of undisputed facts and a declaration (Docket No. 55 and 54, respectively) where he challenged the validity of service underlying the State Court Action and Judgment and substantially

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... **Marco Antonio Martin**

Chapter 7

denied most of the allegations asserted by the Plaintiff. Given that the court must believe all evidence presented by the party opposing summary judgment and must draw all justifiable inferences from that evidence in favor of the opposing party and that the Plaintiff has failed to file a reply, there is a material dispute of fact regarding service of the State Court Action. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). Thus, summary judgment is inappropriate here.

Collateral Estoppel

"[C]ollateral estoppel principles do indeed apply in discharge exception proceedings pursuant to § 523(a)." *Grogan v. Garner*, 498 U.S. 279, 284 n.11 (1991); see also *Cal-Micro, Inc. v. Cantrell (In re Cantrell)*, 329 F.3d 1119, 1123 (9th Cir. 2003). "The party seeking to assert collateral estoppel has the burden of proving all the requisites for its application. To sustain this burden, a party must introduce a record sufficient to reveal the controlling facts and pinpoint the exact issues litigated in the prior action." *Kelly v. Okoye (In re Kelly)*, 182 B.R. 255, 258 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1995). To determine what effect a state court judgment will have on federal courts when applying collateral estoppel, the "federal courts must, as a matter of full faith and credit, apply that state's law of collateral estoppel." *Bugna v. McArthur (In re Bugna)*, 33 F.3d 1054, 1056 (9th Cir. 1994).

In California, "[c]ollateral estoppel precludes relitigation of issues argued and decided in prior proceedings." *Lucido v. Superior Court*, 795 P.2d 1223, 1225 (Cal. 1990) (in bank). Under California law, the threshold requirements for collateral estoppel are as follows:

First, the issue sought to be precluded from relitigation must be identical to that decided in a former proceeding. Second, this issue must have been actually litigated in the former proceeding. Third, it must have been necessarily decided in the former proceeding. Fourth, the decision in the former proceeding must be final and on the merits. Finally, the party against whom preclusion is sought must be the same as, or in privity with, the party to the former proceeding.

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

Id.

The fact that the Judgment is a default judgment does not preclude collateral estoppel here. "[T]he mere fact that a plaintiff 'obtained a judgment by default does not, in itself, foreclose the possibility that the resolution of some issues in the litigation would later have preclusive effect.'" *Baldwin v. Kilpatrick (In re Baldwin)*, 249 F.3d 912, 918 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting *Harmon v. Kobrin (In re Harmon)*, 250 F.3d 1240, 1246 (9th Cir. 2001)).

Where collateral estoppel is sought with respect to a default judgment, California law imposes an additional sixth requirement in addition to the five *Lucido* requirements discussed above. "Collateral estoppel may be applied only if the defendant in the prior action 'ha[d] been personally served with [a] summons or ha[d] actual knowledge of the existence of the litigation.'" *Baldwin*, 249 F.3d at 919 (quoting *Williams v. Williams (In re Williams' Estate)*, 223 P.2d 248, 254 (Cal. 1950)).

Here, it is not the Motion but the Separate Statement that asserts that the Debtor was served with the summons and complaint in the State Court Action, and refers to a proof of service of the summons attached to the RJN (RJN, Exhibit B). The Debtor, however, disputes this fact in his declaration statement (Docket No. 54). Given this dispute, which on its own would preclude summary judgment, collateral estoppel would not be applicable as the issues in the State Court Action would not have been actually litigated and there would not be a record of controlling facts present.

Even if there were no dispute as to effective service on the Debtor, the Plaintiff's Motion falls short with respect to demonstrating that collateral estoppel is appropriate in this nondischargeability action, which invokes provisions of § 523(a)(2)(A), (a)(4), and (a)(6). The only one of these subsections which the Plaintiff attempts to connect to the State Court judgment is § 523(a)(2)(A). The Motion asserts that the court should grant summary judgment under § 523(a)(4) and (a)(6) as well, but the Plaintiff makes no attempt to explain how the Judgment is entitled to collateral estoppel effect as to those provisions.

In any event, the court need not belabor the point. Given the factual dispute regarding service, summary judgment is not appropriate.

Deny.

Party Information

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

CONT... Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

Debtor(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Represented By
Raymond Perez

Defendant(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Lorraine Cota

Represented By
Matthew S DeArmey

Trustee(s):

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Pro Se

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:24-16259 Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:24-01256 Cota v. Martin

#10.00 CONT'D Hearing RE: [39] Motion to Quash Service of the Motion for Summary Judgment.
fr. 3-19-26, 4-14-26

Docket 39

Tentative Ruling:

Deny as moot.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Represented By
Raymond Perez

Defendant(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Lorraine Cota

Represented By
Matthew S DeArmey

Trustee(s):

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Pro Se

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:24-16259 Marco Antonio Martin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 2:24-01256 Cota v. Martin

#11.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:24-ap-01256. Complaint by Lorraine Cota against Marco Antonio Martin . 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. 1-7-25, 2-20-25, 3-25-25, 6-24-25, 9-16-25, 10-21-25, 1-27-26, 4-14-26

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

The court's tentative ruling is to deny the motion for summary judgment.
Continue approximately 30 days for the plaintiff to assess how to proceed.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Represented By
Raymond Perez

Defendant(s):

Marco Antonio Martin

Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Lorraine Cota

Represented By
Matthew S DeArmey

Trustee(s):

Brad D Krasnoff (TR)

Pro Se

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

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-12011 Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta

Chapter 11

Adv#: 2:26-01079 Private Money Lenders, Inc. v. Nagle et al

#12.00 Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 2:26-ap-01079. Complaint by Private Money Lenders, Inc. against John S. Nagle. priority or extent of lien or other interest in property)),(91 (Declaratory judgment))

Docket 1

***** VACATED *** REASON: Cont'd from 6/9/26 to 6/23/26 at 1:00 p.m.
per order entered on 5/7/26.**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Esmeralda Rubio-Acosta

Represented By
Martha A. Warriner

Defendant(s):

John S. Nagle

Pro Se

Does 1 to 10

Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Private Money Lenders, Inc.

Represented By
Robert A Brown

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, June 9, 2026

Hearing Room 1639

1:00 PM

2:26-14532 Arlene Darantan

Chapter 13

#13.00 Hearing RE: [10] Motion for relief from the automatic stay with supporting declarations REAL PROPERTY RE: 2690 Oregon Ave., Long Beach, CA 90806 fr. 6-2-26

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

Service was not proper. The Movant served the debtor, but not borrower Helen R. Sararana, on whom service was required under LBR 4001-1(c)(1) (B).

The declaration attached to the motion is not properly signed -- the Movant's signature is /s/ with his typed name.

This case has been dismissed, so there is currently no stay in effect. If the Movant wants a continuance to properly serve the Motion to obtain relief under § 362(d)(4) only, the court can continue for at least 21 days to allow for service and notice, along with the filing of a properly signed declaration.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Arlene Darantan	Pro Se
-----------------	--------

Trustee(s):

Kathy A Dockery (TR)	Pro Se
----------------------	--------