

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

1: -

Chapter

#0.00 All hearings on this calendar will be conducted remotely, using ZoomGov video and audio.

Parties in interest and members of the public may connect to the video and audio feeds, free of charge, using the connection information provided below.

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

Neither a Zoom nor a ZoomGov account is necessary to participate and no pre-registration is required. The audio portion of each hearing will be recorded electronically by the Court and constitutes its official record.

Video/audio web address: <https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/1607786735>

ZoomGov meeting number: 160 778 6735

Password: 520753

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

For more information on appearing before Judge Barash 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-martin-r-barash> under the tab "Telephonic Instructions."

Judge Barash seeks to maintain a courtroom in which all persons are treated with dignity and respect, irrespective of their gender identity, expression or preference. To that end, individuals are invited to identify their preferred pronouns (he, she, they, etc.) and their preferred honorific (Mr., Miss, Ms., Mrs., Mx, M, etc.) in their screen name, or by advising the judge or courtroom deputy.

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

CONT...

Chapter

Docket 0

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

1:17-12596 Lynne Suzanne Boyarsky

Chapter 13

#1.00 Motion for relief from stay

CITIMORTGAGE, INC.

fr. 8/17/22

Docket 162

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative Ruling for August 17, 2022

Petition Date: 9/27/2017

Ch. 13 plan confirmed: 2/2/2018

Service: Proper. Opposition filed.

Property: 3750 Sunswep Dr., Studio City, CA 91604

Property Value: \$600,000 (per debtor's 2017 schedules)

Amount Owed: \$285,151 (1st DoT)

Equity Cushion:44.5%

Equity: \$74,685

Post-Petition Delinquency: \$30,060.11 (6 payments of \$2,880.29; 5 payments of \$2,873.36, less suspense account balance of \$1,588.43)

Movant requests relief under 11 U.S.C. 362(d)(1), with the specific relief requested in paragraphs 2 (proceed under non-bankruptcy law); 3 (Movant permitted to engage in loss mitigation activities); 6 (relief from co-debtor stay); and 7 (waiver of the 4001(a)(3) stay). Movant believes cause exists for lifting the stay because the Debtor has missed several postpetition payments. Movant asserts that the last payment of \$2,873.36 was received on 7/1/2022.

Debtor states in opposition that she intends to modify the loan through the LMM Program, which she contends would cure the delinquency. On 7/25/22, Debtor's Motion to Commence Loan Modification Management Program (LMM) was filed, ECF doc. 160. Is Creditor amenable to a continuance to allow for Debtor to have her LMM application finalized?

Appearance Required

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

CONT... Lynne Suzanne Boyarsky

Chapter 13

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Lynne Suzanne Boyarsky

Represented By
Matthew D. Resnik

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

1:19-10457 Gerardo Melendez and Maribel Melendez

Chapter 13

#2.00 Motion for relief from stay [RP]

WELLS FARGO BANK NA
VS
DEBTOR

fr. 9/7/22(stip)

STIP TO CONTINUE FILED 9/28/22

Docket 112

*** VACATED *** REASON: Order approving stip entered 9/30/22. [Dkt. 119]

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Gerardo Melendez

Represented By
Shai S Oved

Joint Debtor(s):

Maribel Melendez

Represented By
Shai S Oved

Movant(s):

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Represented By
Nancy L Lee
Gwendolyn C McClain
Melissa A Anderson - INACTIVE -
Sherry Crouell
Tavon Taylor

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

CONT... Gerardo Melendez and Maribel Melendez

Chapter 13

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (SV) F Rojas (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

1:20-11365 Cross Country Holdings Partnership, AGP

Chapter 11

#3.00 Motion for relief from stay [RP]

INVESTOR LENDING USA

fr. 2/16/22; 3/16/22; 3/30/22(stip); 5/25/22(stip); 8/24/22

Docket 115

Tentative Ruling:

Ruling for August 24, 2022

Continued to 10/4/22 at 10:00 a.m. Counsel for the Movant to lodge an order but should wait until the chapter 7 trustee is appointed.

Ruling for March 16, 2022:

Continue to March 30, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. The stay will remain in place. Notice requirement is waived.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Cross Country Holdings Partnership,

Represented By
Raymond H. Aver

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

10:00 AM

1:22-10920 Joanna Leticia Escarrega

Chapter 7

#4.00 Motion for relief from stay [PP]

CAB WEST LLC
VS
DEBTOR

Docket 8

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative Ruling for October 4, 2022

Grant. No opposition filed; **appearances waived**. The moving party shall lodge a conforming order no later than October 25, 2022.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Joanna Leticia Escarrega

Represented By
Sydell B Connor

Movant(s):

Cab West, LLC

Represented By
Sheryl K Ith

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

1:20-10905 Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

#5.00 Motion for relief from stay [AN]

TRUDY REZNICK
VS
DEBTOR

Docket 329

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative Ruling for October 4, 2022:

Grant, insofar as movant Trudy Reznick shall have relief from the automatic stay in this case to move the Ventura County Superior Court ("Superior Court"), in the marital dissolution case of *Jay Reznick v. Trudy Reznick*, Case No. D341511 ("Dissolution Case"), to determine her legal entitlement, if any, to payment by Jay B. Reznick, DMD, MD, Inc. dba Southern California Center for Oral and Facial Surgery (the "Corporation") for any amount, and the priority of any such entitlement as against other creditors of the Corporation.

Without limiting the foregoing, Trudy Reznick is granted relief from the automatic stay to object to and/or seek relief with respect to the fees of the receiver appointed in the Dissolution Case and the payment of any such fees by the Corporation.

Relief is denied, however, to the extent Trudy Reznick seeks an order from the Superior Court regarding disbursement of the equity value of the Corporation (i.e., the *net* proceeds generated from the liquidation and winddown of the Corporation, after payment of all obligations of the Corporation). This Court has held previously, and reiterates here, that the equity in the Corporation is community property (pursuant to a stipulated order of the Superior Court) and therefore property of the estate. 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(2). This Court has exclusive jurisdiction over property of the estate. 28 U.S.C. § 1334(e). (By contrast, this Court's jurisdiction over matters that may be "related" to a bankruptcy case is original but not exclusive. 28 U.S.C. § 1334(b)).

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick
Background

Chapter 7

Jay Reznick (the "Debtor") commenced this case on March 16, 2022 (the "Petition Date"), as a voluntary chapter 11 case pursuant to subchapter V of the Bankruptcy Code. On June 29, 2021, the Court entered an order converting the case to chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. Gregory Kent Jones (the "Trustee") was thereafter appointed chapter 7 trustee for the estate of the Debtor.

As of the Petition Date, the Debtor and Trudy Resnick were parties to the Dissolution Case, which was commenced in 2010.

On February 6, 2017, the Superior Court entered a stipulated judgment in the Dissolution Case (the "Stipulated Judgment"). Case Dkt. 337 at 12-42. The Stipulated Judgment addresses matters such as child custody, child support, spousal support and division of marital property. In pertinent part, the Stipulated Judgment addresses the disposition of the Corporation.

[Section 6.A.6] The corporation known as Jay B. Reznick, D.M.D., M .D., Inc. doing business as Southern California Center for Oral and Facial Surgery, (SCCOFS), including all equipment, furniture, furnishings, appliances, tools, fixtures, inventory, insurance, leasehold interest, goodwill, tangible and intangible assets of every description and incidents of ownership and any/all accounts receivable and/or payable along with any and all encumbrances thereon, conditioned upon and subject to the Petitioner's satisfaction and payment to the Respondent of the sum of \$480,000. of all outstanding child and spousal support arrears, all income tax liabilities for the 2010 tax year, and the transfer of the funds in Petitioner's post QDRO division of his share of the John Hancock 401k account #78922 to Respondent in the amount of \$200,000. to the Respondent. Petitioner shall be responsible for repayment of the current outstanding balance against the account in an amount sufficient to satisfy the transfer of funds in the amount of \$200,000. to the Respondent. ...

[Section 9.B] The parties stipulate and the Court finds that the value of the business as of December 31, 2010 is \$960,000.

[Section 9.C] The parties stipulate and the Court finds that Respondent's community interest in the value of Southern California Center for Oral and

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT...

Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

Facial Surgery is \$480,000 (which sum equals one half of its value as of December 31, 2010).

[Section 9.D] [Petitioner] intends to forthwith sell SCCOFS to a third party purchaser and the Petitioner is herein ordered to forthwith sell said business. The terms of the sale of SCCOFS shall require approval of Attorney Samuel Arsht who is jointly appointed by the parties and designated by the court to act as Receiver to oversee the sale and distribution of the sale proceeds of SCCOFS. [Petitioner] shall have 120 days measured from the date the last party signs this Stipulated Judgment to conclude the sale of SCCOFS and for Samuel Arsht to receive the sale proceeds. ...

[Section 9.J] In the event that the business known as Southern California Center for Oral and Facial Surgery, (SCCOFS) is or cannot be sold and or/the distribution of which cannot be timely accomplished as set forth herein above, the business known as SCCOFS and the business known as Medicus, LLC, shall remain the parties' community property and the Court shall retain jurisdiction over the disposition of this property.

Id. at 33-34, 36.

The assets of the Corporation were not sold within 120 days of entry of the Stipulated Judgment. The Superior Court thereafter entered two stipulated orders in aid of the enforcement of the Stipulated Judgment: (i) the "Stipulated Order Appointing Receiver and for Injunction," entered February 22, 2018 (the "February 22, 2018 Order"), Case Dkt. 337 at 43-51, and (ii) the Amended Order After Hearing Appointing Receiver and for Injunction" entered January 14, 2020 (the "January 14, 2020 Order"). Case Dkt. 337 at 52-60. Among other things, these orders (collectively, the "Receiver Orders") expanded the role of the receiver to include control of the business and financial affairs of the Corporation and the process of marketing and selling the business to a third party—all for the purpose of enforcing the obligations established under the Stipulated Judgment. The Receiver Orders designated several successor receivers to Mr. Arsht, including the receiver who ultimately was in place at the time of the Petition Date, Richard Weissman.

Following the Petition Date, but prior to conversion of the case to chapter 7, the

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

Debtor moved this Court under Bankruptcy Code section 543 for turnover of the Corporation and its assets to the Debtor, as chapter 11 debtor in possession (the "Turnover Motion"). Pursuant to an interim and final order, the Court granted the Turnover Motion. Case Dkt. 49, 73. As the Court explained in greater detail at the hearing on the Turnover Motion, relief was appropriate because the equity interest in the Corporation was community property (i.e., because the business had not been sold within the 120-day window contemplated by Stipulated Judgment) and therefore property of the estate. 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(2). Property of the estate is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1334(e).

Because that equity interest encompasses both economic and managerial rights with respect to the Corporation, the Court concluded it was inappropriate for the receiver to remain in possession and control of the Corporation's assets. Furthermore, the Bankruptcy Code prohibits the use of receivers in bankruptcy. 11 U.S.C. § 105(b). As such, the Court concluded it was appropriate for the receiver to restore possession and control of the Corporation and its assets to the Debtor, as debtor in possession. Upon conversion of the case to chapter 7, possession and control of the Corporation and its assets passed from the Debtor, as debtor in possession, to the Trustee.

In November, 2021, upon application by the Trustee, the Court entered an order authorizing the Trustee to employ a business broker to market the Corporation's business for sale. Case Dkt. 247. With the assistance of that business broker, the Trustee negotiated a sale of the Corporation's assets to a third-party purchaser and brought a motion seeking authority to effectuate the sale and wind up the Corporation (the "Sale and Winding Up Motion"). Case Dkt. 264.

Following briefing and a hearing, the Court granted the Sale and Winding Up Motion. Specifically, the Court's order (the "Sale and Winding Up Order") authorized the Trustee "to exercise the rights of the Debtor and the Estate as a shareholder of Jay B. Reznick, DMD, MD, Inc., a California corporation ("Seller"), to approve a sale of the Purchased Assets (as defined in the Motion), to approve the dissolution and winding up of the affairs of Seller, and to take such other actions as are consistent therewith in the judgment of the Trustee." Case Dkt. 300 at 2.

The Sale and Winding Up Order, however, was careful not to opine on the nature and

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

extent of any rights to payment Trudy Reznick may have directly against the Corporation. In her opposition to the Sale and Winding Up Motion, Trudy Reznick contended not only that she had "equity ownership" in the Corporation, but that she "had charging orders encumbering [the corporation's] assets." Case Dkt. 278 at 2:21, 7:8. The Court did not rule on the nature and extent of any lien on the assets of the Corporation in favor of Trudy Resnick:

The Trustee is authorized to cause the Seller to pay and satisfy all costs of sale, including broker's fees of \$66,725.00 to DDSmatch SoCal, and all liens against the Purchased Assets at the closing of the sale in such amounts as agreed by the Trustee and the lienholder, or in such amount as may be adjudicated by a court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction. If there is a dispute at closing regarding the validity or amount of any lien on the Purchased Assets, the disputed funds shall be escrowed pending a consensual resolution with the lienholder or an adjudication of the dispute.

Case Dkt. 300 at 2-3. Indeed, the Court made no ruling on the nature and extent of the Corporation's liabilities.

Whether Trudy Reznick has a right to payment that constitutes a liability of the Corporation—in addition to have having a community property interest in the equity of the Corporation—is potentially significant. Under California law, upon the winding up of a corporation, the assets of the corporation are distributed to the shareholders of the corporation "[a]fter determining that all the known debts and liabilities of a corporation" have been "paid or adequately provided for . . ." Cal. Corp. Code § 2004. If Trudy Reznick had a lien on the Corporation's assets, or otherwise has a debt against the Corporation, she may be entitled to payment directly by the Corporation. By contrast, if all she has is a community property interest in the net assets of the Corporation available to shareholders (i.e., the Trustee), she must await distribution of that entitlement pursuant to the bankruptcy process.

Further, if Trudy Resnick has a debt against the Corporation, the priority of that debt as against other creditors also may be significant. The Trustee reports (by way of an escrow statement) that the sale of the Corporation's assets yielded \$667,250 in proceeds. After deduction for various amounts, this yielded net proceeds of least \$341,129.68, which is being held by the

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

Trustee. The deductions include \$108,543.55 that was paid out of escrow to the receiver, Mr. Weissman, for certain fees and expenses. An additional \$113,416.86 sought by Mr. Weissman remains in escrow and is the subject of a dispute between Mr. Weissman and the Trustee. Meantime, Trudy Resnick contends that her entitlement to payment of \$480,000 on account of her 50% community interest in the Corporation is senior to *any* entitlement of Mr. Weissman to the payment of his fees and expenses, and any other creditor of the Corporation.

The Trustee and Mr. Weissman recently stipulated to dismiss a pending motion in this Court and permit the Superior Court to decide the appropriate amount of fees owing to Mr. Weissman.

Trudy Resnick requests relief from the automatic stay in this bankruptcy case to obtain a determination from the Superior Court regarding the nature and extent of her rights under the Stipulated Judgment and Receiver Orders to obtain payment of her \$480,000 community property entitlement as a debt or liability of the Corporation. Further, she appears to seek relief from stay to have the Superior Court determine the priority of any such entitlement as against amounts paid by or demanded from the Corporation by Mr. Weissman, on account of his fees and expenses.

Legal Analysis

Although this Court has exclusive jurisdiction over the equity interest in the Corporation because the equity interest is community property (pursuant to the Stipulated Judgment), the exclusivity of that jurisdiction does not extend to determinations of the debts and liabilities of the Corporation, which is not itself a debtor. Although the Trustee is in possession and control of proceeds from the sale of the Corporation's assets, the Trustee holds those proceeds as the sole shareholder administering the wind up of the Corporation. Although the shareholder is ultimately entitled to the net proceeds of the corporation after debts and liabilities are satisfied or provided for, Cal. Corp. Code § 2004, the record does not support the conclusion that the winding up process is complete. To the contrary, it is clear that Trudy Resnick (and Mr. Weissman) have disputes over what constitute the debts and liabilities of the Corporation.

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... **Jay B. Reznick**

Chapter 7

Thus, the motion at bar presents the question: *which court should decide the nature and extent of the debts and liabilities asserted by Trudy Resnick against the Corporation?*

When a party seeks relief from the automatic stay to proceed with litigation in a non-bankruptcy forum, bankruptcy courts frequently look to a series of equitable considerations in exercising their discretion that are known as the *Curtis* factors. See *In re Curtis*, 40 B.R. 795 (Bankr. D. Utah 1984). The Ninth Circuit has recognized that "the *Curtis* factors are appropriate, nonexclusive, factors to consider in deciding whether to grant relief from the automatic stay to allow pending litigation to continue in another forum." [*In re Kronemyer*, 405 B.R. 915, 921 \(9th Cir. B.A.P. 2009\)](#). While the *Curtis* factors are widely used to determine the existence of "cause," not all of the factors are relevant in every case, nor is a court required to give each factor equal weight. *In re Plumberex Specialty Products, Inc.*, 311 B.R. 551, 560 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004).

The Court considers each of the *Curtis* factors below.

(1) Whether relief will result in partial or complete resolution of issues. Granting relief from stay surely will not resolve all of the issues that may arise in this bankruptcy case. But to the extent Trudy Reznick seeks a determination of whether the Stipulated Judgment and/or the Receiver Orders entitle her to a secured or unsecured debt against the Corporation, and the relative priority of that debt against other parties claiming debts against the Corporation, relief from stay should enable a complete resolution of those issues. Irrespective of the determinations of the Superior Court, the distribution of the assets of the Debtor's estate (including the net assets it receives from the liquidation of the equity in the Corporation) will remain within the exclusive jurisdiction and supervision of this Court. This factor weighs in favor of granting relief.

(2) Lack of any connection with or interference with the bankruptcy case. The issues Trudy Reznick intends to present to the Superior Court have a connection to this bankruptcy case and, ultimately, may affect indirectly the size of the Debtor's estate. If Trudy Reznick's \$480,000 community property entitlement is treated as an obligation of the Corporation, there may be little or nothing left to upstream to the estate on account of its equity interest in the Corporation. Although

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

the Court would not characterize this consequence as "interference," it definitely has a strong connection to the administration of this case. This factor weighs against granting relief.

(3) Whether the foreign proceeding involves the debtor as fiduciary. This factor does not apply to the present circumstances.

(4) Whether specialized tribunal has been established to hear particular cause of action and whether that tribunal has the expertise to hear such cases. Although this Court *could* attempt to interpret the orders of the Superior Court, doing so would not be prudent because the Superior Court has specialized expertise in marital dissolution proceedings. Furthermore, the disputes raised by Trudy Resnick involve the interpretation of orders issued by the Superior Court in the Dissolution Case. The Superior Court, therefore, is in a much better position to interpret its own orders and resolve any alleged inconsistencies in those orders. This factor weighs in favor of granting relief.

(5) Whether the debtor's insurance carrier has assumed full financial responsibility for defending the litigation. This factor does not apply to the present circumstances.

(6) Whether the action essentially involves third parties, and the debtor functions only as bailee or conduit for goods or proceeds in question. As noted, the Trustee presently is holding the proceeds from the sale of the Corporation's assets in his capacity as the sole shareholder of the Corporation winding up its affairs. Those proceeds do not become assets of the estate until the winding up process is complete, and it is clear that the process is not complete. Disputes regarding any entitlement of Mr. Weissman and Trudy Resnick to payment by the Corporation are still pending. In other words, what portion of the funds being held by the Trustee ultimately belong to creditors of the non-debtor Corporation remains to be adjudicated. Such funds are, by definition, not (yet) property of the estate. In this sense, the Trustee effectively is acting as bailee. This factor favors granting relief.

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT...

Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

(7) Whether litigation in another forum would prejudice interests of other creditors, creditors committee, and other interested parties. As noted, the outcome of the contemplated litigation may impact whether and to what extent there ultimately are funds in the estate to satisfy administrative expenses and allowed claims. But there is no reason to believe that the sole representative of the estate, the Trustee, would not be involved in that litigation and have standing to appear and be heard in the Superior Court, on behalf of both the estate and the Corporation. Accordingly, this factor favors granting relief.

(8) Whether a judgment claim arising from the foreign action is subject to equitable subordination. This factor does not apply to the present circumstances.

(9) Whether movant's success in the foreign proceeding would result in judicial lien avoidable by debtor. This factor does not apply to the present circumstances. To the extent Trudy Reznick seeks recognition of a lien, she seeks such recognition with respect to assets of the non-debtor Corporation. Any such lien, if it existed, would not be avoidable by the Debtor or the Trustee.

(10) Interests of judicial economy and expeditious and economical determination of litigation for the parties. The Court is persuaded that the interests of judicial economy and economical determination of the litigation would be served by granting relief. As discussed above, the arguments of Trudy Reznick regarding the existence of a secured or unsecured claim against the non-debtor Corporation arise from the Stipulated Judgment and the Receiver Orders. Not only is the Superior Court in a better position to interpret its own orders, but can do so more economically, because it is more familiar with the history of the Dissolution Case. It appears that the Trustee and Mr. Weissman already have reached a similar conclusion by dismissing the motion pending in this Court over Mr. Weissman's fees and expenses, in deference to proceeding in the Superior Court.

(11) Whether the foreign proceeding has progressed to the point where the parties are prepared for trial. The issues presented here do not involve a pending trial, so this factor is not applicable, *per se*. As noted, however, those issues

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT... Jay B. Reznick

Chapter 7

involve the meaning and import of orders already entered in the Dissolution Case, which has been pending in the Superior Court since 2010.

(12) **The impact of the stay on the parties and the "balance of hurt."** The Court concludes that this factor favors relief from stay. The case is a liquidating case under chapter 7. Although the Trustee prefers that the issues presented be adjudicated by this Court, granting relief and permitting those issues to be determined in the Superior Court will not unfairly prejudice the Trustee. There is no particular urgency (e.g., a pending business reorganization) that may be jeopardized if the Superior Court is unable to adjudicate these issues as fast as the Court might otherwise be able to do. Indeed, the Trustee already has decided to revert to the Superior Court for the resolution of issues pertaining to the fees and expenses asserted by Mr. Weissman. It would be unfair to deny Trudy Resnick the opportunity to do the same—particularly where some of her contentions pertain directly to whether and what extent Mr. Weissman is owed compensation directly from the Corporation.

All in all, the Court weighs and balances these considerations in favor of granting relief.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Jay B. Reznick

Represented By
James R Selth
Daniel J Weintraub
Crystle Jane Lindsey

Movant(s):

Trudy Reznick

Represented By
Kathleen P March

Trustee(s):

Gregory Kent Jones (TR)

Represented By
Timothy J Yoo

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

11:00 AM

CONT...

Jay B. Reznick

Carmela Pagay
Philip A Gasteier

Chapter 7

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:11-17414 Hamid Peter Keshavarz and Farideh Keshavarz

Chapter 11

#6.00 Motion For Entry Of Discharge And Closing Debtors Chapter 11 Case

fr. 8/24/22; 9/7/22

Docket 222

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative Ruling for October 4, 2022

Grant the motion. No opposition filed. The debtors' supplemental evidence resolves the issues identified by the Court at the September 7, 2022 hearing. Debtors to lodge an order no later than October 11, 2022. Appearances waived.

Rulings for September 7, 2022

Hearing is continued to October 4, 2022 at 1:30 pm. The filing deadline for the October 4 hearing will be September 27, 2022 (the deadline will be extended to September 28, 2022, if any of the parties or counsel celebrates Rosh Hashanah.)

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Hamid Peter Keshavarz

Represented By
Michael Jay Berger
Ori S Blumenfeld

Joint Debtor(s):

Farideh Keshavarz

Represented By
Michael Jay Berger
Ori S Blumenfeld

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:22-10141 Vanessa Stoller

Chapter 11

#7.00 Motion to Avoid Lien Judicial Lien with First Regional Bank

Docket 101

***** VACATED *** REASON: Atty Kogan filed a withdrawal on 9/12/22 -
Dkt. #151. If**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vanessa Stoller

Represented By
Michael S Kogan

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:22-10141 Vanessa Stoller

Chapter 11

#8.00 Motion to Avoid Lien Judicial Lien with First Regional Bank

Docket 95

***** VACATED *** REASON: Atty Kogan filed a withdrawal on 9/12/22 -
Dkt. #152. If**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vanessa Stoller

Represented By
Michael S Kogan

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:22-10141 Vanessa Stoller

Chapter 11

#9.00 Motion to Avoid Lien Judicial Lien with First Regional Bank

Docket 96

***** VACATED *** REASON: Atty Kogan filed a withdrawal on 9/12/22 -
Dkt. #153. If**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vanessa Stoller

Represented By
Michael S Kogan

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:22-10141 Vanessa Stoller

Chapter 11

#10.00 Motion to Avoid Lien Judicial Lien with First Regional Bank

Docket 97

***** VACATED *** REASON: Atty Kogan filed a withdrawal on 9/12/22 -
Dkt. #154. If**

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vanessa Stoller

Represented By
Michael S Kogan

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
San Fernando Valley
Martin R. Barash, Presiding
Courtroom 303 Calendar**

Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Hearing Room 303

1:30 PM

1:21-10757 PS On Tap, LLC

Chapter 11

#11.00 Post -confirmation status conference

fr. 2/16/22; 6/15/22; 9/28/22

Docket 211

Tentative Ruling:

Ruling for September 28, 2022: This status conference is continued to October 4, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. A court order will be entered to ensure the parties to show up at the 10/4/22 status conference.

Ruling for June 15, 2022: The status conference is continued to September 28, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. Debtor should file a notice of continued hearing. Written status report requirement is waived.

Ruling for February 16, 2022: Submit a brief status report providing updates by 6/8/22. Status conference is continued to 6/15/22.

Ruling for Confirmation Hearing on September 24, 2021: Confirmed as consensual plan under section 1191(a) with Graton lease to be removed from the plan pending the motion to assume. The confirmation order should be circulated to the sub-chapter V trustee and counsel for Graton. They must sign off on the form of the order prior to lodging with the Court. If any party has an issue with the form of the order, they may contact chambers. The post-confirmation status conference is set for February 16, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. A post-confirmation status report is due two weeks prior to the hearing.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

PS On Tap, LLC

Represented By
Carol Chow

Trustee(s):

Moriah Douglas Flahaut (TR)

Pro Se