

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:14-21414 Anthony Paul DeMaria and Deborah Lynn DeMaria**

**Chapter 7**

**#1.00** Motion RE: Objection to Claim Number 4 by Claimant LVNV Funding LLC  
(Motion filed 12/14/23)

EH\_\_

Docket 32

**Tentative Ruling:**

**MOTION RE: OBJECTION TO CLAIM NUMBER 4**

1/31/2024

**BACKGROUND**

On September 10, 2014, Anthony and Deborah DeMaria (together, "Debtors") filed a Chapter 7 voluntary petition. On December 22, 2014, Debtors were discharged. On December 23, 2014, the bankruptcy case was closed. On August 17, 2022, the Court entered an order to reopen the case.

On January 10, 2023, the Clerk of the Court issued a notice of possible dividend and order fixing time to file claims, where creditors of the case were given notice to file their proofs of claim by April 17, 2023, if a proof of claim had not yet been filed.

On April 12, 2023, LVNV Funding, LLC ("LVNV") filed a proof of claim in the amount of \$4,807.52 ("Claim 4"). Trustee Charles W. Daff ("Daff") argues that under California law, C.C.P. § 337, Claim 4 is barred by the statute of limitations, as the date of the delinquency is stated to have occurred on October 2, 2002, over four years

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT...**      **Anthony Paul DeMaria and Deborah Lynn DeMaria**  
prior to the filing of the petition.

**Chapter 7**

**DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(a), a proof of claim is deemed allowed unless a party in interest objects. Absent an objection, a proof of claim constitutes *prima facie* evidence of the validity and amount of the claim under FED. R. BANKR. PRO. Rule 3001(f). *See Lundell v. Anchor Constr. Specialists, Inc.*, 223 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2000). When a party files an objection to a proof of claim, that filing "creates a dispute which is a contested matter" within the meaning of FRBP 9014 and the Court must resolve the matter after notice and opportunity for hearing upon a motion for relief. *Id.*

When a creditor has filed a proof of claim that complies with the rules (thereby giving rise to the presumption of validity), the burden shifts to the objecting party who must "present evidence to overcome the *prima facie* case." *In re Medina*, 205 B.R. 216, 222 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996). To defeat the claim, the objecting party must provide sufficient evidence and "show facts tending to defeat the claim by probative force equal to that of the allegations of the proofs of claim themselves." *Lundell*, 223 F.3d at 1039 (*quoting In re Holm*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991)). "The objector must produce evidence, which, if believed, would refute at least one of the allegations that is essential to the claim's legal sufficiency." *Lundell*, 223 F.3d at 1040 (*quoting In re Allegheny Int'l, Inc.*, 954 F.2d 167, 173-74 (3d Cir. 1992)). If the objecting party produces sufficient evidence to negate one or more of the sworn facts in the proof of claim, the burden reverts back to the claimant to prove the validity of the claim by a preponderance of the evidence. *See In re Consol. Pioneer Mort*, 178 B.R. 222, 226 (9th Cir. BAP 1995), *aff'd*, 91 F.3d 151 (9th Cir. 1996) (*quoting Allegheny Int'l*, 954 F.2d at 173-74). The ultimate burden of persuasion remains at all times on the claimant. *See Lundell*, 223 F.3d at 1039; *see also Holm*, 931 F.2d at 623.

As is required by LBR 3007-1, "an objection to claim must be supported by admissible evidence sufficient to overcome the evidentiary effect of a properly documented proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with FRBP 3001. The evidence must demonstrate that the proof of claim should be disallowed, reduced,

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT...**      **Anthony Paul DeMaria and Deborah Lynn DeMaria**  
subordinated, re-classified, or otherwise modified."

**Chapter 7**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1) claim objections may be based on non-bankruptcy law. § 502(b)(1) provides:

(b) Except as provided in subsections (e)(2), (f), (g), (h) and (i) of this section, if such objection to a claim is made, the court, after notice and a hearing, shall determine the amount of such claim in lawful currency of the United States as of the date of the filing of the petition, and shall allow such claim in such amount, except to the extent that –

(1) such *claim is unenforceable* against the debtor and property of the debtor, *under any agreement or applicable law* for a reason other than because such claim is contingent or unmatured;

11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1) (emphasis added). Accordingly, "[a] claim cannot be allowed if it is unenforceable under non-bankruptcy law." *Diamant v. Kasparian* (in re Southern Cal. Plastics, Inc.), 165 F.3d 1243, 1247 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

Here, pursuant to the applicable non-bankruptcy law, C.C.P. § 337, Claim 4 is barred by the four-year statute of limitations, as the date of delinquency is stated to have occurred over 21 years ago, and the statute of limitations is stated to have expired over 16 years ago. Therefore, the Court is inclined to find that Daff has met his burden in objecting to the validity of the claim.

Further, the Court notes that service was proper and no opposition was filed, which the Court deems consent to the relief requested pursuant to Local Rule 9013-1(h).

**TENTATIVE RULING**

The Court is inclined to SUSTAIN the objection and DISALLOW Claim 4.

APPEARANCES WAIVED. Movant to lodge order within seven days. If oral or written opposition is presented at the hearing, the hearing may be continued.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room      301**

11:00 AM

**CONT...      Anthony Paul DeMaria and Deborah Lynn DeMaria**

**Chapter 7**

**Party Information**

**Debtor(s):**

Anthony Paul DeMaria

Represented By  
Neil R Hedtke  
Simon J Dunstan

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Deborah Lynn DeMaria

Represented By  
Neil R Hedtke  
Simon J Dunstan

**Movant(s):**

Charles W Daff (TR)

Pro Se

**Trustee(s):**

Howard B Grobstein (TR)

Pro Se

Charles W Daff (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:23-13521 Kelly M. Goodwin**

**Chapter 7**

**#1.10** Notice of Motion and Motion of the Chapter 7 Trustee to Dismiss Bankruptcy Case Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 707(b) and 727, or in the Alternative, to Extend the Discharge and Dismissal Deadlines Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 707 and 727; (Motion filed 1/10/24)

EH\_\_

**[Tele. appr. Lynda, Bui, chapter 7 trustee]**

Docket 16

**Tentative Ruling:**

**MOTION OF THE CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE TO DISMISS BANKRUPTCY CASE OR EXTEND  
DISCHARGE AND DISMISSAL DEADLINES PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. §§ 707 AND 727**

1/31/2024

**BACKGROUND**

On August 7, 2023, Kelly M. Goodwin ("Debtor") filed a Chapter 7 voluntary petition.

On September 14, 2023, the 341(a) meeting of the creditors ("341(a) Meeting") was held. On September 28, 2023, a continuance of the 341(a) Meeting was held. On October 26, 2023, another continuance of the 341(a) Meeting was held. On November 9, 2023, another continuance of the 341(a) Meeting was held. The 341(a) Meeting was continued to December 7, 2023.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Kelly M. Goodwin**

**Chapter 7**

On November 1, 2023, the Debtor, Chapter 7 Trustee ("Trustee") and the United States Trustee ("UST") filed a stipulation ("Stipulation") to move the deadline for the Trustee and UST to file a motion to dismiss pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 707(b) or to object to the Debtor's discharge pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 727 from November 13, 2023, to January 18, 2024. On November 2, 2023, the Stipulation was approved.

On January 10, 2024, the Trustee filed a motion to dismiss the case pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 707(b), or in the alternative, to extend the discharge and dismissal deadlines pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 707 and 727 ("Motion").

No opposition was filed.

**DISCUSSION**

*I. DISMISSAL OF THE CHAPTER 7 CASE*

According to LBR 1017-2(b),

"[t]he failure of a chapter 7 debtor to appear at the initial meeting of creditors and any continuance thereof is cause for dismissal of the case. Pursuant to LBR 9013-1(q), the court will dismiss the case without a hearing upon the trustee's motion for dismissal and declaration that the debtor has failed to appear at two meetings of creditors."

Trustee's declaration in support of the Motion says that Debtor failed to appear to

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Kelly M. Goodwin**

**Chapter 7**

each 341(a) Meeting following the initial meeting on September 14, 2023. This indicates that Debtor failed to appear to at least three 341(a) Meetings. Therefore, pursuant to LBR 1017-2(b) and LBR 9013-1(q), the Court may dismiss the instant case.

Additionally, according to 11 U.S.C. § 707,

(a) [t] The court may dismiss a case under this chapter only after notice and a hearing and only for cause, including—

(1) unreasonable delay by the debtor that is prejudicial to creditors;

...

(b)

(1) After notice and a hearing, the court, on its own motion or on a motion by the United States trustee, trustee (or bankruptcy administrator, if any), or any party in interest, may dismiss a case filed by an individual debtor under this chapter whose debts are primarily consumer debts,

§ 707 is applicable here because Debtor appears to be an individual debtor under Chapter 7 whose debts are primarily consumer debts.

Finally, according to 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)

...

(3) if a trustee is serving in the case or an auditor is serving under section 586(f) of title 28, cooperate with the trustee as necessary to enable the trustee to

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT...**

**Kelly M. Goodwin**

**Chapter 7**

perform the trustee's duties under this title;

- (4) (if a trustee is serving in the case or an auditor is serving under section 586(f) of title 28, surrender to the trustee all property of the estate and any recorded information, including books, documents, records, and papers, relating to property of the estate, whether or not immunity is granted under section 344 of this title;

Here, despite four continued 341(a) Meetings, Debtor appears to have failed to provide Trustee with the requested copies of her non-filing spouse's financial account statements, and of the email her non-filing spouse supposedly sent to her with his purported bank statements. As a result, Trustee is unable to complete a review of Debtor's financial affairs, which is causing an unreasonable delay that is prejudicial to the creditors.

*II. Trustee's Request for A 180-Day Bar*

According to *In re Mitchell*, "[a]s its plain language suggests, § 349 gives a court authority to "sanction a debtor for cause by imposing a bar against re-filing." *In re Grischkan*, 320 B.R. 654, 661 (Bankr.D.Ohio 2005)" 357 B.R. 142, 157 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2006). The *Mitchell* court concluded that the debtor filed a Chapter 7 petition in bad faith, and subsequently found this to be sufficient "cause" under 11 U.S.C. § 349 to impose a 180-day bar against refiling another Chapter 7 petition.

Here, Trustee provided evidence that Debtor provided fraudulent bank statements, and has also failed to appear to multiple 341(a) Meetings. Trustee has therefore provided sufficient cause to impose a 180-day bar to refiling pursuant to § 349.



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Kelly M. Goodwin**

**Chapter 7**

**TENTATIVE RULING**

Based on the foregoing, the Court is inclined to GRANT the motion to dismiss the case with a 180-day bar and DENY the alternative requests to extend discharge and dismissal deadlines as MOOT.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Kelly M. Goodwin

Represented By  
Michael Smith

**Trustee(s):**

Lynda T. Bui (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:15-21082 Cameron Richard De Smidt**

**Chapter 7**

**#2.00 Motion to Reopen Chapter 7 Case  
(Motion filed 1/5/24)**

EH\_\_

**[Tele. appr. Christine Hehir, rep. Nationstar Mortgage LLC]**

Docket 38

**Tentative Ruling:**

**MOTION TO REOPEN CHAPTER 7 CASE**

1/31/2024

**BACKGROUND**

On May 26, 2011, Cameron Richard De Smidt ("Debtor") filed a Chapter 13 Voluntary Petition. The case was dismissed on July 13, 2011.

On November 13, 2015, Debtor filed the instant Chapter 7 Voluntary Petition. On February 25, 2016, the Debtor's case was discharged. On April 25, 2016, Debtor filed his Amended Schedule C. On June 24, 2016, the case was closed.

On August 3, 2016, Debtor filed a Chapter 13 Voluntary Petition. The case was dismissed on September 9, 2016.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Cameron Richard De Smidt**

**Chapter 7**

On November 14, 2016, Debtor filed a Chapter 13 Voluntary Petition. The case was dismissed on November 22, 2016. On December 19, 2016, Debtor filed a motion to reopen the case. On December 22, 2016, Debtor filed an amended motion to reopen the case. On January 24, 2017, the motion was denied.

On June 23, 2017, Debtor filed a civil action against various creditors. On February 28, 2018, the case was dismissed. On June 25, 2020, the Court of Appeal denied Debtor's appeal.

On March 18, 2021, Debtor filed a motion to reopen the instant case to amend his schedules. On May 4, 2021, the Court entered an order granting the motion to reopen the case. Debtor never amended his schedules. On August 19, 2021, the case was discharged and closed.

On November 4, 2021, Debtor filed a civil action against many of the same parties. The case is currently pending in state court.

On November 7, 2023, Debtor filed a motion to reopen the instant Chapter 7 case. On December 6, 2023, the Court entered the order denying the motion to reopen the case.

On December 5, 2023, Debtor filed the instant motion to reopen Chapter 7 case ("Motion"). On December 19, 2023, parties Nationstar Mortgage LLC, Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., and Federal National Mortgage Association (collectively, "Responding Parties") filed an opposition to the Motion ("Opposition"). The same day, Responding Parties filed a request for judicial notice in support of the Opposition ("Request for Judicial Notice").

On January 9, 2024, Debtor filed a reply to the Opposition ("Reply").

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Cameron Richard De Smidt**

**Chapter 7**

**DISCUSSION**

**I. REOPENING A CHAPTER 7 CASE**

*a. DEBTOR HAS NOT ESTABLISHED CAUSE TO REOPEN THE CASE*

FRBP 5010 provides "[a] case may be reopened on motion of the debtor or other party in interest pursuant to §350(b) of the Code." 11 U.S.C. § 350(b) provides "[a] case may be reopened in the court in which such case was closed to administer assets, to accord relief to the debtor, or for other cause."

Local Rule 5010-1(a) provides "[a] motion to reopen a closed bankruptcy case must be supported by a declaration establishing a reason or "cause" to reopen. The motion must not contain a request for any other relief."

Here, Debtor does not appear to establish his prima facie burden to show cause to reopen the case under Local Rule 5010-1(a). Instead of establishing cause, Debtor's declaration supporting the Motion simply references an alleged call between Debtor and Chapter 7 Trustee Robert Whitmore ("Trustee") on November 28, 2023, where Trustee allegedly confirmed there are no creditors to the estate and, should Trustee be reappointed to the case if it is reopened, he would stipulate to abandoning the claims. However, on November 29, 2023, at the hearing regarding the previous motion to reopen the Chapter 7 case, Debtor's counsel indicated that he had not yet spoken with Trustee. Debtor's declaration relies on hearsay statements that were allegedly made the day before the hearing on November 29, 2023. As an aside, it is unknown whether creditors would have filed claims because this is a no-asset case with no bar date, and the Trustee would thus not be in a position to make that representation. Therefore, the evidence filed by Debtor does not meet the prima facie case for showing good cause.

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Cameron Richard De Smidt**

**Chapter 7**

In Debtor's Reply, Debtor points to the "for other cause" language of § 350(b) but does not provide detail about the "other cause" to reopen the case. To support his claim that cause has been shown, Debtor relies on *In re Menk*, 241 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999) and *In re Staffer*, 306 F.3d 967 (9th Cir. 2002). *In re Menk* is distinguishable from this case because it focuses on § 1334 statutory interpretation as it pertains to dischargeability actions under § 523(a)(3)(B). *In re Staffer* is also distinguishable from this case because it focuses on nondischargeability actions and the doctrine of laches, which are issues not before the Court in the instant case.

*B. THE APPLICATION OF IN RE CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS CORP.*

According to *In re Consol. Freightways Corp.*, 553 B.R. 396, 399 (C.D. Cal. 2016),

"The Bankruptcy Court's decision to reopen or not is discretionary and governed by 11 U.S.C. § 350. *Id.* In exercising this discretion, the Bankruptcy Court may consider numerous factors, including (1) the benefit to creditors, (2) the benefit to debtor, (3) the prejudice to affected parties, (4) the availability of relief in other forums, (5) whether the estate has been fully administered, (6) the length of time between the closing of the case and the motion to reopen, and (7) good faith."

As shown in Responding Parties' Opposition, many of the above factors weigh against reopening the case. *First*, there has been unreasonable delay between when this case was closed and when Debtor filed a motion to reopen given the seven-and-a-half-year passage of time, and Debtor does not provide any reason for the delay. *Second*, the Responding Parties would be prejudiced by a decision to reopen this case in continuing to incur expenses and delay responding to Debtor's efforts. *Third*, Debtor's Motion does not appear to show good faith because the supporting declaration relies on hearsay and does not appear to be true. Therefore, upon consideration of the delay

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Cameron Richard De Smidt**

**Chapter 7**

in filing the Motion, the prejudice to the Responding Parties, and Debtor's lack of good faith, in addition to Debtor's failure to show cause, the Court is inclined to deny the Motion.

**TENTATIVE RULING**

Based on the foregoing, the Court is inclined to DENY the motion to reopen the Chapter 7 case.

APPEARANCES REQUIRED.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Cameron Richard De Smidt

Represented By  
Ronald H Freshman

**Movant(s):**

Cameron Richard De Smidt

Represented By  
Ronald H Freshman

**Trustee(s):**

Robert Whitmore (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:22-14723 Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

**#3.00** CONT. Motion of Impact Networking, LLC For Allowance and Payment of Chapter 11 Administrative Priority Claim; \$108419.99 (Motion filed 9/28/23)

From: 11/1/23

EH\_\_

Docket 626

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CONTINUED TO 3/27/24 BY ORDER  
ENTERED 1/9/24**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Better Nutritionals, LLC

Represented By  
John N Tedford IV  
Aaron E. DE Leest  
Danielle R Gabai

**Movant(s):**

Impact Networking, LLC

Represented By  
David W. Meadows

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Represented By  
D Edward Hays  
David Wood  
Tinho Mang  
Michael A Sweet

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:22-14723 Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

**#4.00** CONT. Motion By Goli Nutrition Inc For Allowance Of Chapter 11 Administrative Priority And Super priority Claims  
(Motion filed 9/28/23)

From: 11/1/23

EH\_\_

Docket 633

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CONTINUED TO 3/27/24 BY ORDER  
ENTERED 1/11/24**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Better Nutritionals, LLC

Represented By  
John N Tedford IV  
Aaron E. DE Leest  
Danielle R Gabai

**Movant(s):**

Goli Nutrition, Inc.

Represented By  
Eve H. Karasik  
Joseph M Rothberg  
Daniel H Reiss  
Todd M Arnold  
Carmela Pagay

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Represented By  
D Edward Hays  
David Wood  
Tinho Mang



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Better Nutritionals, LLC**

Michael A Sweet

**Chapter 7**

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:22-14723 Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

**#5.00** CONT. Motion for Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expense Claims, Total Transportation Logistics, Pursuant to Section 503(b) of the Bankruptcy Code of the Bankruptcy Code)  
(Motion filed 9/29/23)

From: 11/1/23

EH\_\_

**[Tele. appr. Larry D. Simons, rep. Trustee]**

**[Tele. appr. Hala Hammi, rep. Total Transportation Logistics, Inc.]**

**[Tele. appr. William Fennell, rep. Total Transportation Logistics, Inc.]**

Docket 652

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Better Nutritionals, LLC

Represented By  
John N Tedford IV  
Aaron E. DE Leest  
Danielle R Gabai

**Movant(s):**

Total Transportation Logistics, Inc.

Represented By  
Evan R Sorem  
William P Fennell

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Represented By  
D Edward Hays

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**CONT... Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

David Wood  
Tinho Mang  
Michael A Sweet

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:22-14723 Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

**#6.00** CONT. Motion to Allow Claim 169 Filed by Creditor Cigna Health and Life Insurance Company  
(Motion filed 9/27/23)

From: 11/1/23

EH\_\_

**[Tele. appr. Larry D. Simons, rep. Trustee]**

**[Tele. appr. Jeffrey Wisler, rep. Cigma Health and Life Insurance Company]**

Docket 622

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Better Nutritionals, LLC

Represented By  
John N Tedford IV  
Aaron E. DE Leest  
Danielle R Gabai

**Movant(s):**

Cigna Health and Life Insurance

Represented By  
Andrew Michael Cummings

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Represented By  
D Edward Hays  
David Wood  
Tinho Mang  
Michael A Sweet

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**6:22-14723 Better Nutritionals, LLC**

**Chapter 7**

**#7.00** CONT. Notice of Motion and Motion of Allied Universal Security Services for Allowance of an Administrative Priority Expense Claim; \$78,525.46 (Motion filed 9/29/23)

From: 11/1/23

EH\_\_

Docket 646

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CONTINUED TO 3/27/24 BY ORDER  
ENTERED 1/12/24**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Better Nutritionals, LLC

Represented By  
John N Tedford IV  
Aaron E. DE Leest  
Danielle R Gabai

**Movant(s):**

Allied Universal Security Services

Represented By  
Jamie L Edmonson

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Represented By  
D Edward Hays  
David Wood  
Tinho Mang  
Michael A Sweet

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

11:00 AM

**:**                    **Gordmans Stores Inc et al v. Office Star Products**  
Misc#: 6:21-00101      Gordmans Stores Inc et al v. Office Star Products

**Chapter 0**

**#8.00**      Application for Appearance and Examination of Judgment Debtor

EH\_\_

Docket      10

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Defendant(s):**

Office Star Products	Pro Se
----------------------	--------

**Movant(s):**

CREDITORS ADJUSTMENT	Pro Se
----------------------	--------

**Plaintiff(s):**

Meta Advisors LLC on behalf of G-	Pro Se
-----------------------------------	--------

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

2:00 PM

**6:13-27611 Douglas Jay Roger**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 6:16-01163 Revere Financial Corporation v. Burns

**#9.00** CONT Pre-Trial Conference RE: [1] Adversary case 6:16-ap-01163. Complaint by Revere Financial Corporation against Don C. Burns. (12 (Recovery of money/property - 547 preference)),(11 (Recovery of money/property - 542 turnover of property)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other)),(91 (Declaratory judgment))

**[Holding Date]**

From: 8/31/16, 11/2/16, 1/11/17, 3/8/17, 6/7/17, 8/2/17, 8/23/17, 11/8/17, 1/31/18, 4/25/18, 2/27/18, 6/12/19, 1/29/20, 5/27/20, 9/30/20, 10/26/20, 2/12/20, 2/17/21, 6/30/21, 9/29/21, 12/15/21, 2/16/22, 6/29/22, 1/4/23, 2/1/23, 5/3/23, 8/16/23, 11/15/23

EH\_\_

**[Tele. appr. Franklin Fraley, rep. Plaintiff]**

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

The Court, having reviewed the Stipulation by All Parties to Continue Pre-Trial Conference, dated June 28, 2022 (the "Stipulation") [Doc. No. 188], intends to continue the pre-trial conference to September 28, 2022, at 2:00 p.m.

APPEARANCES WAIVED.

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

**Debtor(s):**

Douglas Jay Roger

Represented By  
Summer M Shaw  
Marc C Forsythe

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

2:00 PM

**CONT... Douglas Jay Roger**

**Chapter 7**

**Defendant(s):**

Don Cameron Burns

Represented By  
Don C Burns

**Plaintiff(s):**

Revere Financial Corporation

Represented By  
Franklin R Fraley Jr

**Trustee(s):**

Helen R. Frazer (TR)

Represented By  
Arjun Sivakumar  
Carmela Pagay  
Franklin R Fraley Jr  
Cathrine M Castaldi



**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

2:00 PM

**6:22-10197 Sumit Sodhi**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 6:22-01030 Zavala v. Sodhi

**#10.00** CONT. Status Conference RE: [1] Adversary case 6:22-ap-01030. Complaint by Gerardo Zavala against Sumit Sodhi. willful and malicious injury)),(62 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(2), false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud)),(41 (Objection / revocation of discharge - 727(c),(d),(e)))

From: 6/29/22, 12/14/22, 6/14/23, 8/30/23, 11/29/23, 1/10/24

EH\_\_

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CASE DISMISSED 1/12/24**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Sumit Sodhi

Represented By  
Stephen K Moran

**Defendant(s):**

Sumit Sodhi

Represented By  
Stephen K Moran

**Plaintiff(s):**

Gerardo Zavala

Represented By  
Hector R Martinez  
Tania Fonseca  
Stan S Mallison  
Tania Guadalupe Fonseca  
Cody Alexander Bolce

**Trustee(s):**

Howard B Grobstein (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

2:00 PM

**6:23-10232 Jorge Ocampo Lopez**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 6:23-01062 Ivy Portfolio, LLC v. Lopez et al

**#11.00** CONT. STATUS CONFERENCE re: Complaint by Ivy Portfolio, LLC against Jorge Ocampo Lopez, Karina Ponce. false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud))

From: 8/30/23, 11/1/23

EH\_\_

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Jorge Ocampo Lopez

Represented By  
George C Panagiotou

**Defendant(s):**

Jorge Ocampo Lopez

Pro Se

Karina Ponce

Pro Se

**Joint Debtor(s):**

Karina Ponce

Represented By  
George C Panagiotou

**Plaintiff(s):**

Ivy Portfolio, LLC

Represented By  
Richard T Baum

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court  
Central District of California  
Riverside  
Mark Houle, Presiding  
Courtroom 301 Calendar**

**Wednesday, January 31, 2024**

**Hearing Room 301**

2:00 PM

**6:23-12911 Shalena Denise Elise Armstrong**

**Chapter 7**

Adv#: 6:23-01100 Regions Bank successor by merger to Ascentium Capi v. Armstrong

**#12.00** CONT. Status Conference RE: Complaint by Regions Bank Successor by Merger to Ascentium Capital, LLC against Shalena Denise Elise Armstrong Willful and Malicious injury)), (65 (Dischargeability - other))

From: 12/6/23

EH \_\_\_\_

Docket 1

**\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CASE DISMISSED 1/8/24**

**Tentative Ruling:**

- NONE LISTED -

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

**Debtor(s):**

Shalena Denise Elise Armstrong

Represented By  
Keith Q Nguyen

**Defendant(s):**

Shalena Denise Elise Armstrong

Pro Se

**Plaintiff(s):**

Regions Bank successor by merger

Represented By  
Andrew K Alper

**Trustee(s):**

Larry D Simons (TR)

Pro Se