Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9: - Chapter 0

#0.00

PLEASE TAKE NOTE:

THE <u>10:00 A.M.</u> REAFFIRMATION HEARING CALENDAR WILL BE <u>IN-PERSON</u> ONLY.

THE ZOOM INSTRUCTIONS APPLY TO 9:00 A.M. AND 1:00 P.M. CALENDARS ONLY.

Unless ordered otherwise, appearances for matters may be made in-person in Courtroom 201 at 1415 State Street, Santa Barbara, California, 93101, by video through ZoomGov, or by telephone through ZoomGov. If appearing through ZoomGov, parties in interest 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. Individuals may opt to participate by audio only using a telephone (standard telephone charges may apply).

All parties making an appearance via ZoomGov video and audio connection **must** have their video on. Proper court attire is required of all parties appearing via ZoomGov video. Any virtual backgrounds are to be of a solid color, without pictures, videos, or scenes. No party may appear by ZoomGov from any place other than a quiet room in an office or home. Parties may not appear via ZoomGov from a vehicle of any kind, moving or not.

Regarding remote access to hearings, members of the public may <u>NOT</u> observe any hearing via ZoomGov web address or app. Members of the public may <u>ONLY</u> **listen to** non-evidentiary hearings, where no live testimony is being taken, via ZoomGov telephone conference line or in-person at the address listed above. If members of the public attempt to observe hearings remotely in any manner other than via ZoomGov telephone conference line, the Court will remove them from ZoomGov for the hearing(s). No members of the public will be permitted to observe, via telephone line or otherwise, trials, evidentiary hearings, hearings where live testimony will be taken, and hearings where sensitive information is being disseminated that may not be adequately safeguarded.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM CONT...

Chapter 0

You may obtain the ZoomGov connection details by clicking the hyperlink below or copying and pasting the web address into your browser.

https://forms.office.com/g/d3SqfMtsuv

Neither a Zoom nor a ZoomGov account is necessary to participate, and no preregistration is required. The audio portion of each hearing will be recorded electronically by the Court and that recording will constitute its official record. Recording, retransmitting, photographing, or imaging Court proceedings by any means is strictly prohibited.

Docket 0

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:21-10020 Core Scientific North America, Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:22-01033 Faith v. Core Scientific North America, Inc. et al

CONT'D Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:22-ap-01033. Complaint by #1.00 Jeremy W. Faith against Core Scientific North America, Inc., Core Scientific Creations Ltd., Coreva Health Science LLC, Damian Delfino, Craig Bluth, Cassie Inglis. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). -- Complaint for: (1) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (2) Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (3) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers with Actual Intent [11 U.S.C. § 544(b)]; (4) Avoidance of Fraudulent Transfers with Actual Intent [11 U.S.C. § 548(a)(1)(A)]; (5) Avoidance of Constructively Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. § 548(a)(1)(B)]; (6) Avoidance of Preferential Transfers [11 U.S.C. § 547]; (7) Avoidance of Unauthorized Postpetition Transfers [11 U.S.C. § 549]; (8) Recovery and Preservation of Avoided Transfers; (9) Conversion; (10) Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage; (11) Negligent Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage; (12) Accounting; and (13) Substantive Consolidation - Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(02 (Other (e.g. other actions that would have been brought in state court if unrelated to bankruptcy))),(12 (Recovery of money/property - 547 preference)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other)),(02 (Other (e.g. other actions that would have been brought in state court if unrelated to bankruptcy))

fr. 10-6-22, 12-14-22, 6-14-23, 9-27-23, 1-10-24, 2-7-24, 4-10-24, 5-8-24, 6-5-24

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 72. The Court has three queries for the parties. First, does Coreva Health Science, LLC have counsel in this matter? Second, has the early payoff option been exercised? If not, does this adversary proceeding need to remain open?

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Core Scientific North America, Inc.

Chapter 7

June 5, 2024

See Matter No. 4.

May 8, 2024

Appearances waived.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 66. It appears that this matter has settled. *See id.* at p. 4. The status conference is continued to June 5, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

April 10, 2024

Appearances required. Parties may appear via Zoom.

On October 2, 2023, the Court entered that Order Approving Stipulation to Stay Litigation Deadlines (the "Order"). See Docket No. 49. The Court has continued the status conference to allow the parties to memorialize a settlement. Those Adversary Proceeding Status Conference Procedures [for] Judge Ronald A. Clifford III require that "[a] joint status report prepared using Local Form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT must be filed fourteen (14) days before each status conference." See Docket No. 2, p. 1. This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(2) provides that "[u]nless otherwise ordered by the court, at least 14 days before the date set for each status conference the parties are required to file a joint status report using mandatory form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT." No status report has been filed in preparation for the upcoming status conference in violation of this Court's adversary procedures and its Local Rules. The Court has unnecessarily used its resources attempting to prepare for a status conference without any information from the parties through a status report to assist the Court in this effort. The Court is inclined to continue the status conference for 30 days to allow the parties to provide the Court with a status conference report as they were required to do for the upcoming status report, and to sanction each party \$1,000 for their violation of this Court's procedures and this Court's Local Rules.

In person appearances are required for every hearing in this matter moving forward,

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Core Scientific North America, Inc.

Chapter 7

including the upcoming status conference.

February 7, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court continued the status conference to February 7, 2024 from January 10, 2024, and required that a joint status report be filed at least 14 days prior to the February 7, 2024 status conference. *See* Docket Entry Dated January 10, 2024. The Court finds no joint status report.

January 10, 2024

Appearances required.

On October 2, 2023, the Court entered that *Order Approving Stipulation to Stay Litigation Deadlines* to allow the parties time to resolve the matter. *See* Docket No. 49. Now, more than three (3) months on, the matter remains pending. The Court is inclined to set the matter for trial. The parties should meet and confer regarding litigation dates.

December 14, 2022

No appearances required.

On December 5, 2022, the Court entered that *Order Assigning Matter to Mediation Program and Appointing Mediator and Alternate Mediator*. In reviewing the *Joint Status Report*, it appears that the parties are (1) conducting discovery, set to conclude by April 2023, and (2) attending mediation on or before February 28, 2023. *See* Docket No. 18, pp. 3-4.

The Court continues the status conference to June 14, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

October 6, 2022

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Core Scientific North America, Inc. Appearances required.

Chapter 7

The Court has reviewed the *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 13. The Court will set the following dates and deadlines:

- (1) Discovery cutoff is April 1, 2023, by which date discovery must be completed, including receiving responses to discovery requests;
- (2) The last day to have pretrial motions heard is May 17, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. (motions must be filed in time for any such motions to be heard on this date pursuant to this Court's Local Rules and/or the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure);
- (3) A joint pre-trial order must be filed on or before June 1, 2023;
- (4) A pre-trial conference is scheduled for June 14, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.; and
- (5) Trial is scheduled to begin on June 20, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Core Scientific North America, Inc.

Represented By

Brent D George Andrew Goodman

Defendant(s):

Core Scientific North America, Inc.

Represented By

Andrew Goodman

Core Scientific Creations Ltd. Represented By

Michael Jay Berger

Coreva Health Science LLC Represented By

Andrew Goodman

Damian Delfino Represented By

Andrew Goodman

Craig Bluth Represented By

6/4/2025 7:44:23 AM

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... Core Scientific North America, Inc. Chapter 7

Andrew Goodman

Cassie Inglis Represented By

Andrew Goodman

Plaintiff(s):

Jeremy W. Faith Represented By

Dylan J Yamamoto Annie Y Stoops

Ronghua Sophia Wang

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR)

Represented By

Aram Ordubegian Annie Y Stoops Dylan J Yamamoto Ronghua Sophia Wang

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10968 John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:24-01017 Saint v. Thomas

#2.00 CONT'D Status Hearing re: [1] Adversary case 9:24-ap-01017. Complaint by Steve Saint against John Charles Thomas. willful and malicious injury)); Counter-Claim (Docket #[8])

fr. 7-10-24, 1-29-25, 2-12-25, 03-26-25, 4-9-25, (Advanced from 6-18-25),

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Order granting stipulation for non-dischargeability of judgment entered 5/13/25

Tentative Ruling:

April 9, 2025

In-person appearances required of counsel for all parties.

Pursuant to those *Adversary Proceeding Status Conference Procedures* (the "Procedures"), "[a] joint status report prepared using Local Form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT must be filed fourteen (14) days before each status conference." *See* Docket No. 3, p. 1. "A failure to file a joint status report may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions and/or the status conference being continued." *Id.* The requirement that the parties file a status conference report fourteen (14) days prior to a status conference can only be waived by action of this Court. *See id.*

Pursuant to this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(2), "[u]nless otherwise ordered by the court, at least 14 days before the date set for each status conference the parties are required to file a joint status report using mandatory form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT []."

Pursuant to this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(b)(1)(A), "[i]n an adversary proceeding, unless otherwise ordered by the court [], attorneys for the parties [] must prepare a written pretrial stipulation approved by counsel for all parties." (emphasis added). This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(b)(1)(B) provides that "[u]nless otherwise ordered by

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

the court, the pretrial stipulation *must* be filed or lodged [] and served not less than 14 days before the date set for the pretrial conference []." (emphasis added).

This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(f) provides that "[i]n addition to the sanctions authorized by F.R.Civ.P. 16(f), if a status conference statement or a joint proposed pretrial stipulation is not filed or lodged within the times set forth in subsections (a), (b), or (e), respectively, of this rule, the court may [] award [] monetary sanctions [and/or award] non-monetary sanctions against the party at fault including entry of judgment or dismissal or the entry of an order striking the answer and entering a default."

Pursuant to this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(g), "[t]he failure of a party's counsel [] to appear before the court at a status conference or pretrial conference, or to complete the necessary preparations therefor [] may be considered an abandonment or failure to prosecute or defend diligently, and judgment may be entered against the defaulting party with respect to a specific issue or as to the entire proceeding, or the proceeding may be dismissed."

On April 29, 2024, Steve Saint ("Plaintiff") filed that *Complaint to Determine Nondischargeability of Debt Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523* (the "Complaint") as against John Charles Thomas ("Defendant"). *See* Docket No. 1. On July 17, 2024, the Court entered that *Scheduling Order*, through which the Court set a continued status conference on the Complaint for January 29, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., and a pretrial conference for March 27, 2025. *See* Docket No. 18. The Court ordered the parties to mediate the Complaint "no later than January 15, 2025." *See id.* at p. 2.

On August 5, 2024, the Court entered that *Order Rescheduling of Pretrial Conference*, rescheduling the pretrial conference to March 26, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. *See* Docket No. 20. After Plaintiff's failure to appear at the status conference or file a status conference report fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference, on January 31, 2025, the Court entered that *Order to Show Cause Why: (1) The Adversary Complaint Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to Prosecute, and (2) Sanctions Should Not Be Issued Against Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's Counsel(s). See Docket No. 27. The Court vacated its show cause order on February 12, 2025. See Docket No. 30, Order Vacating Order to Show Cause Why: (1) The Adversary Complaint Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to Prosecute, and (2) Sanctions Should Not Be Issued*

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

Against Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's Counsel(s). The Court continued the status conference to March 26, 2025. See Docket Entry at February 12, 2025.

On February 28, 2025, that *Mediator's Certificate Regarding Completion of Mediation Conference* was filed, denoting that the Complaint was mediated on February 26, 2026 [sic], after the date ordered by the Court, and that the Complaint settled. *See* Docket No. 33.

No timely and conforming status conference report or pretrial stipulation were filed prior to the status conference and pretrial conference.

On March 25, 2025, the day before the scheduled status conference and pretrial conference, Defendant filed that *Status Report*, informing the Court that the Complaint has settled, and graciously informing the Court "that the status conference may be taken off calendar." *See* Docket No. 34, p. 1, lines 21-22. Counsel to Defendant was also kind enough to the Court to inform the Court that "he will not appear at the status conference," as he would be instead traveling "to New York to celebrate a milestone birthday." *See id.* at pp. 1-2.

True to his word, neither counsel to Defendant nor Defendant appeared at the status conference or pretrial conference on March 26, 2025.

On March 26, 2025, Plaintiff appeared for the status conference and pretrial conference having filed not a single piece of paper to prepare the Court, in violation of this Court's Local Rules and the Procedures. Again, Defendant did not appear at all, and what Defendant did file less than 24 hours prior to the status conference and pretrial conference, a self-styled "status report," violated the Court's Local Rules and the Procedures requiring the use of this Court's mandatory local form, and was unacceptably untimely.

Assuming this matter has in-fact settled, and that settlement has been reduced to an agreed upon writing, it escapes the Court why the parties did not inform the Court of this fact fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference or pretrial conference. If the parties had an agreement in principle as early as February 26, 2025, a month prior to the status conference and pretrial conference, why would the parties not file a request to continue the trial date, and the status and pretrial conference shortly thereafter? Why would Defendant's counsel, knowing of the pretrial conference for months book

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

a "birthday" vacation on a date that collided with one of the most important dates his client faced in this adversary proceeding? The Court, perhaps unwisely in this matter, allows parties to appear via Zoom.gov and by telephone. Could Defendant's counsel not have appeared for the hearings virtually no matter where he was in the country?

The parties, or at least their counsel, have wasted this Court's time in attempting to prepare for a status conference and pretrial conference that neither party intended advancing. This is not the first of such occasions in this proceeding. The parties, and their counsel, are in violation of both the Procedures and this Court's Local Rules. The Complaint is dismissed, with prejudice. Each party, and their counsel, jointly and severally, are each to pay sanctions to the Court in the amount of \$7,500. Neither counsels are to appear remotely in this Division for any matter in the future, including the instant matter, unless this Court orders otherwise.

March 26, 2025

Appearances required.

In reviewing Mediator's Certificate Regarding Completion of Mediation Conference, it appears that matter has settled. See Docket No. 33.

February 12, 2025

In-person appearances required of Plaintiff <u>and</u> Plaintiff's counsel, Douglas A. Prutton

Before the Court is the Court's Order to Show Cause Why: (1) The Adversary Complaint Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to Prosecute, and (2) Sanctions Should Not Be Issued Against Plaintiff and/or Plaintiff's Counsel(s) (the "OSC"), issued on January 31, 2025, as to why (1) this adversary proceeding should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, and/or (2) the Court should not issue monetary sanctions for Douglas A. Prutton's ("Prutton") failure to file a status conference report or appear at the status conference. See Docket No. 27. The OSC provides that any opposition to the dismissal of this adversary proceeding, or issuance of sanctions may

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

be filed not later than February 5, 2025. See id. at p. 2, lines 6-8.

On January 30, 2025, Prutton, counsel to Plaintiff Steve Saint ("Plaintiff"), filed that *Response to Order to Show Cause by Plaintiff's Attorney Douglas A. Prutton* (the "Response") in which Prutton stated that he never calendared the status conference. *See* Docket No. 24, p. 2 ¶ 3. Prutton also stated that he alone is responsible for this adversary proceeding, whereas co-counsel Michael Wallin is handling the bankruptcy case. *See id.* at ¶ 6. Further, Prutton requested that the Court continue the hearing on the OSC to another day, as he will be traveling from February 12, 2025 to February 18, 2025. *See id.* at ¶ 7; *see also* Docket No. 26, *Letter to Judge Clifford III*.

Those Adversary Proceeding Status Conference Procedures (the "Procedures") provide that "[f]ailure to appear for a status conference may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions." See Docket No. 3, p. 1. The Procedures also provide that "[a] joint status report prepared using Local Form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT must be filed fourteen days before each status conference." Id. "Failure to file a joint status report may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions and/or the status conference being continued." Id. "Stipulations for extensions of time are ineffective unless approved by the Court." *Id.* This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(1) requires appearance at status conferences by "the attorney [] who is responsible for trying the case..." If the Procedures did not provide sufficient notice, this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(2) provides, "[u]nless otherwise ordered by the court, at least 14 days before the date set for each status conference the parties are required to file a joint status report using mandatory court form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT." This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(f) provides that "if a status conference statement [] is not filed [] within the times set forth in subsection (a) [], the court may order [a]n award of monetary sanctions including attorneys' fees against the party at fault and/or counsel, payable to the party not at fault [and/or a]n award of non-monetary sanctions against the party at fault including entry of judgment of dismissal or the entry of an order striking the answer and entering a default." Pursuant to this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(g), "[t]he failure of a party's counsel [] to appear before the court at the status conference [] may be considered an abandonment or failure to prosecute or defend diligently, and judgment may be entered against the defaulting party either with respect to a specific issue or as to the entire proceeding, or the proceeding may be dismissed."

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7016(a), "Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 applies in an adversary proceeding." Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f)(1)(A), "[o]n motion or its own, the court may issue any just orders, including those authorized by Rule 37(b),(2),(A),(ii)-(vii), if a party or its attorney [] fails to appear at a scheduling or other pretrial conference." Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f)(2), "[i]nstead of or in addition to any other sanction, the court must order the party, its attorney, or both to pay the reasonable expenses—including attorney's fees—incurred because of any noncompliance with this rule, unless the noncompliance was substantially justified or other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust."

"The task of keeping track of necessary deadlines will involve some delegation," however, "[t]he responsibility for the error falls on the attorney regardless of whether the error was made by an attorney or a paralegal." *Pincay v. Andrews*, 389 F.3d 853, 856 (9th Cir. 2004)(citing Model Rules of Prof'l Conduct R. 5.5 cmt (2002)).

In the instant proceeding, the parties were aware of the status conference as of July 17, 2024. *See* Docket No. 18, *Scheduling Order* (the "Order"), p. 2, line 4. Plaintiff and Prutton failed to appear. What is more, the Court ordered the parties to mediate the matter no later than January 15, 2025, with an order assigning the matter to mediation to be uploaded no later than November 15, 2024. *See id.* at lines 10-13. The parties ignored the Order.

The Court now has an adversary proceeding that is set for trial to take place on April 10, 2025, where Plaintiff has not attended a status conference, which attendance was mandatory, failed to file the required status conference statement, and where neither party has complied with the Order regarding mediation. Instead, the parties filed that *Stipulation for Order Modifying Scheduling Order* without providing any reason why this Court should modify the Order. *See* Docket No. 22.

Monetary sanctions appear appropriate, likely for both parties, but non-monetary sanctions may also be appropriate. The parties have also failed to comply with a direct order of this Court concerning mediation. Thus, the Court, beyond monetary sanctions and non-monetary sanctions for their failure to file a status conference statement, and as against Plaintiff and/or Prutton for their failure to appear at the status conference, is inclined to issue a further order to show cause regarding why both parties should not be held in contempt of the Order.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

January 29, 2025

In-person appearances required. No Zoom appearances will be taken.

The Court set this matter for a continued status conference. See Docket No. 18, Scheduling Order (the "Scheduling Order"), p. 2. As the parties are aware, "[a] joint status report preparing using Local Form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT must be filed fourteen (14) days before each status conference." See Docket No. 3, Adversary Proceeding Status Conference Procedures (the "Procedures Order"). The Court also set a discovery cutoff of December 31, 2024, and required that the parties attend at least ½ day of mediation on or before January 15, 2025, lodging an order assigning the matter to mediation on or before November 15, 2024. See id.

Here, at the time of the continued status conference, no status report has been filed, as this Court has required through the Procedures Order. On January 17, 2025, the parties filed that *Stipulation for Order Modifying Scheduling Order* (the "Stipulation"). *See* Docket No. 22. The parties, through the Stipulation, seek to continue the trial date and other dates within the Scheduling Order. *See id.* The Court has some confusion. First, the parties seek to modify the discovery cutoff as March 31, 2025. *See id.* at p. 2, lines 1-3. Yet, the discovery cutoff has passed. Discovery was to be completed, including receipt of responses by December 31, 2024. Next, the parties seek to conduct a day of mediation by April 15, 2025. *See id.* at lines 11-13. This Court ordered that mediation in this matter take place by January 15, 2025, and that an order assigning the matter to mediation be uploaded by November 15, 2024, more than two (2) months ago. Lastly, the Court has no understanding why the Scheduling Order has not been, and in the future cannot be met.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7016(a), Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 applies in adversary proceedings. *See* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7016(a). Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(1)(B), "the district judge [] must issue a scheduling order [] after consulting with the parties' attorneys and any unrepresented parties at a scheduling conference." Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4), "[a]

schedule may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." "The pretrial

schedule may be modified 'if it cannot be reasonably met despite the diligence of the

United States Bankruptcy Court Central District of California Northern Division

Ronald A Clifford III, Presiding Courtroom 201 Calendar

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

party

seeking the extension." Zivkovic v. So. Cal. Edison Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir.

2002)(citing *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)).

"If the party seeking the modification 'was not diligent, the inquiry should end' and the motion to modify should not be granted." *Id.* "'The Ninth Circuit has also repeatedly and emphatically

addressed the importance of scheduling orders as tools for district courts to manage their heavy

caseloads." Williams v. James River Grp. Inc., 627 F.Supp.3d 1172, 1177 (D. Nev. 2022)(citing

Desio v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 339 F.R.D. 632, 641 (D. Nev. 2021)).

The Ninth Circuit has "held that Rule 16(b)'s reference to 'good cause' was 'a close correlate' of 'extraordinary circumstances.'" *Matrix Motors Co., Inc. v. Toyota Jidosha*

Kabushiki Kaisha, 218 F.R.D. 667, 674 (C.D. Cal. 2003)(citing Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 610 (9th Cir. 1992)).

"When a request to extend case management deadlines is made by stipulation, courts may

consider the joint nature of the request in deciding whether the circumstances warrant

amendment to the scheduling order. Nonetheless, courts addressing such requests are deciding at

bottom whether to modify their own orders, an issue that need not be based necessarily on the

promptings of the parties." *Id.* at 1178 (internal citations omitted). "That a request is made

jointly neither mandates allowance of the extension sought nor exempts parties from making the

necessary showings to justify that relief. Failure to provide such showings may result in denial of

a stipulated request to extend the case management deadlines." Id.

United States Bankruptcy Court Central District of California Northern Division

Ronald A Clifford III, Presiding Courtroom 201 Calendar

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas

Chapter 7

That Complaint to Determine Nondischargeability of Debt Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523 was filed on April 29, 2024. See Docket No. 1. With the matter at issue, the Court held an initial status conference on July 17, 2024, and after meeting with the parties issued the Scheduling Order. See Docket No. 18. It is unclear to the Court why it would modify the Scheduling Order, now six (6) months after it was issued, and without any reason provided. The Court ordered the matter to mediation, which order the parties seemingly have disregarded, and the discovery cutoff passed weeks ago. The parties did not as much as extend to the Court the good courtesy of complying with its Procedures Order regarding status conferences, thereby filing a report updating the Court as to the status of the matter. What efforts to comply with the Scheduling Order have been undertaken, and what prevented/prevents the parties from complying with the Scheduling Order? To this question, the Court has no answers.

July 10, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed the *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 12. The Court is inclined to set the following litigation deadlines:

July 26, 2024 – Last day to amend pleadings and join other parties

December 31, 2024 – Last day to complete discovery, including receiving responses

January 29, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Continued status conference

February 26, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Deadline for dispositive motions to be heard

March 13, 2025 – Deadline to file joint pre-trial conference stipulation and proposed order

March 27, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Pre-trial conference (in-person)

April 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Trial (in-person)

Plaintiff is to lodge a scheduling order with the above dates within 7 days.

Party Information

United States Bankruptcy Court Central District of California Northern Division

Ronald A Clifford III, Presiding Courtroom 201 Calendar

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... John Charles Thomas Chapter 7

Debtor(s):

John Charles Thomas Represented By

John D Faucher

Defendant(s):

John Charles Thomas Represented By

John D Faucher

Plaintiff(s):

Steve Saint Represented By

Michael A Wallin Douglas A Prutton

Trustee(s):

Jerry Namba (TR) Represented By

Jeremy Faith

Meghann A Triplett

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10572 Thomas Anthony Ferro

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:24-01022 Cal-West Equities, Inc. v. Ferro

#3.00 CONT'D Status hearing re: [1] Adversary case 9:24-ap-01022. Complaint by Cal-West Equities, Inc. against Thomas Anthony Ferro. and § 523(a)(6) (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A # 2 Exhibit B) Nature of Suit: (62 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(2), false pretenses, false representation, actual fraud)),(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury))

fr. 9-25-24, 2-12-25, 2-26-25, 3-12-25, 4-9-25,

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances waived.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. See Docket No. 59. The status conference is continued to August 6, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. A status conference report is to be filed fourteen (14) days prior to the continued status conference.

April 9, 2025

Appearances required.

March 12, 2025

Appearances waived.

This matter is continued to March 26, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

February 26, 2025

Appearances waived.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Thomas Anthony Ferro

Chapter 7

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 42. The status conference is continued to March 12, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

September 25, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 7. The Court is inclined to set the following litigation dates:

October 1, 2024 – Last day to amend pleadings and join other parties

April 1, 2025 – Last day to complete discovery, including receiving responses

February 12, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Continued status conference

May 21, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Deadline for dispositive motions to be heard

June 4, 2025 – Deadline to file joint pre-trial conference stipulation and proposed order

June 18, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Pre-trial conference (in-person)

July 17, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Trial (in-person)

Plaintiff is to lodge a scheduling order with the above dates within 7 day

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Thomas Anthony Ferro Represented By

Robert M Yaspan Debra Brand Joseph G McCarty

Defendant(s):

Thomas Anthony Ferro Represented By

Robert M Yaspan

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... Thomas Anthony Ferro Chapter 7

Plaintiff(s):

Cal-West Equities, Inc. Represented By

Vanessa M Haberbush

Trustee(s):

Jerry Namba (TR) Represented By

Timothy J Yoo

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10608 Brian Morgan Heit

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:24-01028 Gonzalez v. Adept Legal Counsel, PC et al

#4.00 CONT'D Status Hearing RE: [1] Adversary case 9:24-ap-01028. Complaint by Daniel E. Gonzalez against Adept Legal Counsel, PC, Brian Morgan Heit. Nature[s] of Suit: (62 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(2), 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)), (41 (Objection / revocation of discharge - 727(c),(d),(e))), (91 (Declaratory judgment))

fr. 11-6-24, 1-29-25, 3-12-25, 3-26-25,

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

March 26, 2025

Appearances required.

March 12, 2025

Appearances waived.

This matter is continued to March 26, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

January 29, 2025

Appearances waived.

This matter is continued to March 12, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Brian Morgan Heit

Chapter 7

November 6, 2024

In-person appearance by all parties and counsel required.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Brian Morgan Heit Represented By

Marcus G Tiggs Rachel M Sposato

Defendant(s):

Adept Legal Counsel, PC Represented By

Brian Morgan Heit

Brian Morgan Heit Represented By

Brian Morgan Heit

Plaintiff(s):

Daniel E. Gonzalez Pro Se

Trustee(s):

Sandra McBeth (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10302 Matthew Joseph Pavin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01004 Pavin v. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee

#5.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01004. Complaint by Matthew Joseph Pavin against Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee. (\$350.00 Fee Not Required). Complaint for Declaratory Relief Nature of Suit: (91 (Declaratory judgment))

fr. 4-23-25,

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed the *Joint Status Report* filings. *See* Docket Nos. 17 and 18. The Court is inclined to set the following deadlines, including as they relate to the cross-complaint:

August 29, 2025 - Deadline to complete discovery, including the deadline to receive responses

October 22, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Last day for dispositive motions to be heard

November 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Pre-trial Conference

November 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Continued status conference

December 3, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. - Trial

Plaintiff is to upload a scheduling order within 7 days.

April 23, 2025

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Matthew Joseph Pavin

Chapter 7

Appearances waived.

The status conference is continued to June 4, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. by order approving that *Stipulation to Continue Status Conference*. *See* Docket No. 10.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Matthew Joseph Pavin Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Carmela Pagay

Plaintiff(s):

Matthew Joseph Pavin Represented By

William E. Winfield

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR)

Represented By

Todd A. Frealy Carmela Pagay

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10302 Matthew Joseph Pavin

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01004 Pavin v. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee

#6.00 Status Conference re: [4] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01004 - Defendant Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee, CounterClaim against Matthew Joseph Pavin and Pavin Trust for turnover and accounting

Docket 4

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

See calendar item 5.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Matthew Joseph Pavin Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Carmela Pagay

Plaintiff(s):

Matthew Joseph Pavin Represented By

William E. Winfield

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR)

Represented By

Todd A. Frealy Carmela Pagay

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10157 Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01007 Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Bamieh De Smeth, a Professional

#7.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01007. Complaint by Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee against Bamieh De Smeth, a Professional Law Corporation, a California corporation. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Status Conference reset for 7/9/25 at 9:00 a.m. per another summons issued 4/29/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc. Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

Bamieh De Smeth, a Professional Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Trustee(s):

Sandra McBeth (TR) Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Jeremy Faith

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10157 Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01010 Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Law Offices of Gregory Larson

#8.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01010. Complaint by Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee against Law Offices of Gregory Larson a/k/a Gregory L. Larson, a Professional Corporation, a California corporation. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint For: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Status Conference reset for 7/9/25 at 9:00 a.m. per another summons issued 5/5/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc. Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

Law Offices of Gregory Larson a/k/a Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Trustee(s):

Sandra McBeth (TR) Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Jeremy Faith

6/4/2025 7:44:23 AM

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10157 Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01011 Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee v. OceanAir Federal Credit Union

#9.00 CONT'D Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01011. Complaint by Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee against OceanAir Federal Credit Union f/k/a CBC Federal Credit Union. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; and (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

fr. 4-23-25,

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket Nos. 12. The Court is inclined to set the following deadlines:

October 31, 2025 - Deadline to complete discovery, including the deadline to receive responses

November 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Last day for dispositive motions to be heard

November 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Pre-trial Conference

November 19, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Continued status conference

December 2, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. - Trial

Plaintiff is to upload a scheduling order within 7 days.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc.

Chapter 7

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc. Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

OceanAir Federal Credit Union f/k/a Represented By

Ashley Morris

Plaintiff(s):

Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Trustee(s):

Sandra McBeth (TR) Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Jeremy Faith

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10157 Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01012 Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Law Offices of Stephanie L.

#10.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01012. Complaint by Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Trustee against Law Offices of Stephanie L. Mahdavi a Professional Law Corporation, a California corporation. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Status Conference reset for 7/9/25 at 9:00 a.m. per another summons issued 4/29/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Baron Brothers Nursery, Inc. Represented By

William E. Winfield

Defendant(s):

Law Offices of Stephanie L. Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Sandra K. McBeth, Chapter 7 Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Trustee(s):

Sandra McBeth (TR) Represented By

Samuel Mushegh Boyamian

Jeremy Faith

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10241 Sustenance Inc.

Chapter 7

#11.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01015. Complaint by Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee against Capital One, National Association. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07]; (3) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (4) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Hearing continued to 7/9/25 at 9:00 a.m. per order entered on 5/19/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Sustenance Inc. Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Defendant(s):

Capital One, National Association Represented By

Jared D Bissell

Plaintiff(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room

9:00 AM

CONT... Sustenance Inc. Chapter 7

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

201

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10241 Sustenance Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01016 Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee v. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK,

#12.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01016. Complaint by Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee against JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07]; (3) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (4) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 11. The Court is inclined to set the following deadlines:

November 28, 2025 - Deadline to complete discovery, including the deadline to receive responses

December 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Last day for dispositive motions to be heard

December 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Continued status conference

Plaintiff is to upload a scheduling order within 7 days.

Party Information

Courtroom 201 Calendar

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... Sustenance Inc. Chapter 7

Debtor(s):

Sustenance Inc. Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Defendant(s):

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, Represented By

Christopher O Rivas

Plaintiff(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR)

Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10241 Sustenance Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01017 Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Citibank, National Association

#13.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01017. Complaint by Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee against Citibank, National Association. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07]; (3) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (4) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551] (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 13. The Court is inclined to set the following deadlines:

November 28, 2025 - Deadline to complete discovery, including the deadline to receive responses

December 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Last day for dispositive motions to be heard

December 10, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Continued status conference

Plaintiff is to upload a scheduling order within 7 days.

Party Information

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... Sustenance Inc. Chapter 7

Debtor(s):

Sustenance Inc. Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Defendant(s):

Citibank, National Association Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:23-10241 Sustenance Inc.

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01018 Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee v. Alessandro Mogul Khan a/k/a Nawab

#14.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01018. Complaint by Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee against Alessandro Mogul Khan a/k/a Nawab Sher. (\$350.00 Fee Charge To Estate). Complaint for: (1) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Actual Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(1), 3439.07 and 3439.09]; (2) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Constructive Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 544(b), 550, and 551, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3439.04(a)(2) or 3439.05 and 3439.07]; (3) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(A), 550, and 551]; and (4) Avoidance, Recovery and Preservation of Fraudulent Transfers [11 U.S.C. §§ 548(a)(1)(B), 550, and 551]; (5) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (6) For Unjust Enrichment; and (7) Conversion (Attachments: # 1 Adversary Proceeding Cover Sheet) Nature of Suit: (13 (Recovery of money/property - 548 fraudulent transfer)),(14 (Recovery of money/property - other))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Hearing continued to 7/9/25 at 9:00 a.m. per order entered on 5/22/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Sustenance Inc. Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Defendant(s):

Alessandro Mogul Khan a/k/a Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Jeremy W. Faith, Chapter 7 Trustee Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

6/4/2025 7:44:23 AM

Page 37 of 82

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room

9:00 AM

CONT... Sustenance Inc. Chapter 7

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Represented By

Meghann A Triplett

201

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:25-10016 David Andrew Hubbell

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01019 Banc of California, a California state-chartered b v. Hubbell et al

#15.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01019. Complaint by Banc of California, a California state-chartered bank fka PACIFIC WESTERN BANK against David Andrew Hubbell, Kristen Dennise Hubbell. 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))

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Hearing continued to 8/6/25 at 9:00 a.m. per order entered 5/13/25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

David Andrew Hubbell Represented By

Edwin J Rambuski

Defendant(s):

David Andrew Hubbell Represented By

Edwin J Rambuski

Kristen Dennise Hubbell Represented By

Edwin J Rambuski

Joint Debtor(s):

Kristen Dennise Hubbell Represented By

Edwin J Rambuski

Plaintiff(s):

Banc of California, a California state

Represented By

Raffi Khatchadourian

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room 201

9:00 AM

CONT... David Andrew Hubbell Chapter 7

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:25-10168 Ivan Lopez

Chapter 7

Adv#: 9:25-01020 Lira et al v. Lopez

#16.00 Status Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:25-ap-01020. Complaint by Patricia Lira, Gelacio Lopez, Mallison & Martinez against Ivan Lopez. fraud as fiduciary, embezzlement, larceny)),(68 (Dischargeability - 523(a)(6), willful and malicious injury)),(65 (Dischargeability - other))

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

In-person appearances required. Zoom appearances will not be allowed.

Those Adversary Proceeding Status Conference Procedures (the "Procedures") provide that "[f]ailure to appear for a status conference may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions." See Docket No. 3, p. 1. The Procedures also provide that "[a] joint status report prepared using Local Form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT must be filed fourteen days before each status conference." *Id.* "Failure to file a joint status report may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions and/or the status conference being continued." Id. "Stipulations for extensions of time are ineffective unless approved by the Court." Id. This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(1) requires appearance at status conferences by "the attorney [] who is responsible for trying the case..." If the Procedures did not provide sufficient notice, this Court's Local Rule 7016-1(a)(2) provides, "[u]nless otherwise ordered by the court, at least 14 days before the date set for each status conference the parties are required to file a joint status report using mandatory court form F 7016-1.STATUS.REPORT." This Court's Local Rule 7016-1(f) provides that "if a status conference statement [] is not filed [] within the times set forth in subsection (a) [], the court may order [a]n award of monetary sanctions including attorneys' fees against the party at fault and/or counsel, payable to the party not at fault [and/or a]n award of non-monetary sanctions against the party at fault including entry of judgment of dismissal or the entry of an order striking the answer and entering a default."

No status report has been filed by the Plaintiffs or the Defendant. Sanctions are

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Ivan Lopez

Chapter 7

appropriate, monetary and/or otherwise.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Ivan Lopez Represented By

Frank X Ruggier

Defendant(s):

Ivan Lopez Represented By

Frank X Ruggier

Joint Debtor(s):

Gladys Lopez Represented By

Frank X Ruggier

Plaintiff(s):

Patricia Lira Represented By

Gonzalo Quezada Jr Stan S Mallison Hector R Martinez

Gelacio Lopez Represented By

Gonzalo Quezada Jr Stan S Mallison Hector R Martinez

Law Firm of Mallison & Martinez Represented By

Gonzalo Quezada Jr Stan S Mallison Hector R Martinez

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10319 Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Adv#: 9:24-01038 Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 4 v. Makat Investments,

#17.00 Hearing re: [25] Order to Show Cause why Defendant Makat Investments, LLC, Should not be held in Contempt and Sanctioned

Docket 25

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required. Mr. Olmstead is to appear in-person.

Background

On September 27, 2024, Jerry Namba, solely in his capacity as the duly appointed Chapter 7 trustee for the bankruptcy estate of 40800SEGC LLC (the "Trustee") filed that Complaint to: (1) Avoid Transfer; (2) Recover Avoided Transfer; (3) Obtain Turnover; and (4) Obtain Accounting (the "Complaint") as against Makat Investments, LLC (the "Defendant"). See Docket No. 1. The Defendant is represented by Reed H. Olmstead ("Olmstead"). See Docket No. 4, Answer to Complaint to: (1) Avoid Transfer; (2) Objecting to Entry of Discharge Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 523(a)(2); 523(a)(4) 532(a)(6) [sic].

On January 28, 2025, the Trustee filed *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Initial Disclosures* (the "First Motion to Compel"). *See* Docket No. 10. On February 27, 2025, the Court entered that *Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Initial Disclosures* (the "First Discovery Order"), which First Discovery Order granted the First Motion to Compel, requiring the Defendant to provide the Trustee with obligatory disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7026. *See* Docket No. 12.

On March 12, 2025, the Trustee filed *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Interrogatory Answers and Payment of Expenses, and Vacate Discovery Cut-Off Date* (the "Second Motion to Compel"). *See* Docket No. 16. Through the Second Motion to Compel, the Trustee sought responses to interrogatories that were served on the Defendant on January 30, 2025 (the "Interrogatories"). *See id.* On April 11, 2025, the Court entered that *Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Interrogatory*

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Answers and Payment of Expenses, and Vacate Discovery Cut-Off Date (the "Second Discovery Order"). See Docket No. 20. The Second Discovery Order required that the Defendant provide "full answers to [the Trustee's] first set of interrogatories" on or before April 16, 2025. See id. at p. 2, lines 10-11.

On April 10, 2025, the Court entered that *Order to Show Cause Why the Court Should Not Issue Terminating Sanctions and/or Monetary Sanctions Against Defendant and Defendant's Counsel, Joint and Severally* (the "Initial OSC"). *See* Docket No. 19. The Initial OSC required the Defendant and Olmstead to appear and explain why sanctions should not be issued against each of them, jointly and severally, for the failure of the Defendant to respond to the Interrogatories. *See id.* The Court's tentative ruling for the hearing on the Initial OSC required Olmstead to appear at the hearing, in-person. Olmstead did not appear in-person, but rather appearance counsel, with no knowledge of the case, appeared in his stead.

On April 25, 2025, the Trustee filed *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Makat Investments, LLC, Should Not Be Held In Contempt and Sanctions* (the "Contempt Motion"). *See* Docket No. 25. According to the Trustee, as provided through the Contempt Motion, the Defendant, as of April 25, 2025, "failed to answer the Interrogatories" in conformance with the Second Discovery Order. *See id.* at p. 3, line 18.

On May 5, 2025, the Court entered that *Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Makat Investments, LLC, Should Not be Held in Contempt and Sanctioned* (the "Second OSC"). *See* Docket No. 28. The Second OSC required the Defendant to appear and show cause why it should not be held in contempt for its failure to comply with the Second Discovery Order. The Second OSC provides that "[o]n or before May 21, 2025, Defendant shall file a written explanation, if there is an explanation, to show cause why Defendant should not be held in contempt for the conduct described above and sanctions as described above." *See id.* at p. 2, lines 14-16. The Defendant has filed no such written explanation.

On May 13, 2025, regarding the Initial OSC, the Court entered that *Order as to (1) Order to Show Cause Why the Court Should Not Issue Terminating Sanctions and/or Monetary Sanctions Against Defendant and Defendant's Counsel, Jointly and Severally, and (2) Continued Status Conference* (the "Third Discovery Order"). *See*

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Docket No. 35. The Third Discovery Order levied sanctions against Olmstead in the amount of \$3,335, and continued the hearing on the Initial OSC regarding the balance of the relief requested therein, namely, terminating sanctions. *See id.* at pp. 2-3.

On May 21, 2025, the Defendant filed that *Declaration of Reed H. Olmstead in Response to Order to Show Cause* (the "Olmstead Declaration"). *See* Docket No. 38. The Olmstead Declaration was filed in response to the Initial OSC. *See id.* at p. 2, lines 1-3. Yet, the deadline for a response to the Initial OSC was April 23, 2025. *See* Docket No. 19, p. 2, lines 11-12. No leave of Court was taken to file a further, late response to the Initial OSC. The Court declines to consider late-filed responses to the Initial OSC.

On May 21, 2025, the Trustee and the Defendant, jointly, filed that *Joint Status Report [LBR 7016-1(a)(2)] and Declaration of Michael G. D'Alba* (the "Status Report"). *See* Docket No. 37. The Defendant, through the Status Report, provides that "Counsel has worked with representatives of the Defendant to respond to discovery requests as best as they can and provide Plaintiff with relevant document." *See id.* at p. 4.

Before the Court is a continued status conference on the Complaint, the continued hearing on the Initial OSC, and the hearing on the Second OSC. Again, the Second OSC has gone without response by the Defendant.

Analysis

"The power to punish for contempts is inherent in all courts; its existence is essential to the preservation of order in judicial proceedings, and to the enforcement of the judgments, orders, and writs of the courts, and consequently to the due administration of justice." *Bessette v. W.B. Conkey Co.*, 194 U.S. 324, 324 (1904). "Bankruptcy courts derive their civil contempt authority from § 105(a)..." *In re Count Liberty, LLC*, 370 B.R. 259, 272 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2007). Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a), "[t] he court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." "A court may wield its civil contempt powers for two separate and independent purposes: (1) 'to coerce the defendant into compliance with the court's order'; and (2) 'to compensate the complainant for losses sustained." *Shell Offshore Inc. v. Greenpeace, Inc.*, 815 F.3d 623, 629 (9th Cir. 2016)(internal citations omitted). "Because civil compensatory sanctions are

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

remedial, they typically take the form of unconditional monetary sanctions; whereas coercive civil sanctions, intended to deter, generally take the form of conditional fines." *Id*.

"In a civil contempt action, the moving party has the burden of establishing 'by clear and convincing evidence that the contemnors violated a specific and definite order of the court. The burden then shifts to the contemnors to demonstrate why they were unable to comply." *In re Count Liberty*, 370 B.R. at 273. "The court is not required to find that a party willfully or intentionally failed to comply, nor is 'good faith' a defense." *Id.* "A compensatory fine must be limited to actual damages incurred as a result of the violation." *Id.* at 274. "Actual loss includes attorneys fees and costs incurred in securing compliance with the order." *Id.* "Substantial compliance with the terms of a court's order is a defense to civil contempt." *Id.* at 275. "To establish substantial compliance, the contemnor must show that he took all reasonable steps within his power to comply." *Id.* "Inability to comply with the court's order is also a defense to civil contempt." *Id.* "The burden is on the contemnor to establish 'categorically and in detail' why he has the present inability to comply with the court's order." *Id.*

Here, the analysis is straightforward. The Court entered the Initial OSC for the Defendant's failure to respond at all to the Interrogatories. The Court issued the Second Discovery Order requiring that the Defendant respond to the Interrogatories by a date certain. The Defendant failed to comply with the Second Discovery Order, leading to the filing of the Contempt Motion and the issuance of the Second OSC. The Trustee has met his burden to show that the Defendant violated an order of this Court, and the Defendant has not filed any written retort in response.

It appears that on May 16, 2025, the Defendant finally provided the Trustee with responses to the Interrogatories. *See* Docket No. 37, p. 7, lines 1-2. The Defendant may now, a month late, have finally complied with the Second Discovery Order.

Still, the Contempt Motion is granted insofar as it seeks sanctions related to attorneys' fees and costs associated with the Trustee's filing and arguing of said motion. The Court will award the Trustee its fees and costs related to the Contempt Motion, with such fees and costs to be paid within seven (7) days of the entry of an order on the Contempt Motion. A remaining question, however, is the party upon whom said

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

sanctions should be levied. It is unclear to the Court that Olmstead made the Defendant aware of the Interrogatories or the Second Discovery Order, meaning Olmstead would have played the foremost role in the Defendant's non-compliance. The Court will hear from Olmstead on this issue.

The Court will continue the status conference for the purpose of resetting litigation dates, assuming there are no further issues at that point, including the payment of sanctions related to the Second Discovery Order and an order to be entered on the Contempt Motion.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Defendant(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Movant(s):

Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for Represented By

Timothy J Yoo Michael G D'Alba

Plaintiff(s):

Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for Represented By

Timothy J Yoo Michael G D'Alba

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (ND) F Rojas (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10319 Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Adv#: 9:24-01038 Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 4 v. Makat Investments,

#18.00 CONT'D Hearing re: Order to show cause why the court should not issue terminating sanctions and/or monetary sanctions against defendant and defendant's counsel, jointly and severally

fr. 5-7-25,

Docket 19

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

See calendar item 17.

May 7, 2025

Appearances required. In person appearance of Defendant's counsel required.

Background

On September 27, 2024, Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 40800SEGC LLC (the "Plaintiff") filed that *Complaint to: (1) Avoid Transfer; (2) Recover Avoided Transfer; (3) Obtain Turnover; and (4) Obtain Accounting* (the "Complaint") against Makat Investments, LLC (the "Defendant"). *See* Docket No. 1. On October 28, 2024, the Defendant filed that *Answer to Complaint to: (1) Avoid Transfer; (2) Objecting to Entry of Discharge Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 523(a)(2); 523(a)(4) 532(a)(6) [sic] (the "Answer"). <i>See* Docket No. 4. The Answer was filed by "[a]ttorney for Defendant," Reed H. Olmstead ("Counsel"). *See id.* at p. 6, lines 10-13.

On January 28, 2025, the Plaintiff filed *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Initial Disclosures and Payment of Expenses*, requesting that the Court

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

compel the Defendant to make its initial disclosures required under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7026, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, and this Court's Local Rule 7026-1, and award costs pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7037 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. *See* Docket No. 10. On February 27, 2025, the Court entered that *Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Initial Disclosures* (the "Order"), requiring Counsel to provide the Plaintiff with its Rule 26 disclosures on or before March 3, 2025. *See* Docket No. 12.

On March 12, 2025, the Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Interrogatory Answers and Payment of Expenses, and Vacate Discovery Cut-Off Date (the "Motion to Compel"). See Docket No. 16. Through the Motion to Compel, the Plaintiff sought to compel the Defendant to respond to interrogatories that were served, but that the Defendant had failed to respond to. On April 10, 2025, the Court entered that Order to Show Cause Why the Court Should Not Issue Terminating Sanctions and/or Monetary Sanctions Against Defendant and Defendant's Counsel, Jointly and Severally (the "OSC"). See Docket No. 19. The OSC was issued in response to the Motion to Compel. On April 11, 2025, the Court entered that Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Interrogatory Answers and Payment of Expenses, and Vacate Discovery Cut-Off Date. See Docket No. 20.

On April 23, 2025, Counsel filed that *Declaration of Reed H. Olmstead in Response to Order to Show Cause* (the "Response"). *See* Docket No. 24. Through the Response, Counsel explains that medical and health issues of his family have led to some of the delays by the Defendant in this proceeding. *See id.* at ¶ 9. Counsel further attests that he has sought replacement counsel to substitute in as he is closing his litigation practice, but has been unable to find anyone willing to substitute in this proceeding. *See id.* at ¶¶ 8-13. The issue surrounds the fact that Counsel is representing the Defendant in numerous adversary proceedings and a Chapter 12 case. Counsel simply lacked the bandwidth at the time he filed the Answer to see the instant adversary proceeding through. The familial health issues seemed to only exacerbate the issue, but was not the source of the issue. Counsel admits that he "operate[s] a very small law firm," and that he "generally will not agree to take on so many cases all at the same time." *See id.* at ¶ 8. "In hindsight, [he] should have declined to take on these cases." *Id.*

On April 25, 2025, the Plaintiff filed *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion for Order to Show Cause Why Defendant Makat Investments, LLC, Should Not be Held In*

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Contempt and Sanctioned, wherein the Plaintiff argues that the Defendant has still yet to respond to the interrogatories that were the subject of the Motion to Compel. See Docket No. 25.

On April 28, 2025, the Plaintiff filed that *Declaration of Michael G. D'Alba Re Expenses Incurred in Compelling Answers to Interrogatories* providing invoices for the total fees incurred related to the Motion to Compel of \$4,232.50. *See* Docket No. 27.

Analysis

The Motion to Compel

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(d)(2)(A)(ii), made applicable to the instant proceeding through Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7037, "[t]he court where the action is pending may, on motion, order sanctions if [] a party, after being properly served with interrogatories under Rule 33 [] fails to serve its answers, objections, or written response." Instead of, or in addition to the sanctions listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(i)-(vi), "the court must require the party failing to act, the attorney advising that party, or both to pay the reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, caused by the failure, unless the failure was substantially justified or other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust." Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(d)(3). "The party contesting the discovery sanction under Rule 37 bears the burden of establishing substantial justification or that other circumstances make an award of expenses unjust." *Trujillo v. Chef'S' Warehouse West Coast LLC*, 2021 WL 3578308 *4 (C.D. Cal. 2021)(citing *Hyde & Drath v. Baker*, 24 F.3d 1162, 1171 (9th Cir. 1994)).

In determining attorneys' fee awards, the "Supreme Court adopted the lodestar method" where the Court is to multiply "the number of hours reasonably expended on a particular motion by a reasonable hourly rate." *Dish Network L.L.C. v. Jadoo TV, Inc.*, 2019 WL 7166067 *3 (C.D. Cal. 2019)(internal citations omitted).

Here, the Court granted the Motion to Compel, compelling the Defendant to provide interrogatory responses. As to substantial justification and other circumstances that would make sanctions unjust, Counsel takes the fall for the Defendant's failure to provide responses to the interrogatories. The Court finds sanctions appropriate. The Court must view this proceeding and the related proceedings together. Counsel

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

provides that he lacked the bandwidth to represent the Defendant in this and the other adversary proceedings filed against the Defendant. Counsel seems to the Court to admit that this engagement was beyond his firm's capabilities when coupled with all of the other adversary proceedings he appeared in on behalf of the Defendant. Beyond Counsel's inability to handle this proceeding and the others at the same time, Counsel experienced "medical issues" with his family. If it were just familial health issues, perhaps the Court's analysis would be different here. By all accounts, however, and by Counsel's own admission, he should have never appeared in this proceeding on behalf of the Defendant understanding his inability to service the Defendant due to the volume of all the other adversary proceedings Counsel agreed to represent the Defendant in. Counsel did not even file a response to the Motion to Compel. The Motion to Compel was a foreseeable result of Counsel agreeing to represent the Defendant in this and all the other adversary proceedings filed against the Defendant.

What is more, this is only the second in line of motions that the Plaintiff has had to file to compel the Defendant to provide discovery.

As to the hourly rate of \$725 of Counsel to the Plaintiff, the Court notes that counsel has been employed at the rate of \$695, and notice of a change in the hourly rate to \$725 as of January 1, 2025 was filed in the *In re 595S7th LLC* matter. *See* Case No. 9:24-bk-11077-RC, Docket Nos. 10, *Application of Chapter 7 Trustee to Employ Levene, Neale, Bender, Yoo & Golubchik L.L.P. as General Bankruptcy Counsel* and 15, *Notice of Change In Billing Rates of Levene, Neale, Bender, Yoo & Golubchik L.L.P.*, respectively. For purposes of the Motion, and based on the Court's knowledge of the prevailing rates of attorneys with a similar skill and experience level, \$725 is a reasonable hourly rate for counsel to the Plaintiff. The Court finds as reasonable a total of 2.5 hours drafting the Motion to Compel, .1 hours reviewing the Court's tentative ruling on the Motion to Compel, and 1.4 hours attending the hearing on the Motion to Compel, and 6 hours drafting the order granting the Motion to Compel. At an hourly rate of \$725, and for 4.6 hours, the total sanction award will be \$3,335.00. The sanction award shall be paid to the Plaintiff by Counsel within sixty (60) days of the entry of the order on the OSC.

The Plaintiff is to upload a conforming order within 7 days.

Party Information

Courtroom 201 Calendar

Wednesday, June 4, 2025 Hearing Room

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC Chapter 12

Debtor(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

201

Defendant(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Plaintiff(s):

Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for Represented By

Timothy J Yoo Michael G D'Alba

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (ND) F Rojas (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10319 Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Adv#: 9:24-01038 Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 4 v. Makat Investments,

#19.00 CONT'D Status Conference re: RE: [1] Adversary case 9:24-ap-01038. Complaint by Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 40800SEGC LLC against Makat Investments, LLC.

fr. 12-4-24, 5-7-25,

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

See calendar item 17.

May 7, 2025

Appearances required. In person appearance of Defendant's counsel required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 23. The Court is inclined to vacate the dispositive motion deadline, pre-trial conference, and trial dates, and reset those dates due to the Defendant's failure to respond to discovery. The Court will also need to set a new discovery cutoff. The Court will hear from the parties as to what those continued dates should be.

December 4, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Joint Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 6. The Court will issue the following litigation deadlines and dates:

March 3, 2025 – Last day to conduct discovery, including receipt of responses

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

CONT... Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

April 9, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Last day to have dispositive motions heard

April 23, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. – Pre-trial conference

April 23, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Continued status conference

May 8, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. - Trial

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Defendant(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Plaintiff(s):

Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for Represented By

Timothy J Yoo Michael G D'Alba

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (ND) F Rojas (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

9:00 AM

9:24-10319 Makat Investments, LLC

Chapter 12

Adv#: 9:24-01038 Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 4 v. Makat Investments,

#20.00 Pre-Trial Conference re: [1] Adversary case 9:24-ap-01038. Complaint by Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for the Estate of 40800SEGC LLC against Makat Investments, LLC

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Pretrial vacated at status conference held 5-7-25

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Defendant(s):

Makat Investments, LLC Represented By

Reed H Olmstead

Plaintiff(s):

Jerry Namba, Chapter 7 Trustee for Represented By

Timothy J Yoo Michael G D'Alba

Trustee(s):

Elizabeth (ND) F Rojas (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10142 Darrell Duane Collard

Chapter 7

#21.00

Hearing re: [13] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC (1013 West Locust Avenue, Lompoc, CA 93436)

Docket 13

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearances required.

Court approval of the agreement is not required to reaffirm a consumer debt secured by real property. See 11 U.S.C. § 524(c)(6)(B); see also In re Grisham, 436 B.R. 896, 905 n.6 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2010) (citing 4 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 524.04, pp. 524–41 (16th ed. 2009)); see also In re Rhodes, 635 B.R. 849, 859-860 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 2021) (citations omitted).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Darrell Duane Collard Represented By

Dean W Feldman

Trustee(s):

Nancy J Zamora (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10166 Christina Cortez

Chapter 7

#22.00 Hearing re: [19] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc. dba GM Financial (2019 Cadillac XT4)

Docket 19

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances required.

If the Debtor's income has increased, there is no amended *Schedule I* to inform the Court and parties as much.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Christina Cortez Pro Se

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10243 Jefferson Braulio Montar Guzman and Clarita Isabel

Chapter 7

#23.00 Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

SESLOC Credit Union (2022 Honda Accord)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Jefferson Braulio Montar Guzman Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Joint Debtor(s):

Clarita Isabel Mendoza Gomez Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10285 Jill I Liston Jones

Chapter 7

#24.00 Hearing re: [19] Amended Reaffirmation agreement between debtor

and OneMain Financial Group, LLC (2013 BMW 3 Series)

Docket 19

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Jill I Liston Jones Represented By

Joseph A Weber

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10298 Brandon Joshua Meulpolder

Chapter 7

#25.00

Hearing re: [13] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and AmeriCredit Financial Services, Inc. dba GM Financial (2021 Chevrolet Silverado 1500)

Docket 13

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearance required.

No court approval of the reaffirmation agreement is required. *See In re Ong*, 461 B.R. 559 (9th Cir. BAP 2011).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Brandon Joshua Meulpolder Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Trustee(s):

Nancy J Zamora (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10300 Nicolas F Ortiz and Elizabeth Ortiz

Chapter 7

#26.00

Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and 21st Mortgage Corporation (1977 Skyline Manufactured Home)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Nicolas F Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Joint Debtor(s):

Elizabeth Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Movant(s):

21st Mortgage Corporation Represented By

Amy Dukes

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10300 Nicolas F Ortiz and Elizabeth Ortiz

Chapter 7

#27.00 Hearing re: [12] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

Logix Federal Credit Union (2012 GMC Sierra)

Docket 12

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Nicolas F Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Joint Debtor(s):

Elizabeth Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10300 Nicolas F Ortiz and Elizabeth Ortiz

Chapter 7

#28.00 Hearing re: [13] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

Logix Federal Credit Union (2018 Coachmen)

Docket 13

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Nicolas F Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Joint Debtor(s):

Elizabeth Ortiz Represented By

Daniel A Higson

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

<u>10:00 AM</u>

9:25-10319 Ursula Romero Rios

Chapter 7

#29.00 Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

Golden 1 Credit Union (2013 Honda Accord)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearance required.

No court approval of the reaffirmation agreement is required. *See In re Ong*, 461 B.R. 559 (9th Cir. BAP 2011).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Ursula Romero Rios Represented By

Leslie A Tos

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10320 Lilia Torres

Chapter 7

#30.00

Hearing re: [14] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Nissan Motor Acceptance Company LLC fka Nissan Motor Acceptance Corporation (2020 Nissan Sentra)

Docket 14

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party	Inform	nation
1 alty		nauvn

Debtor(s):

Lilia Torres Pro Se

Trustee(s):

Nancy J Zamora (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10327 Yolanda Vasquez

Chapter 7

#31.00 Hearing re: [8] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

VW Credit, Inc. (2023 Volkswagon Jetta)

Docket 8

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Yolanda Vasquez Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10350 Diego Hernandez

Chapter 7

#32.00

Hearing re: [9] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (2022 Toyota Camry)

Docket 9

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Diego Hernandez Pro Se

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10350 Diego Hernandez

Chapter 7

#33.00

Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (2020 Honda Accord Sedan)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Diego Hernandez Pro Se

Trustee(s):

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10357 Mary Celeste Hopkins

Chapter 7

#34.00

Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and American Honda Finance Corporation (2023 Honda CRV)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Mary Celeste Hopkins Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10377 Michael Daniel Wied and Stacey Louise Wied Chapter 7

#35.00

Hearoing re: [13] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Santander Consumer USA Inc. (2015 Chevrolet Malibu)

> Docket 13

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Michael Daniel Wied Represented By

Karen L Grant

Joint Debtor(s):

Stacey Louise Wied Represented By

Karen L Grant

Trustee(s):

Pro Se Sandra McBeth (TR)

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

<u>10:00 AM</u>

9:25-10385 Domingo Pimentel

Chapter 7

#36.00 Hearing re: [7] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (2024 Toyota Camry)

Docket 7

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Domingo Pimentel Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10387 Rosa Prieto Quintero

Chapter 7

#37.00 He

Hearing re: [7] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Bank of America, N.A. (2015 Toyota Corolla)

Docket 7

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearance required.

No court approval of the reaffirmation agreement is required. *See In re Ong*, 461 B.R. 559 (9th Cir. BAP 2011).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Rosa Prieto Quintero Represented By

D Justin Harelik

Trustee(s):

Amy L Goldman (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10397 Thelma Murillo

Chapter 7

#38.00

Hearing re: [9] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and CBC Federal Credit Union (2014 Buick Encore)

Docket 9

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Thelma Murillo Pro Se

Trustee(s):

David Keith Gottlieb (TR)

Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10399 Arturo Chantes Garcia and Yoana Elizabeth Lopez Nunez

Chapter 7

#39.00

Hearing re: [7] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Onslow Bay Financial, LLC (1830 N. Depot St., Santa Maria, CA 93458)

Docket 7

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearances required.

Court approval of the agreement is not required to reaffirm a consumer debt secured by real property. See 11 U.S.C. § 524(c)(6)(B); see also In re Grisham, 436 B.R. 896, 905 n.6 (Bankr. N.D. Tex. 2010) (citing 4 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 524.04, pp. 524–41 (16th ed. 2009)); see also In re Rhodes, 635 B.R. 849, 859-860 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 2021) (citations omitted).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Arturo Chantes Garcia Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Joint Debtor(s):

Yoana Elizabeth Lopez Nunez Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

Amy L Goldman (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10399 Arturo Chantes Garcia and Yoana Elizabeth Lopez Nunez

Chapter 7

#40.00

Hearing re: [10] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (2022 Toyota Camry)

Docket 10

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Arturo Chantes Garcia Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Joint Debtor(s):

Yoana Elizabeth Lopez Nunez Represented By

Michael B Clayton

Trustee(s):

Amy L Goldman (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

10:00 AM

9:25-10462 Nicole Maxine Keller

Chapter 7

#41.00 Hearing re: [8] Reaffirmation agreement between debtor and Santander Consumer USA Inc. (2015 Land Rover Range Rover)

Docket 8

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

No appearance required.

No court approval of the reaffirmation agreement is required. *See In re Ong*, 461 B.R. 559 (9th Cir. BAP 2011).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Nicole Maxine Keller Represented By

Kevin Tang

Trustee(s):

Jeremy W. Faith (TR) Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

9:24-10693 Shaffiq Salim Rahim and Naseem Sayani

Chapter 11

#42.00 CONT'D Post Confirmation Status Conference (Subchapter V)

fr. 8-7-24, 10-23-24, 01-15-25, 3-26-25, 4-23-25,

Docket

*** VACATED *** REASON: Continued to July 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. per tentative ruling

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances waived.

The Court has reviewed *SubChapter V Debtors' Post-Confirmation Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 114. The post-confirmation status conference is continued to July 16, 2025, at 1:00 p.m., by which time the professional fee applications will have been heard.

March 26, 2025

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed SubChapter V Debtors' Third Status Report. See Docket No. 83.

January 15, 2025

Appearances required.

October 23, 2024

Appearances required.

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

CONT... Shaffiq Salim Rahim and Naseem Sayani August 7, 2024

Chapter 11

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that SubChapter V Status Report. See Docket No. 24. The last day for the Debtors to file a plan of reorganization is September 18, 2024. See 11 U.S.C. § 1189(b). The Court will set a plan confirmation hearing for October 23, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. The deadline for the Debtors to file and serve a notice of the confirmation hearing, ballots, and the to-be filed plan of reorganization will be September 23, 2024. The last day for parties-in-interest to file any opposition to confirmation of the to-be filed plan of reorganization will be October 9, 2024. The last day for the Debtors to file a ballot tally and memorandum in support of confirmation of the to-be filed plan of reorganization will be October 16, 2024.

The Court will hear from the Office of the U.S. Trustee regarding the Debtors' compliance with those *Guidelines and Requirements for Chapter 11 Debtors in Possession* (the "Guidelines"). The Court will also hear from the SubV Trustee.

Assuming full compliance with the Guidelines, the Court will continue the status conference to October 23, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.

The Debtors are to upload a scheduling order.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Shaffiq Salim Rahim Represented By

Summer M Shaw

Joint Debtor(s):

Naseem Sayani Represented By

Summer M Shaw

Trustee(s):

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

9:24-10909 Ramiro S Silva

Chapter 11

#43.00 CONT'D Chapter 11 Status Conference

fr. 10-9-24, 11-20-24, 4-23-25,

Docket 1

*** VACATED *** REASON: Continued to August 6, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. per tentative ruling

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances waived.

The Court has reviewed *Debtor Ramiro S. Silva's Chapter 11 Status Report. See* Docket No. 181. The status conference is continued to August 6, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.

April 23, 2025

Appearances required.

November 20, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed *Debtor Ramiro S. Silva's Chapter 11 Status Report. See* Docket No. 63. The Court will hear from the Office of the United States Trustee regarding the Debtor's compliance with those *Guidelines and Requirements for Chapter 11 Debtors in Possession*. Assuming full compliance, the Court will set the following dates:

December 23, 2024 – Last day for the Debtor to file and serve a disclosure statement, plan of reorganization, and notice of hearing on approval of the disclosure statement

February 12, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. – Disclosure statement hearing

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

CONT... Ramiro S Silva

Chapter 11

February 12, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. – Continued status conference

The Debtor is to upload a scheduling order with the above referenced dates within 7 days.

October 9, 2024

Appearances required.

The Court has reviewed that *Chapter 11 Status Conference Report* (the "Report"). *See* Docket No. 38. The Court has no understanding of the Debtor's exit strategy. To the Court's understanding, there is an avocado orchard that is not producing fruit in amounts that the Debtor expected, causing them to default on the orchard's underlying purchase money loan. Several issues have plagued the orchard's production, including a well water issue and other significant upgrade needs for the orchard. It is unclear if these issues have been corrected, or can be corrected. That purchase money loan is now due. There are no income and expense projections attached to the Report as required by that *Order Setting Initial Status Conference* (the "Order"). *See* Docket No. 5, p. 5, lines 1-10. If the Debtor intends on a liquidation, that is not disclosed as is required by the Order. *See id.* at lines 17-19.

By all accounts, the instant case was simply filed to forestall collection efforts by a lender of the Debtor. There is no evidence that the Debtor has any ability to reorganize. The point of the Order, at least in part, is to illustrate such ability. The Court is inclined to dismiss this case.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Ramiro S Silva

Represented By
Jeremy Faith
Samuel Mushegh Boyamian
Jonathan Serrano

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

9:25-10329 Global Premier Regency Palms Oxnard, LP

Chapter 11

#44.00 CONT'D Chapter 11 Status Conference (Partnership)

fr. 5-7-25.

Docket 13

*** VACATED *** REASON: Continued to July 9, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. per tentative ruling

Tentative Ruling:

June 4, 2025

Appearances waived.

The Court has reviewed that *Status Report*. *See* Docket No. 53. The status conference is continued to July 9, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.

May 7, 2025

Appearances required.

On August 16, 2022, Global Premier Regency Palms Oxnard, LP (the "Debtor") filed a voluntary petition pursuant to Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code. See Case No. 9:22-bk-10626-RC, Docket No. 1, Voluntary Petition for Non-Individuals Filing for Bankruptcy. On August 15, 2023, the Court entered that Order Approving Debtor's Motion for Order: (1) Approving Compromise of Controversy with JKO Group, Inc. and (2) Dismissing Chapter 11 Case (the "Dismissal Order"). See id. at Docket No. 119. Among other things, the Dismissal Order established the amount of the claim of JKO Group, LLC ("JKO") against the Debtor, \$30,854,934.02 as of August 10, 2023, required ongoing payments to JKO by the Debtor, and, in the case of the Debtor's default in making said payments to JKO, provided JKO with a grant deed in lieu of foreclosure." See id.

The Debtor, having defaulted in payments to JKO, filed a further voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of Title 11 of the United States Code on March 11, 2025. *See* Case No. 9:25-bk-10329-RC, Docket No. 1, *Voluntary Petition for Non-*

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

Hearing Room

201

1:00 PM

CONT... Global Premier Regency Palms Oxnard, LP

Chapter 11

Individuals Filing for Bankruptcy.

The Court has reviewed that *Initial Status Report*. *See id.* at Docket No. 34. The Debtor's planned exit strategy involves either take out financing and/or a sale. The Court will want to understand the estimated timing of such financing/sale, and, based thereon, will establish certain deadlines related to claims and the filing of a plan of reorganization.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Global Premier Regency Palms

Represented By Garrick A Hollander