Tuesday, May 30, 2023

<u>1:30 PM</u> **2:00-00000**

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter

#0.00 During the COVID-19 pandemic, and until further notice by the Court, or as otherwise ordered by the Court, appearances for matters heard by Judge Kwan in Courtroom 1675 may be made in-person, by video through Zoom for Government (ZoomGov), or by telephone through ZoomGov. If appearing through ZoomGov, hearing participants and other parties in interest may connect to the video and audio feeds, free of charge, using the connection information provided below.

As a hearing participant, you are free to choose any of these options, except that evidentiary hearings/trials must be in person in the courtroom (unless otherwise ordered). You do not need to call Chambers for advance approval or notice.

If you choose to appear in person, you must comply with all applicable Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines regarding the wearing of face coverings and physical distancing inside and outside of the courtroom. Pursuant to the Court's General Order 21-05, where an in-person matter is held in a courtroom, all participants are to observe all safety protocols posted and announced in the courtroom, and Judge Kwan as the presiding judge will determine the protocols in effect in his assigned courtroom consistent with guidance from the CDC. By order of Judge Kwan, all persons that choose to appear in person must wear a face covering or mask covering their nose and mouth, and must observe physical distancing inside and outside of the courtroom. However, with permission of Judge Kwan, a witness testifying on the witness stand may remove his or her face covering while testifying in order for the court and the parties to observe the witness's demeanor. You should not enter the courthouse when feeling unwell, if you have tested positive for COVID-19, or if you fall within the quarantine recommendations after having come into close contract with someone who has COVID 19.

ZoomGov logon information for all matters on today's hearing calendar:

Video/audio web address: https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/1605910529

ZoomGov meeting number: 160 591 0529

Password: 834331

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

<u>1:30 PM</u> CONT...

Chapter

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

Please connect at least 5 minutes before the start of your hearing, and wait with your microphone muted until your matter is called.

Zoomgov hearing etiquette: (a) wait until the judge calls on you, so everyone is not talking at once; (b) when you first speak, state your name and, if you are an attorney, whom you represent (do not make your argument until asked to do so); (c) when you make your argument, please pause from time to time so that, for example, the judge can ask a question or anyone else can make an objection; (d) if the judge does not see that you want to speak, or forgets to call on you, please say so when other parties have finished speaking (do not send a "chat" message, which the judge might not see); and (e) please let the judge know if he mispronounces your name or uses the wrong pronoun.

Docket 0

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

11

<u>1:30 PM</u>			
2:18-10290	People	Who Care Youth Center, Inc.	Chapter
Adv#: 2:18-01	139	People Who Care Youth Center, Inc. v. Ammec, Inc. et al	

#1.00 Status Conference

fr 4/11/23, 5/23/23

Docket 318

Tentative Ruling:

No updated tentative ruling as of 5/24/23. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling. The status conference will concern the further evidentiary hearing on 5/26/23. The court had indicated to the parties at the last hearing that defendants should be able to inquire regarding whether debtor assigned its tort claim rights to counsel. The court had also indicated that it may have improvidently granted partial summary adjudication on the impact of the automatic stay on defendants' right to file their state court action to enforce their claimed mechanic's lien. The court stated that it would address these issues at the further session of trial on 5/26/23. Appearances are required on 5/23/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Supplemental tentative ruling as of 4/10/23. On 4/10/23, the Ninth Circuit issued an unpublished memorandum decision in Philmont Management, Inc. v. 450 S. Western Ave., LLC (In re 450 S. Western Ave., LLC), No. 21-60060 (9th Cir. Apr. 10, 2023), in which it held that the 90 day time period to file an action for a claimant to enforce a mechanic's lien under California law was tolled when the debtor filed for bankruptcy pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 108(c) and that the claimant was not time-barred by failing to file a notice under 11 U.S.C. 546(b) because the notice requirement of 11 U.S.C. 546(b) is inapplicable to enforcement as opposed to perfection, citing In re Hunters Run Limited Partnership, 875 F.2d 1425 (9th Cir. 1989). This holding, though unpublished

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

<u>1:30 PM</u>

CONT... People Who Care Youth Center, Inc.

and nonprecedential, indicates that the court's ruling granting plaintiff partial summary adjudication incorrectly relied upon In re Baldwin Builders, 202 B.R. 406 (9th Cir. BAP 1999), which held that the 90 day time period to bring suit to enforce a California mechanic's lien was not tolled due to the automatic stay in the debtor's bankruptcy case and had expired for failure to file a notice pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 546(b) as notice would serve to maintain or continue lien perfection. Thus, it appears that the order granting plaintiff partial summary adjudication on grounds that defendants' purported mechanic's lien was void for failure to file a notice pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 546(b) within 90 days of the recording of the lien on 10/19/18 was erroneous because the automatic stay tolled the filing period when the bankruptcy case was filed on 1/10/18.

Under the reasoning of 450 S. Western Ave., LLC, the pendency of the automatic stay tolled the filing period to bring suit to enforce a mechanic's lien under California Civil Code Section 8460(a) until the stay was lifted upon termination when debtor's discharge was granted on the date of plan confirmation on 6/3/20 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 1141(d)(1) until 6/10/20, the end of the 90 day period which had 7 days left when the bankruptcy was filed pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 108(c)(1), or 7/17/20, 30 days after "notice of termination of the stay", which may have been when the order for discharge was served on creditors on 6/17/20. See Schumacher v. Worcester, 55 Cal.App.4th 376 (1997) (the time period under 11 U.S.C. 108(c) did not expire if no notice of termination of stay was given to the creditor). Thus, it appears that the court should reconsider its ruling granting partial summary adjudication and have those issues reconsidered for trial as the factual record is unclear when the lien enforcement period ended, if it did, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 108(c).

The resolution of plaintiff's slander of title claim may resolve the timeliness issue since the issue of the validity of defendant's lien as a mechanic's lien was at issue in the trial, that is, as a factual matter, if defendants' lien is not a valid mechanic's lien, then the timeliness issue would be moot because there would be no valid lien. However, If defendants' lien is a valid mechanic's lien as a factual matter, then the timeliness issue presented by 11 U.S.C. 108(c) would have to be addressed and resolved. Thus, it appears to the court that the evidentiary record for trial may have to be reopened for additional reasons other than defendants' assignment defense.

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

<u>1:30 PM</u>

CONT... People Who Care Youth Center, Inc.

In light of this additional issue, the court is considering a postponement of the further evidentiary hearing on 4/20/23 and instead set a further status conference to discuss what issues need to be addressed in a further evidentiary hearing.

Prior tentative ruling. The court will discuss the reopening of the evidence at trial and the further evidentiary hearing set for 4/20/23. Otherwise, no tentative ruling on the merits. Appearances are required on 4/11/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Party Information Debtor(s): People Who Care Youth Center, Inc. Represented By John-Patrick M Fritz David B Golubchik **Defendant(s):** Ammec, Inc. Represented By John Barriage Greta Curtis Pro Se **Plaintiff(s):** People Who Care Youth Center, Inc. Represented By John-Patrick M Fritz David B Golubchik

Hearing Room

1675

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

<u>2:00 PM</u>		
2:18-11525	Shahriar Joseph Zargar	Chapter 11
Adv#: 2:18-0	1144 Shadsirat v. Zargar et al	
#2.00	Hrg re: Motion to Dismiss Adversary Proceeding Second Amended Complaint fr 4/18/23	

Docket 65

Tentative Ruling:

No updated tentative ruling as of 5/24/23. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear either in person in the courtroom or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling as of 4/11/23. At the hearings in this adversary proceeding on 4/11/23, with the agreement of counsel, the court continued the hearing on defendant's motion to dismiss to 5/30/23 at 2:00 p.m. No appearances are required on 4/18/23.

Prior tentative ruling. The court will be rescheduling the hearing of the motion at the request of the Clerk's Office due to the court's CM/ECF and other information systems not being available to installation of essential systems and security upgrades from 4/14/23 to 4/18/23. See Public Notice 23-004 on the court's website. The court will discuss rescheduling at the status conference in this adversary proceeding on 3/28/23. No appearances will be required on 4/18/23.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Shahriar Joseph Zargar

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Defendant(s):

Shahriar Joseph Zargar

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

<u>2:00 PM</u>

CONT... Shahriar Joseph Zargar Shabnam Mesachi

<u>Joint Debtor(s):</u>

Shabnam Mesachi

Movant(s):

Shahriar Joseph Zargar

Plaintiff(s):

Behrouz Shadsirat

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Rosendo Gonzalez

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

	Shahriar Joseph Zargar 1144 Shadsirat v. Zargar et al	
#3.00	Hrg re: Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, or in the alternative. for summary adjudication	

fr. 4/11/23

Docket 56

Tentative Ruling:

No updated tentative ruling as of 5/24/23. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear either in person in the courtroom or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Revised and updated tentative ruling as of 4/7/23. The hearing is to discuss status of proceedings only. See tentative ruling for matter no. 3. Appearances are required on 4/11/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling as of 3/23/23. Defendants have filed a motion for continuance which is pending and will be discussed at the status conference in this adversary proceeding on 3/28/23. Otherwise, no tentative ruling on the merits.

Appearances are required on 4/11/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Shahriar Joseph Zargar

Represented By Raymond H. Aver Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

2:00 PM CONT... Shahriar Joseph Zargar Defendant(s):

Shahriar Joseph Zargar

Shabnam Mesachi

Joint Debtor(s):

Shabnam Mesachi

<u>Plaintiff(s)</u>:

Behrouz Shadsirat

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Raymond H. Aver

Represented By Rosendo Gonzalez Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

<u>2:00 PM</u>

2:18-11525Shahriar Joseph ZargarAdv#: 2:18-01144Shadsirat v. Zargar et al

Chapter 11

#4.00 Cont'd status conference re: Complaint

(1) objecting to dischargeability of debt pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(2);

(2) objecting to dischargeability of debt pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(4);

(3) objecting to dischargeability of debt pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §523(a)(6); and,

(4) for declaratory relief requesting adjudication of pending state court lawsuits

fr. 6/14/22, 9/13/22, 11/29/22, 3/14/23, 3/28/23, 4/11/23

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

No updated tentative ruling as of 5/24/23. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear either in person in the courtroom or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling as of 4/7/23. The hearing is to discuss the status of the proceedings only. After reviewing the docket, it appears that the court's abstention order of 12/7/18 staying "all applicable deadlines" is still in effect. The court granted plaintiff's abstention motion to allow the state courts to decide the Van Nuys and Los Angeles actions, and the court in this adversary proceeding has conducted status conferences to monitor the state court proceedings. The wording of the abstention order was that all applicable deadlines were stayed, and it appears that the then pending 45 day deadline for plaintiff to file a second amended complaint then due on 12/8/18 was also stayed. The court's review of the docket reflects that there has been no order lifting that stay and restarting the deadline clock for plaintiff to serve and file a second amended complaint. (However, it now appears that the court should issue a formal order lifting the prior stay.) Given the peculiar wording of the abstention order staying deadlines as opposed to proceedings, it does not appear to the court that the stay prevented plaintiff from filing and serving the amended complaint when he did on 2/13/23. The executed summons on the second amended complaint indicates that defendant was served on 2/27/23, and defendant responded by filing and serving his motion to dismiss on 3/21/23 within the 30 day time period for response in the order granting the

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

<u>2:00 PM</u>

CONT... Shahriar Joseph Zargar

motion to dismiss. Although a summary judgment motion may be made at any time at least 30 days before the first date set for an evidentiary hearing on the issue for which summary judgment is sought pursuant to FRBP 7056, the court believes that the summary judgment motion should not be heard until the adversary proceeding is at issue resolving defendant's motion to dismiss first since the court and parties need to know what claims are at issue for defendant to meaningfully respond to the summary judgment motion.

The court will discuss setting further proceedings with the parties. The court is of the view that a date for argument on the motion to dismiss should be promptly set. After the pleadings are at issue with the filing of defendant's answer, the court will set a date for hearing on the summary judgment motion.

Regarding the motion to dismiss, defendant's argument that there is no fiduciary relationship under the federal standard to support a claim under 11 U.S.C. 523(a)(4) appears to be well-taken in the court's tentative view. See Double Bogey, L.P. v. Enea, 794 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2015). However, defendant's argument that the fraud claims to support the 11 U.S.C. 523(a)(2) and (6) claims appear to be hypertechnical in the court's tentative view as the state court in the Van Nuys action described in detail what the conduct was. The conclusiveness of the language in the settlement agreement for the Los Angeles state court action will have to be addressed as there was no express language regarding debt dischargeability. However, the court's tentative view scan be discussed at argument on the motion to dismiss.

Appearances are required on 4/11/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling as of 3/22/23. The court notes that plaintiff has filed a motion for summary judgment set for hearing on 4/11/23, but defendants have filed a motion to continue the hearing on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on 4/11/223 and a motion to dismiss noticed for hearing on 4/18/23. The court will discuss with the parties defendant's continuance motion at the status conference as well as rescheduling the hearing on defendants' motion to dismiss because the Clerk's Office has requested the judges not to conduct hearings during the week of 4/14/23-4/18/23 due to CM/ECF and other

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 11

<u>2:00 PM</u>

CONT... Shahriar Joseph Zargar

software system and security upgrades. See Public Notice 23-004 posted on the court's website on 3/1/23. Otherwise, no tentative ruling on the merits. Appearances are required on 3/28/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Prior tentative ruling as of 11/22/22. The court notes that this matter is trailing the trial in the contested matters of debtors' objection to amended claim of judgment creditors and judgment creditors' motion to determine secured interest in and turnover of sale proceeds set for further hearing on 12/20/22. No tentative ruling on the merits. Appearances are required on 11/29/22, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear in person or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Party I	nformation
<u>Debtor(s):</u>	
Shahriar Joseph Zargar	Represented By Ashley M McDow
<u>Defendant(s):</u>	
Shahriar Joseph Zargar	Pro Se
Shabnam Mesachi	Pro Se
Joint Debtor(s):	
Shabnam Mesachi	Represented By Ashley M McDow
<u>Plaintiff(s):</u>	
Behrouz Shadsirat	Represented By Rosendo Gonzalez

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 7

2:30 PM 2:11-35922 Victor Huezo Adv#: 2:11-02825 Ball v. Huezo

#5.00 Hrg re: Motion for authorization for issuance of earnings withholding order against Krista Ann Huezo aka Krista Ann Godbold, nondebtor spouse of judgment debtor Victor Huezo

Docket 353

Tentative Ruling:

No tentative ruling on the merits of the garnishment motion in light of respondent's motion to continue the hearing on the motion. The court notes that the creditor has not filed an opposition to the respondent's motion for the continuance. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear either in person in the courtroom or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Party Information		
<u>Debtor(s):</u>		
Victor Huezo	Represented By Baruch C Cohen	
<u>Defendant(s):</u>		
Victor Huezo	Represented By M. Jonathan Hayes	
<u>Plaintiff(s):</u>		
Joey Ball	Pro Se	
<u>Trustee(s):</u>		
Brad D Krasnoff (TR)	Pro Se	

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

Chapter 7

2:30 PM 2:11-35922 Victor Huezo Adv#: 2:11-02825 Ball v. Huezo

#5.10 Hrg re: Motion of Krista Ann Huezo for extension of time to file reply brief to assignee Gregg Robert's Motion for issuance of earnings withholding order

Docket 355

Tentative Ruling:

The court has reviewed respondent's motion to continue the hearing on the motion and the opposition filed by the creditor. No tentative ruling on the merits. Appearances are required on 5/30/23, but counsel and self-represented parties must appear either in person in the courtroom or remotely through Zoom for Government in accordance with the court's remote appearance instructions.

Party Inform	Party Information		
Debtor(s):			
Victor Huezo	Represented By Baruch C Cohen		
<u>Defendant(s):</u>			
Victor Huezo	Represented By M. Jonathan Hayes		
<u>Movant(s):</u>			
Krista Huezo	Pro Se		
<u>Plaintiff(s):</u>			
Joey Ball	Pro Se		
Trustee(s):			
Brad D Krasnoff (TR)	Pro Se		

Tuesday, May 30, 2023

Hearing Room 1675

2:30 PM 2:15-25283 Arturo Gonzalez Adv#: 2:16-01037 Avery v. Gonzalez

Chapter 7

#6.00 Hrg re: Motion to Vacate order 18 for trustee lack of estate control and lack of due process.

Docket 222 *** VACATED *** REASON: Per Order Ent. 5/24/23 nv

Tentative Ruling:

Off calendar. The court has issued an order taking the motion under submission and vacating the hearing. No appearances are to be made on 5/30/23 as the court will not call the matter for hearing on 5/30/23.

Party Information		
<u>Debtor(s):</u>		
Arturo Gonzalez	Pro Se	
Defendant(s):		
Arturo Gonzalez	Pro Se	
<u>Movant(s):</u>		
Arturo Gonzalez	Pro Se	
<u>Plaintiff(s):</u>		
Wesley H. Avery	Represented By Brett B Curlee	
Trustee(s):		
Wesley H Avery (TR)	Represented By Dennis E McGoldrick	

Tuesday, May 30, 2023		Hearing Room 167	
<u>2:30 PM</u> 2:20-18801	Hollywood for Children, Inc., a New York non-profi	Cha	pter 11
#7.00	Hrg re: Plan confirmation (Subchapter V)		
	fr. 3/2/22 ,7/12/22, 7/14/22, 11/29/22, 2/28/23		
	Docket 71		

Tentative Ruling:

Off calendar. Plan confirmation hearing continued to 9/26/23 at 2:30 p.m. pursuant to motion of debtor to continue and the court's ruling granting the motion after hearing on 5/23/23. A written order for continuance is expected to be entered shortly. No appearances are required on 5/30/23.

Party Information			
Debtor(s):			
Hollywood for Children, Inc., a New	Represented By Daniel A Lev		
<u>Movant(s):</u>			
Hollywood for Children, Inc., a New	Represented By Daniel A Lev Daniel A Lev		
<u>Trustee(s):</u>			
Andrew W. Levin (TR)	Pro Se		

Tuesday, M	ay 30, 2023	Hearing Room	1675
<u>2:30 PM</u> 2:19-24026	Martin Campos Ruiz and Evelia Campos Ruiz	Cha	opter 7
#8.00	Hrg re: Trustee's final report and account; Application for fees and expenses [John J. Menchaca, Chapter 7 Trustee]		
	Docket 67		

Tentative Ruling:

Off calendar. In light of the lack of any timely written opposition to the trustee's final report and fee application for the trustee, the court determines that oral argument on the final report and fee application is not necessary and dispenses with oral argument pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(j)(3). The court deems the lack of filing and service of a timely written opposition as consent to approval of the final report and fee application pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(f) and (h), rules on the final report and fee application for the reasons stated in the final report and fee application and for lack of timely written opposition. No appearances are required on 5/30/23. Trustee to lodge a proposed order within 7 days of hearing.

Party Information		
<u>Debtor(s):</u>		
Martin Campos Ruiz	Represented By Michael E Clark	
Joint Debtor(s):		
Evelia Campos Ruiz	Represented By Michael E Clark	
<u>Trustee(s):</u>		
John J Menchaca (TR)	Represented By David M Goodrich	

Tuesday, M	ay 30, 2023	Hearing Room	1675
<u>2:30 PM</u> 2:19-24026	Martin Campos Ruiz and Evelia Campos Ruiz	Ch	apter 7
#9.00	Hrg re: Application for Compensation (First and Final), fo Menchaca & Company, LLP, Accountant, Period: 2/22/20 to 12/30/2022, Fee: \$4,564.00, Expenses: \$80.78.		
	Docket 66		

Tentative Ruling:

Off calendar. In light of the lack of any timely written opposition to the final fee application of the accountant for the trustee, the court determines that oral argument on the final fee application is not necessary and dispenses with oral argument pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(j)(3). The court deems the lack of filing and service of a timely written opposition as consent to approval of the final fee application pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(f) and (h), rules on the final fee application on the papers, and approves the final fee application for the reasons stated in the final fee application and for lack of timely written opposition. No appearances are required on 5/30/23. Applicant or trustee to lodge a proposed order within 7 days of hearing.

, 5			
Party Information			
<u>Debtor(s):</u>			
Martin Campos Ruiz	Represented By Michael E Clark		
Joint Debtor(s):			
Evelia Campos Ruiz	Represented By Michael E Clark		
<u>Movant(s):</u>			
Menchaca & Company, LLP	Pro Se		
<u>Trustee(s):</u>			
John J Menchaca (TR)	Represented By David M Goodrich		

Tuesday, May 30, 2023		Hearing Room	16/5
<u>2:30 PM</u> 2:19-24026	Martin Campos Ruiz and Evelia Campos Ruiz	Cha	apter 7
#10.00	Hrg re: First And Final Application For Allowance And Payment Of Fees And Reimbursement Of Expenses Of G Goodrich LLP, Counsel For The Trustee for Period: 1/6/20 10/20/2022, Fee: \$8795.00, Expenses: \$239.65.		

Docket 63

Tentative Ruling:

Off calendar. In light of the lack of any timely written opposition to the final fee application of the attorney for the trustee, the court determines that oral argument on the final fee application is not necessary and dispenses with oral argument pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(j)(3). The court deems the lack of filing and service of a timely written opposition as consent to approval of the final fee application pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(f) and (h), rules on the final fee application on the papers, and approves the final fee application for the reasons stated in the final fee application and for lack of timely written opposition. No appearances are required on 5/30/23. Applicant or trustee to lodge a proposed order within 7 days of hearing.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Martin Campos Ruiz

Represented By Michael E Clark

Joint Debtor(s):

Evelia Campos Ruiz

Trustee(s):

John J Menchaca (TR)

Represented By Michael E Clark

Represented By David M Goodrich