

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM
8:00-00000

Chapter

#0.00 Hearings on this calendar will be conducted using ZoomGov video and audio.

For information about appearing in person (or a hybrid hearing) please visit <https://www.cacb.uscourts.gov/judges/honorable-theodor-c-albert>.

Case participants may connect to the video and audio feeds, free of charge, using the connection information provided below.

BY MANDATE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS, MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE MEDIA MAY ONLY CONNECT TO THE ZOOMGOV AUDIO FEED, AND ONLY BY TELEPHONE. ACCESS TO THE VIDEO FEED BY THESE INDIVIDUALS IS PROHIBITED. IN THE CASE OF A TRIAL OR EVIDENTIARY HEARING, NO AUDIO ACCESS WILL BE PROVIDED.

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

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

Video/audio web address: <https://cacb.zoomgov.com/j/1602641214>

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

10:00 AM

CONT...

Chapter

ZoomGov meeting number: 160 264 1214

Password: 092314

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

For more information on appearing before Judge Albert by ZoomGov, please see the "Notice of Video and Telephonic Appearance Procedures for Judge Theodor C. Albert's Cases" on the Court's website at: <https://www.cacb.uscourts.gov/judges/honorable-theodor-c-albert> under the "Telephonic Instructions" section.

To assist in creating a proper record and for the efficiency of these proceedings, please:

- Connect early so that you have time to check in.
- Change your Zoom name to include your calendar number, first initial and last name, and client name (*ex. 5, R. Smith, ABC Corp.*) if appearing by video. This can be done by clicking on "More" and "Rename" from the Participants list or by clicking on the three dots on your video tile.
- Mute your audio to minimize background noise unless and until it is your turn to speak. Consider turning your video off until it is your turn to appear.
- Say your name every time you speak.
- Disconnect from the meeting by clicking "Leave" when you have

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

CONT...

Chapter

completed your appearance(s).

Docket 0

Tentative Ruling:

- NONE LISTED -

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

8:23-11627 Vu Le

Chapter 11

#1.00 Application for Compensation Interim Fees and/or Expenses For Period 8/1/2023 to 12/31/2023:

ARTURO M. CISNEROS , CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE:

FEE: \$18,511.00

EXPENSES: \$0.00

Docket 77

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024
Allow as prayed. Appearance is optional.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vu Le

Represented By
Andy C Warshaw
Richard L. Sturdevant
David M Goodrich

Trustee(s):

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Represented By
Arturo Cisneros

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

8:23-11627 Vu Le

Chapter 11

#2.00 First Interim Application For Allowance And Payment Of Chapter 11 Fees and Reimbursement of Chapter 11 Expenses For Period: 9/13/2023 to 1/19/2024:

GOLDEN GOODRICH LLP, SPECIAL COUNSEL FOR DEBTOR AND DEBTOR-IN-POSSESSION

FEE: \$6,570.00

EXPENSES: \$1.10

Docket 83

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024

Is there a declaration of non-opposition from the client? Appearance is optional.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vu Le

Represented By
Andy C Warshaw
Richard L. Sturdevant
David M Goodrich

Trustee(s):

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Represented By
Arturo Cisneros

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

8:23-11627 Vu Le

Chapter 11

#3.00 Financial Relief Law Center, APC's First Interim Application For Allowance And Payment Of Chapter 11 Fees And Reimbursement For Period: 8/11/2023 to 1/18/2024:

RICHARD L. STURDEVANT, DEBTOR'S ATTORNEY:

FEE: \$35,198

EXPENSES: \$741.60

Docket 86

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024
Allow as prayed. Appearance is optional.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Vu Le

Represented By
Andy C Warshaw
Richard L. Sturdevant
David M Goodrich

Trustee(s):

Arturo Cisneros (TR)

Represented By
Arturo Cisneros

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

8:23-11855 Anne K Hoang

Chapter 11

#4.00 Financial Relief Law Center, APC's First Interim Application For Allowance And Payment Of Chapter 11 Fees And Reimbursement Of Chapter 11 Expenses For Period: 9/11/2023 to 1/18/2024

RICHARD L. STURDEVANT, DEBTOR'S ATTORNEY:

FEE: \$20,704.00

EXPENSES: \$2,965.40

Docket 53

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024
Allow as prayed. Appearance is optional.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Anne K Hoang

Represented By
Andy C Warshaw
Richard L. Sturdevant

Trustee(s):

Mark M Sharf (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM

8:23-12656 XD Industries, Inc.

Chapter 11

#5.00 Motion Of Debtor For Entry Of Order Approving Stipulation Regarding Use Of Cash Collateral, And Adequate Protection

Docket 23

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024

Grant as unopposed. Optional but form of order requested.

Party Information

Debtor(s):

XD Industries, Inc.

Represented By
Jeremy H Rothstein

Trustee(s):

Robert Paul Goe (TR)

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

8:22-11585 AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co

Chapter 7

Adv#: 8:23-01021 Marshack v. Israyelyan et al

- #6.00** STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Extension of Automatic Stay
(Notice of Dismissal fld on 3-24-23 to dismiss defendants (1) Equity Trtust Company, FBO Jeffrey M. Hawkinson IRA, And (2) Pacific Premier Bank f/k/a Pensco Trust Company LLC, as Custodian FBO Paul O'Rear IRA [FRCP 41(a)(1); FRBP 7041] - See Document #13)
(Notice of Dismissal fld on 3-29-23 without prejudice of defendant Cororna Capital Group, LLC - See Document #14)
[Another summons issued on 4-11-23 re: counterclaim]
(cont'd from 8-10-23 per order approving stip. to cont. entered 6-22-23)
(Notice of dismissal without prejudice of defendant AXOS Bank fld on 8-18-23 - see document #49)
(cont'd from 8-31-23)
(Notice of Dismissal fld on 9-11-23 with prejudice of defendant West One Capital Group, Inc. - See Document #57)

Docket 1

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024
See ##7 and 8. Appearance is optional.

Tentative for August 31, 2023
See #10 and #11

Tentative for 6/8/23:
No deadlines at this time. Evaluate at the hearing already set August 10 at 11:00AM.

Party Information

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

CONT... AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co

Chapter 7

Debtor(s):

AB Capital, LLC, a California Pro Se

Defendant(s):

Mikayel Israyelyan Pro Se

14241 VENTURA LLC Pro Se

Randy Rose Pro Se

WEST ONE CAPITAL GROUP, Pro Se

EQUITY TRUST COMPANY Pro Se

PACIFIC PREMIER BANK Pro Se

AXOS BANK Pro Se

DONALD GREGORY NICHOLS Pro Se

THE BAIOCCHI FAMILY Pro Se

CORONA CAPITAL GROUP, LLC Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Richard A. Marshack Represented By
Shane M Biornstad

Trustee(s):

Richard A Marshack (TR) Represented By
D Edward Hays
Alan W Forsley
Ryan D O'Dea
Kristine A Thagard
James C Bastian Jr
Marc A Lieberman
Rika Kido

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

8:22-11585 AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co

Chapter 7

Adv#: 8:23-01021 Marshack v. Israyelyan et al

**#7.00 STATUS CONFERENCE Re: Trustee's Motion For Order Extending The Automatic Stay To Debtor Affiliates And Enjoining Debt Collection Efforts Against Them Or Their Properties
(cont'd from 8-31-23)**

Docket 2

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024
Grant as unopposed. Appearance is optional.

Tentative for August 31, 2023
Items #10 and #11 (discussed together) are really two sides of the same issue. The matters respectively are Trustee's motion to further extend the stay protecting assets of affiliated entities and further stay the adversary proceeding *Marshack v. Israyelyan* and counterclaim, pending further liquidations. The Israyelyan entities are the only opponents. The opponents do not really articulate why the stays are not beneficial but seem eager to start the litigation immediately against Pukini, Young and CalPac entities, and perhaps the estate as well. But why this advances their interests until there are identified assets against which they, as unsecured entities, might recover, is not made clear. But proceeding now will undoubtedly incur administrative expenses making recovery by unsecured creditors even more distant. The Israyelyan parties do correctly argue that continuation of the stay should not be indefinite but is an exercise of equitable principles only so long as it continues to serve the best interest of the parties and considering balances of harm. That balance has to be reevaluated periodically as it likely not static. The Trustee has shown some success in selling properties and accumulating proceeds. It would help if Israyelyan and affiliated parties could more clearly articulate the countervailing harm so the court can evaluate where the balance point is. Gross generalizations amounting to nothing more specific

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

than "...it just ain't fair" are not helpful. On the Trustee's side, he needs to give a clearer roadmap as to what is left, what the pot might look like in, say 90 days, and why he needs continued protection to effectively sort this all out, and when he proposes to restart the litigation he filed, unless he is contending the litigation is merely a platform for issuance of the injunction.

No tentative. Appearance required.

Tentative for 3/30/23:

This is Chapter 7 Trustee Richard A. Marshack's Motion for order extending the automatic stay and/or for a preliminary injunction. [Motion p. 5 at lines 5-6]. Trustee seeks to enjoin Defendants, including Israyelyan, from any collection and litigation efforts against Debtor Affiliates Joshua R. Pukini, Ryan Young, 1034 W Balboa LLC, Calpac Management, Inc, CalPac Mortgage Fund, LLC, and Luna Construction Management, LLC. [Motion p.5 at lines 6-20].

Since entry of the Pukini Preliminary Injunction on November 30, 2022, plaintiffs' counsel in those actions agreed with Trustee to a stay of the litigation to allow Trustee time to evaluate the merits of the claims and defenses for purposes of informal out-of-court resolution. [Motion p. 7 at lines 26-28; p. 8 at lines 1-2]. However, Israyelyan, in a private arbitration compelled by the court in the matter of Israyelyan v. AB Capital et al, insists on pursuing arbitration claims against Debtor Affiliates Joshua Pukini, Ryan Young and Calpac Management, Inc. [Id. at lines 2-6]. As such, Trustee asserts that it is necessary that the court extend the automatic stay to Debtor Affiliates to protect and preserve estate assets and prevent Defendants from obtaining inflated judgments from being entered or collected that jeopardize those same Estate assets. [Id. at lines 14-18]. Trustee also requests extension of the stay to Debtor Affiliates' properties subject to the Pukini Preliminary Injunction, and for which many of the loans related to the properties are in default and under threat of foreclosure. [Id. at lines 19-24].

Defendant Israyelyan timely opposed the Motion on March 26, 2023 and Trustee timely replied on March 23, 2023. Defendant Corona untimely

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

opposed the Motion on March 22, 2023. However, there appears to be a pending stipulation to resolve the issues regarding Corona and dismiss without prejudice the adversary complaint at to Corona. [Reply p. 2-3 footnote 3]. The court has not yet received word on this issue.

A. Automatic Stay Extends to Debtor Affiliates

First, Trustee admits that the automatic stay traditionally applies only to debtors. 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1). [Motion p. 16 at lines 8-9]. However, Trustee argues that the automatic stay can extend to Debtor Affiliates because Debtor is an indispensable party to the Israyelyan Action in that Debtor Affiliates were acting as Debtor's agents and/or alter egos. [Id. at lines 9-10]. Further, Trustee asserts that extension of the stay would protect Debtor's estate and allow Trustee time to marshal estate assets and evaluate claims without the time constraints of litigation. [Id. at lines 23-26]. Trustee cites to *United States v. Dos Cabezas Corp.*, 995 F. 2d 1486, 1491 n.3 (9th Cir. 1993) for support. The *Dos Cabezas* court held that when a debtor is an indispensable party to the pending litigating, the litigation may not proceed in the debtor's absence. Id.

In its opposition, Israyelyan argues that while the scope of the automatic stay is broad, its protection typically applies only to debtors. *ACands, Inc. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co.*, 435 F.3d 252, 259 (3d Cir. 2006). A narrow exception allows a stay to be imposed under section 362(a)(1) against a nonbankrupt party in "unusual situations" as "when there is such identity between the debtor and the third-party defendant that the debtor may be said to be the real party defendant and that a judgment against the third-party defendant will in effect be a judgment or finding against the debtor." *A.H. Robins Co. v. Piccinin*, 788 F.2d 994, 999 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 479 U.S. 876, 107 S. Ct. 251, 93 L.Ed.2d 177 (1986). However, Israyelyan argues that there are not unique circumstances present here to warrant the act of extending the stay to non-debtors. [Opp. p. 7 at lines 1-5].

The court agrees that there are unique circumstances here. As discussed in Trustee's reply, the Pukini Preliminary Injunction demonstrated recognition by all parties and the court that there was a close relationship between Debtor and Debtor Affiliates in that they seemed to be one and the

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

same and were acting largely without corporate formality[Reply p.3 at lines 22-23]. This was based on information indicating an intermingling and comingling of assets between them. [Id.]. Moreover, Defendant's complaint even admits that Debtor and Debtor Affiliates are "alter egos of each other" and had a "unity of interests between each other". [Motion Ex.1 p.4 at lines 15-19]. It would certainly be difficult to prove claims for fraud against Debtor Affiliates without the presence of Debtor, and it seems that Debtor is directly implicated in the action against Debtor Affiliates. As such, the court is persuaded to find the narrow exception described in the *Piccinin* court applicable to this case, and conclude that Debtor is an indispensable party, authorizing extension of the automatic stay to the Debtor Affiliates.

B. Injunctive Relief is Appropriate

Under Section 105(a), "the court may issue any order, process, or judgment that is necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title." The Ninth Circuit has found that section 105(a) contemplates injunctive relief in precisely those instances where parties are pursuing actions pending in other courts that threaten the integrity of a bankruptcy's estate. *In re Canter*, 299 F.3d 1150, 1155 (9th Cir. 2002). Further, the Ninth Circuit has held that the usual preliminary injunction standard applies to stays of proceedings against non-debtors under Section 105(a). *In re Excel Innovations*, 502 F.3d at 1086, 1094-95 (9th Cir. 2007). The usual preliminary injunction standard requires that a court consider: (1) whether the debtor has a reasonable likelihood of a successful reorganization; (2) the relative hardship of the parties; and (3) any public interest concerns if relevant. *Id.* at 1096. *Israyelyan* cites to *McTernan v. City of York, Pa.*, 577 F.3d 521, 527 (3d Cir. 2009) in showing these factors, but the parties generally agree on this standard of law to determine whether preliminary injunction is appropriate here.

1. Reasonable Likelihood of Successful Reorganization

Both parties agree that this prong does not apply as this is a chapter 7 bankruptcy case that will be liquidated and not reorganized. [Motion p. 7 at lines 16-18; Opp. p.8 at lines 8-12].

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

2. Relative Hardship of the Parties

Evaluation of this factor requires the court to weigh the harms caused to Defendants against Trustee's threatened injury. Trustee argues that the only harm Defendant will face is waiting to proceed with their arbitration action and collection efforts, like every other creditor in this matter. [Motion p. 18 at lines 1-9]. It is Trustee's position that the harm to Trustee and the Debtor's estate outweighs harm to the Defendants because the estate's assets under the control of the Debtor Affiliates will likely be subject to an arbitration award and eventual judgment on the award, which is prejudicial to the estate and other creditors who are not permitted to pursue collection efforts. [Id.]. Israyelyan argues in contrast that he has already incurred monetary damages in excess of \$9,883,766.10 and would be more seriously harmed by the extension of the stay than Trustee, the estate, and the Debtor Affiliates. [Opp. p. 8 at lines 1-7].

While the court appreciates the hardships both parties would face in either outcome of the Motion, the injury to Trustee and the Debtor's estate is greater than that of the Defendants. The extension of the automatic stay would not eliminate Defendants' claims against Debtor Affiliates, but delay its pursuit of action until Trustee has complete his investigation. Defendants will have the opportunity and right to recover on a meritorious claim eventually. However, if the court allows collection to move forward through arbitration action, there would be further delays in Trustee's administration of the estate and prejudice other creditors who are forced to wait their turn. Consequently, the court finds that the harm to Trustee outweighs the harm to Defendants and rules in favor of Trustee on this factor.

3. Public Interest Concerns

Trustee argues in the Motion that the public interest analysis is not a major factor here under *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1139 (9th Cir. 2009) because "when the reach of an injunction is narrow, limited only to the parties, and has no impact on non-parties, the public interest will be at most a neutral factor..." [Motion p. 18 at lines 22-26]. Trustee asserts that the

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co** Chapter 7

scope of the injunction is narrow, limited only to prohibiting Defendants from pursuing Debtor Affiliates and the properties for debt collection purposes. [Motion p.18 at lines 27-28]. Even if court considers this factor, Trustee argues that the public is well-served when bankruptcy estates protect the assets they are charged with marshalling. [Motion p.19 at lines 1-4].

Israyelyan argues that the public interest not benefited by an order enjoining him to proceed with the arbitration action. [Opp. p. 9 at lines 11-16]. Pukini and Young allegedly made personal representations to Defendant and induced him to begin a multi-million-dollar construction. [Id.]. CalPac was the loan servicer, who in concert with Pukini and Young, allegedly presented a hugely inflated pay off amount to defendant which defendant had no choice but to pay to save the property from foreclosure. [Id.].

Israyelyan cites to *In re Denby Peterson*, 941 F.3d 115, 122 (3d Cir. 2019) in describing the public policies of the automatic stay. According to Denby, the purpose of the automatic stay is (1) to protect the debtor, by stopping all collection efforts, harassment, and foreclosure actions, thereby giving debtor respite from creditors and relief from financial pressures; and (2) protect creditors by preventing particular creditors from acting unilaterally in self-interest to obtain payment from a debtor to the detriment of the other creditors. Id. The court agrees with Trustee that these public policies support the argument that it is in the public interest relieve Debtor from collection efforts in the bankruptcy and prevent other creditors from being prejudiced by the unilateral efforts to obtain judgment of one creditor. Thus, the court finds that public policy also favors extension of the automatic stay and injunctive relief.

C. Trustee is Not Required to Post a Bond

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c) requires that a bond or security must be posted in order for the court to issue a preliminary injunction. [Motion p.19 at lines 10-11]. Trustee argues that since he is bringing this action, a bond is not required under FRBP 65. Israyelyan asserts that Debtor Affiliates must be ordered to post a bond in the event the court grants the Motion. Under FRBP 7065, compliance of FRCP 65(c) is not required if the

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

application for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunctions is made by a debtor, trustee, or debtor in possession. As such, the court finds that since Trustee made the application, he is not required to post a bond under FRCP 65(c).

D. Conclusion

Extension of the stay to protect non-debtors is rarely appropriate, as by statute it is only the debtor and property of the estate that is protected. But an exception to this general principle is recognized in "unusual" circumstances. *Piccinin*, 788 F.2d at 999. It seems clear to the court that this mess keeps growing in size and complexity, and is largely attributable to the apparent ignoring of corporate formalities by Messrs. Pukini, Young and by Affiliates as well as the Debtor. At some point there may need to be a consolidation of all the entities if that can be done consistent with equity, but it is clear that sorting all of this out will take time and resources. But to do equity to any may require at least a temporary delay as to all. This tips the balance in favor of a "time out" and so supports either an extension of the stay or an addition to the preliminary injunction to include the respondents here. The Trustee is admonished, however, to remember that this is not an unlimited stay nor is it permanent and so a clearer roadmap of how to proceed generally will be needed soon.

Grant.

Appearance: required

Party Information

Debtor(s):

AB Capital, LLC, a California

Pro Se

Defendant(s):

Mikayel Israyelyan

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

CONT...	AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co	Chapter 7
	14241 VENTURA LLC	Pro Se
	Randy Rose	Pro Se
	WEST ONE CAPITAL GROUP,	Pro Se
	EQUITY TRUST COMPANY	Pro Se
	PACIFIC PREMIER BANK	Pro Se
	AXOS BANK	Pro Se
	DONALD GREGORY NICHOLS	Pro Se
	THE BAIOCCHI FAMILY	Pro Se
	CORONA CAPITAL GROUP, LLC	Pro Se

Plaintiff(s):

Richard A. Marshack	Represented By Shane M Biornstad
---------------------	-------------------------------------

Trustee(s):

Richard A Marshack (TR)	Represented By D Edward Hays Alan W Forsley Ryan D O'Dea Kristine A Thagard James C Bastian Jr Marc A Lieberman Rika Kido
-------------------------	--

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

8:22-11585 AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co

Chapter 7

Adv#: 8:23-01021 Marshack v. Israyelyan et al

**#8.00 Trustee's Motion To Stay Adversary Proceeding and Counterclaim
(cont'd from 5-04-23) [To Reevaluate]
(cont'd from 8-31-23)**

Docket 25

Tentative Ruling:

Tentative for February 14, 2024

Grant as unopposed? Appearance is optional unless the motion is opposed.

Tentative for August 31, 2023

See #10

Tentative for 5/4/23:

This is the Trustee's Motion To Stay Adversary Proceeding and Counterclaim. The motion is opposed by defendants/counterclaimants Mikayel Israyelyan and 14241 Ventura, LLC ("Counterclaimants").

1. Basic Background

This court ordered on March 20, 2023, that the automatic stay be extended to, among others, Joshua R. Pukini, Ryan Young and Calpac Management, Inc. ("Debtor Affiliates"). The court also ordered that Counterclaimants are enjoined from pursuing debt collection activities against the Debtor Affiliates and their properties, Trustee asserts, to provide Trustee the breathing room necessary to gather and liquidate the Debtor's assets without the time and financial pressures of ongoing litigation. The court entered the Stay Extension Order specifying these same terms on April 7, 2023. The Stay Extension Order also set forth a briefing schedule and set a date for a status conference on August 31, 2023, and ordered that the injunction against Counterclaimants and the extension of the automatic stay

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co** Chapter 7
to the Debtor Affiliates would end automatically on September 10, 2023,
unless further extended by court order.

On April 10, 2023, Counterclaimants filed an answer to Trustee's complaint and counterclaims ("the Counterclaim") against Trustee and the Debtor Affiliates alleging a number of claims, all of which are already pending in both state court and the arbitration that were the subject of Trustee's motion that prompted the Stay Extension Order. Thus, despite the entry of the Stay Extension Order preventing Counterclaimants from pursuing claims against the Debtor Affiliates in state court and arbitration, Trustee asserts, Counterclaimants now seek to pursue such claims before this Court in this adversary. At Counterclaimants' request, the Court Clerk issued another summons on Counterclaimants' counterclaims, which requires Trustee and the Debtor Affiliates to respond to the counterclaims by May 2, 2023, and sets a status conference on June 8, 2023.

2. Should The Stay Be Extended?

As pointed out by Counterclaimants, A stay is not a matter of right "even if irreparable injury might otherwise result." *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 433 (2009). "The party requesting a stay bears the burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of that discretion," and the "propriety" of the stay "is dependent upon the circumstances of the particular case." *Nken*, supra, 434. "[T]he factors regulating the issuance of a stay are . . . : (1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies. *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 776 (1987).

Here, Trustee asserts that this court has already applied the above elements in granting the Motion to Extend Stay and entering the Stay Extension Order. Thus, Trustee argues, Trustee has already met his burden to prove that a stay of the adversary proceeding and the Counterclaim is both warranted and necessary. Thus, Trustee argues, pursuing the Counterclaim would likely be violation of the Stay Extension Order because Counterclaimants are attempting to pursue debt collection activities against the Debtor Affiliates in violation of the injunction portion of the Stay Extension

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room

5B

11:00 AM

CONT... **AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co**

Chapter 7

Order. By contrast, Counterclaimants argue that the Counterclaims are not subject to any of this court's orders. In fact, Counterclaimants argue, there are economies in adjudicating the matter in this Court as opposed to in Arbitration. Counterclaimants also point out that Trustee has also indicated that it will take up to twenty-four months to liquidate all assets. Thus, Counterclaimants argue, if any prejudice would accrue due to staying adjudication of the Counterclaim, it would accrue to Counterclaimants, not Trustee.

The court does not see the wisdom in allowing the counterclaims to go forward, at least at this time. In the court's view, allowing Trustee breathing room to get a handle on this substantial case was at least part of the reason for granting the stays. The court does not see what has changed given how little time has passed since issuing the stay order. The court understands Counterclaimants' position and the eagerness to pursue the Counterclaims. The court will be conducting regular status conferences to make sure administration of the main case is proceeding at a reasonable pace. If Counterclaimants are aware of any undue delays in administration, or unreasonable or undue delays by the Trustee, the court will certainly be open to hearing about them. But at this point, the court is willing to again accept Trustee's representations that he needs time to properly administer this case and must do so with limited distraction. This is not to say that the parties should not earnestly engage in discussion and negotiation over possibly an agreed amount of the Israyelyan/14241 Ventura claims. Nor is it to say that the stay is endless. But as the Trustee has recently and often agreed, this case only has a good result for creditors if litigation/process are minimized in favor of efficient and, where appropriate, even informal resolution.

Grant but subject to reevaluation in 90 days.

Appearance: required

Party Information

Debtor(s):

AB Capital, LLC, a California

Pro Se

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Santa Ana
Theodor Albert, Presiding
Courtroom 5B Calendar**

Wednesday, February 14, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

11:00 AM

CONT... AB Capital, LLC, a California limited liability co

Chapter 7

Defendant(s):

Mikayel Israyelyan	Represented By Talin V Yacoubian
14241 VENTURA LLC	Represented By Talin V Yacoubian
Randy Rose	Pro Se
WEST ONE CAPITAL GROUP, EQUITY TRUST COMPANY	Pro Se
PACIFIC PREMIER BANK	Pro Se
AXOS BANK	Pro Se
DONALD GREGORY NICHOLS	Pro Se
THE BAIOCCHI FAMILY	Pro Se
CORONA CAPITAL GROUP, LLC	Represented By Eric A Mitnick

Plaintiff(s):

Richard A. Marshack	Represented By Shane M Biornstad
---------------------	-------------------------------------

Trustee(s):

Richard A Marshack (TR)	Represented By D Edward Hays Alan W Forsley Ryan D O'Dea Kristine A Thagard James C Bastian Jr Marc A Lieberman Rika Kido
-------------------------	--