Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

# <u>10:00 AM</u> 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/1614131564

Wednesday, November 6, 2024		Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> CONT		Cha	pter
	ZoomGov meeting number:	161 413 1564	-
	Password:	588861	
	<b>Telephone conference lines:</b>	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

Wednesday, November 6, 2024	Hearing Room	5B

<u>10:00 AM</u> CONT...

completed your appearance(s).

Chapter

Docket 0

**Tentative Ruling:** 

- NONE LISTED -

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

8:23-12656 XD Industries, Inc.

#1.00 STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Non-Individual. Inc. (cont'd from 5-01-24) (cont'd from 9-11-24)

Docket 1

**Tentative Ruling:** 

Tentative for November 6, 2024 Convert to Chapter 7. *Appearance is optional*.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for September 11, 2024 A dismissal motion is forthcoming? Arrangements should be made for payment of administrative fees unless the alternative of conversion is accepted. *Appearance required*.

-----

Tentative for June 26, 2024 A declaration re financial prospects was promised in the Status Report. Are there any orders needed prior to the confirmation hearing September 11, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.? *Appearance required.* 

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for May 1, 2024 Why no status report? See #6. Appearance required.

-----

Tentative for March 13, 2024 Set confirmation date approximately 45-60 days hence. Separate disclosure statement not required. Appearance required.

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AMCONT...XD Industries, Inc.

Chapter 11

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for January 24, 2024

Based on suggestion of the Subchapter V trustee disclosure statement is deemed unnecessary. When will plan be filed? Is confirmation date of March 13, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. about right? If so court will set last dates to file ballots and briefing schedule. *Appearance required.* 

#### **Party Information**

#### **Debtor(s):**

XD Industries, Inc.

Represented By Jeremy H Rothstein

# Trustee(s):

Robert Paul Goe (TR)

Pro Se

Individual. (cont'd from 7-03-24) (cont'd from 10-02-24 per court's own mtn) Docket 1 Tentative for November 6, 2024 Tentative for July 3, 2024 Schedule status conference in about 90 days. Appearance required. \_\_\_\_\_ Tentative for May 1, 2024 Continue to July 3, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. Appearance required.

A separate disclosure statement is probably not required. Is it appropriate to set a confirmation date now? How about the suggestion of expanding the Subchapter V trustee's powers to assist in selling the target property? Appearance required.

**Party Information Debtor(s):** 

Walter Arthur Barker

Represented By Summer M Shaw **Hearing Room 5B** 

1<u>0:00 AM</u>

8:24-10286 Walter Arthur Barker STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition #2.00

# **Tentative Ruling:**

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Continue plan deadline to February 12, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. as requested. Continue status conference approximately 90 days. Appearance required.

Tentative for March 13, 2024

Chapter 11

Wednesday	, November 6, 2024		Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> CONT <u>Trustee(s</u>	Walter Arthur Barker		Chapter	· 11
Robe	ert Paul Goe (TR)	Pro Se		

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

8:24-11046 MASHindustries, Inc.

 #3.00 STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Non-Individual. Inc. (cont'd from 8-14-24) (cont'd from 10-09-24 per order cont. subchapter V ch 11 status conference entered 9-19-24)

Docket 1

# **Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative for November 6, 2024 Set confirmation and associated deadlines. *Appearance required*.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for August 14, 2024 Status conference continued per request of debtor to October 9 to give parties sufficient time to analyze the plan which is due by September 10. *Appearance suggested particularly if the continued date is a problem.* 

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for June 26, 2024 Has a plan been filed? Do we need a disclosure statement? Set confirmation deadlines? See ## 8 and 9

Perhaps an order clarifying that the jointly administered case has been dismissed is warranted so that it can be removed from the caption?

Appearance required.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for May 22, 2024

Wednesday,	November	6,	2024
------------	----------	----	------

Hearing Room 5B

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

# CONT... MASHindustries, Inc. Chapter 11 Do we need a disclosure statement? Set confirmation deadlines? Appearance required.

# **Party Information**

# **Debtor(s):**

MASHindustries, Inc.

Represented By Susan K Seflin Jessica Wellington David M Poitras

# Trustee(s):

Gregory Kent Jones (TR)

Pro Se

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

8:24-11522 Piecemakers

#4.00 STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Chapter 11 Subchapter V Voluntary Petition Non-Individual. (cont'd from 9-11-24)

Docket

\*\*\* VACATED \*\*\* REASON: CONTINUED TO 12-11-24 AT 10:00 A.M. PER HEARING HELD ON 10-23-24 RE: MOTION TO CONVERT CASE TO CH 7 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE - SEE RULING HELD ON 10-23 -24

**Tentative Ruling:** 

Tentative for September 11, 2024 Set a date for adequacy of the disclosure statement filed 9/4/24, for approximately 30 days hence. If approved at that continued date, a confirmation date will then be set with attendant deadlines for a companion plan to be filed. *Appearance required*.

1

-----

Tentative for July 24, 2024

There seem to be contentious issues which may require a disclosure statement, centering on questions about the reported prepetition conveyance of an interest in real property (or in a partnership that owned real property?) and possible conflict between the duties of a DIP and the current management, which may also be involved in the transfer described. Also, counsel may have conflicts which ought to be examined and revealed. The court makes no pronouncement at this time, but merely observes that these are not insignificant issues.

The revocation of subchapter V status seems problematic since there is a difference between a "small business debtor" and eligibility for filing Subchapter V. In any event that should be the subject of a separate motion.

The court would values the input of the Subchapter V trustee. Is it appropriate to set a deadline for confirmation? *Appearance required.* 

Wednesday, November 6, 2024		<b>Hearing Room</b>	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> CONT Piecemakers		Chap	ter 11
Pa	rty Information	1	
<u>Debtor(s):</u>			
Piecemakers	Represented By Ralph Ascher		
<u>Trustee(s):</u>			
Mark M Sharf (TR)	Pro Se		

Wednesday	November 6, 2024		Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> <b>8:24-12497</b>	Afrin Transport, Inc.		Chap	ter 11
#5.00	STATUS CONFERENCE F Individual.	RE: Chapter 11 Subchapter V	Voluntary Petition	
	Docket	1		
Tentative	Ruling:			
	ative for November 6, 2024 onfirmation date and associa	ated deadlines. Appearance r	required.	
	Party	Information		
Debtor(s)	<u>):</u>			
Afrin	Transport, Inc.	Represented By Matthew D. Resnik		
<u>Trustee(s</u>	<u>):</u>			

John-Patrick McGinnis Fritz (TR)

Pro Se

Wednesday,	November 6, 2024		Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> <b>8:24-11213</b>	Ben Edward Lofstedt		Chap	ter 11
#6.00	STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Individual. (cont'd from 9-11-24)	Chapter 11 Subchapter V	Voluntary Petition	
	Docket	1		
Tentative	Ruling:			
	ative for November 6, 2024 \$7. <i>Appearance required.</i>			
	ative for September 11, 2024 #3. <i>Appearance required.</i>			
Do w Conti for pla	ative for June 26, 2024 e need a disclosure statement? nue status conference to Augus an filing, at which time a confirm e set. <i>Appearance required.</i>			
	Party Inf	formation		]
<u>Debtor(s)</u>	<u>:</u>			
Ben I	Edward Lofstedt	Represented By D Edward Hays		

# <u>Trustee(s):</u>

Robert Paul Goe (TR)

Pro Se

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing	Room	5B
---------	------	----

Chapter 11

# 10:00 AM 8:24-11213 Ben Edward Lofstedt #7.00 Confirmation Of Chapter 11 Plan Of Reorganization

Docket 64

# **Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative for November 6, 2024

This record is confusing. The Plan essentially provides for a two-year opportunity to sell this Newport Beach property debtor co-owns with his exspouse and daughter. The plan is opposed by the secured lender, New Residential Mortgage; the ex-spouse and daughter have also rejected the plan. There is a report that terms have been reached between debtor and the co-owners but very few details are provided. The court cannot tell whether this plan is to be implemented as written or the debtor intends to start over under new terms, given the reported agreement. While the court recognizes that there appears to be a sizeable equity cushion, it is also not clear whether debtor can consistent with obligations of good faith, simply wait for two years without servicing the secured claim. This might turn on whether some cash for that purpose is forthcoming from the agreement. *Appearance required*.

-----

Tentative for September 11, 2024

The Disclosure Statement may be approved but the Trustee's observations and comments should be reviewed. Set confirmation date and attendant deadlines. *Appearance required.* 

#### **Party Information**

# **Debtor(s):**

Ben Edward Lofstedt

Represented By D Edward Hays Sarah Rose Hasselberger

Wednesday	, November 6, 2024		Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> CONT <u>Trustee(s</u>	Ben Edward Lofstedt		Chapt	er 11
Robe	rt Paul Goe (TR)	Pro Se		

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

8:17-10517 Lisa Hackett

 #8.00 POST-CONFIRMATION STATUS CONFERENCE Re: Scheduling And Case Management Conference (cont'd from 4-10-24 per court's own mtn - 12-15-23) (cont'd from 4-24-24 at 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. per court's own mtn) (cont'd from 10-02-24 per court's own mtn)

[fr: 6/7/17, 9/6/17, 12/6/17, 1/10/18, 2/28/18, 8/29/18, 3/13/19, 10/2/19, 2/12/20, 4/1/20, 7/22/20]

Docket 1

# **Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative for November 6, 2024 One last continued Post Confirmation Status Conference January 22, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. By then, or coinciding with that conference, the court expects a motion for final decree. *Appearance is optional.* 

-----

Tentative for April 24, 2024 Schedule further status in about 6 months. Appearance is optional.

-----

Tentative for September 13, 2023

Further post confirmation status conference on April 10, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. Appearance is optional unless there is a problem with the continuance date.

Tentative for 3/29/23:

Continue for further status conference September 13, 2023 @ 10. In meantime the court expects that close consideration be given to a final decree motion.

Appearance: suggested

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

10:00 AM CONT... Lisa Hackett

Chapter 11

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 11/30/22: Continue for further status conference March 28, 2023 @ 10:00AM.

Appearance: optional

-----

Tentative for 6/22/22: Where's the Motion for Final Decree?

-----

Tentative for 12/8/21: The court would have appreciated an updated status report. Is debtor in compliance?

-----

Tentative for 8/11/21: Why no updated status report? Can a final decree be expected soon?

-----

Tentative for 6/30/21: Continue to August 11 @ 10:00AM. More continuances should not be expected.

Appearance: excused

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 3/3/21: It sounds from the December status report like the plan is being paid as agreed but since no updated report was filed, the court is uncertain. Will

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Lisa Hackett Ch debtor seek to administratively close or obtain a final decree? Timetable?

Chapter 11

-----

Tentative for 12/9/20: Why no updated status report?

Appearance: required

-----

Appearances necessary. Telephonic appearances only. Any party who wishes to appear must register in advance by contacting CourtCall at (866) 582-6878.

#### **Party Information**

# Debtor(s):

Lisa Hackett

Pro Se

Wednesday, November 6, 2024Hearing Room5B10:00 AM<br/>8:20-10143Bridgemark CorporationChapter 11#9.00POST-CONFIRMATION STATUS CONFERENCE RE: Chapter 11 Voluntary<br/>Petition Non-Individual.<br/>(cont'd from 7-03-24)<br/>(cont'd from 10-02-24 per court's own mtn)5B

Docket 1

# **Tentative Ruling:**

Tentative for November 6, 2024 This case has been dragging post-confirmation for far too long. Is a final decree appropriate now? *Appearance required*.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for July 3, 2024 Continue to Oct. 2, 2024 at10:00 a.m. per request, to combine with final decree. *Appearance is not required.* 

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for April 3, 2024 Continued to July 3, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. per request. Final decree motion is expected, preferably to coincide. *Appearance suggested*.

-----

Tentative for December 6, 2023 Continue to April 3, 2024 @ 10:00 per request. Appearance is optional.

Tentative for September 13, 2023

Continue to Dec. 6, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. Appearance is optional.

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

# CONT... Bridgemark Corporation

Tentative for 3/15/23: Continue for further status conference June 28, 2023 @ 10. The court expects a final decree motion to be filed before or to coincide.

Appearance: optional

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 11/2/22:

Continue for final post confirmation conference in about 120 days. It is expected that a motion for final decree will be filed in meantime.

Appearance: suggested

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for May 25, 2022:

Continue for further status conference to November 2, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. with the expectation that a motion for final decree will be filed either for that date or before. Appearance is optional.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 12/8/21: Status? Appearance: required

-----

Tentative for 8/25/21: See #2.

-----

Tentative for 8/4/21: See #s 5 and 6.

\_\_\_\_\_

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Bridgemark Corporation

Tentative for 7/28/21: See #s 14-16.

-----

Tentative for 6/23/21: Continue to adequacy of disclosure or confirmation hearing.

-----

Tentative for 4/7/21: See #9.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 3/31/21: See #16. Appearance: optional

Tentative for 2/24/21: Continue to March 31, 2021 @ 10:00 a.m.

-----

-----

Tentative for 2/10/21: Same as #8. Appearance: required

-----

Tentative for 2/26/20:

The court will, at debtor's request, refrain from setting deadlines at this time in favor of a continuance of the status conference about 90 days, but the parties should anticipate deadlines to be imposed at that time.

#### **Party Information**

11/5/2024 1:30:03 PM

Wednesday, November 6, 2024

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

**CONT...** Bridgemark Corporation

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

Bridgemark Corporation

Represented By William N Lobel Chapter 11

5B

**Hearing Room** 

Wednesday,	November 6, 2024	Hearing Room	5B
<u>10:00 AM</u> 8:24-10803	Bridge Diagnostic, LLC	Chap	ter 11
#10.00	Debtor's Emergency Motion For Order Authorizing Deb Petition Loan; And Request For Expedited Hearing (OST Signed 4-23-24) (cont'd from 8-14-24)	tor To Obtain Post-	
	Docket 52		
Tentative	Ruling:		
Gran	tive for November 6, 2024 request for continuance to coincide with status conferer at 10:00 a.m. <i>Appearance is optional.</i>	ice February 12,	
	itive for August 14, 2024 s? <i>Appearance required.</i>		
	itive for June 26, 2024 s? <i>Appearance required.</i>		
How collat	ative for May 8, 2024 is the post-petition loan functioning? Is a discussion nee eral, perfection and security as was alluded to in Trustee arance required.		
 Tenta	tive for April 25, 2024		

Opposition due at hearing. Appearance required.

# **Party Information**

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Bridge Diagnostic, LLC

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

Bridge Diagnostic, LLC

# Trustee(s):

Robert Paul Goe (TR)

Pro Se

Represented By David Wood Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

8:15-15311	Freedom Communications, Inc.	Chapter 11
Adv#: 8:21-0	01034 Freedom Communications Inc. et al v. California Department of	Tax and Fee
#11.00	Motion for Abstention Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c) and 11 U.S. (1)	C. § 505(a)
	[Affects Freedom Communications, Inc and Freedom Communicati Holdings, Inc ONLY]	ons
	[cont'd from 2-16-23 Amended Notice Of Motion and Suppleme Of Hearing filed 2/3/2023, dkt#31] (cont'd from 5-29-24)	ntal Notice

Docket 25

**Tentative Ruling:** 

Tentative for November 6, 2024 So, what is the outcome of the re-audits and where do we stand? *Appearance required.* 

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for May 29, 2024

Why shouldn't this court either abstain or convert this case? See #9. The extraordinary delay is unseemly and little prospect is shown for a resolution. *Appeance required.* 

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for March 27, 2024 Continued to May 29, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. while we wait to hear from the CDTFA Appeals Bureau. Appearance waived.

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for October 4, 2023

The motion to continue was denied by order entered on October 2, 2023. Except for the retirement of a key employee of CDTFA nothing new is raised on the abstention question. Consequently, the court adopts from the tentative

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Freedom Communications, Inc. Chapter 11 posted for the hearing 3/9/23 and grants the abstention request. Appearance required.

#### \_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 6/7/23: Mediation results?

Appearance: required

\_\_\_\_\_

Tentative for 3/9/23:

This is defendant, California Department of Tax and Fee Administration's (FKA California Board of Equalization) ("CDTFA") motion for abstention from this adversary proceeding. The motion is opposed by debtors/plaintiffs, Freedom Communications, Inc. ("FCI"), Freedom Communications Holdings, Inc. ("FCHI") and related entities (collectively "Debtors").

# Basic Background

Debtors filed petitions for Chapter 11 relief in November 2015. During their bankruptcy case, Debtors filed amended sales tax returns for every quarterly period from tax year 2012 through 2016 (collectively, the "Amended Sales and Use Tax Returns"). As a result of the Amended Sales and Use Tax Returns, Debtors seek total tax refunds of \$6,309,122 for FCI, and \$1,131,534 for FCHI (i.e., sum of refunds for each quarterly period). Thereafter, CDTFA commenced comprehensive audits of all relevant quarterly periods. CDTFA concluded the audits in October 2020 by issuing, in part, CDTFA Form 836-A (collectively, the "Audit Findings"). Form 836-A identifies and summarizes Debtors' main contentions along with the findings reached by CDTFA. On November 5, 2020, Debtors filed Petitions for Redetermination, each of which commence an administrative tax appeal of the Audit Findings (collectively, "Administrative Tax Appeal").

While the Administrative Tax Appeal was pending, Debtors sought to

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

**CONT...** Freedom Communications, Inc.

confirm a Chapter 11 Plan. In the months leading up to confirmation, Debtors commenced this Adversary Proceeding on June 17, 2021. The Adversary Proceeding continues to run parallel to the Administrative Tax Appeal. CDTFA asserts that the Adversary Proceeding concerns issues of pure state sales tax law, and the tax issues to be litigated in this Adversary Proceeding are identical to those at issue in the Administrative Tax Appeal.

Debtors confirmed their "Second Amended Plan of Liquidation Proposed by Debtors and Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors" on July 16, 2021 (the "Plan"). However, the Plan is not effective unless certain conditions precedent are met, one of which is whether the sales tax litigation with CDTFA generates sufficient cash "to pay all Allowed Administrative Expenses, Allowed Priority Tax Claims and Allowed Priority Non-Tax Claims."

CDTFA's asserts that its Appeals Bureau conducted a hearing on September 7, 2021, where Debtors, reportedly represented by the same counsel as in the Adversary Proceeding, presented evidence and extensive briefing to an independent hearing officer on the identical issues that are at issue in this Adversary Proceeding. On November 23, 2022(?), the Appeals Bureau issued two lengthy decisions, one for FCI and one for FCHI (the "Appeals Bureau Decisions"). As result, CDTFA was ordered to conduct a reaudit to make certain audit adjustments in Debtors' favor. On January 11, 2023, CDTFA completed the reaudits (the "Reaudit Results").

If Debtors disagree with the Appeals Bureau and reaudit results, CDTFA asserts, they have two serviceable options: The first is to submit a written request for reconsideration to the Appeals Bureau identifying the specific issue(s) for which they seek reconsideration and explaining the reasons they disagree with the decision. Cal. Code Regs. tit. 18, § 35065(e) (1). The second is to appeal to the California Office of Tax Appeals (the "OTA"), an independent state agency established to hear such appeals. *Id*. at (e)(2).

# Legal Standards

The issue of abstention is governed by 28 U.S.C. §1334(c), which states in pertinent part:

(1) Except with respect to a case under chapter 15 of title 11, nothing

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Freedom Communications, Inc.

in this section prevents a district court in the interest of justice, or in the interest of comity with State courts or respect for State law, from abstaining from hearing a particular proceeding arising under title 11 or arising in or related to a case under title 11.

(2) Upon timely motion of a party in a proceeding based upon a State law claim or State law cause of action, related to a case under title 11 but not arising under title 11 or arising in a case under title 11, with respect to which an action could not have been commenced in a court of the United States absent jurisdiction under this section, the district court shall abstain from hearing such proceeding if an action is commenced, and can be timely adjudicated, in a State forum of appropriate jurisdiction.

In the Ninth Circuit, the court considers the following factors in its determining whether abstention is appropriate:

(1) the effect or lack thereof on the efficient administration of the estate if a Court recommends abstention;

(2) the extent to which state law issues predominate over bankruptcy issues;

(3) the difficulty or unsettled nature of the applicable law;

(4) the presence of a related proceeding commenced in state court or other nonbankruptcy court;

(5) the jurisdictional basis, if any, other than 28 U.S.C. § 1334;

(6) the degree of relatedness or remoteness of the proceeding to the main bankruptcy case;

(7) the substance rather than form of an asserted "core" proceeding;

(8) the feasibility of severing state law claims from core bankruptcy matters to allow judgments to be entered in state court with enforcement left to the bankruptcy court;

(9) the burden of [the bankruptcy court's] docket;

(10) the likelihood that the commencement of the proceeding in

bankruptcy court involves forum shopping by one of the parties;

(11) the existence of a right to a jury trial; and

(12) the presence in the proceeding of nondebtor parties.

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Freedom Communications, Inc.

In re Tucson Estates, Inc., 912 F.2d 1162, 1167 (9th Cir. 1990).

Additionally, when a case involves a tax issue under 11 U.S.C. § 505(a), courts rely on a six-factor test to determine whether abstention is appropriate. Those factors are as follows:

(1) the complexity of the tax issue;

(2) the need to administer the bankruptcy case in an orderly and efficient manner;

(3) the burden on the bankruptcy court's docket;

(4) the length of time required for trial and decision;

(5) the asset and liability structure of the debtor;

(6) the prejudice to the debtor and the potential prejudice to the taxing authority.

See In re New Haven Projects Ltd. Liability Co., 225 F.3d 283, 289 (2d Cir. 2000); Lavoie v. U.S., 191 B.R. 818, 819 (D. Ariz. 1995).

Because of the substantial overlap in the factors for permissive abstention under both 28 U.S.C. § 1334(c)(1) and 11 U.S.C. § 505(a)(1), the analysis as it relates to this Adversary Proceeding is much the same, and so the court will consider the motion under the more traditional *Tucson Estates* factors. The court also preliminarily notes that not all of the *Tucson Estates* factors are clearly implicated, but also notes that certain of these factors warrant greater weight on these facts.

#### Efficient Administration

The first factor requires the court to consider the effect of abstention on the efficient administration of the bankruptcy case. All parties agree that resolution of the tax issues attending the Adversary Proceeding is a condition precedent to effectuate the Chapter 11 Plan. What is less clear is why resolving those tax issues in this court would be more efficient than in a highly specialized state proceeding. The court understands Debtors' skepticism of the state's objectivity, but that is not at issue in this motion. Debtors also argue that adjudication outside this court will likely result in undue delay, especially if appeals follow any decision. However, the same could be said for having the case adjudicated here. After all, if unsatisfied with a judgment issued by this court, either party could also appeal, which could be followed

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

**CONT...** Freedom Communications, Inc.

by a stay pending appeal, resulting in lengthy delays given the centrality of the issues with respect to the Chapter 11 Plan. Therefore, the court finds this factor neutral on the issue of abstention.

# Extent To Which State Laws Predominate

The second factor requires the court to consider whether state law predominates over bankruptcy issues. This factor likely weighs heavily in favor of abstention. The issues in the Adversary Proceeding are of state law, but it seems that the success of the Chapter 11 Plan likely hinges on the outcome of those state law issues. Though this is a court of competent jurisdiction, the court would aver that it seldom is called upon to resolve esoteric issues of state tax law. This is likely because such procedures already exist at the state level. The court believes that the highly specialized state agencies and administrations are better positioned to resolve the dispute given their expertise, and this court's relative lack thereof. Therefore, this court finds this factor heavily (probably decisively) weighs in favor of abstention.

# Difficulty of the Issues

The third factor requires the court to consider the difficulty or unsettled nature of the applicable law. CDTFA argues that this case involves complex and highly technical interpretations of California tax law, which is likely best left to the state experts, rather than this court, which only intermittently confronts such complex tax issues. Debtors argue, by contrast, that the case is only complex factually, but that the legal issues are relatively straight forward. At this point the court does not know who is properly characterizing the difficulty of the dispute. Thus, the court agrees with Debtors that this factor is not determinative.

# Presence of a Related Proceeding In State Court

The fourth factor requires the court to consider the presence of a related proceeding in the state court. Here, it is obvious that there is a related administrative proceeding, but Debtors argue, it is not a court proceeding. For example, Debtors point out that the Office of Tax Appeals is unlike this court as it has no formal discovery, has limited authority to require the disclosure of witnesses and evidence, and does not follow the Federal Rules of Evidence or California Evidence Code. Therefore, Debtors argue, abstention at this

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

**CONT...** Freedom Communications, Inc.

stage, with its side effect of halting formal discovery, will hinder the interests of justice and unfairly prejudice Debtors. However, Debtors do not explicitly argue that the results of the state proceeding are not binding or do not carry preclusive effect. The court is not inclined or equipped to make findings as to the relative tactical disadvantages each party may encounter if this court abstains. Without a fulsome understanding of how full adjudication by the state agencies might/will affect whether the Chapter 11 Plan takes full effect, the court is not ideally situated to assess this element. The court will hear further argument on this point However, as noted above, the court would still prefer that a highly specialized state agency preside over the esoteric state tax issues.

# The Court's Jurisdictional Basis

The fifth factor requires the court to consider its jurisdictional basis, if any, other than 28 U.S.C. § 1334. Here, as Debtors argue, there is an independent basis for federal jurisdiction — namely, 11 U.S.C. § 505(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 157. In the court's view, this factor is not determinative.

# Degree of Relatedness To The Main Bankruptcy Case

The sixth factor requires the court to consider the degree of relatedness or remoteness of the proceeding to the main bankruptcy case. Here, as noted, the state proceeding is intertwined with the main bankruptcy case, with the bankruptcy case being dependent on the state proceeding for its own progress. This factor is neutral in this case.

#### Substance Over Form Of "Core" Proceeding

The seventh factor requires the court to consider the substance rather than form of an asserted "core" proceeding. Here again, issues of purely state law govern both the state proceeding and Adversary Proceeding, though claim allowance and dischargeability are undeniably also implicated. Again, this factor is neutral.

# Severing State Law Claims From Core Bankruptcy Issues

The eighth factor requires the court to consider the feasibility of severing state law claims from core bankruptcy matters to allow judgments to be entered in state court with enforcement left to the bankruptcy court. Again, the court is unclear as to how enforceability of state adjudication would affect

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

#### Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u>

# **CONT...** Freedom Communications, Inc.

this bankruptcy case. If the state proceeding resolves all current substantial issues concerning administration of this case, the court believes this factor favors abstention. However, the court will hear further argument on this point.

# Burden On This Court's Docket

The ninth factor requires the court to consider the burden of this court's docket if it does not abstain. CDTFA argues persuasively that a trial in this case, due to its complex factual and legal features, would require at least several weeks, if not months, to complete. In the meantime, this court would maintain its regular caseload, but would also need to set aside ample time to conduct the trial and issue a final judgment. This, CDTFA persuasively argues, would be a significant impact on this court's docket. Debtors argue that at least some of the issues have already been resolved by the Appeals Bureau, thus, the trial would not be as extensive as initially presented. Debtors also argue that, depending on how matters resolve in the state proceeding, the weight off this court's docket, if it abstains, might only be temporary. Again, this court needs to fully understand whether adjudication in the state proceeding would allow the bankruptcy case to move forward or whether further substantial involvement from this court would likely be required. At this juncture, the court is inclined to find that this factor favors abstention. It does so in deference to the efficient administration of its many other cases. The court is legitimately concerned about being disproportionately weighed down or distracted by a trial, which might take weeks or even months to complete, when another highly specialized state government entity is capable of resolving the issues.

# Forum Shopping?

The tenth factor requires the court to consider the likelihood that the commencement of the proceeding in bankruptcy court involves forum shopping by one of the parties. Here, CDTFA argues that the filings of the bankruptcy case and the adversary proceeding are litigation tactics to see how many bites at the proverbial apple Debtors can get. Instead, CDTFA argues, Debtors should be required to rely on their efforts in the Administrative Tax Appeal, where they have been for much of the last two years. By contrast, Debtors argue, this court is the only forum where all claims can be pursued.

#### Wednesday, November 6, 2024

# Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

# <u>10:00 AM</u>

CONT... Freedom Communications, Inc.

The court does not find obvious evidence of forum shopping by either party. The court understands that the parties perceive tactical disadvantages attend either outcome of this motion. But the court cannot take sides in that regard. The court is still unclear how the state proceedings being allowed to continue materially prejudice Debtors. After all, these types of proceedings appear to be exactly those contemplated by the state legislature.

The last two factors: right to a jury trial and presence of nondebtor entities are either not implicated (no party requests a jury trial), or are not particularly significant to the outcome of this motion (CDTFA is a nondebtor).

In sum, although arguments based on the *Tucson Estates* factors can be summoned by both sides, the court is largely persuaded by the fact that litigation on esoteric issues of state law is already of long standing before a specialized state tribunal. This court has seen no compelling reason to change that at this late date.

Grant.

# **Party Information Debtor(s):** Freedom Communications, Inc. Represented By William N Lobel Beth Gaschen Alan J Friedman Christopher J Green Caroline Djang Scott D Fink Reed M Mercado Jeffrey W Dulberg Rika Kido Jonathan T Amitrano **Defendant(s):** California Department of Tax and Represented By Donny P Le

# Wednesday, November 6, 2024

# Hearing Room 5B

Chapter 11

#### <u>10:00 AM</u> CONT

CONT... Freedom Communications, Inc. <u>Plaintiff(s):</u>

Freedom Communications Inc.

Represented By Jonathan T Amitrano

Freedom Communications Holding,

Represented By Jonathan T Amitrano