

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California
Honorable René Lastreto II
Hearing Date: Tuesday, March 28, 2017
Place: Department B – Courtroom #13
Fresno, California

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

1. The following rulings are tentative. The tentative ruling will not become the final ruling until the matter is called at the scheduled hearing. **Pre-disposed matters will generally be called, and the rulings placed on the record at the end of the calendar.** Any party who desires to be heard with regard to a pre-disposed matter may appear at the hearing. If the party wishes to contest the tentative ruling, he/she shall notify the opposing party/counsel of his/her intention to appear. **If no disposition is set forth below, the hearing will take place as scheduled.**

2. Submission of Orders:

Unless the tentative ruling expressly states that the court will prepare an order, then the tentative ruling will only appear in the minutes. If any party desires an order, then the appropriate form of order, which conforms to the tentative ruling, must be submitted to the court. When the debtor(s) discharge has been entered, proposed orders for relief from stay must reflect that the motion is denied as to the debtor(s) and granted only as to the trustee. Entry of discharge normally is indicated on the calendar.

3. Matters Resolved Without Opposition:

If the tentative ruling states that no opposition was filed, and the moving party is aware of any reason, such as a settlement, why a response may not have been filed, the moving party must advise Vicky McKinney, the Calendar Clerk, at (559) 499-5825 by 4:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled hearing.

4. Matters Resolved by Stipulation:

If the parties resolve a matter by stipulation after the tentative ruling has been posted, but **before the formal order is entered on the docket**, the **moving party** may appear at the hearing and advise the court of the settlement or withdraw the motion. Alternatively, the parties may submit a stipulation and order to modify the tentative ruling together with the proposed order resolving the matter.

5. Resubmittal of Denied Matters:

If the moving party decides to re-file a matter that is denied without prejudice for any reason set forth below, the moving party must file and serve a new set of pleadings with a new docket control number. It may not simply re-notice the original motion.

THE COURT ENDEAVORS TO PUBLISH ITS PREDISPOSITIONS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, HOWEVER CALENDAR PREPARATION IS ONGOING AND THESE PREDISPOSITIONS MAY BE REVISED OR UPDATED AT ANY TIME PRIOR TO 4:00 P.M. THE DAY BEFORE THE SCHEDULED HEARINGS. PLEASE CHECK AT THAT TIME FOR POSSIBLE UPDATES.

9:30

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. 16-12900 -B-7 ARTBEAT, INC., A
TGM-2 WASHINGTON CORPORATION
JAMES SALVEN/MV

HAGOP BEDOYAN/Atty. for dbt.
TRUDI MANFREDO/Atty. for mv. | MOTION TO COMPROMISE
CONTROVERSY/APPROVE SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT WITH DAVID SHAW
2-28-17 [18] |
|--|---|

The motion will be granted without oral argument based upon well-pled facts. The trustee shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This matter was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there is no opposition. Accordingly, the respondents' defaults will be entered. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55, made applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7055, governs default matters and is applicable to contested matters under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014(c). Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). *Televideo Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal* (826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir., 1987)). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here. It appears that the trustee has evaluated the A & C Properties factors and that the compromise is a reasonable exercise of the trustee's business judgment.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 2. 16-14300 -B-7 REZA/ELIZABETH MAKKI
RHT-1
ROBERT HAWKINS/MV
PETER BUNTING/Atty. for dbt.
ROBERT HAWKINS/Atty. for mv. | MOTION TO SELL
3-1-17 [17] |
|---|---|

This matter will proceed as scheduled. Higher and better bids will be accepted.

Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults and grant the motion. If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

3. [16-10706](#)-B-7 ARLEEN MAROZIK
JES-2
JAMES SALVEN/MV
DAVID JENKINS/Atty. for dbt.

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR
JAMES SALVEN, ACCOUNTANT(S)
2-22-17 [[77](#)]

The motion will be denied without prejudice. The court will enter an order. No appearance is necessary.

The record does not show that the motion and other moving papers were served on the debtor.

The court notes that the trustee's accountant, the applicant, has charged the estate approximately \$650 to perform legal services on behalf of the trustee. The applicant is not an attorney and cannot charge for legally representing the trustee.

The record shows that the applicant represented the trustee in the motion to employ himself and preparing the declaration for the trustee to sign in both that motion and this application for compensation. While a trustee may represent him or herself *pro se*, the applicant was not employed as an attorney and is not an attorney. The applicant cannot be paid by the estate for his legal representation of the trustee. Employment applications are generally prepared and filed by the chapter 7 trustee as part of work that is compensated by the trustee's commission.

4. [16-14412](#)-B-7 ALFRED/REBECCA ESCAMILLA
EPE-1
ALFRED ESCAMILLA/MV
ERIC ESCAMILLA/Atty. for dbt.

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT
2-17-17 [[26](#)]

The motion will be denied without prejudice. The court will enter an order. No appearance is necessary.

All creditors were required to receive notice of this hearing that contains sufficient information for them to decide whether to oppose the debtor's motion. LR 9014-1(d)(5): "Service of Notice Only. When notice of a motion is served without the motion or supporting papers, the notice of hearing shall also succinctly and sufficiently describe the nature of the relief being requested and set forth the essential facts necessary for a party to determine whether to oppose the motion. However, the motion and supporting papers shall be served on those parties who have requested special notice and those who are directly affected by the requested relief."

The debtors' notice merely stated: "The property of which Debtor seeks abandonment consists of completely exempt tools of trade that Debtor has exempted in their entirety." In fact, the moving papers identify other property that is not "tools of the trade."

5. [17-10114](#)-B-7 KENNETH ROTHSTEIN
APN-1
SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC./MV
CATARINA BENITEZ/Atty. for dbt.
AUSTIN NAGEL/Atty. for mv.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-16-17 [[13](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument for cause shown. Movant shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This motion for relief from stay was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there was no opposition. The debtor's and the trustee's defaults will be entered. The automatic stay is terminated as it applies to the movant's right to enforce its remedies against the subject property under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

The record shows that cause exists to terminate the automatic stay.

The proposed order shall specifically describe the property or action to which the order relates. A waiver of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be granted.

Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief. If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See *In re Van Ness*, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

6. [17-10323](#)-B-7 STEVEN SINGLETON
APN-1
SANTANDER CONSUMER USA,
INC./MV
JOHN BIANCO/Atty. for dbt.
AUSTIN NAGEL/Atty. for mv.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-28-17 [[9](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument for cause shown. Movant shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This motion for relief from stay was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there was no opposition. The debtor's and the trustee's defaults will be entered. The automatic stay is terminated as it applies to the movant's right to enforce its remedies against the subject property under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

The record shows that cause exists to terminate the automatic stay.

The proposed order shall specifically describe the property or action to which the order relates. A waiver of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be granted.

Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief. If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See *In re Van Ness*, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

7. [17-10029](#)-B-7 ERNESTO/MARTHA LOPEZ
EAT-1
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A./MV
DARLENE VIGIL/Atty. for mv.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-21-17 [[21](#)]

This motion will be denied as moot. The court will enter an order. No appearance is necessary.

Pursuant to §362(c)(3)(A) and §362(c)(4)(A)(i), no stay arose as to the debtor when this case was filed on January 6, 2016, and the stay as to the co-debtor terminated by force of law on or about February 6, 2017. The record does not show that a motion was filed under either §362(c)(3)(B) or §362(c)(4)(B).

The record shows the debtor had at least two cases prior to filing this one, all three of which were pending during the same 12 month period. The last case was pending as of December 2, 2016, when it was dismissed. The case prior to that was pending as of September 26, 2016, when it was dismissed. The record shows that the co-debtor had one prior case pending within 12 months of the date that the current case was filed. The prior case was dismissed November 14, 2016.

8. [16-14531](#)-B-7 JOSE/SEDEL VARGAS
JCW-1
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION/MV
MARK ZIMMERMAN/Atty. for dbt.
JENNIFER WONG/Atty. for mv.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-16-17 [[21](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument for cause shown. Movant shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This motion for relief from stay was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there was no opposition. The debtors' and the trustee's defaults will be entered. The automatic stay is terminated as it applies to the movant's right to enforce its remedies against the subject property under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

The record shows that cause exists to terminate the automatic stay.

The proposed order shall specifically describe the property or action to which the order relates. If the motion involves a foreclosure of real property in California, then the order shall also provide that the bankruptcy proceeding has been finalized for purposes of California Civil Code § 2923.5 to the extent that it applies. A waiver of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will not be granted. No exigency has been shown.

Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief. If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See *In re Van Ness*, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

9. [17-10340](#)-B-7 FREDDIE MONTIJO AND
EPE-1 LORENA GONSALEZ
FREDDIE MONTIJO/MV
ERIC ESCAMILLA/Atty. for dbt.

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT
2-14-17 [[19](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument based upon well-pled facts. The moving party shall submit a proposed order. No appearance is necessary.

This matter was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and governs default matters and is applicable to contested matters under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014(c). Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). *Televideo Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal* (826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir., 1987)). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here. there is no opposition. Accordingly, the respondents' defaults will be entered. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55, made applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7055. The order shall specifically describe the property to be abandoned.

10. [17-10151](#)-B-7 JEANETTE ARAIZA
JES-1
JAMES SALVEN/MV

MOTION TO RECONSIDER
2-21-17 [[16](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondent's default and grant the motion.

Pursuant to FRCP 60(b)(2), incorporated here by FRBP 9024, the court may relieve a party from an order based on newly discovered evidence that could not have been discovered earlier. Here, the trustee has presented evidence showing that the debtor's income on the application for waiver of the filing fee understated her income and that she is not eligible for the waiver.

If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

11. [15-13455](#)-B-7 HIROAKI TERANISHI
TGM-3
PETER FEAR/MV
ROSALINA NUNEZ/Atty. for dbt.
TRUDI MANFREDO/Atty. for mv.

MOTION TO EMPLOY J. STANLEY
TEIXEIRA AS SPECIAL COUNSEL
2-17-17 [[87](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument based upon well-pled facts. The moving party shall submit a proposed order. No appearance is necessary.

This matter was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and governs default matters and is applicable to contested matters under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014(c). Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). *Televideo Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal* (826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir., 1987)). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here. there is no opposition. Accordingly, the respondents' defaults will be entered. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55, made applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7055.

12. [16-14655](#)-B-7 MANUEL REYNOSO
ABG-1
KINECTA FEDERAL CREDIT
UNION/MV
MARK BLACKMAN/Atty. for mv.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY AND/OR MOTION
FOR ADEQUATE PROTECTION
2-21-17 [[17](#)]

The motion will be granted without oral argument for cause shown. Movant shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This motion for relief from stay was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there was no opposition. The debtor's and the trustee's defaults will be entered. The automatic stay is terminated as it applies to the movant's right to enforce its remedies against the subject property under applicable nonbankruptcy law.

The record shows that cause exists to terminate the automatic stay.

The proposed order shall specifically describe the property or action to which the order relates. Waiver of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be granted; the record shows this property has already been surrendered by the debtor.

Unless the court expressly orders otherwise, the proposed order shall not include any other relief. If the proposed order includes extraneous or procedurally incorrect relief that is only available in an adversary proceeding then the order will be rejected. See *In re Van Ness*, 399 B.R. 897 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009).

13. [16-14676](#)-B-7 JOHN/PATRICIA FARINELLI MOTION TO ASSUME LEASE OR
TGM-2 EXECUTORY CONTRACT AND/OR
PETER FEAR/MV MOTION TO CURE LEASE ARREARAGE
3-7-17 [[27](#)]

PETER BUNTING/Atty. for dbt.
PETER FEAR/Atty. for mv.

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults and grant the motion subject to higher and better bids. If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

14. [15-11288](#)-B-7 FRESNO ACADEMY FOR CIVIC MOTION TO COMPROMISE
FW-2 & ENTREPRENEURIAL CONTROVERSY/APPROVE SETTLEMENT
TRUDI MANFREDO/MV AGREEMENT WITH CHARTER ASSET
MANAGEMENT FUND, LP
2-22-17 [[45](#)]

DAVID JENKINS/Atty. for dbt.
GABRIEL WADDELL/Atty. for mv.

The motion will be granted without oral argument based upon well-pled facts. The trustee shall submit a proposed order as specified below. No appearance is necessary.

This matter was fully noticed in compliance with the Local Rules of Practice and there is no opposition. Accordingly, the respondents' defaults will be entered. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55, made applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7055, governs default matters and is applicable to contested matters under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014(c). Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). *Televideo Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal* (826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir., 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here. It appears from the moving papers that the trustee has considered the standards of *In re Woodson*, 839 F.2d 610, 620 (9th Cir. 1987), citing *In re A & C Properties*, 784 F.2d 1377 (9th Cir. 1986), and that the compromise pursuant to FRBP 9019 is a reasonable exercise of the trustee's business judgment.

15. [16-13697](#)-B-7 SCOTT/KELLY ALLRED
KDG-2
TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
PETER BUNTING/Atty. for dbt.
LISA HOLDER/Atty. for mv.

MOTION TO SELL
3-7-17 [[46](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults and grant the motion. If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

11:00 A.M.

1. [16-14418](#)-B-7 CARYSS JOHNSON PRO SE REAFFIRMATION AGREEMENT
WITH NISSAN MOTOR ACCEPTANCE
CORPORATION
3-3-17 [[14](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

2. [16-14132](#)-B-7 REYNALDO/MARIA CERVANTES REAFFIRMATION AGREEMENT WITH
TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION
2-20-17 [[22](#)]
TIMOTHY SPRINGER/Atty. for dbt.

The hearing will be dropped from calendar. Counsel shall inform his clients that no appearance is necessary at this hearing.

Debtor was represented by counsel when they entered into the reaffirmation agreement. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §524(c)(3), "'if the debtor is represented by counsel, the agreement *must* be accompanied by an affidavit of the debtor's attorney' attesting to the referenced items before the agreement will have legal effect." *In re Minardi*, 399 B.R. 841, 846 (Bankr. N.D. Ok, 2009) (emphasis in original). In this case, the debtors' attorney affirmatively represented that the reaffirmation agreement was presumptively an undue hardship and the presumption was not rebutted. Therefore, the agreement does not meet the requirements of 11 U.S.C. §524(c) and is not enforceable.

3. [17-10153](#)-B-7 LINDA RABE REAFFIRMATION AGREEMENT WITH
ALLY FINANCIAL
2-28-17 [[12](#)]
ISMAEL RODRIGUEZ/Atty. for dbt.

The reaffirmation agreement cannot be approved. The court will enter an order. Counsel shall inform his client that no appearance is necessary at this hearing.

The reaffirmation agreement is incomplete and does not meet the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 524. It is therefore not enforceable against the debtors and cannot be approved. *In re Lopez*, 274 B.R. 854, 861-62 (9th Cir. BAP 2002), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 701 (9th Cir. CA 2003). Part D, containing the debtor's financial information, is blank. The court is required to examine the reaffirmation agreement for the presumption of undue hardship and cannot do so here. The debtor shall have 14 days to refile the reaffirmation agreement properly completed.

1:30 P.M.

1. [16-10016](#)-B-13 KEVIN DAVEY
[16-1074](#)
DAVEY V. OCWEN LOAN SERVICING,
LLC ET AL
VINCENT GORSKI/Atty. for pl.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE:
AMENDED COMPLAINT
11-18-16 [[84](#)]

This status conference will be continued to April 26, 2017, at 1:30 p.m., and will be held as a scheduling conference.

All parties shall file a status report by April 19, 2017. Parties are free to join in a single report. Failure of any party to timely file a joint or separate report may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions.

All parties shall be prepared to suggest dates for a scheduling order, including those for, non-expert discovery cutoff, expert witness disclosure, expert discovery cutoff, the last day to amend pleadings, the last day to file a dispositive motion, and trial dates. These issues shall be addressed in the status report(s).

2. [16-13860](#)-B-7 JANNET ANTUNA
[17-1008](#)
GABRIEL ALVARADO, BY AND
THROUGH HIS SUCCESSOR IN V.
NICHOLAS ANIOTZBEHERE/Atty. for pl.

STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
1-30-17 [[1](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled as a status conference re any pending motion for entry of default judgment.

The court notes that the facts, not legal conclusions, alleged in the complaint appear to only include the following:

1. June 8, 2013- Plaintiff's husband was killed by third parties while attending a celebration at the home of Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares, who are parents of the debtor;
2. September 16, 2013- Plaintiff filed a wrongful death complaint against the same Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares who were served with the summons and complaint on October 2, 2013;
3. October 16, 2013- the same Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares transferred 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, to Jannet Antuna, their daughter and the debtor in this case, without consideration;
4. May 7, 2014, Maria Luisa Cazares, one of the two defendant's in the wrongful death litigation, transferred an unrelated property to a different debtor without consideration;
5. May 15, 2015- judgment in excess of \$3M was entered in the wrongful death litigation against the same Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares;

6. May 21, 2015- Abstract of judgment in the wrongful death litigation was issued and recorded June 5, 2015;
7. August 4, 2015, a UFTA case was filed against, at least, the same Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares, and the debtor;
8. August 12, 2015, Lis Pendens were recorded on the transferred properties, including 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, which had been transferred to the debtor;
9. August 14, 2015, the debtor executed a transfer of 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, to relatives who were co-defendants in the UFTA litigation;
10. The recorder's office declined to record the transfer because of the prior Lis Pendens recorded against it;
11. December 16, 2015, the same Florencio Antuna and Maria Luisa Cazares, the other daughter, and the debtor, all filed answers in the UFTA litigation;
12. May 5, 2016, and May 17, 2016, defaults were entered, respectively, against two defendants who did not file answers;
13. July 11, 2016, the answering defendants', including debtor's, answers were stricken and defaults were entered against them as well;
13. Plaintiff applied for a default judgment in the UFTA litigation and this was set to be heard when the debtor filed the bankruptcy case on October 24, 2016;
14. Debtor testified at her §341 meeting of creditors that 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, was transferred to her at the request of her grandmother, the former owner, who allegedly desired that the debtor take title to the property, but that no will, trust or record exists which would support this claim. [This fact is the basis for plaintiff's first claim for relief, under §727(a)(3)(A), "debtor concealed, destroyed, mutilated, falsified or failed to keep records"];
15. Debtor's schedule A lists ownership of 558 N. 3rd, Porterville;
16. Debtor's schedule C states that she lives at 558 N. 3rd, Porterville;
17. Debtor's petition states that she lives at 9044 Rd 236, Terra Bella [the debtor has filed a motion to correct her residential address to 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, saying that the address in Terra Bella is her mailing address only];

18. That debtor's statement under penalty of perjury that she lives at 558 N. 3rd, Porterville, was made so that she could exempt that property as her homestead [This is the basis for plaintiff's claim for relief under §727(a)(4)(A) "debtor made a false oath or account in or in connection with the case to defraud creditors"].

The plaintiff's claim for relief under §523(a)(2)(A) rests on a statements of a legal conclusions and is not supported by any statements of fact:

"24. Defendant's acceptance of the subject property, without consideration, shortly after service of a lawsuit against her uninsured parents was a deliberate and knowing act by Debtor to assist her parents in hiding property of the family in jeopardy of being sold to satisfy the judgment in the underlying case."

"25. The actions of Debtor resulted in severe damages to Plaintiff in that the Plaintiff has not, to date, collected upon the judgment as to the Antuna's, despite the Antuna's owning, without lien, several real properties at the time of the Quinceañera."

"26. On information and belief a fraudulent transferee's debt is nondischargeable pursuant to Husky v. Ritz."

3. [16-10169](#)-B-13 FRANK/MARY ANNE DORES
AMM-2
BUNNETT & CO., INC./MV
PETER FEAR/Atty. for dbt.
ANDREW MINEAR/Atty. for mv.

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE
RE: MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
8-17-16 [[161](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

4. [16-10169](#)-B-13 FRANK/MARY ANNE DORES
FW-1
FRANK DORES/MV
PETER FEAR/Atty. for dbt.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE
RE: MOTION FOR CONTEMPT
1-28-16 [[7](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

5. [16-10169](#)-B-13 FRANK/MARY ANNE DORES
FW-1
BUNNETT & CO., INC./MV

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE
RE: AMENDED MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM AUTOMATIC STAY ,
AMENDED MOTION TO CONFIRM
TERMINATION OR ABSENCE OF STAY
3-15-16 [[73](#)]

PETER FEAR/Atty. for dbt.
ANDREW MINEAR/Atty. for mv.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

This matter will proceed as scheduled.

6. [14-14593](#)-B-7 WAYNE HEAD
[17-1004](#)
U.S. TRUSTEE V. HEAD
ROBIN TUBESING/Atty. for pl.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
1-24-17 [[1](#)]

This matter will proceed as scheduled.