



**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California
Honorable René Lastreto II
Department B – Courtroom #13
Fresno, California
Hearing Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2026**

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable René Lastreto II, shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person** at, Courtroom #13 (Fresno hearings only), (2) via **ZoomGov Video**, (3) via **ZoomGov Telephone**, and (4) via **CourtCall**. You may choose any of these options unless otherwise ordered or stated below.

All parties or their attorneys who wish to appear at a hearing remotely must sign up by **4:00 p.m. one business day** prior to the hearing. Information regarding how to sign up can be found on the **Remote Appearances** page of our website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/Calendar/CourtAppearances>. Each party/attorney who has signed up will receive a Zoom link or phone number, meeting I.D., and password via e-mail.

If the deadline to sign up has passed, parties and their attorneys who wish to appear remotely must contact the Courtroom Deputy for the Department holding the hearing.

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest and/or their attorneys may connect to the video or audio feed free of charge and should select which method they will use to appear when signing up.
- Members of the public and the press who wish to attend by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the Zoom telephone number. Video participation or observing are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may attend in person unless otherwise ordered.

To appear remotely for law and motion or status conference proceedings, you must comply with the following guidelines and procedures:

1. Review the [Pre-Hearing Dispositions](#) prior to appearing at the hearing.
2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the [CourtCall Appearance Information](#). If you are appearing by ZoomGov phone or video, please join at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the calendar and wait with your microphone muted until the matter is called.

Unauthorized Recording is Prohibited: Any recording of a court proceeding held by video or teleconference, including "screen shots" or other audio or visual copying of a hearing is prohibited. Violation may result in sanctions, including removal of court-issued media credentials, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the court. For more information on photographing, recording, or broadcasting Judicial Proceedings, please refer to Local Rule 173(a) of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

Each matter on this calendar will have one of three possible designations: No Ruling, Tentative Ruling, or Final Ruling. These instructions apply to those designations.

No Ruling: All parties will need to appear at the hearing unless otherwise ordered.

Tentative Ruling: If a matter has been designated as a tentative ruling it will be called, and all parties will need to appear at the hearing unless otherwise ordered. The court may continue the hearing on the matter, set a briefing schedule, or enter other orders appropriate for efficient and proper resolution of the matter. The original moving or objecting party shall give notice of the continued hearing date and the deadlines. The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions.

Final Ruling: Unless otherwise ordered, there will be **no hearing on these matters**. The final disposition of the matter is set forth in the ruling and it will appear in the minutes. The final ruling may or may not finally adjudicate the matter. If it is finally adjudicated, the minutes constitute the court's findings and conclusions.

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within 14 days of the final hearing on the matter.

Post-Publication Changes: The court endeavors to publish its rulings as soon as possible. However, calendar preparation is ongoing, and these rulings 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 any possible updates

9:30 AM

1. [26-10523](#)-B-11 **IN RE: INDUSTRY STANDARD ELECTRIC, INC.**
[CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: CHAPTER 11 SUBCHAPTER V
VOLUNTARY PETITION
2-6-2026 [[1](#)]

DAVID JOHNSTON/ATTY. FOR DBT.

NO RULING.

2. [26-10978](#)-B-11 **IN RE: HRONIS, INC.**
[RFL-1](#)

MOTION TO EMPLOY ROBERT S. MARTICELLO AS ATTORNEY(S)
5-5-2026 [[271](#)]

OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF
UNSECURED CREDITORS/MV
ZEV SHECHTMAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.
ROBERT MARTICELLO/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order after hearing.

The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors ("the Committee") of Hronis, Inc. and its affiliated debtors and debtors-in-possession (collectively "Debtors" or "Hronis"), moves the court for an order authorizing the employment of Raines Feldman Littrell LLP ("RFL" or "the Firm") as counsel for Committee in the above-styled jointly administered cases, effective as of March 23, 2026 ("the Retention Date") pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1103. Doc. #271 *et seq.*

Written opposition was not required and may be presented at the hearing. In the absence of opposition, this motion will be GRANTED.

This motion was filed and served pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(2) and 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 U.S.C. § 1103(a) allows a creditor's committee to select and authorize the employment of one or more attorneys, accountants, auctioneers, or other professional persons to represent or perform services for such committee. The professional may neither hold nor represent interests adverse to the estate § 1103(b).

11 U.S.C. § 328(a) permits employment by the Committee of "a professional person under section 327" on "any reasonable terms and conditions of employment, including on a retainer, on an hourly basis, on a fixed or percentage fee basis, or on a contingent fee basis." Section 328(a) further "permits a professional to have the terms and conditions of its employment pre-approved by the bankruptcy court, such that the bankruptcy court may alter the agreed-upon compensation only 'if such terms and conditions and conditions prove to have been improvident in light of developments not capable of being anticipated at the time of the fixing of such terms and conditions.'" *In re Circle K Corp.*, 279 F.3d 669, 671 (9th Cir. 2002).

This motion is supported by the Declaration of Robert S. Marticello ("Marticello"), a partner at RFL, and by Exhibits consisting of (a) the engagement letter, (b) a list of interested parties, and RFL's disclosures. Docs. ##273-274.

Marticello declares, *inter alia*, that, to the best of his knowledge, none of the partners, associates, or paraprofessionals of RFL have any connection to the Committee and that RFL does not presently represent any interest adverse to the Committee relevant to the matters for which RFL is to be employed. Doc. #273. Marticello's declaration and the Exhibits seem to show that RFL is disinterested as defined by 11 U.S.C. § 101(14); that RFL neither holds nor represents any interests materially adverse to the Committee, the estate or any class of creditors or equity security holders, nor does RFL have any connections to any party involved in the case at bar which would preclude RFL's employment under § 327. Docs. ##273-274.

Based on the Application, the record before the court, and the verified statement made by Marticello as required by Bankruptcy Rule 2014(a), it appears that RFL is eligible to be employed. Accordingly, in the absence of any opposition at the hearing, the Court is inclined to GRANT the application, and permit the employment of RFL, subject to the following reasonable terms and conditions and to the applicable provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 327 and §§ 329-331 set forth below.

Reasonable terms and conditions of employment include the following matters related to compensation:

1. No compensation is permitted except upon court order following application with notice and a hearing pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a).
2. Compensation will be at the "lodestar rate" applicable at the time that services are rendered in accordance with the Ninth Circuit decision in *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687 (9th Cir.

1988). No hourly rate referred to in the application is approved unless unambiguously so stated in this order or in a subsequent order of this Court.

3. RFL's rates are \$635-\$1,575 per hour for partners and of counsel; \$460-\$795 for associates; and \$250-\$495 for paraprofessionals. Notwithstanding those standard rates, RFL has agreed to a blended attorney rate of \$600 per hour that will apply to all attorneys who work on this matter. Doc. #271, pg. 6.

The Application also requests that the Firm's employment be effective as of the Retention Date which is more than 30 days prior to the filing of the Application. Doc. #271. LBR 2014-1(b)(2) states that:

All requests for retroactive authorization for employment exceeding 30 days duration must be set for hearing, must show exceptional circumstances, must satisfactorily explain the applicant's failure to receive prior judicial approval, and must demonstrate that the applicant's services benefited the bankrupt estate in a significant manner.

The moving papers assert that "exceptional circumstances" exist as a basis for approval of retroactive authorization beyond the 30-day time limit of LBR 2014-1(b)(2):

By the Application, the Firm's requests that its employment be effective as of the Retention Date (March 23, 2026), which is more than 30 days in duration. The Firm's services were needed immediately upon its selection as the Committee's counsel with respect to substantive matters, such as responding to the Debtors' post-petition financing and proposed sale procedures and negotiating consensual forms of orders as to both such matters based on the rulings of the Court. This is in addition to quickly becoming familiar with the Debtors and their assets and liabilities, including by review of the Debtors' schedules and statements of financial affairs and examination of the Debtors during the 341(a) meetings of creditors. The Firm was also required to begin its investigation into liens asserted against the Debtors' assets and claims held by the estates.

Doc. #273. While the court acknowledges the need for RFL to move quickly to get up to speed in this case, the preceding paragraph is not actually responsive to the question of what exceptional circumstances led to the instant employment application being filed almost six weeks after the Retention Date. The court is aware of the helpful input Committee-proposed counsel provided for the finance motion and recognizes the need for counsel's rapid familiarity with the capital structure of these debtors. Regardless, the Committee and the Firm are free to address this issue more fully at the hearing.

Written opposition was not required and may be presented at the hearing. In the absence of any objection, the court is inclined to GRANT this motion.

11:00 AM

1. [26-10830](#)-B-7 **IN RE: MAXIMINO/EDITH FLORES**

PRO SE REAFFIRMATION AGREEMENT WITH TRAVIS CREDIT UNION
5-1-2026 [[16](#)]

PAULDEEP BAINS/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Denied.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Debtor's counsel will inform debtor that no appearance is necessary.

A Reaffirmation Agreement between Maximino Flores and Edith Flores ("Debtors") and Travis Credit Union for a 2018 Honda Accord ("Vehicle") was filed on May 1, 2026. Doc. #16.

Debtors were 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). The reaffirmation agreement, in the absence of a declaration by debtors' counsel, does not meet the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 524(c) and is not enforceable.

11 U.S.C. § 524(c)(6)(A)(ii) states "An agreement between a holder of a claim and the debtor, the consideration for which, in whole or in part, is based on a debt that is dischargeable in a case under this title is enforceable only to any extent enforceable under applicable non-bankruptcy law, whether or not discharge of such debt is waived, only if the court approves such agreement as in the best interest of the debtor."

The lack of a signature by Debtors' counsel is moot here as the documents submitted in support of the reaffirmation agreement include information that the Debtors are a co-signers on the contract. Doc. #1, Schedules A/B, D and H. This means another party may be liable for this obligation.

Approval of the reaffirmation agreement is DENIED.

1:30 PM

1. [26-11208](#)-B-7 **IN RE: LISA VOORHEES**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO UPDATE CONTACT
INFORMATION IN PACER
4-21-2026 [[15](#)]

ANTHONY ROTHMAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

There is a discrepancy between the attorney name and email address stated on debtor's petition and the PACER account used to file the petition. Debtor's counsel has failed to correct this discrepancy. Local Bankruptcy Rule 5005.5-1(e) provides that each registered user shall maintain a complete and accurate PACER registration.

2. [26-11018](#)-B-7 **IN RE: DEMAR MARSHALL**
[ICE-1](#)

OPPOSITION RE: TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO
APPEAR AT SEC. 341(A) MEETING OF CREDITORS
4-16-2026 [[17](#)]

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Denied as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue the order.

Chapter 7 trustee Irma Edmonds ("Trustee") seeks dismissal of this case for the debtor's failure to appear and testify at the § 341(a) meeting of creditors held on April 13, 2026. Doc. #10. Demar E Marshall ("Debtor") timely opposed. Doc. #19.

The continued § 341(a) meeting of creditors was held on May 10, 2026, prior to this hearing. On May 14, 2026, the Trustee filed a report which stated the Debtor did appear at the continued creditors' meeting. Docket generally. Accordingly, this motion will be denied as moot.

3. [21-22362](#)-B-7 **IN RE: EVA AGUILERA**
[BLG-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF US DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, CLAIM
NUMBER 1
4-13-2026 [[81](#)]

EVA AGUILERA/MV
CHAD JOHNSON/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled without prejudice.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Eva Katarina Aguilera ("Debtor") objects to Claim 1 filed by US Department of Education c/o Nelnet ("DOE") in the amount of \$14,609.29 dated September 17, 2021, and filed with the court on September 17, 2021. Doc. #81. This motion will be DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007(a)(2)(A)(i), an objection to a claim of the United States or one of its officers or agencies must also be served as if it were a summons and complaint under Rule 7004(b)(4) or (5). Those Rules, in turn, state that service on the United States must be effectuated by mailing the summons and complaint via First Class mail to (i) the civil-process clerk in the United States attorney's office in the district where the action is filed; (ii) the Attorney General of the United States in Washington, D.C.; and (iii) in an action attacking the validity of an order of a United States officer or agency that is not a party, also to that officer or agency. Fed. R. Bankr. 7004(b)(4)-(5). In other words, for any adversary proceeding brought against a government agency, the plaintiff must serve the summons and complaint to the local U.S. Attorney's office, to the attention of the U.S. Attorney General, and to the attention of the named individual overseeing that agency.

Here, Debtor served the U.S. Department of Education c/o Nelnet at 121 S. 13th Street, Lincoln, NE 68508 (which is the address provided on POC #1-1) and "General Counsel," 400 Maryland Ave SW, Washington, DC 20202 (which address appears to be the physical address of the DOE). Doc. #85. Debtor did not serve the local U.S. Attorney's Office nor the U.S. Attorney General nor the named individual overseeing the DOE.

For the above reason(s), this objection will be OVERRULED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

4. [20-23267](#)-B-7 **IN RE: SHON/JILL TREANOR**

CONTINUED MOTION TO SUBMIT DIRECT EVIDENCE OF FRAUD
3-23-2026 [[519](#)]

SHON TREANOR/MV

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On May 13, 2026, Co-Debtor Jill Treanor requested a continuance in this matter due to a need for an emergency medical procedure to take place in May. The court finds that this request is well-taken. The hearing in this matter is hereby CONTINUED to June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m.

5. [20-23267](#)-B-7 **IN RE: SHON/JILL TREANOR**

CONTINUED MOTION TO RECEIVE PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF MY
HOME
2-2-2026 [[514](#)]

JILL TREANOR/MV

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On May 13, 2026, Co-Debtor Jill Treanor requested a continuance in this matter due to a need for an emergency medical procedure to take place in May. The court finds that this request is well-taken. The hearing in this matter is hereby CONTINUED to June 9, 2026, at 1:30 p.m.

6. [26-11273](#)-B-7 **IN RE: JULIO GUZMAN**
[JCG-1](#)

MOTION FOR SANCTIONS FOR VIOLATION OF THE AUTOMATIC STAY
AND/OR MOTION FOR TURNOVER OF PROPERTY UNDER SEC. 542(A),
MOTION TO VOID STATE COURT EVICTION
4-7-2026 [[22](#)]

JULIO GUZMAN/MV

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Denied without prejudice.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Pro se debtor Julio Guzman ("Debtor") moves for sanctions for an alleged violation of the automatic stay and/or turnover of property under 11 U.S.C. § 542(a) and for an order voiding his eviction entered in state court. Doc. #22 *et seq.* The moving papers include three separate Certificates of Service. Docs. #44, #55, and #57.

In the first of the three certificates, Debtor writes in the name of Maria E. Guzman ("Maria") next to Question 5 (Who is Being Served) but does not include Maria's name in the attachment and, indeed, does not include an attachment at all indicating who was served and at what address. Doc. #44. Debtor also checked box 6B-2 indicating that service was obtained through "Other Means" but no Attachment 6B-4 is appended to the certificate. *Id.* For context, the moving papers indicate that Maria is Debtor's estranged wife against whom he seeks sanctions for the alleged stay violation, though in most of the moving papers, he confusingly refers to her as "Petitioner." *Docket generally.*

In the other two certificates, Debtor gives no indication whatsoever of who was served or how service was effected. Docs. #55, #57.

In addition, LBR 9004-2(a)(6), (b)(5), (b)(6), (e)(3), LBR 9014-1(c), and (e)(3) are the Local Rules about Docket Control Numbers ("DCN"). These rules require a DCN to be in the caption page on all documents filed in every matter with the court and each new motion requires a new DCN. The DCN shall consist of not more than three letters, which may be the initials of the attorney for the moving party (e.g., first, middle, and last name) or the first three initials of the law firm for the moving party, and the number that is one number higher than the number of motions previously filed by said attorney or law firm in connection with that specific bankruptcy case. Each separate matter must have a unique DCN linking it to all other related pleadings.

Here, Debtor filed this motion without attaching any DCN at all, which is grounds for denial without prejudice for failure to comply with the Local Rules.

This motion will be DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to provide proper proof of service and for failure to include a Docket Control Number. Debtor may file another motion, but any subsequent motion must be filed with a new DCN and a properly completed Certificate of Service.