

<p>Attorney or Party Name, Address, Telephone & FAX Nos., State Bar No. & Email Address</p> <p>ALAN I. NAHMIAS (#125140) STEPHEN F. BIEGENZAHN (#60584) SCOTT H. NOSKIN (#164923) MIRMAN, BUBMAN & NAHMIAS, LLP 21860 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 360 Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Phone: 818-451-4600 FAX: 818-451-4620 Emails: anahmias@mbnlawyers.com sbiegenzahn@mbnlawyers.com snoskin@mbnlawyers.com</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual <i>appearing without an attorney</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Attorney for:</i> JOSEFINA ROBLES, by and through her Conservator, SERGIO ROBLES</p>		<p>FOR COURT USE ONLY</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – <u>LOS ANGELES</u> DIVISION</p>			
<p>In re:</p> <p>VERITY HEALTH SERVICES OF CALIFORNIA, INC., et al.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Debtor(s)</p>		<p>CASE NO.: 2:18-bk-20151-ER</p> <p>CHAPTER: 11</p> <p>NOTICE OF LODGMENT OF ORDER IN BANKRUPTCY CASE RE: <i>(title of motion¹)</i>: MOTION [OF JOSEFINA ROBLES] FOR RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY UNDER 11 USC 362 (ACTION IN NONBANKRUPTCY FORUM)</p>	

PLEASE TAKE NOTE that the order titled
ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY UNDER 11 U.S.C. §362 (ACTION IN
NONBANKRUPTCY FORUM)

was lodged on (date) November 19, 2018 and is attached. This order relates to the motion which is docket number 696.

¹ Please abbreviate if title cannot fit into text field.

EXHIBIT "A"

<p>Attorney or Party Name, Address, Telephone & FAX Nos., State Bar No. & Email Address ALAN I. NAHMIA (#125140) STEPHEN F. BIEGENZAHN (#60584) SCOTT H. NOSKIN (#164923) MIRMAN, BUBMAN & NAHMIA, LLP 21860 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 360 Woodland Hills, CA 91367 Phone: 818-451-4600 FAX: 818-451-4620 Emails: anahmias@mbnlawyers.com sbiegenzahn@mbnlawyers.com snoskin@mbnlawyers.com</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Movant appearing without an attorney</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Attorney for Movant</i></p>	<p>FOR COURT USE ONLY</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA -LOS ANGELES DIVISION</p>	
<p>In re:</p> <p>VERITY HEALTH SERVICES OF CALIFORNIA, INC.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Debtor(s).</p>	<p>CASE NO.: 2:18-bk-20151-ER CHAPTER: 11</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 362 (Action in Nonbankruptcy Forum)</p>
	<p>DATE: November 19, 2018 TIME: 10:00 AM COURTROOM: 1568 PLACE: 255 East Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012</p>
<p>MOVANT: JOSEFINA ROBLES, by and through her Conservator, SERGIO ROBLES</p>	

1. The Motion was: ☒ Opposed ☐ Unopposed ☐ Settled by stipulation

2. The Motion affects the following Nonbankruptcy Action:

Name of Nonbankruptcy Action: Robles v. St. Francis Medical Center, et al., Case No. BC697012

Docket number: 696

Nonbankruptcy court or agency where the Nonbankruptcy Action is pending:
Los Angeles Superior Court, Central District

3. The Motion is granted under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).
4. As to Movant, its successors, transferees and assigns, the stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) is:
- a. ☒ Terminated as to the Debtor and the Debtor's bankruptcy estate.
 - b. ☐ Modified or conditioned as set forth in Exhibit _____ to the Motion.
 - c. ☐ Annulled retroactively to the bankruptcy petition date. Any postpetition acts taken by Movant to enforce its remedies regarding the nonbankruptcy action do not constitute a violation of the stay.
5. **Limitations on Enforcement of Judgment:** Movant may proceed in the nonbankruptcy forum to final judgment (including any appeals) in accordance with applicable nonbankruptcy law. Movant is permitted to enforce its final judgment only by *(specify all that apply)*:
- a. ☐ Collecting upon any available insurance in accordance with applicable nonbankruptcy law.
 - b. ☐ Proceeding against the Debtor as to property or earnings that are not property of this bankruptcy estate.
6. This order is binding and effective despite any conversion of this bankruptcy case to a case under any other chapter of the Bankruptcy Code.
7. ☐ The co-debtor stay of 11 U.S.C. § 1201(a) or § 1301(a) is terminated, modified or annulled as to the co-debtor, on the same terms and conditions as to the Debtor.
8. ☒ The 14-day stay prescribed by FRBP 4001(a)(3) is waived.
9. ☐ This order is binding and effective in any bankruptcy case commenced by or against the Debtor for a period of 180 days, so that no further automatic stay shall arise in that case as to the nonbankruptcy action.
10. ☐ This order is binding and effective in any future bankruptcy case, no matter who the debtor may be, without further notice.
11. ☒ Other *(specify)*:

The stay is modified in accordance with the Court's Ruling [Docket No. 839], a copy of which is attached.

###

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar**

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

2:18-20151 Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

#7.10 HearingRE: [696] Notice of motion and motion for relief from automatic stay with supporting declarations ACTION IN NON-BANKRUPTCY FORUM RE: Robles v. St. Francis Medical Center, Case No. BC697012 .

Docket 696

Matter Notes:

11/19/2018

The tentative ruling will be the order.
Party to lodge order: Movant

Note to docket:
Effective date was changed after oral argument to January 11, 2019.

POST PDF OF TENTATIVE RULING TO CIAO

Tentative Ruling:

11/16/2018

For the reasons set forth below, the Motion is GRANTED; however, the order granting the Motion shall not take effect until **January 15, 2019**.

Pleadings Filed and Reviewed:

- 1) Notice of Motion and Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay Under 11 U.S.C. §362 [Doc. No. 696] (the "Motion")
- 2) Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Response to Motion for Relief from Stay (Non-Bankruptcy Forum) Filed by Josefina Robles [Doc. No. 777]
- 3) Debtors' Response to Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay Filed on Behalf of Josefina Robles By and Through Her Conservator Sergio Robles [Doc. No. 791]
- 4) Reply of Josefina Robles to: (1) Debtors' Response to Motion for Relief from

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar**

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

CONT... Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

Stay; and (2) Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Response to Motion for Relief from Stay [Doc. No. 823]

I. Facts and Summary of Pleadings

On August 31, 2018 (the "Petition Date"), Verity Health Systems of California ("VHS") and certain of its subsidiaries filed voluntary petitions for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. On August 31, 2018, the Court entered an order granting the Debtors' motion for joint administration of the Debtors' Chapter 11 cases. Doc. No. 17.

Josefina Robles, by and through her conservator, Sergio Robles ("Movant"), seeks stay-relief, pursuant to §362(d)(1), for the purpose of litigating a personal injury action against Debtor St. Francis Medical Center ("St. Francis") in the Los Angeles Superior Court (the "State Court Action"). The State Court Action asserts claims against St. Francis and various other third-party defendants. In the State Court Action, the recovery Movant seeks is not limited to applicable insurance, and Movant is not willing to waive any deficiency claim against St. Francis.

Debtors argue that the Motion should be denied without prejudice, because it is premature and would undermine the Debtors' efforts to successfully proceed under Chapter 11. Debtors assert that allowing the State Court Action to proceed would impair their ability to pursue critical issues, such as the pending sales of two of the Debtors' hospitals. Debtors further oppose the Motion on the ground that Movant is not willing to limit her recovery to applicable insurance. The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee") opposes the Motion for the same reasons.

Movant makes the following arguments in reply to the opposition of the Debtors and the Committee:

- 1) The Debtors' assertion that the granting of the Motion would interfere with the case by distracting the Debtors' professionals with personal injury litigation is disingenuous. As soon as stay-relief is granted, defense of the State Court Action will be assigned to litigation and/or coverage counsel. In e-mail communications with the Movant, Debtors have already identified the lawyer who will ultimately defend against the State Court Action.
- 2) Movant has sustained horrific injuries as a result of the negligence of the doctors and nurses at St. Francis, and should not be required to wait to seek redress.

II. Findings and Conclusions

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar**

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

CONT... Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

As explained by the Ninth Circuit Bankruptcy Appellate Panel in *Kronemyer v. American Contractors Indemnity Co. (In re Kronemyer)* (internal citations omitted): "What constitutes 'cause' for granting relief from the automatic stay is decided on a case-by-case basis. Among factors appropriate to consider in determining whether relief from the automatic stay should be granted to allow state court proceedings to continue are considerations of judicial economy and the expertise of the state court, ... as well as prejudice to the parties and whether exclusively bankruptcy issues are involved." 405 B.R. 915, 921. The factors articulated in *In re Curtis*, 40 B.R. 795, 799-800 (Bankr. D. Utah 1984) and adopted by the bankruptcy court in *Truebro, Inc. v. Plumberex Specialty Prods., Inc. (In re Plumberex Specialty Prods., Inc)*, 311 B.R. 551, 559-60 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2004) are also "appropriate, nonexclusive factors to consider in deciding whether to grant relief from the automatic stay to allow pending litigation to continue in another forum." *Kronemyer*, 405 B.R. at 921. The *Curtis* factors are as follows:

- 1) Whether the relief will result in a partial or complete resolution of the issues;
- 2) The lack of any connection with or interference with the bankruptcy case;
- 3) Whether the foreign proceeding involves the debtor as a fiduciary;
- 4) Whether a specialized tribunal has been established to hear the particular cause of action and whether that tribunal has the expertise to hear such cases;
- 5) Whether the debtor's insurance carrier has assumed full financial responsibility for defending the litigation;
- 6) Whether the action essentially involves third parties, and the debtor functions only as a bailee or conduit for the goods or proceeds in question;
- 7) Whether the litigation in another forum would prejudice the interests of other creditors, the creditors' committee and other interested parties;
- 8) Whether the judgment claim arising from the foreign action is subject to equitable subordination under Section 510(c);
- 9) Whether movant's success in the foreign proceeding would result in a judicial lien avoidable by the debtor under Section 522(f);
- 10) The interests of judicial economy and the expeditious and economical determination of litigation for the parties;
- 11) Whether the foreign proceedings have progressed to the point where the parties are prepared for trial, and
- 12) The impact of the stay on the parties and the "balance of hurt."

United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

CONT... Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

Plumberex, 311 B.R. at 599.

The primary disagreement between Movant and the Debtors is the extent to which allowing the State Court Action to proceed would interfere with the case. Movant asserts that lifting the stay would have very little impact on the ability of the Debtors' professionals to attend to other pressing matters; the Debtors dispute this contention.

The Court finds that although it certainly would be possible for the Debtors to defend against the State Court Action at this time, requiring them to do so would nonetheless interfere with the case by distracting the Debtors' professionals from other pressing matters. The State Court Action alleges that Movant suffered extremely serious injuries as a result of the alleged malpractice of physicians employed by Debtor St. Francis. If these allegations are proven, the damages would be substantial. While it is true that primary responsibility for the Debtors' defense could be assigned to special litigation counsel, the Debtors' general bankruptcy counsel would still be required to monitor the litigation, given the seriousness of the allegations. Contrary to Movant's contention, Debtors' general bankruptcy counsel cannot simply assign the State Court Action to special litigation counsel and then forget about it.

An auction of two of the Debtors' hospitals is set to occur on December 10–11, with a hearing to approve the results of the auction set for December 19, 2018. To successfully prosecute the case for the benefit of creditors, Debtors will be required to devote substantial resources to the auction and the subsequent hearing to approve the results of the auction. Granting stay-relief at this juncture would require the Debtors to divert their attention from issues pertaining to the sale, which would be detrimental to creditors.

In view of the findings set forth above, *Curtis* factors two, five, seven, and eleven weigh against granting stay-relief at this time. However, after the December 19 auction has concluded, application of the *Curtis* factors will yield a different result. Although the relevant *Curtis* factors do not warrant stay-relief now, stay-relief will be warranted as of **January 15, 2019**.

Granting stay-relief now would interfere with the bankruptcy case by distracting the Debtors' professionals from other pressing matters (the second *Curtis* factor). With respect to factor five, the damages sought in the State Court Action are substantial; Movant has not agreed to limit her recovery to applicable insurance; and it is therefore not known whether available insurance proceeds will be sufficient to cover any judgment Movant may obtain. Factor five therefore weighs against granting immediate stay-relief. The litigation's interference with the case has the potential to reduce creditor recoveries; therefore, factor seven weighs against granting immediate

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar**

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

CONT... Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

stay-relief. The State Court Action has not reached the trial stage, so factor eleven also weighs against granting immediate stay-relief.

Factor twelve—the balance of the hurt—is neutral. As discussed, granting immediate stay-relief will harm the Debtors by distracting the Debtors' professionals from other pressing matters. On the other hand, Movant has sustained serious injuries and is prejudiced by the inability to pursue legal redress.

To the extent that they apply, the remaining *Curtis* factors weigh in favor of immediate stay-relief. The State Court Action will completely resolve the issues (factor one); the State Court is the tribunal best suited to hear the Movant's claims (factor three); and lifting the stay would result in a more expeditious determination of the State Court Action (factor ten). Nonetheless, these factors are outweighed by the harm that immediate stay-relief would impose upon the Debtors.

As noted, the *Curtis* factors are not the exclusive guideposts for assessing the appropriateness of stay-relief. Particularly relevant to this case is the reasoning of *Sumitomo Trust & Banking Co. v. Grand Rapids Hotel, L.P.*, 140 B.R. 643, 700 (Bankr. W.D. Mich. 1992), wherein the court held:

[I]f the relief from stay is requested at the early stages of the bankruptcy case, the burden upon the debtor is less stringent. But, if relief from stay is requested later in the case, the debtor's showing is closely scrutinized.

Sumitomi Trust, 140 B.R. at 700. *See also Chrysler LLC v. Plastech Engineered Prods., Inc.*, 382 B.R. 90, 109 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2008) ("The longer the case goes on, the more the analysis may change and the balance of competing interests may compel a different result.").

Movant's attempts to distinguish *Sumitomi Trust* and *Plastech Engineered Prods.* are unavailing. Movant notes that *Sumitomo Trust* addressed stay-relief under §362(d)(2)(B), whereas the present Motion was filed under §362(d)(1). That is a distinction without a difference. Movant notes that the facts of *Plastech Engineered Prods.* were considerably different from the facts of this case. Those differences are immaterial. *Plastech Engineered Prods.* stands for the general proposition that at the outset of the case, a stay-relief motion should be closely scrutinized to further the Bankruptcy Code's objective of providing debtors breathing space to reorganize. That general proposition is valid regardless of the type of business that the debtor conducts.

Having considered the applicable *Curtis* factors and the principles set forth in *Sumitomo Trust* and *Plastech Engineered Prods.*, the Court finds that Movant is entitled to stay-relief, effective as of **January 15, 2019**. This result gives the Debtors

**United States Bankruptcy Court
Central District of California
Los Angeles
Judge Ernest Robles, Presiding
Courtroom 1568 Calendar**

Monday, November 19, 2018

Hearing Room 1568

10:00 AM

CONT... Verity Health System of California, Inc.

Chapter 11

some breathing space to achieve their objectives, while at the same time delaying Movant's ability to proceed with the State Court Action by only two months.

III. Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, the Motion is GRANTED; however, the order granting the Motion shall not take effect until **January 15, 2019**. Movants shall submit an order, incorporating this tentative ruling by reference, within seven days of the hearing. [Note 1]

No appearance is required if submitting on the court's tentative ruling. If you intend to submit on the tentative ruling, please contact Jessica Vogel or Daniel Koontz at 213-894-1522. **If you intend to contest the tentative ruling and appear, please first contact opposing counsel to inform them of your intention to do so.** Should an opposing party file a late opposition or appear at the hearing, the court will determine whether further hearing is required. If you wish to make a telephonic appearance, contact Court Call at 888-882-6878, no later than one hour before the hearing.

Note 1

To ensure that the Debtors have the opportunity to review Movants' proposed order as to form, Movants shall either (a) submit a *Notice of Lodgment* of the proposed order in accordance with the procedure set forth in Local Bankruptcy Rule 9021-1(b)(3)(A) or, in the alternative, shall (b) obtain Debtors' endorsement as to the form of the proposed order pursuant to the procedure set forth in Local Bankruptcy Rule 9021-1(b)(3)(C).

Party Information

Debtor(s):

Verity Health System of California,

Represented By

Samuel R Maizel

John A Moe II

Tania M Moyron

Claude D Montgomery

Sam J Alberts

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is:
21860 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 360, Woodland Hills, CA 91367

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled: **NOTICE OF LODGMENT OF ORDER IN BANKRUPTCY CASE** will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner stated below:

1. **TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF):** Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On (date) November 19, 2018, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below:

Robert N Amkraut ramkraut@foxrothschild.com
Kyra E Andrassy kandrassy@swelawfirm.com,
csheets@swelawfirm.com;gcruz@swelawfirm.com;jchung@swelawfirm.com
Simon Aron saron@wrslawyers.com
Keith Patrick Banner kbanner@greenbergglusker.com, sharper@greenbergglusker.com;calendar@greenbergglusker.com
Cristina E Bautista cristina.bautista@kattenlaw.com, ecf.lax.docket@kattenlaw.com
James Cornell Behrens jbehrens@milbank.com,
gbray@milbank.com;mshinderman@milbank.com;hmaghakian@milbank.com;dodonnell@milbank.com;jbrewster@milbank.com;JWeber@milbank.com
Ron Bender rb@lnbyb.com
Bruce Bennett bbennett@jonesday.com
Peter J Benvenuti pbenvenuti@kellerbenvenuti.com, pjbenven74@yahoo.com
Elizabeth Berke-Dreyfuss edreyfuss@wendel.com
Steven M Berman sberman@slk-law.com
Alicia K Berry Alicia.Berry@doj.ca.gov
Stephen F Biegenzahn efile@sfbllaw.com
Karl E Block kblock@loeb.com, jvazquez@loeb.com;ladoCKET@loeb.com;l Rubin@loeb.com;ptaylor@loeb.com
Dustin P Branch branchd@ballardspahr.com,
carolod@ballardspahr.com;hubenb@ballardspahr.com;Pollack@ballardspahr.com
Michael D Breslauer mbreslauer@swsslaw.com,
wyones@swsslaw.com;mbreslauer@ecf.courtdrive.com;wyones@ecf.courtdrive.com
Damarr M Butler butler.damarr@pbgc.gov, efile@pbgc.gov
Lori A Butler butler.ori@pbgc.gov, efile@pbgc.gov
Howard Camhi hcamhi@ecjlaw.com, tcastelli@ecjlaw.com;amatsuoka@ecjlaw.com
Sara Chenetz schenetz@perkinscoie.com,
dlax@perkinscoie.com;cmallahi@perkinscoie.com;mduncan@perkinscoie.com
Shawn M Christianson cmcintire@buchalter.com, schristianson@buchalter.com
David N Crapo dcrapo@gibbonslaw.com, elrosen@gibbonslaw.com
Mariam Danielyan md@danielyanlawoffice.com, danielyan.mar@gmail.
Brian L Davidoff b davidoff@greenbergglusker.com, calendar@greenbergglusker.com;jking@greenbergglusker.com
Aaron Davis aaron.davis@bryancave.com, kat.flaherty@bryancave.com
Kevin M Eckhardt keckhardt@huntonak.com, keckhardt@hunton.com
Andy J Epstein taxcpaesq@gmail.com
Christine R Etheridge christine.etheridge@ikonfin.com
M Douglas Flahaut flahaut.douglas@arentfox.com
Michael G Fletcher mfletcher@frandzel.com, sking@frandzel.com
Eric J Fromme efromme@tocounsel.com, agarcia@tocounsel.com
Jeffrey K Garfinkle jgarfinkle@buchalter.com, docket@buchalter.com;dcyrankowski@buchalter.com
Lawrence B Gill lgill@nelsonhardiman.com, rrange@nelsonhardiman.com
Paul R. Glassman pglassman@sycr.com
Eric D Goldberg eric.goldberg@dlapiper.com, eric-goldberg-1103@ecf.pacerpro.com
Mary H Haas maryhaas@dwt.com, melissastrobels@dwt.com;laxdocket@dwt.com;yunialubega@dwt.com

{00534005}This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

Michael S Held mheld@jw.com
Robert M Hirsh Robert.Hirsh@arentfox.com
Florice Hoffman fhoffman@socal.rr.com, floricehoffman@gmail.com
Michael Hogue hoguem@gtlaw.com, fernandezc@gtlaw.com;SFOlitDock@gtlaw.com
Marsha A Houston mhouston@reedsmith.com
Brian D Huben hubenb@ballardspahr.com, carolod@ballardspahr.com
John Mark Jennings johnmark.jennings@kutakrock.com
Monique D Jewett-Brewster mjb@hopkinscarley.com, jkeehnen@hopkinscarley.com
Gregory R Jones gjones@mwe.com, rnhunter@mwe.com
Lance N Jurich ljurich@loeb.com, karnote@loeb.com;ladocket@loeb.com
Ivan L Kallick ikallick@manatt.com, ihernandez@manatt.com
Lior Katz katzlawapc@gmail.com
Jane Kim jkim@kellerbenvenuti.com
Monica Y Kim myk@lnbrb.com, myk@ecf.inforuptcy.com
Gary E Klausner gek@lnbyb.com
Marilyn Klinger MKlinger@smtldlaw.com, svargas@smtldlaw.com
Joseph A Kohanski jkohanski@bushgottlieb.com, kprestegard@bushgottlieb.com
Chris D. Kuhner c.kuhner@kornfieldlaw.com
Darryl S Laddin bkrfilings@agg.com
Richard A Lapping richard@lappinglegal.com
Paul J Laurin plaurin@btlaw.com, slmoore@btlaw.com;jboustani@btlaw.com
David E Lemke david.lemke@wallerlaw.com,
chris.cronk@wallerlaw.com;Melissa.jones@wallerlaw.com;cathy.thomas@wallerlaw.com
Elan S Levey elan.levey@usdoj.gov, louisa.lin@usdoj.gov
Samuel R Maizel samuel.maizel@dentons.com,
alicia.aguilar@dentons.com;docket.general.lit.LOS@dentons.com;tania.moyron@dentons.com;kathryn.howard@dentons.com;joan.mack@dentons.com
Alvin Mar alvin.mar@usdoj.gov
Craig G Margulies Craig@MarguliesFaithlaw.com, Victoria@MarguliesFaithlaw.com;Helen@MarguliesFaithlaw.com
Hutchison B Meltzer hutchison.meltzer@doj.ca.gov, Alicia.Berry@doj.ca.gov
John A Moe john.moe@dentons.com,
glenda.spratt@dentons.com,derry.kalve@dentons.com,jennifer.wall@dentons.com,andy.jinnah@dentons.com,bryan.bates@dentons.com
Monserrat Morales mmorales@marguliesfaithlaw.com, Victoria@marguliesfaithlaw.com;Helen@marguliesfaithlaw.com
Kevin H Morse kevin.morse@saul.com, rmarcus@AttorneyMM.com;sean.williams@saul.com
Marianne S Mortimer mmortimer@sycr.com, jrothstein@sycr.com
Tania M Moyron tania.moyron@dentons.com, chris.omeara@dentons.com
Alan I Nahmias anahmias@mbnlawyers.com, jdale@mbnlawyers.com
Jennifer L Nassiri jennifernassiri@quinnemanuel.com
Charles E Nelson , wassweilerw@ballardspahr.com
Mark A Neubauer mneubauer@carltonfields.com,
mlrodriguez@carltonfields.com;smcloughlin@carltonfields.com;schau@carltonfields.com
Bryan L Ngo bngo@fortislaw.com,
BNgo@bluecapitallaw.com;SPicariello@fortislaw.com;JNguyen@fortislaw.com;JNguyen@bluecapitallaw.com
Melissa T Ngo ngo.melissa@pbgc.gov, efile@pbgc.gov
Abigail V O'Brient avobrient@mintz.com, docketing@mintz.com;DEHashimoto@mintz.com;nleali@mintz.com
Paul J Pascuzzi ppascuzzi@ffwplaw.com, lnlasley@ffwplaw.com
Lisa M Peters lisa.peters@kutakrock.com, marybeth.brukner@kutakrock.com
Christopher J Petersen cjpetersen@blankrome.com, gsolis@blankrome.com
Mark D Plevin mplevin@crowell.com, cromos@crowell.com
David M Poitras dpoitras@wedgewood-inc.com, dpoitras@jmbm.com;dmarcus@wedgewood-inc.com;aguisinger@wedgewood-inc.com
Steven G. Polard spolard@ch-law.com, cborrayo@ch-law.com
Thomas J Polis tom@polis-law.com, paralegal@polis-law.com;r59042@notify.bestcase.com
Lori L Purkey bareham@purkeyandassociates.com
William M Rathbone wrathbone@grsm.com, jmydlandevans@grsm.com
Michael B Reynolds mreynolds@swlaw.com, kcollins@swlaw.com

{00534005}This form is mandatory. It has been approved for use by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California.

Emily P Rich erich@unioncounsel.net, bankruptcycourtnotices@unioncounsel.net
Debra Riley driley@allenmatkins.com,
plewis@allenmatkins.com;jalisuag@allenmatkins.com;bcrfilings@allenmatkins.com
Julie H Rome-Banks julie@bindermalter.com
Mary H Rose mrose@buchalter.com, salarcon@buchalter.com
Megan A Rowe mrowe@dsrhealthlaw.com, lwestoby@dsrhealthlaw.com
Nathan A Schultz nschultz@foxrothschild.com
Mark A Serlin ms@swllplaw.com, mor@swllplaw.com
Seth B Shapiro seth.shapiro@usdoj.gov
Rosa A Shirley rshirley@nelsonhardiman.com, rrange@nelsonhardiman.com;lgill@nelsonhardiman.com
Kyrsten Skogstad kskogstad@calnurses.org, rcraven@calnurses.org
Michael St James ecf@stjames-law.com
Andrew Still astill@swlaw.com, kcollins@swlaw.com
Jason D Strabo jstrabo@mwe.com, ahoneycutt@mwe.com
Sabrina L Streusand Streusand@slolp.com
Ralph J Swanson ralph.swanson@berliner.com, sabina.hall@berliner.com
Gary F Torrell gft@vrmlaw.com
United States Trustee (LA) ustpreion16.la.ecf@usdoj.gov
Matthew S Walker matthew.walker@pillsburylaw.com, candy.kleiner@pillsburylaw.com
Jason Wallach jwallach@ghplaw.com, g33404@notify.cincompass.com
Kenneth K Wang kenneth.wang@doj.ca.gov,
Jennifer Kim@doj.ca.gov;susan.lincoln@doj.ca.gov;yesenia.carro@doj.ca.gov
Phillip K Wang phillip.wang@rimonlaw.com, david.kline@rimonlaw.com
Gerrick Warrington gwarrington@frandzel.com, dmoore@frandzel.com
Adam G Wentland awentland@tocounsel.com
Latonia Williams lwilliams@goodwin.com, bankruptcy@goodwin.com
Jeffrey C Wisler jwisler@connollygallagher.com, dperkins@connollygallagher.com
Neal L Wolf nwolf@hansonbridgett.com, calendarclerk@hansonbridgett.com,lchappell@hansonbridgett.com
Hatty K Yip hatty.yip@usdoj.gov
Andrew J Ziaja aziaja@leonardcarder.com,
sgroff@leonardcarder.com;msimons@leonardcarder.com;lbadar@leonardcarder.com
Rose Zimmerman rzimmerman@dalycity.org

☐ Service information continued on attached page

2. SERVED BY UNITED STATES MAIL: On (date) November 19, 2018, I served the following persons and/or entities at the last known addresses in this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that mailing to the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

PRESIDING JUDGE'S COPY:

Honorable Ernest M. Robles
United States Bankruptcy Court
255 E. Temple Street, Suite 1560
Los Angeles, CA 90012

COUNSEL FOR COMMITTEE:

Mark Shinderman
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy
2029 Century Park East, 33rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

☐ Service information continued on attached page


3. SERVED BY PERSONAL DELIVERY, OVERNIGHT MAIL, FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OR EMAIL (state method for each person or entity served): Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 5 and/or controlling LBR, on (date) _____, I served the following persons and/or entities by personal delivery, overnight mail service, or (for those who consented in writing to such service method), by facsimile transmission and/or email as follows. Listing the judge here constitutes a declaration that personal delivery on, or overnight mail to, the judge will be completed no later than 24 hours after the document is filed.

☐ Service information continued on attached page

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

November 19, 2018 JACQUELINE DALE
Date Printed Name

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jacqueline Dale", written over a horizontal line.