1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

In re

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22 | 23 |

24

26

25

27

28



## UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES DIVISION

GARRY MICHAEL KANN.		
	Debtor.	
GARRETT KELLY KRAUSE.		
	Plaintiff(s),	
vs.		
GARRY MICHAEL KANN.		
	Defendant(s).	

Case No. 2:13-bk-23722-RK

Chapter 7

Adversary No. 2:13-ap-01840-RK

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND SETTING FURTHER PROCEEDINGS

DATE: April 8, 2014 TIME: 3:30 p.m.

PLACE: Courtroom 1675

255 East Temple Street Los Angeles, CA 90012

Pending before the court is the motion of defendant Garry Michael Kann to dismiss the second amended complaint of plaintiff Garrett Krause, which is now set for hearing on April 8, 2014. Having reviewed and considered the moving and opposing papers,

//

//

//

3

8

9

6

10 11

13 14

12

16 17

15

18 19

21

20

23

22

24 25

26

27 28 pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(j)(3), the court dispenses with oral argument, takes the motion under submission, vacates the hearing on April 8, 2014 and rules on the motion as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(d) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7012(b), the court declines to consider the matters presented by defendant outside the pleadings in support of his motion to dismiss.
- 2. The court determines that the allegations of plaintiff's second amended complaint set forth a plausible claim for relief on its face under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(2)(A) for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7012(b), see Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)(citation omitted), and thus, denies the motion to dismiss the second amended complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
- The court denies plaintiff's request to deny the motion to dismiss with prejudice since that relief is unnecessary, assuming arguendo that such relief is authorized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to begin with.
- 4. The court notes that plaintiff by counsel filed and served his opposition late in violation of Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1(f), which requires that an opposition to a motion be filed at least 14 days in advance of the date designated for the hearing and that such late filing and service are without prior leave of court or are not otherwise excused. While the late filing and service of papers may be deemed by the court to be consent to the granting of the motion, the court exercises its discretion not to impose such a sanction, which would be a terminating sanction. Instead, the court orders counsel for plaintiff, Daren M. Schlecter, to show cause by filing a written declaration under penalty of perjury why monetary sanctions of \$100 should not be imposed against him personally for failing to file and serve a timely opposition to defendant's motion and that such written responsive declaration must be filed by Mr. Schlecter on or before April 22, 2014. Afterwards, the court will take the order to show cause under

Robert Kwan

United States Bankruptcy Judge

28

25

26

27