Cas	e 2:16-ap-01307-RK Doc 5 Filed 08/23/10 Main Document Pa	6 Entered 08/23/16 11:59:11 Desc age 1 of 2
1 2 3 4 5		FILED & ENTERED AUG 23 2016
6		Central District of California BY tatum DEPUTY CLERK
7	NOT FOR PUBLICATION	
8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	LOS ANGELES DIVISION	
11	In re:	Case No. 2:16-bk-19089-RK
12	LYDIA CHO,	Chapter 7
13	Debtor.	Adv. No. 2:16-ap-01307-RK
14 15	LYDIA CHO, Plaintiff,	ORDER REMANDING THIS REMOVED UNLAWFUL DETAINER ACTION TO STATE COURT
 16 17 18 19 20 	v. MARMAY INC., Defendant.	
21	By notice of removal filed on July 8, 2016, Debtor Lydia Cho ("Debtor") removed	
22	an unlawful detainer action entitled Marmay, Inc. v. Byung Kim (Case No. 30-2016-	
23	00833678-CL-UD-NJC) pending before the Superior Court of California, County of	
24	Orange ("Unlawful Detainer Action") to this court, which action was entered on this court's	
25	docket as an adversary proceeding. On August 16, 2016 at 1:30 p.m., a status	
26	conference regarding the removal of the Unlawful Detainer Action to this court was	
27	conducted by the undersigned United States Bankruptcy Judge. No appearances were	
28	made by or on behalf of Debtor and Marmay	v, Inc. at the status conference on August 16,

Case 2:16-ap-01307-RK Doc 5 Filed 08/23/16 Entered 08/23/16 11:59:11 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 2

2016. Although the case docket for this adversary proceeding does not reflect any proof
 of service of the notice of removal on the responding party, Marmay, Inc., the plaintiff in
 the unlawful detainer action, the case docket reflects that Debtor was served with the
 court's order for status conference filed on July 11, 2016, requiring all parties to appear
 for the status conference set for August 16, 2016. Despite the order for status
 conference, Debtor failed to appear at the status conference.

By order entered on July 26, 2016, the court dismissed the underlying bankruptcy 7 case of Debtor. Having determined that the underlying bankruptcy case of Debtor has 8 9 been dismissed, the court determines that there is no bankruptcy purpose for this court to hear the removed unlawful detainer action which raises only noncore state law claims 10 and that there is no longer any bankruptcy case that is being administered. See, 11 11 U.S.C. § 349(b); Nash v. Kester (In re Nash), 765 F.2d 1410, 1414 (9th Cir. 1985)(noting 12 13 the legislative history for 11 U.S.C. § 349(b) that "[t]he basic purpose of the subsection is to undo the bankruptcy case, as soon as practicable, and to restore all property rights to 14 the position in which they were found at the commencement of the case."), *citing*, S. Rep. 15 No. 989, 95th Cong., 2nd Sess. 49, *reprinted in*, 1978 U.S. Code Cong. & Adm. News 16 5787, 5835. Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1452(b), the court on its own motion 17 remands this removed Unlawful Detainer Action, now an adversary proceeding before 18 this court, to the Superior Court of California, County of Orange. In re Bisno, 433 B.R. 19 753, 758 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2010). 20

27

28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 23, 2016

###

De

Robert Kwan United States Bankruptcy Judge