



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **LOS ANGELES DIVISION**  
11

12  
13 In re:

14 Ashot Gevork Egiazarian

15  
16  
17  
18 Debtor(s).

Case No.: 2:25-bk-13838-BB

CHAPTER 7

**ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S MOTION TO  
DISQUALIFY SPECIAL COUNSEL LOUCAS  
HAVIARAS/HAVIARAS & PHILIPPOU LLC  
AND MPH LAW SERVICES LIMITED**

(No hearing noticed)

19  
20 The Court, having reviewed and considered the motion of debtor Ashot Gevork  
21 Egiazarian (the "Debtor") to disqualify Loucas Haviaras, Haviaras & Philippou LLC and  
22 MPH Law Services Ltd. (collectively, the "Attorneys") from serving as special counsel to  
23 the chapter 7 trustee in the above case (the "Trustee") filed April 13, 2026, as docket  
24 no. 217 (the "Motion"), hereby makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of  
25 law:

- 26 1. The Trustee moved for authority to retain the Attorneys as his special  
27 counsel in the Republic of Cyprus by application filed and served July 7,  
28 2025, as docket no. 29 (the "Application").

- 1 2. The Application was served electronically on Debtor's then counsel of record  
2 on July 7, 2025.
- 3 3. As set forth in the Application, the deadline for the filing of oppositions to the  
4 Application was 14 days after service of the Application, or July 21, 2025.
- 5 4. Debtor did not file an opposition to the Application by July 21, 2025.
- 6 5. The Court resolved the timely opposition to the Motion filed by the Debtor's  
7 ex-wife and entered an order granting the Application on September 15, 2025  
8 [Docket No. 94].
- 9 6. Debtor neither served notice of the date, time and place of a hearing on the  
10 Motion nor utilized the procedures necessary to have a motion determined  
11 upon notice of and opportunity to request a hearing, as required by the  
12 provisions of Local Bankruptcy Rule 9013-1.
- 13 7. The prior representations that the Debtor claims disqualify the Attorneys from  
14 serving as special counsel for the Trustee all occurred before the deadline for  
15 filing oppositions to the Application, and the Debtor was aware of these prior  
16 representations at the time the Application was served. Thus, there is no  
17 reason for this Court to consider what is, in effect, an objection to the  
18 Application filed almost 8 months after the deadline for the filing of such  
19 objections passed.
- 20 8. Bankruptcy Code section 327(e) expressly permits the trustee to employ for a  
21 specified special purpose "an attorney that has represented the debtor," if  
22 such employment is in the best interest of the estate and the attorney does  
23 not (currently) hold or represent an interest adverse to the debtor or the  
24 estate with respect to the matter for which he is to be employed.
- 25 9. The Trustee disclosed in the Application that the Attorneys had previously  
26 represented the Debtor in connection with matters that the firm would be  
27 handling for the Trustee:

28 To ensure full and proper administration of assets of the Debtor's estate,  
the Trustee must participate in various international proceedings already

1 pending, and may need to initiate other such proceedings. Among the  
2 pending proceedings are:

3 (a) Winding Up Application of NGY Holdings Limited - No. IJ 559/22  
4 with the District Court of Nicosia;

5 (b) Application to restore NGY Holdings Limited - IJ 106/2025 with  
6 the District Court of Nicosia;

7 (c) Appeal No. IJ 69/23 against the interim judgement dated  
8 05/10/2023 issued by the District Court of Nicosia in the context of  
9 Winding Up Application IJ 559/22 (see below) for the appointment of a  
10 provisional liquidator;

11 (d) Norwich pharmaceutical action and application IJ 1173/24 with the  
12 District Court of Nicosia filed on behalf of the Debtor against the service  
13 provider of Mikhail Fridman;

14 (e) Action 1103/19 with the District Court of Nicosia, by Suren  
15 Eyiaryan against the Debtor, Dovroco Limited, MPH Law Services and  
16 Skendleby Investments Limited for unjust enrichment (186,600,000 USD);  
17 and

18 (f) Application in aid of foreign proceedings no. 21Φ/2024 with the  
19 District Court of Nicosia. Application submitted by on behalf of the Debtor  
20 and Natalia Tsagolova, against Skendleby Investments Limited, Dovroco  
21 Limited and Suren Eyiaryan in aid of the US proceedings  
22 20STFL03636, California.

23 Some of these matters involve entities which themselves may be,  
24 at least in part, property of the estate, and that either directly or indirectly  
25 hold assets that may be property of the estate, including NGY Holdings  
26 Limited and Skendleby Investments Limited. Other matters were  
27 previously initiated by or against the Debtor, and may need to be pursued  
28 on behalf of the estate, or at a minimum monitored. The Firm is very  
familiar with all of these matters, as it has previously represented the  
Debtor in connection therewith, and in general has been the legal advisor  
of the Debtor in the Republic of Cyprus since 2008. Therefore, the Trustee  
seeks to engage the Firm to render legal services in the Republic of  
Cyprus, to assist with the pending proceedings, as well as any other  
issues or proceedings that may need to be addressed in the Republic of  
Cyprus, as needed.

\*\*\*

Here, the Firm does not hold any interest adverse to the Debtor or  
the estate with regard to the matters pending in the Republic of Cyprus. It  
did previously represent the Debtor in connection with matters in that  
country. However, the Trustee believes that this actually provides a benefit  
to the estate, for several reasons. First, because the Firm is already  
familiar with the matters in the Republic of Cyprus, it does not need to  
spend the time – or expend estate resources – learning the background  
necessary to commence with representation of the Trustee. Second, the  
Firm obtained information in connection with its prior representation of the

1 Debtor that it believes will be useful in connection with efforts to preserve  
2 and recover the Debtor's assets for the benefit of the estate.

3 10. The Debtor's objection to the employment of the Attorneys appears to be,  
4 at least in part, his concern that, during the course of their representation of him, the  
5 Attorneys "obtained confidential information about the Debtor's assets, strategies, and  
6 vulnerabilities" and could now use that knowledge as special counsel to the Trustee  
7 against him. See Motion, p. 6 of 107, last paragraph. The Debtor is confused as to the  
8 nature of the services being performed by the Attorneys. They were employed to assist  
9 the Trustee in asserting rights as against third parties for the benefit of the estate that  
10 the estate acquired when it stepped into the Debtor's shoes at the time of the  
11 bankruptcy filing. There is nothing inappropriate about the Debtor's former counsel  
12 using the knowledge and experience that it obtained during the course of its  
13 representation of the Debtor to enable the Trustee to maximize the value of assets  
14 available to satisfy claims against the estate.

15 11. The Debtor complains further that, "On or about April 6, 2026, MPH Law  
16 Services Limited – Mr. Haviaras's own nominee company – filed an application in a  
17 Cyrus court proceeding without the Debtor's knowledge and without any written  
18 instruction from the Debtor." Motion, p. 4 of 107, last paragraph. This is as it should be.  
19 It was a condition of the Attorneys' employment, and it was expressly discussed at the  
20 hearing on the Application, that the Attorneys would be taking direction **from the**  
21 **Trustee and not from the Debtor** in connection with the matters for which they were to  
22 be employed. When the Debtor filed chapter 7, subject to the Debtor's ability to retain  
23 exempt assets, "all legal or equitable interests of the debtor in property" that existed as  
24 of that date became property of his bankruptcy estate under the control of the Trustee.  
25 11 U.S.C. § 541(a).

26 12. The Trustee is the party authorized to administer assets of the Debtor's  
27 bankruptcy estate – not the Debtor. Attempts by the Debtor to interfere with the  
28 Trustee's administration of these assets, to exercise control over assets that now

1 belong to his bankruptcy estate or to divert to his own personal use assets that belong  
2 to his bankruptcy estate are not only violations of the automatic stay under Bankruptcy  
3 Code section 362(a)(3), they may also constitute violations of Section 152 of Title 18 of  
4 the United States Code for which fines, imprisonment, or both, may be imposed.

5 13. The Debtor states in paragraph 11 of the declaration that he filed in  
6 support of the Motion that he received an email on April 12, 2026, from counsel for the  
7 Trustee in which counsel says, "this should help us to get a deal finalized with Natalia."  
8 The Debtor then goes on to complain, "I was not aware of any negotiations between the  
9 Trustee's team and Ms. Tsagolova. These negotiations were not disclosed to me or to  
10 this Court." The Debtor is mistaken. Counsel for both the Trustee and Ms. Tsagolova  
11 have disclosed to the Court on several occasions over the course of the last few months  
12 that they have been engaged in negotiations in an effort to resolve consensually the  
13 issues that exist between them. It is unclear why the Debtor feels entitled to be kept  
14 apprised of the existence or status of these negotiations. The Trustee has no duty to  
15 keep the Debtor in this or any other loop. The Trustee is the party with authority to  
16 administer assets of the Debtor's bankruptcy estate, not the Debtor. And, in any event,  
17 no compromise as between Ms. Tsagolova, on the one hand, and the Trustee and the  
18 estate, on the other, will be binding or become effective unless and until it has been  
19 approved by the Court after notice and an opportunity for hearing under Bankruptcy  
20 Rule 9019.

21 14. Nothing contained in the Motion or in the accompany declaration identifies  
22 any respect in which the Attorneys have been acting contrary to the interests of the  
23 estate.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

In light of the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED** on both substantive and procedural grounds.

###

Date: April 17, 2026



Sheri Bluebond  
United States Bankruptcy Judge