1 JUDGE HERB ROSS (Recalled) 2 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA 605 West 4th Avenue, Room 138, Anchorage, AK 99501-2253 — (Website: www.akb.uscourts.gov) 3 Clerk's Office: 907-271-2655 (1-800-859-8059 In-State) — Judge's Fax: 907-271-2692 4 Filed On 5 4/22/11 6 7 Case No. A10-00478-HAR In Chapter 7 8 In re SAMANTHA DELAY-WILSON, 9 Debtor(s) 10 JEAN HEBERT, Adv Proc No A11-90005-HAR 11 Plaintiff(s) MEMORANDUM REGARDING LODGED DEFAULT JUDGMENT FORM v. 12 SAMANTHA DELAY-WILSON, 13 Defendant(s) 14 I have not signed the lodged judgment (copy attached). For one thing, it does not include 15 what the plaintiff seeks - a nondischargeability judgment. I would hesitate, based on the prove-16 up declarations supplied, to sign a default judgment even if it did contain a 11 USC § 523(a) 17 holding. The prove-up declarations say only that the allegations in the complaint are true. 18 For one thing, the declarations do not establish justifiable reliance required under 19 § 523(a)(2)(A). Also, the underpinning of the complaint is an oral agreement between the parties 20 if Hebert gave Delay-Wilson money – eventually \$3.7 million – she would guarantee a 14.2% 21 return on the money. Assuming that is true, it does not establish there was a present intent not to 22 23 24 25 26 <sup>1</sup>Docket Nos. 4 and 6, several declarations by Mr. Hebert and one by Mr. Shier. 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

DEFAULT JUDGMENT FORM

perform, which is an element of a § 523(a)(2)(A) claim. Nor does it explain the history of the relationship, which began in August 2001, almost 11 years ago. There was subsequently a lot of shucking and jiving by Delay-Wilson alleged by Hebert.<sup>3</sup> If this proves Hebert's fraud or misrepresentation claim, provide the court with authority and connect the factual dots to  $\S 523(a)(2)(A)$ . Likewise, provide the court with authority that Delay-Wilson was a fiduciary under Alaska law presumably to comply with § 523(a)(4). Hebert has not alleged embezzlement. Finally, the § 523(a)(6) conversion claim is not sufficiently established. She could have lost the money in risky investments, without having actually converted it. At least provide the court some legal authority that the inference in the complaint supports a § 523(a)(6) judgment. In short, the plaintiff must file an adequate prove-up declaration, with supporting legal analysis, to comply with FRBP 7055, incorporating FRCP 55(b)(2). I suggest the prove-up memo provide an outline, based on the well settled law in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit with respect to §§ 523(a)(2)(A), (4), and (6), and explain how the facts and law support Hebert's claims for each element. DATED: April 22, 2011 /s/ Herb Ross **HERB ROSS** U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Serve:  $\overline{\text{Matthew J. Shier, Esq., for }\pi$ Samantha Delay-Wilson,  $pro se \Delta$ Cheryl Rapp, Adv. Proc. Mgr. Courtesy copy to Willaim Artus, Esq., for the trustee Courtesy copy to David Bundy, Esq., for petitioning creditor US Trustee, Anchorage D7476 04/22/11 <sup>2</sup>In re Ortenzo Hayes, 315 BR 579, 587 (Bankr CD Cal 2004).  $^{3}$ *See*, ¶ 8 of the complaint. MEMORANDUM REGARDING LODGED