	Case 22-11824-abl Doc 803 Entere	d 04/06/23 10:02:44 Page 1 of 7
1	STEVEN T. GUBNER – NV Bar No. 4624	
2	SUSAN K. SEFLIN – CA Bar No. 213865 – Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> JESSICA S. WELLINGTON – CA Bar No. 324477 – Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> BG LAW LLP 300 S. 4 th Street, Suite 1550	
3		
4	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 835-0800	
5	Facsimile: (866) 995-0215 Email: sgubner@bg.law	
6	sseflin@bg.law jwellington@bg.law	
7	Attorneys for Province, LLC, solely in its capacity as the Liquidating Trustee of the Front Sight Creditors Trust	
8	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
9		
10	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
11	In re:	Case No. 22-11824-abl
12	Front Sight Management LLC,	Chapter 11
13		•
14 15	Debtor.	Hearing Date: April 13, 2023
16		Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.
17	A LOUID A TIME TO DEPLY TO MICHAEL DESCRIPTION OF S	
18	LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE'S REPLY TO MICHAEL DESLAURIERS' RESPONSES TO THE NINTH OMNIBUS OBJECTION (1) REDUCING AND ALLOWING	
19	CERTAIN MEMBER CLAIMS AND (2) DISALLOWING AND <u>EXPUNGING CERTAIN OTHER MEMBER CLAIMS</u>	
20	Province, LLC, solely in its capacity as the duly authorized and acting Liquidating Trustee	
21	(the "Liquidating Trustee") of the Front Sight Creditors Trust (the "Trust"), hereby submits its reply	
22	(the "Reply") to the responses [ECF Nos. 784, 789 and 796] (collectively, the "Responses") filed by	
23	Michel Deslauriers ("Claimant") to the Liquidating Trustee's Ninth Omnibus Objection (1) Reducing	
24	and Allowing Certain Member Claims and (2) Disallowing and expunging Certain Other Member	
25	Claims [ECF No. 695] (the "Objection"). In support of the Reply, the Liquidating Trustee	
26	respectfully represents as follows:	
27	Pursuant to Front Sight Management LLC's (t	he "Debtor") confirmed chapter 11 plan of
28	reorganization and order thereon, the Liquidating Trustee has standing to pursue all claim objections of general unsecured creditors in this case.	

I. INTRODUCTION

Claimant filed Proof of Claim 82-1 ("Claim 82") in the amount of a \$4,410.00 general unsecured claim. As stated in the Objection, the Debtor's books and records reflect that Claimant paid \$2,891.00 for his membership and membership upgrades. However, Claimant was banned by the Debtor, his membership was terminated and he was refunded the full amount he paid to the Debtor pre-petition (even though there was no requirement that the Debtor refund a banned member). Attached to the concurrently filed declaration of Susan K. Seflin as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the check stub issued on April 14, 2022 evidencing the Debtor's full refund to Claimant for his membership payments.

Claimant has failed to provide this Court with any evidence that he paid more than \$2,891.00 for his memberships and membership upgrade/rewards, or that he had any agreement with the Debtor that entitled him to a refund if he was banned. In fact, Claim 82 actually supports the Objection and the amount reflected in the Debtor's books and records. Specifically, Claim 82 includes an email allegedly from Dr. Piazza, the Debtor's principal pre-petition, stating that Claimant had paid \$2,891.00 towards his membership. Although Claimant attached additional emails to the Responses, none of the emails are supported by an affidavit or declaration authenticating the documents as required by Local Rule 9014(c) and, therefore, are not admissible as evidence. Similarly, Claimant has not submitted a declaration under penalty of perjury testifying that he did not receive the refund check issued by the Debtor.

Simply put, the Liquidating Trustee has presented facts tending to defeat Claim 82 by probative force at least equal to the allegations in Claim 82. *See Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the burden shifts back to Claimant to prove the validity of Claim 82 by a preponderance of evidence. *Id.* Claimant has failed to meet this burden.

II. CLAIMANT IS NOT ENTITLED TO ANY CLAIM AGAINST THE ESTATE AS HE WAS PERMANENTLY BANNED BY THE DEBTOR, HIS MEMBERSHIP WAS TERMINATED PRE-PETITION AND HE WAS REFUNDED

Claimant only paid \$2,891.00 for all memberships and membership upgrades/rewards, which amount was refunded to Claimant pre-petition. Claimant has not been damaged in the amount of

\$4,410.00 (which is the amount asserted in Claim 82). In fact, Claimant has not been damaged at all as he received a full refund pre-petition. Assuming, *arguendo*, Claimant did not receive a full refund, Claimant's own actions caused him to be banned permanently and for his membership to be terminated, and there was no contract or other provision pre-petition that required the Debtor to refund members that were banned and whose memberships were terminated.

However, to the extent the Court determines that Claimant is allowed to any claim against the estate, such claim should be limited to the amount paid by Claimant to the Debtor. Bankruptcy courts routinely find that rejection damages from termination of memberships are based on what the respective claimants paid for their memberships. *See In re Nittany Enterprises, Inc.*, 502 B.R. 447, 456-7 (Bankr. W.D. Va. 2012) (allowing a general unsecured claim only as to a pro-rated amount of the membership purchase price); *In re Palmas del Mar Country Club, Inc.*, 443 B.R. 569 (Bankr. D. P.R. 2010) (disallowing priority claims filed by the country club's members for refund of the membership deposit and allowing the claims as general unsecured claims in the amount of the membership deposit); *In re Yellowstone Mountain Club, LLC*, 469 Fed. Appx. 584 (9th Cir. 2012) (holding that claimant's allegations for damages above and beyond his \$250,000 membership deposit were speculative and not provided for under the membership agreement).

For example, *In re Four Star Financial Services*, *LLC* ("Four Star"), 469 B.R. 30 (C.D. Cal. 2012), the claimant paid an initiation fee to purchase a transferable lifetime membership which entitled the member to use various campgrounds for life. On average, the initiation fee was \$4,500 plus annual dues. *Id.* at 31. The claimant argued he was entitled to a priority claim and that "he contracted for a transferable, lifetime membership, and the services that go with it, and at the time of the bankruptcy he had not yet received all these services." *Id.* at 33. In *Four Star*, the district court noted that "the initiation fee paid here by Appellee entitled him to immediate use of the campground network. With the payment of the initiation fee, Appellee was immediately a member. He was not waiting for services to be rendered by TAI. Somewhat illogically, Appellee points to his lifetime membership and transferability as evidence of undelivered services. Assuming this were true, Appellee's bargained-for services would not be delivered for several generations. While not discounting the premium placed on the longevity and transferability of the memberships, the Court

Case 22-11824-abl Doc 803 Entered 04/06/23 10:02:44 Page 4 of 7

finds these benefits inherent in the membership Appellee received immediately, rather than something incapable of delivery for several generations ... Appellee paid an initiation fee and was immediately entitled to avail himself of the entire campground network. Appellee contracted with his eyes wide open, and while he might not have foreseen the financial trouble of TAI, this was a risk he took in signing up to be a member of the campground network." *Id.* at 35. The district court ultimately found that "the initiation fee entitled Appellee to the immediate use of the facilities. The initiation fee was not paid for the future guarantee of services and monthly dues were required in order to continue utilizing the campground network ... In neither case was the initiation fee offered as security for the future provision of services; it was merely the price of admission. Thus, the initiation fee was not a deposit and the bankruptcy court erred by giving Appellee's Claim priority..." *Id.* While the claimant was not seeking a claim more than what he had paid, the analysis done by the district court is helpful in this matter as Claimant received his membership when purchased and he took the risk when signing up with the Debtor that it may have unforeseen financial trouble.

The ultimate burden of persuasion with respect to an objection to claim is always on the claimant. *Holm*, 931 F.2d at 623. Claimant has failed to meet this burden. Claimant has failed to produce any admissible evidence supporting the amount of Claim 82 or controverting the Liquidating Trustee's evidence in the Objection. Accordingly, Claim 82 should be disallowed in its entirety. To the extent the Court allows Claim 82 in any amount, Claim 82 is clearly excessive. The request to reduce Claim 82 to the amount paid by Claimant is supported by case law, and the Objection should be sustained.

[Remainder of Page Intentionally Blank]

Case 22-11824-abl Doc 803 Entered 04/06/23 10:02:44 Page 5 of 7 **CONCLUSION** III. For the foregoing reasons, the Liquidating Trustee respectfully requests that the Court sustain the Objection in its entirety, including as it relates to Claim 82. DATED: April 6, 2023 BG Law LLP By: /s/ Susan K. Seflin Susan K. Seflin Jessica S. Wellington Attorneys for Province, LLC, solely in its capacity as the Liquidating Trustee of the Front Sight Creditors

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 I declare that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am 2 employed in the County of Los Angeles and my business address is 21650 Oxnard Street, Suite 500, Woodland Hills, California 91367. 3 On April 6, 2023, I served the following document: 4 LIQUIDATING TRUSTEE'S REPLY TO MICHAEL DESLAURIERS' RESPONSES TO THE NINTH OMNIBUS OBJECTION (1) REDUCING AND ALLOWING 5 CERTAIN MEMBER CLAIMS AND (2) DISALLOWING AND EXPUNGING 6 **CERTAIN OTHER MEMBER CLAIMS** 7 Those designated "[NEF]" on the Court docket were served with the Notice by the Court via Electronic Mail, as follows: 8 (1) The Court's CM/ECF List: 9 JASON BLUMBERG Jason.blumberg@usdoj.gov CANDACE C CARLYON ccarlyon@carlyoncica.com, 10 CRobertson@carlyoncica.com;nrodriguez@carlyoncica.com;9232006420@filings.docketbird.com;Dcica@carlyo ncica.com 11 CHAPTER 11 - LV USTPRegion 17.lv.ecf@usdoj.gov **DAWN M. CICA** dcica@carlyoncica.com, 12 nrodriguez@carlyoncica.com;crobertson@carlyoncica.com;dmcica@gmail.com;dcica@carlyoncica.com;tosteen @carlyoncica.com;3342887420@filings.docketbird.com 13 WILLIAM C DEVINE william@devine.legal, courtney@devine.legal;devinewr72773@notify.bestcase.com THOMAS H. FELL tfell@fennemorelaw.com, 14 clandis@fennemorelaw.com;CourtFilings@fennemorelaw.com PHILIP S. GERSON Philip@gersonnvlaw.com 15 STEVEN T GUBNER sgubner@bg.law, ecf@bg.law RAMIR M. HERNANDEZ rhernandez@wrightlegal.net, jcraig@wrightlegal.net;nvbkfiling@wrightlegal.net 16 MICHAEL R. HOGUE hoguem@gtlaw.com, LVLitDock@GTLAW.com;flintza@gtlaw.com;andersonel@gtlaw.com;navarrom@gtlaw.com 17 JASON B KOMORSKY jkomorsky@bg.law BART K. LARSEN BLARSEN@SHEA.LAW, 3542839420@filings.docketbird.com 18 NICOLE E. LOVELOCK nlovelock@joneslovelock.com, ljanuskevicius@joneslovelock.com EDWARD M. MCDONALD edward.m.mcdonald@usdoj.gov 19 **DAVID MINCIN** dmincin@mincinlaw.com, cburke@mincinlaw.com TRACY M. O'STEEN tosteen@carlyoncica.com, 20 crobertson@carlyoncica.com;nrodriguez@carlyoncica.com;ccarlyon@carlyoncica.com TERESA M. PILATOWICZ tpilatowicz@gtg.legal, bknotices@gtg.legal 21 **SAMUEL A. SCHWARTZ** saschwartz@nvfirm.com, ecf@nvfirm.com;schwartzsr45599@notify.bestcase.com;eanderson@nvfirm.com;samid@nvfirm.com 22 SUSAN K. SEFLIN sseflin@bg.law brian@brianshapirolaw.com, BRIAN D. SHAPIRO 23 kshapiro@brianshapirolaw.com;6855036420@filings.docketbird.com ecf@cases-cr.stretto-services.com, aw01@ecfcbis.com,pacerpleadings@stretto.com 24 U.S. TRUSTEE - LV - 11 USTPRegion 17.1v.ecf@usdoj.gov JESSICA S. WELLINGTON jwellington@bg.law, ecf@bg.law 25 26 27