

1 D. EDWARD HAYS, #162507
ehays@marshackhays.com
2 ALINA MAMLYUK, #284154
amamlyuk@marshackhays.com
3 MARSHACK HAYS WOOD LLP
870 Roosevelt
4 Irvine, California 92620
Telephone: (949) 333-7777
5 Facsimile: (949) 333-7778
6 Attorneys for Judgment Creditors,
TOPDEVZ, LLC and TYLER DAVIS
7

8 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN DIEGO

10 In re
11 ASHKAN MIRFAKHR RAJAEI and NASSIM
12 RAJAEI,
13 Debtors.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Case No. 24-00617-CL11

Chapter 11

JUDGMENT CREDITORS' MOTION TO
APPOINT A CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE OR,
ALTERNATIVELY, CONVERT CASE TO
ONE UNDER CHAPTER 7;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS OF
AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF
D. EDWARD HAYS IN SUPPORT

Date: May 6, 2024
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Ctm: 5
Room: 318
Place: 325 West F. Street,
San Diego, CA 92101

22 ///

23 ///

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Summary of Argument	2
2.	Bankruptcy Filing	3
3.	Legal Actions	3
A.	The Arbitration.....	5
1.	The dissolution of TopDevz.....	6
2.	Funds fraudulently transferred abroad by Ashkan in violation of an order by the Arbitrator.....	6
3.	Ashkan’s self-dealing and the millions of dollars he pilfered.	7
4.	Ashkan’s breaches of fiduciary duty and fraud	8
B.	The Debtors’ Fraudulent Transfers	9
C.	Ashkan’s Collateral Attacks on the Arbitration Award.....	10
1.	Efforts to stay the Arbitration	10
2.	Efforts to circumvent the Judgment.....	11
D.	The Undisclosed Assets	12
4.	Cause Exists to Appoint a Chapter 11 Trustee	13
A.	A Motion to Appoint a Chapter 11 Trustee is Governed by a Preponderance of the Evidence Standard	13
B.	Cause Exists to Appoint a Chapter 11 Trustee	14
5.	Alternatively, Cause Exists to Convert the Case to Chapter 7	17
6.	Conclusion	24
	Declaration of D. Edward Hays	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

In re Syndor,

431 B.R. 584, 2010 WL 2428655, *5 (Bankr. D. Md. 2010)..... 18

Chu v. Syntron Bioresearch, Inc. (In re Chu),

253 B.R. 92..... 19

Farley v. Coffee Cupboard, Inc. (In re Coffee Cupboard, Inc.),

119 B.R. 14, 17-18 (E.D.N.Y. 1990)..... 19

Green v. Howard Family Trust (In re Green),

2016 Bankr. LEXIS 3963, at *23 (9th Cir. BAP 2016) 21

Grego v. U.S. Tr. (In re Grego),

2015 Bankr. LEXIS 1792, at *5 (9th Cir. BAP 2015) 21

Grogan v. Garner,

498 U.S. 279 (1991) 13

Idaho Dep't of Lands v. Arnold (In re Arnold),

806 F.2d 937, 939 (9th Cir. 1986) 21

In re Can-Alta Properties, Ltd.,

87 B.R. at 91 22

In re Cardinal Industries, Inc.,

109 B.R. 755, 766 (Bankr. S.D. Ohio 1990)..... 15

In re Celeritas Technologies, LLC,

446 B.R. 514, 518 (Bankr. D.Kans. 2011). 15

In re Chinichian,

784 F.2d 1440, 1445-46 (9th Cir. 1986)..... 21

In re Green,

2016 Bankr. LEXIS 3963, at *24 23

1	<i>In re Keeley & Grabanski Land P’ship,</i>	
2	455 B.R. 153 (8th Cir. BAP 2011)	13
3	<i>In re Koerner,</i>	
4	800 F.2d 1358 (5th Cir. 1986)	18
5	<i>In re Marvel Entertainment Group, Inc.,</i>	
6	140 F.3d 463, 472 (3d Cir. 1998)	15
7	<i>In re Oklahoma Refining Co.,</i>	
8	838 F.2d 1133, 1136 (10th Cir. 1988)	15
9	<i>In re Savino Oil & Heating Co., Inc.,</i>	
10	99 B.R. 518, 525 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 1989).	15
11	<i>In re SGL Carbon Corp.,</i>	
12	200 F.3d 154 (3d Cir. 1999)	18
13	<i>In re Sharon Steel Corp.,</i>	
14	871 F.2d 1217 (3d. Cir. 1989)	13
15	<i>In Re Southern California SoundSystems, Inc.,</i>	
16	69 B.R. 893 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1987).....	22
17	<i>In re Sullivan,</i>	
18	522 B.R. 604, 614 (9th Cir. BAP 2014)	18
19	<i>In re Walter,</i>	
20	108 B.R. 244, 250 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1989)	22
21	<i>Kingsway Capital Partners, LLC v. Sosa,</i>	
22	549 B.R. 897, 904 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	20
23	<i>Laguna Assocs. Ltd. Partnership v. Aetna Casualty & Sur. Co. (In re Laguna Assocs. Ltd.</i>	
24	<i>Partnership),</i>	
25	30 F.3d 734, 738 (6th Cir. 1994)	19
26	<i>Little Creek Dev. Co. v. Commonwealth Mortgage Corp. (In re Little Creek Dev. Co.),</i>	
27	779 F.2d 1068, 1072-73 (5th Cir. 1986) [**8]	19, 22

1	<i>Margitan v. Hanna (In re McWilliams-Hanna),</i>	
2	2018 Bankr. LEXIS 3608 at *22 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2018)	20
3	<i>Marsch v. Marsch (In re Marsch),</i>	
4	36 F.3d 825, 828 (9th Cir. 1994) (per curiam)	19, 21
5	<i>Marshall v. Marshall (In re Marshall),</i>	
6	721 F.3d 1032, 1047 (9th Cir. 2013)	21
7	<i>Phoenix Piccadilly, Ltd. v. Life Ins. Co. (In re Phoenix Piccadilly Ltd.),</i>	
8	849 F.2d 1393, 1394-95 (11th Cir. 1988).....	19
9	<i>Pioneer Liquidating Corp. v. United States Trustee (In re Consol. Pioneer Mortgage Entities),</i>	
10	248 B.R. 368, 375 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2000)	19
11	<i>Savino,</i>	
12	99 B.R. at 525-26.....	15
13	<i>St. Paul Self Storage Ltd. Partnership v. Port Auth. (In re St. Paul Self Storage Ltd. Partnership),</i>	
14	185 B.R. 580, 583 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1995)	22
15	<i>Sullivan v. Harnisch (In re Sullivan),</i>	
16	522 B.R. 604, 614 (9th Cir. BAP 2014)	21
17	<i>Udall v. FDIC (In re Nursery Land Dev., Inc.),</i>	
18	91 F.3d 1414, 1416 (10th Cir. 1995)	19
19	Statutes	
20	11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)	17
21	11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)(2)	18
22	11 U.S.C. § 1112(b)(4)	18
23	11 U.S.C. §1104.....	14, 15
24	11 U.S.C. §1104(a)(1).....	14, 15, 17
25	11 U.S.C. §1104(a)(2).....	15
26	11 U.S.C. 1112(b)	18
27	11 U.S.C. §1112(b)(4)(E)	20

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

Other Authorities

7 *Collier on Bankruptcy* ¶ 1112.01 (16th ed. 2024). 18

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTOPHER B. LATHAM, UNITED STATES
BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE, THE DEBTORS, THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES
TRUSTEE, AND ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

Judgment Creditors, TOPDEVZ, LLC (“TopDevz” / “LLC”) and Tyler Davis (“Davis,” and together with TopDevz, “Judgment Creditors”) move the Court for an order appointing a Chapter 11 Trustee in the case filed by Ashkan Mirfakhr Rajaee (“Ashkan”) and Nassim Rajaee (“Nassim,” and together with Ashkan, “Debtors”) or, alternatively, converting Debtors’ Chapter 11 case to a proceeding under Chapter 7 (“Motion”). In support of this Motion, Judgment Creditors represent as follows:

1. Summary of Argument

Bankruptcy proceedings are designed to assist the honest but unfortunate debtors. In a Chapter 11 case, debtors-in-possession have fiduciary obligations to act in the best interests of the bankruptcy estate (“Estate”), presupposing that the individuals executing that office are honest. Unfortunately, the Debtors are neither honest nor capable of acting as fiduciaries for the Estate.

Where debtors have engaged in gross mismanagement or fraud, bankruptcy courts have authority to appoint a trustee to act as the representative of the bankruptcy estate. In this case, after a multi-day arbitration that resulted in Movants obtaining a \$10 million judgment, Debtor Ashkan Rajaee was adjudicated to have committed substantial fraud and repeated breaches of fiduciary duty over a five-year period.

In entering the Arbitration Award (as defined below), the Arbitrator (as defined below) made extensive findings regarding Debtor Ashkan Rajaee’s complete lack of honesty, including his complete “indifference to the oath he took, promising to answer truthfully . . . [and instead over the course of many days] testified as if the truth was something that he could change from day to day depending on his then current need, objective, whim, or state of mind.”¹ Movants respectfully request that the Court review the arbitrator’s extensive findings regarding Debtor’s fraud, breaches

¹ See Hays Decl., Ex. 3, pg. 135.

of fiduciary duties, and perjury. In addition, Debtor has been incessantly suing creditors in this case, making reorganization implausible due to the exposure created by the frivolous lawsuits.

Further, in this case, the Debtors' dishonesty persists as evidenced by their failure to disclose at least one significant asset from their schedules, their interest in Monster Mobile. But, the lawsuit filed by Debtor post-petition references his ownership of this company and its claimed significant value. The evidence is clear that Debtors cannot and will not be good stewards of Estate assets. The Court should either appoint a Chapter 11 trustee or convert this case to a Chapter 7 proceeding.

2. Bankruptcy Filing

On February 26, 2024, Debtors filed a voluntary petition under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code ("Chapter 11 BK Case"), schedules of the assets and liabilities, and statement of their financial affairs (collectively, "Schedules"). A true and correct copy of this Court's webPACER Docket for Case No. 24-00617-CL11 as of April 8, 2024, is attached to the Declaration of D. Edward Hays ("Hays Declaration") as Exhibit "1." A true and correct copy of the Schedules is attached to the Hays Declaration as Exhibit "2."

Although the Debtors are acting as debtors-in-possession, as described below, the Debtors pre-petition conduct proves their inability to serve as fiduciaries to the Estate and its creditors. Further, positions taken by the Debtors in connection with the filing of the Schedules, as well as actions taken post-petition, including post-petition lawsuits filed by Ashkan, confirm the Debtors' unwillingness to be honest stewards for the Estate and their inability to perform their fiduciary duties.

The Debtors cannot be allowed to continue as debtors-in-possession.

3. Legal Actions

The Debtors are not and cannot be trusted to be fiduciaries of this Estate. First, while acting as TopDevz's chief executive officer, and with only a small ownership interest, Ashkan treated the company as his personal piggybank, diverting assets to other companies owned by him, and sending funds out of the country to keep them from the TopDevz and its majority shareholder—Davis. See Hays Decl., Ex. 3, pgs. 92-190. Indeed, Ashkan transferred over \$1 million of company funds out of

1 the country to bank accounts controlled by him in violation of an order issued by the Arbitrator
2 within hours of Ashkan being notified of the same. *Id.*, pgs. 124-126.

3 Moreover, after Ashkan lost the Arbitration, the Debtors fraudulently transferred two
4 properties to others, allowing family members to strip the equity from those properties in the
5 process. A true and correct copy of the fraudulent transfer defaults obtained by the Judgment
6 Creditors against the Trusts and LLC are attached to the Hays Declaration as Exhibit “4.” On the eve
7 of filing this case, Debtors caused title to be re-transferred to them but the equity has been stripped
8 and there is no accounting for the disposition of the funds borrowed against those properties.
9 *Compare* Hays Decl., Ex. 2, pgs. 52-87; *with* Ex. 4, pgs. 192-195. In all likelihood, Debtors caused
10 title to their home to be restored in what will be an unsuccessful attempt to claim a nearly \$700,000
11 homestead.²

12 Finally, the Debtors omit significant assets from their Schedules, including Ashkan’s
13 ownership interest in a company (Mobile Monsters, Inc.) that received the largest share of the funds
14 illegally stolen by Ashkan from TopDevz. *Id.*, Ex 3, pgs. 108-132. In a post-petition action filed by
15 Ashkan, he alleges this company to be very valuable. A true and correct copy of the post-petition
16 actions commenced by Ashkan are attached to the Hays Declaration as Exhibits “5,” and “6.” Other
17 false statements in the Schedules include the failure to disclose a \$1 million deed of trust recorded
18 against Debtors’ \$8.5 million home in La Jolla in favor of Debtors’ attorneys Brown Neri as well a
19 \$1 million deed of trust in favor of Ashkan’s father, Majid Rajaei. A true and correct copy of the
20 deeds of trust are attached to the Hays Declaration as Exhibit “8”. Instead, Schedule F only reflects a
21 \$20,000 unsecured claim owed to the firm. *Id.*, pgs. 63-71.

22
23
24
25 ² Debtors’ fraudulent transfers were the subject of a state court action to avoid them. Title to that
26 action is now vested in the estate. Debtors cannot possibly prosecute that action for the benefit of
27 creditors. Specifically, judgment avoiding the transfers should be entered so that the estate can
28 recover the fraudulent transfers and disallow any claimed exemption under Section 522(g). The
Debtor are subsequent transferees of the original fraudulent transfer who did not take in good faith,
for value, and without knowledge of the voidability of the initial transfer. In other words, Debtors’
argument that restoring title results in no-harm, no-foul fails. But, they will never prosecute the
estate’s claims for the benefit of creditors. A trustee must be appointed.

1 The Debtors' repeated acts of fraud and breach of fiduciary duty and conflicts of interest
2 prevent them from being trusted to act as fiduciary for creditors in this bankruptcy. They simply
3 cannot be trusted.

4 **A. The Arbitration**

5 In February 2021, an arbitration was commenced ("Arbitration") which lasted more than two
6 years. The parties to the Arbitration were Ashkan and Judgment Creditors. The arbitrator was
7 Rebecca Callahan ("Arbitrator"),³ who issued a 93-page written Final Award in May 2023
8 ("Arbitration Award"). A true and correct copy of the Judgment and Arbitration Award is attached
9 as one document to the Hays Declaration as Exhibit "3." The issues addressed in the Arbitration
10 Award include (1) the respective ownership interests of Ashkan and Davis in TopDevz; (2) whether
11 grounds existed to dissolve TopDevz and, if so, who should oversee the dissolution; (3) an
12 accounting of amounts owed to or from TopDevz by Davis; (4) an accounting of amounts owed to or
13 from TopDevz by Ashkan; (5) Davis's claims against Ashkan for fraud and breach of fiduciary duty;
14 (6) Ashkan's claims against Davis for defamation, civil extortion, intentional infliction of emotional
15 distress; intentional interference with contract, intentional interference with prospective business
16 advantage, and breach of fiduciary duty. *Id.*, pgs. 99-102, 115-120, 127-135 and 153-160. In August
17 2023, the San Diego County Superior Court entered a Judgment confirming the Arbitration Award
18 ("Judgment"). A true and correct copy of the Judgment is attached to the Hays Declaration as
19 Exhibit "7." The Debtors have appealed the Judgment, and the appeal has been stayed pending the
20 conclusion of the bankruptcy.

21 The Arbitration contained three distinct parts. *Id.*, Ex. 3, pgs. 98, 103-106. The first portion
22 of the trial addressed issues relating to dissolution. *Id.*, Ex. 3, pgs. 98, 103-106. The second portion
23 of the trial addressed issues relating to the parties' contentions regarding an accounting. *Id.*, Ex. 3,
24 pgs. 98, 103-106.. The final portion of the trial addressed the parties' various tort claims. *Id.*, Ex. 3,
25 pgs. 98, 103-106.

26
27
28 ³ Ms. Callahan is a 30-year AV-rated attorney that was a highly-respected bankruptcy litigator prior to becoming a full-time neutral.

Generally, the Arbitration Award addresses the various issues in the same order they were addressed at trial. *Id.*, Ex. 3, pgs. 98, 99-102, and 103-106. Nonetheless, a portion of the Arbitration Award addresses specific actions taken by Ashkan to divert TopDevz’s assets to accounts controlled by him in another country in direct defiance of a ruling by the Arbitrator are the conclusion of the portion of the trial. *Id.*, Ex. 3, pgs. 121-126. The Arbitration Award is summarized below.

1. The dissolution of TopDevz

Davis and Ashkan decided to go into business together and in May 2017, they formed TopDevz. *Id.*, Ex. 3, pgs. 115-120. In the company’s operating agreement, Ashkan was designated as TopDevz’s managing member. *Id.*, pg. 111. Ashkan was also the company’s chief executive officer. The Arbitration included a determination of the member’s capital contributions. Ashkan misrepresented the claim that he put \$750,000 into the LLC, but Ashkan first testified that he had put in no capital. The Operating Agreement provides that the member’s capital accounts change annually, and that Rajaei put in only \$37,000. The judgment therefore confirms that Ashkan’s ownership interest was small. Indeed, as confirmed in the Arbitration Award, Davis held more than 95% of the membership interest in TopDevz. *Id.*, pgs. 121 and 166.

As manager and CEO, however, Ashkan illegally funneled millions of dollars to companies owned and controlled by him, most of which are headquartered abroad. *Id.*, pgs. 136-138. Ashkan also improperly used TopDevz’s money to fund his lavish lifestyle. *Id.*, pgs. 136-138. Eventually, Davis grew tired of Ashkan’s poor-decision making and petitioned for dissolution. *Id.*, pgs. 103-106. Over Ashkan’s objection, the Arbitrator agreed with Davis, determining that multiple grounds existed to order the dissolution of TopDevz. *Id.*, pgs. 98, 103-106.

2. Funds fraudulently transferred abroad by Ashkan in violation of an order by the Arbitrator

Ashkan’s actions in response to the Arbitrator’s ruling regarding the dissolution of TopDevz proves his inability to serve as a chapter 11 fiduciary. In December 2021, the Arbitrator conducted a 3-day trial. *Id.* Ex. 3, pgs. 98, 103-106. On January 6, 2022, the Arbitrator issued her order directing Davis to oversee the dissolution of TopDevz (“January 6 Ruling”). *Id.*, pgs. 98, 103-106. Among

1 other things, the January 6 Ruling designated Davis as the immediate, new managing member of
2 TopDevz, and unequivocally provided that, “Davis and only Davis, or his designee, shall have
3 authority to access, disburse funds from, open and close bank and other financial accounts belonging
4 to or standing in the name of” TopDevz. *Id.*, pgs. 122. The January 6 Ruling was provided to Ashkan
5 immediately after it was issued. *Id.*, pgs. 121-125.

6 At approximately 11:00 pm on January 6, 2022, hours after being provided with a copy of the
7 January 6 Ruling, Ashkan caused \$900,000 to be wired out of TopDevz’s bank account and to an
8 international account held by him. *Id.*, pgs. 121-125. The following day, Ashkan caused another
9 \$131,586.76 to be wired out of TopDevz’s bank account to an international account held by Mobile
10 Monster, a company wholly owned by Ashkan. *Id.*, pgs. 122. This theft of TopDevz’s funds in
11 contempt of the Arbitrator’s order, left TopDevz with insufficient funds to make its payroll. *Id.*, pgs.
12 122.

13 Less than a week later, after an emergency hearing, the Arbitrator ordered Ashkan to return
14 the funds that he sent abroad on January 6 and 7, 2022. *Id.*, pgs. 122. To date, Ashkan has failed and
15 refused to comply. With Movants’ \$10 million judgment being the largest creditor claim in this
16 estate, Debtor’s history proves that he will continue his campaign to hinder, delay, and defraud
17 creditors.

18 **3. Ashkan’s self-dealing and the millions of dollars he pilfered.**

19 In April 2022, the Arbitrator received 10 days of testimony from the parties regarding their
20 various accounting claims. Hays Decl., Ex. 3, pgs. 127-153. In particular, the evidence focused on
21 (a) the capital contributions of Davis and Rajae to TopDevz; (b) a reconciliation of the financial
22 affairs of the TopDevz; (c) whether there were outstanding loans owed by TopDevz to Ashkan or
23 Davis; and (d) whether Ashkan or Davis was owed money by or owed money back to TopDevz. *Id.*,
24 pgs. 128. An important piece of the reconciliation was substantiation of funds paid to or for the
25 benefit of the parties or companies owned by them. *Id.*, pgs. 129.

26 Despite being the managing member of TopDevz, Ashkan was unable to produce documents
27 or explain the alleged business purposes behind the millions of dollars in payments he made to
28