

CASE TYPE: CIVIL OTHER

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

In Re: Wayzata Home Products, LLC and
cliqstudios.com LLCCourt File No.: 27-CV-20-4326
Judge: David L. Piper**ASSIGNEE'S THIRD OMNIBUS
OBJECTION TO CLAIMS
(DISALLOWED CLAIMS)**

INTRODUCTION

Lighthouse Management Group, Inc. (“**Lighthouse**” or the “**Assignee**”), by and through its undersigned counsel, files this third omnibus objection (the “**Objection**”) and seeks entry of an order disallowing **22** claims totaling \$103,581.89 (the “**Disallowed Claims**”) in which the filed claim amount was not consistent with or supported by all books, records and documentation available to the Assignee. The Disallowed Claims are listed on Exhibit A to the Declaration of Samuel J.H. Sigelman in Support of Assignee’s Third Omnibus Objection to Claims under the heading “*Disallowed Claim #.*” In connection with the claim process, creditors were instructed to provide the necessary information and documentation in support of the claims they submitted. Assignee has reviewed all information available to it, including, but not limited to the books and records of Assignor, filed claims and documents provided by creditors and publicly available information to verify the validity of the claims in amounts submitted. Based on Assignee’s review of such information, the Disallowed Claims are not consistent with the books and records available to the Assignee and lack supporting documentation. Accordingly, the Assignee seeks an order disallowing the Disallowed Claims in their entirety.

BACKGROUND

On March 13, 2020, in accordance Minnesota Statutes § 577.12, Wayzata Home Products, LLC, and its subsidiaries, including cliqstudios.com LLC (together with the other subsidiaries, Square Cabinets LLC f/k/a Itasca Cabinets LLC and Wayzata Cabinetry LLC, collectively the “**Assignors**”), as the assignors, and Lighthouse, as the Assignee, entered into an Assignment for Benefit of Creditors (the “**Assignment**”). [Sigelman Declaration. ¶ 2.] As part of its duties, the Assignee proposed procedures for the resolution and treatment of claims against the assignment estate. [*Id.* at ¶ 5.] On June 26, 2020, the Court entered that certain Order Granting Assignee’s Motion to Establish a Claims Process (the “**Claims Order**”).

The Claims Order required the Assignee to prepare an initial schedule of claims that sets forth the known creditors of the Assignors and the amounts owing to such creditors based upon the books and records of the Assignor (the “**Preliminary Schedule**”). [*Id.* at ¶ 6.] On June 29, 2020, the Assignee sent each known claimant a Notice of Claim, Proof of Claim Form, and Proof of Claim Instructions (as those terms are defined in the Claims Order) (“**Claims Notice**”). [*Id.* at ¶ 10-11.] Pursuant to the Claims Order, creditors whose claims were listed on the Preliminary Schedule were not required to file a claim if they did not object to the amount of their claim as listed on the Preliminary Schedule. [*Id.* at ¶ 15.] However, if a creditor disputed the claim as set forth on the Preliminary Schedule, or the creditor was not listed on the Preliminary Schedule, the creditor was required to file a proof of claim on or before July 29, 2020, which was 30 days after the date that the Assignee sent the Claims Notice to all known creditors and other parties in interest of the Assignors (the “**Claims Deadline**”). [*Id.* at ¶ 16.] The Claims Notice directed creditors to provide the Assignee with necessary information and documentation in support of their asserted claims when filing their claims. [*Id.* at ¶ 17.] On August 28, 2020, the Assignee filed a schedule

of all claims, which includes all claims included on the Preliminary Schedule as well as all claims filed with the Assignee (the “**Schedule of All Claims**”). [*Id.* at ¶ 18.] In general, if a claimant filed a claim for an amount that was already included on the Preliminary Schedule, only the filed claim amount was included on the Schedule of All Claims. [*Id.* at ¶ 19.]

Pursuant to the Claims Order and Minnesota Statutes § 576.50, the Assignee and other interested parties are authorized to object to claims and present the basis for their objection to the Court. The Claims Order provides for the following deadlines that the deadline for Assignee and any other interested parties to file written objections to claims shall be on September 27, 2020, which is 60 days after the Claims Deadline.

As of the Claims Deadline, the Assignee received approximately 150 claims filed against one or more of the Assignor entities. [*Id.* at ¶ 20.] The Assignee has reviewed those claims, as well as late filed claims, including the supporting documentation, and reconciled the filed claims with the Assignor’s books and records in order to determine the validity and amount of the filed claims. [*Id.* at ¶ 21.] Based on its review, the Assignee has determined that the 22 Disallowed Claims are objectionable on the grounds set forth below.

OBJECTION

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes § 576.50, the Assignee objects to the Disallowed Claims because upon Assignee’s review of the books, records and documentation available, Assignee has determined the Disallowed Claims are not consistent with the books and records available to the Assignee, lack supporting documentation, and are not legitimate claims. [*Id.* at ¶ 24.] Accordingly, the Assignee objects to the Disallowed Claims, which are identified in detail on Exhibit A to the Sigelman Declaration, and seeks an order disallowing the Disallowed Claims.

A. Claimants have the burden to establish the validity and amount of their claims.

Pursuant to the Claims Order and Minnesota Statutes § 576.49, Subdivision 3, the claims included on the Preliminary Schedule were based on the books and records of the Assignor. Claimants asserting a right to a payment in a different amount have the obligation to establish validity of their claims. *See, e.g., Lowder v. All Star Mills, Inc.*, 405 S.E.2d 794, 796 (N.C. Ct. App. 1991) (stating N.C.G.S. § 1-507.6 requires claimants to a receivership to prove their claims); *see also Acad. Life Ins. Co. v. Odiorne*, 797 P.2d 727, 732 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1990) (explaining the claimant has the burden of proving the validity of its claim); *In re Bristol*, 37 Minn. 248, 249 (1887) (denying a creditor's claim for failure to establish liability on the alleged debt); 75 C.J.S. *Receivers* § 275 (2019) (explaining that the claimant has the obligation to prove the validity of its claim and that the receiver does not have the obligation to investigate claims). Here, the claimants asserting the Disallowed Claims have failed to meet their burden to establish the validity and amount of their claims.

B. The Disallowed Claims should be disallowed.

Each of the Disallowed Claims are similarly situated in that the claimant asserting the particular claim failed to provide the Assignee with adequate support for the validity or amount claimed therein after Assignee's review of all books, records and documents available to it. [Sigelman Decl. ¶ 23.]

In 14 cases, claimants are customers that appear to have received replacement orders or other compensation. Effectively, they have failed to provide documentation showing they were damaged. As such, Assignee seeks to have their claims deemed to be disallowed. [Sigelman Decl. ¶ 25.]

Claim 5149 filed by Lynn Moore and claim 5423 filed Lynn Scholl are both employee claims. Upon the information and documents available to Assignee, Claim 5149 was paid for the amounts claimed on March 20, 2020 and claim 5423 was only payable if Lynn Scholl was employed in 2021, which, of course, is a factual impossibility. Assignee seeks to have claims 5149 and 5423 deemed to be disallowed. [Sigelman Decl. ¶ 26.]

Claim 6168 filed by Dalene Erickson and claim 5396 filed by PSJIM Inc were filed for orders that Assignee believes, upon information and documents available to it, were canceled and never paid for by the claimants. Assignee seeks to have claims 6168 and 5396 deemed to be disallowed. [Sigelman Decl. ¶ 27.]

Claim 6336 filed by Dina Russo, claim 6356 filed by Chelsea Lyon, and claim 6367 filed by Carol Schmidt were not filed with sufficient documentation for which the Assignee is able to support the filed claims amount. As such, Assignee seeks to have claim 6336, 6356, and 6357 disallowed. [Sigelman Decl. ¶ 28.]

As set forth above, a claimant has the burden to establish the validity and amount of its claim. In addition to this legal requirement, the Claims Notice specifically directed claimants to “[a]ttach to the Proof of Claim form all documents that show the Debtor owes the amount claimed. If documents are not available, you must attach an explanation as to why they are not available.” [Id. ¶ 17.] The Assignee is not obligated to seek out independent verification of a deficient claim beyond what was made available to the Assignee in connection with the Assignment. *See, e.g.*, 75 C.J.S. *Receivers* § 275 (2019). Because the claimants have failed to meet their burden and the Disallowed Claims are not supported by the books and records available to the Assignee, the Disallowed Claims should be disallowed in their entirety.

C. Objection may be withdrawn upon delivery of adequate documentation.

Throughout the claim objection process the Assignee anticipates an ongoing dialogue with claimants regarding objections. [Sigelman Decl. at ¶ 29.] If a claimant whose claim is the subject of this Objection provides the Assignee with adequate support or evidence of the validity and amount of its claim prior to the hearing on the Objection, the Assignee reserves the right to withdraw its objection in the event and to the extent that the support for the applicable claim is adequate.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Assignee respectfully requests that the Court sustain the Objection and enter the proposed order disallowing the Disallowed Claims.

Date: September 25, 2020

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

By: /s/ Michael A. Cavallaro

Christopher J. Knapp (MN #0344412)

Michael A. Cavallaro (MN #0389995)

225 South Sixth Street, Suite 2800

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 333-2111

Facsimile: (612) 333-6798

cknapp@btlaw.com

mcavallaro@btlaw.com

Attorneys for Lighthouse Management
Group, Inc., as Assignee