## FLED

OCT 1 2 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT U.S. BANKRUPICY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

4	In re:	Chapter 11
5	EDWARD KILE,	No. 4-04-bk-02237-JMM
6	Debtor.	Adv. No. 4-05-ap-00009-JMM
7	M. KENNETH MUDGE, et ux., et al.,	MEMORANDUM DECISION RE
8	Plaintiffs,	DISCHARGE OF INTERPLEADING PARTY
9	vs. ) EDWARD KILE, et ux., et al.,	(Opinion to Post)
10	Defendants.	
11		

Statewide Group, Inc. has filed a motion to be discharged as the interpleading party, and to be awarded its fees and costs associated therewith. The Debtor objects. The court, after consideration of the adversary and administrative files herein, now rules.

This adversary complaint, filed by Statewide, seeks to have the court determine the rightful parties to excess trustee's sale proceeds, and, having joined into the action all parties claiming an interest thereto, be discharged.

The Debtor objects, claiming that (1) Statewide may be liable for violating statutory duties pursuant to Cal. Civ. P. Code § 2924; (2) Statewide did not act quickly enough after the sale and with due diligence; and (3) Statewide's fees are unreasonable.

The court first notes that Edward Kile, the Debtor and a Defendant, has never answered the complaint in this matter, nor asserted any interest in the proceeds. Nor has he filed a cross-claim or counterclaim asserting, in this or any other action, any violations of California law as a basis for holding Statewide liable on any legal theory. Two parties (Statewide and Mudge) have filed

h:\wp\orders\

applications for entry of default against the Debtor.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, having failed to appropriately plead in this matter, Mr. Kile's standing is non-existent. In either event, having failed to file a responsive pleading to Statewide's interpleader complaint for nine months, the Debtor's bare assertions of statutory liability are without merit, and are not issues for this court to resolve.

As for Mr. Kile's assertion that Statewide did not react quickly enough, suffice it to say that the court disagrees. Statewide had always been forthcoming in this complicated affair, and has acted at all times in a timely manner. The interpleader was filed on January 12, 2005, after much litigation over ownership drew Statewide into the bramble bush of Debtor's legal entanglements.

As for the Debtor's final objection concerning the reasonableness of Statewide's fees, the court notes that, but for the Debtor's efforts to obfuscate title issues, this matter would have ended long ago. Statewide's fees are not unreasonable, in view of the convoluted history of this case.

Accordingly, the Debtor's objection to Statewide's fee request, and its request to be discharged of further liability and to be dismissed as an active party in this case, is OVERRULED.

Statewide's motion is GRANTED, and it shall be awarded \$9,443.17 for its attorneys' fees and costs incurred herein.

DATED: October 2, 2005.

JAMES M. MARLAR UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

ums h. Maria

See, docket Nos. 29 and 33.

1	day of October, 2005, upon:	
3	Matthew R.K. Waterman Waterman & Waterman, P.C.	
4	33 North Stone Avenue, Suite 2020 Tucson, AZ 85701	
5	Email mrkw@watermanlaw.com Attorneys for Debtor	
6	Steven M. Cox  Westerful Foognamidia Coldwell Househows & Villemans B.C.	
7	Waterfall Economidis Caldwell Hanshaw & Villamana, P.C. 5210 E. Williams Cir., #800	
8	Tucson, AZ 85711 Email smcox@wechv.com	
9	Timothy J. Silverman	
10	Holly Nolan   Solomon Grindle Silverman & Spinella	
11	12651 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130	
12	Email tim@sgsslaw.com Email holly@sgsslaw.com	
13	Larry Lee Watson	
14	Office of the United States Trustee 230 North First Avenue, Suite 204	
15	Phoenix, AZ 85003-1706 Email <u>larry.watson@usdoj.gov</u>	
16		
17	By M.B. Thompson	
18	Judicial Assistant	
19		
20		
21	•	
22		
23		
24		