

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Praveen Kevin Khurana v. Auto-Owners Insurance Company, et al.

In re Khurana · No. 2:25-CV-0461-TOR · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington dismisses Praveen Kevin Khurana’s bankruptcy appeal as duplicative of another case arising from the same bankruptcy proceeding. The court denies all pending motions as moot and directs that any added, modified, or removed issues be pursued in the original case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-0461-TOR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant filed a bankruptcy appeal in the district court. The district court dismissed the appeal as duplicative of another appeal arising from the same bankruptcy case and denied pending motions as moot.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Praveen Kevin Khurana v. Auto-Owners Insurance Company, et al.

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- bankruptcy
- res judicata
- mootness
- subject matter jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

- bankruptcy
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the bankruptcy appeal was duplicative of another case arising from the same bankruptcy proceeding.

2. Whether the duplicative appeal should be dismissed and pending motions denied as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss a second action as duplicative when it involves the same subject matter and arises from the same transactional nucleus of facts as prior litigation; applying that principle, this bankruptcy appeal was duplicative of case number 2:25-cv-0347-TOR.
2. Pending motions in a case dismissed as duplicative are denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiffs ‘generally have ‘no right to maintain two separate actions involving the same subject matter at the same time in the same court and against the same defendant.’” (at 1)

“For these reasons, the case is duplicative and must be dismissed.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Appellant filed multiple district court appeals arising from the same bankruptcy case, including this appeal and several related cases. Although some notices of appeal identified different or additional issues or orders, the appeals arose from the same bankruptcy proceeding and involved overlapping subject matter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The appeal was filed in the Eastern District of Washington under 28 U.S.C. § 158. The court determined that Appellant had filed numerous appeals arising from the same bankruptcy case, that this matter was duplicative of case number 2:25-cv-0347-TOR, and that the outcome of another related case would affect this case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Adams v. California Department of Health Services, 487 F.3d 684, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Taylor v. Sturgell, 553 U.S. 880 (2008)

OPINION

In re: Khurana

PER CURIAM.

1

2 FILED IN THE

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

3 Mar 03, 2026

4 SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7

8 PRAVEEN KEVIN KHURANA,
9 NO. 2:25-CV-0461-TOR

10 Appellant,
11 ORDER DISMISSING THIS CASE
12 9 v. AS DUPLICATIVE

13 10 AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE

14 COMPANY, et al., 15 Appellees. 16 12 13 BEFORE THE COURT is Appellant's Bankruptcy Appeal
17 (ECF No. 1). 18 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158, this Court has jurisdiction over bankruptcy appeals
19 15 from final judgments, interlocutory orders under 11 U.S.C. § 1121, and with leave 16 of the
20 Court, from other interlocutory orders. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a). 17 Appellant filed numerous appeals
for the same bankruptcy case. ECF No. 1. 18 Plaintiffs "generally have 'no right to maintain two
separate actions involving the 19 same subject matter at the same time in the same court and
against the same 20 defendant.'" *Adams v. California Dep't of Health Servs.*, 487 F.3d 684, 688
(9th

1 Cir. 2007) (citation omitted), overruled in part on other grounds by *Taylor v.*

2 *Sturgell*, 553 U.S. 880 (2008). To determine when an action is duplicative of prior 3 litigation,
the Ninth Circuit uses "the transaction test, developed in the context of 4 claim preclusion." *Id.* at
689. In applying the transaction test, courts examine four 5 criteria: 6 (1) whether rights or
interests established in the prior judgment would be destroyed or impaired by prosecution of the
second action; (2) 7 whether substantially the same evidence is presented in the two actions;
(3) whether the two suits involve infringement of the same right; and

8 (4) whether the two suits arise out of the same transactional nucleus of facts. 9

10 *Id.* at 689.

11 This appeal results from the same bankruptcy case as multiple other district 12 court cases: In
re: *Khurana*, 2:25-cv-0461-TOR, In re: *Khurana*, 2:25-cv-0430, In 13 re: *Khurana*, 2:25-cv-00431,
In re *Khurana*, 2:25-cv-00432, etc. While some of 14 the appeal notices refer to different or
additional issues or orders, they arise from 15 the same bankruptcy case. The outcome of In re:
Khurana, 2:25-cv-0374-TOR 16 would affect the outcome of this case and related cases. For these
reasons, the case 17 is duplicative and must be dismissed. However, if Appellant wishes to add, 18
modify, or remove information or issues, Appellant must pursue this in the original 19 case not in
duplicative matters. 20 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 2 1. This case is
DISMISSED as duplicative of the case at 2:25-cv-0347- 3 TOR. 4 2. All pending motions are
DENIED as moot. 5 The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order and furnish 6||

copies to counsel. 7 DATED March 3, 2026. <> United States District Judge 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
17 18 19 20

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-was/2026/praveen-kevin-khurana-v-auto-owners-insurance-company-et-al-1zh12za0>