

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.

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

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

6

7 PRAVEEN KEVIN KHURANA,

NO. 2:25-CV-0461-TOR

8 Appellant,

ORDER DISMISSING THIS CASE

9 v. AS DUPLICATIVE

10 AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE

COMPANY, et al., 11 Appellees. 12 13 BEFORE THE COURT is Appellant’s Bankruptcy Appeal (ECF No. 1). 14 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158, this Court has jurisdiction over bankruptcy appeals 15 from final judgments, interlocutory orders under 11 U.S.C. § 1121, and with leave 16 of the 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