

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

North Star Partners, LLC v. Matthew R. Buskard

North Star Partners · No. Adv. No. 25-4229 · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan dismissed North Star Partners, LLC’s adversary proceeding against Matthew R. Buskard as moot and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court held that a separate default judgment denying Buskard’s discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727(a)(6) already provided the dischargeability-related relief sought in the proceeding.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas J. Tucker
JURISDICTION	United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	December 18, 2025
DOCKET	Adv. No. 25-4229
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff-creditor commenced an adversary proceeding seeking a determination that the Chapter 7 debtor's debt was nondischargeable under 11 U.S.C. §§ 523(a)(2)(A), 523(a)(2)(B), and 523(a)(4). After the Chapter 7 Trustee obtained a default judgment denying the debtor's discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727(a)(6) in a separate adversary proceeding, the court dismissed this proceeding as moot and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- adversary proceedings
- nondischargeable debts
- chapter 7
- subject matter jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

- Bankruptcy
- Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Chapter 7 Trustee's separate order denying the debtor a discharge rendered the creditor's adversary proceeding seeking a determination of nondischargeability moot.
2. Whether the bankruptcy court retained subject matter jurisdiction over the adversary proceeding after the creditor's claims became moot.

HOLDINGS

1. A separate order denying the Chapter 7 debtor a discharge renders moot a creditor's adversary proceeding seeking a determination that the creditor's debt is nondischargeable, because the creditor has already received the requested relief that the debt will not be discharged.
2. Once the plaintiff's claims became moot, the bankruptcy court no longer had authority or subject matter jurisdiction over the adversary proceeding, requiring dismissal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because the Plaintiffs claims have been rendered moot, this bankruptcy court no longer has authority or subject matter jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding.”

“IT IS ORDERED that this adversary proceeding is dismissed, as moot, and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

North Star Partners, LLC sought a determination that Matthew R. Buskard's debt to it was nondischargeable under several provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 523. In a separate adversary proceeding, the Chapter 7 Trustee obtained a default judgment denying Buskard a discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727(a)(6). That no-discharge order ensured that the debt would not be discharged in the pending Chapter 7 case, providing the relief sought by North Star Partners.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

North Star Partners, LLC filed the adversary proceeding on November 13, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Chapter 7 Trustee obtained a default judgment denying Matthew R. Buskard's discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727(a)(6) in Adv. No. 25-4230. Because the no-discharge order gave the plaintiff the dischargeability-related relief it sought, the bankruptcy court dismissed this adversary proceeding as moot and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency v. Pettibone (In re Pettibone), 577 B.R. 689 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2017)

- *Rosenfeld v. Rosenfeld* (In re *Rosenfeld*), 535 B.R. 186, 193-96 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2015), *aff'd*, 558 B.R. 825 (E.D. Mich. 2016), *aff'd*, 698 F. App'x 300 (6th Cir. 2017)
- *Mapley v. Mapley* (In re *Mapley*), 437 B.R. 225, 227-30 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2010)
- *Cowan v. Ladosenszky* (In re *Ladosenszky*), 617 B.R. 275, 277-78 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2020)

OPINION

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION In re: Case No. 25-46017 MATTHEW R. BUSKARD, Chapter 7 Debtor.
/ Judge Thomas J. Tucker NORTH STAR PARTNERS, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. Adv. No. 25-4229
MATTHEW R. BUSKARD, pro se, Defendant. / ORDER DISMISSING THIS ADVERSARY
PROCEEDING, AS MOOT On November 13, 2025, the Plaintiff North Star Partners, LLC filed
this adversary proceeding, seeking a determination that the Debtor/Defendant's debt to the
Plaintiff is nondischargeable under 11 U.S.C. §§ 523(a)(2)(A), 523(a)(2)(B), and 523(a)(4).

On December 18, 2025, in a separate adversary proceeding, the Chapter 7 Trustee, Wendy Turner
Lewis, obtained a default judgment denying the Debtor/Defendant's discharge under 11 U.S.C. §
727(a)(6). See Default Judgment in Adv. No. 25-4230 (Docket # 6 in Adv. No. No. 25-4230 (the
"no-discharge order").

The Court concludes that the no-discharge order renders moot the Plaintiff's claims in this
adversary proceeding. This is because the Plaintiff has received the dischargeability-related relief
it was seeking in this adversary proceeding — namely, that the Debtor/Defendant's debt to the
Plaintiff will not be discharged in the Debtor/Defendant's pending Chapter 7 bankruptcy case.

See, e.g., *Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency v. Pettibone* (In re *Pettibone*), 577 B.R. 689
(Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2017). Thus, the Court is no longer able to grant the Plaintiff any meaningful
relief in addition to what the Court has already ordered. Cf. *Rosenfeld v. Rosenfeld* (In re
Rosenfeld), 535 B.R. 186, 193-96 (Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2015), *aff'd*, 558 B.R. 825 (E.D.

Mich. 2016), *aff'd* 698 F. App'x 300 (6th Cir. 2017) (dismissing, for lack of jurisdiction, a
creditor's adversary proceeding seeking an order denying the debtor a discharge under several
provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 727(a), where the debtor's debt to the creditor was nondischargeable
under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)); *Mapley v. Mapley* (In re *Mapley*), 437 B.R. 225, 227-30 (Bankr.

E.D. Mich. 2010) (same). Because the Plaintiff's claims have been rendered moot, this bankruptcy
court no longer has authority or subject matter jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding. See,
e.g., *Pettibone*, 577 B.R. at 690; *Cowan v. Ladosenszky* (In re *Ladosenszky*), 617 B.R. 275, 277-78
(Bankr. E.D. Mich. 2020).

For these reasons, IT IS ORDERED that this adversary proceeding is dismissed, as moot, and for
lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Signed on December 18, 2025 (JB) Thomas J. Tucker i □□ E
Thomas J. Tucker @ a United States Bankruptcy Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-bankruptcy-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-m/2025/north-star-partners-llc-v-matthew-r-buskard-dxe799ko>