

**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.

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 Plaintiffs 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 (QBs) Thomas J. Tucker i □□ E Thomas J. Tucker @ a United States Bankruptcy Judge