

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

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

Khurana · No. 2:25-CV-0431-TOR · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington dismissed Praveen Kevin Khurana’s appeal as duplicative of a separately docketed case involving the same subject matter. The court denied all pending motions as moot and directed entry of the order and judgment.

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	January 23, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-0431-TOR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appellant pursued a duplicate bankruptcy appeal in the Eastern District of Washington. The court dismissed the appeal as duplicative of another case involving the same subject matter and denied pending motions as moot.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Praveen Kevin Khurana v. Auto-Owners Insurance Company, et al.

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- appellate jurisdiction
- bankruptcy
- civil procedure
- res judicata

PRACTICE AREAS

- bankruptcy
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should dismiss the appeal as duplicative of another case involving the same subject matter.

HOLDINGS

1. The court dismissed the appeal as duplicative of case number 2:25-CV-0430-TOR.
2. All pending motions were denied as moot following dismissal of the duplicative appeal.

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)

“To determine when an action is duplicative of prior litigation, the Ninth Circuit uses ‘the transaction test, developed in the context of claim preclusion.’” (at 1-2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Praveen Kevin Khurana filed or pursued two appeals in the Eastern District of Washington concerning the same subject matter and defendant. The court identified this appeal as duplicative of case number 2:25-CV-0430-TOR. Because the two matters were duplicative, the court dismissed this case and denied all pending motions as moot.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court considered Appellant's duplicate appeal under its jurisdiction over bankruptcy appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 158(a). It dismissed this case as duplicative of case number 2:25-CV-0430-TOR and directed entry of the order and judgment.

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

1 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON Jan 23, 2026 2 SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 7 PRAVEEN KEVIN KHURANA, NO. 2:25-CV-0431-TOR 8 Appellant, ORDER DISMISSING THIS CASE 9 v. AS DUPLICATIVE 10 AUTO-OWNERS INSURANCE COMPANY, et al., 11 Appellees. 12 BEFORE THE COURT is Appellant's duplicate appeal.

This Court has 13 jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 158, this Court has jurisdiction over bankruptcy 14 appeals for final judgments, interlocutory orders and leave of the Court for other 15 interlocutory appeals. 28 U.S.C. 158(a). 16 Plaintiffs “generally have ‘no right to maintain two separate actions

17 involving the same subject matter at the same time in the same court and against 18 the same defendant.” Adams v. California Dep't of Health Servs., 487 F.3d 684, 19 688 (9th Cir.

2007) (citation omitted), overruled in part on other grounds by 20 Taylor v. Sturgell, 553 U.S. 880 (2008). To determine when an action is duplicative of prior litigation, the Ninth Circuit uses “the transaction test, 2 || developed in the context of claim preclusion.” Id. at 689.

In applying the 3 || transaction test, courts examine four criteria: 4 (1) whether rights or interests established in the prior judgment would be destroyed or impaired by prosecution of the second action; (2) 5 whether substantially the same evidence is presented in the two actions; (3) whether the two suits involve infringement of the same 6 right; and (4) whether the two suits arise out of the same transactional nucleus of facts.

7 8 || Id. at 689. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 10 1. This case is DISMISSED as duplicative of the case at 2:25-CV-0430- 11 TOR. 12 2. All pending motions are DENIED as moot. 13 The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order and Judgment, 14|| and furnish copies to the parties. 15 DATED January 23, 2026 << United States District Judge 18 19 20