

11 USC § 523(a)(15)
ORS 106.300 et. seq.
FRCP 5.1; LBR 9005-1.1
FRCP 12(b)(6)
equal protection clause (14th Amend, U.S. Const.)
privileges and immunities clause (Or. Const.)
registered domestic partnership
spouse

Sato v. Hanlon (In re Hanlon)
8/15/16

Adv. No. 16-6040-tmr
Renn

2016 WL ?

Plaintiff brought an action to except a state court judgment from Debtor/Defendant's Ch. 7 discharge under 11 USC § 523(a)(15). Defendant moved to dismiss. The pleadings indicated Plaintiff and Defendant were an opposite-sex couple who had a long-term relationship, but never married. Eventually the relationship ended and Defendant brought suit in state court to have their domestic partnership dissolved. In the state court suit, Plaintiff obtained an attorney fee judgment for over \$41,000 as a discovery sanction.

Plaintiff first argued she need not be a "spouse" or "former spouse" as contemplated by § 523(a)(15), but rather the Court should look to the type of proceeding in which the judgment arose, which here, a dissolution, fit within the statute's scope. The Court rejected that argument. It recognized that caselaw had not strictly limited standing under § 523(a)(15) to those payees (i.e., "spouse, former spouse, and child of the debtor") designated in the statute. However, in every such instance, as a result of the third-party's services, the bounty of the debt flowed to, or discharge of the debt adversely impacted the finances of, a designated payee. Plaintiff was not such a third party.

Plaintiff next argued she was the equivalent of a "spouse" or "former spouse." Again the Court rejected her argument. In that the federal statutory definition of "spouse" was declared unconstitutional, the Court looked to Oregon law, either as explicating federal law or as the primary source, for the definition of "spouse." It noted Oregon does not recognize common law marriage, and thus at most, Plaintiff and Defendant were common law domestic partners who did not have the rights of married persons. Plaintiff, however, argued she and Defendant were similarly-situated to Oregon same-sex Registered Domestic Partners, who have the same privileges of married persons, and thus the Registered Domestic Partnership (**RDP**) scheme unconstitutionally discriminated against her, and as a result, the scheme should be opened up to opposite-sex unmarried couples. The Court first rejected Plaintiff's argument that the RDP scheme did not require registration. It next noted potentially fatal flaws in Plaintiff's standing to make the constitutional argument, in that she had not pled that she and Defendant would have registered if permitted, and in any event, at no point was she denied the opportunity to gain the rights of a married person by actually getting married. However, the Court deferred ruling on the constitutional issues until Plaintiff complied with the applicable rules designed to enable the Oregon Attorney General to intervene.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

IN RE)
CHARLES JEFFREY HANLON,)
Debtor.)

PEGGY A. SATO,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
CHARLES JEFFREY HANLON,)
Defendant.)

Bankruptcy Case
No. 15-64121-tmr7

Adversary Proceeding
No. 16-6040-tmr

AMENDED¹
MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff filed the instant adversary complaint seeking to except a state court judgment from discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(15).² The matter before the Court is Defendant’s motion to dismiss. After briefing and oral argument, the matter is ripe for decision.

///
///

¹This Amended Opinion corrects formatting and typographical errors. There are no substantive changes from the Original.

²Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent statutory references are to Title 11 of the United States Code.

1 FRCP 12(b)(6) Standards:

2 Defendant's motion is brought under FRCP 12(b)(6) (made applicable by FRBP 7012(b)) for failure
3 to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Under FRCP 12(b)(6), the court must accept as true all
4 well-pleaded allegations contained in the complaint, but it need not accept as true "conclusory statements,
5 statements of law, or unwarranted inferences cast as factual allegations." Taylor v. U.S. Dep't of Justice (In
6 re Taylor), 2012 WL 1957984, *2 (9th Cir. BAP May 31, 2012) (internal quotation omitted).

7 To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual
8 matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. A
9 claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that
allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable
for the misconduct alleged.

10 Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009) (internal citations and quotations
11 omitted). In ruling on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court must draw all reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's
12 favor. Usher v. City of Los Angeles, 828 F.2d 556, 561 (9th Cir. 1987).

13 In considering the [Rule 12(b)(6)] motion, the court may not consider any
14 material beyond the pleadings. . . . [However], a document whose contents are
15 alleged in the complaint, or which is crucial to the complaint, and whose
16 authenticity no party questions, but which is not physically attached to the
pleading, may be considered. Finally, matters that may be judicially noticed
may be considered, including court records in related or underlying cases.

17 McCoy v. BNC Mortg., Inc. (In re McCoy), 446 B.R. 453, 456 (Bankr. D. Or. 2011) (internal citations and
18 quotations omitted).³

19 The Allegations:

20 Slightly paraphrased, the Complaint, including the exhibits attached to counsel's Declaration, allege
21 the following:

22 // // //

23 // // //

24
25 ³Plaintiff's Opposition to the present Motion is supported by her counsel Mark Comstock's
26 Declaration authenticating several exhibits consisting of documents from the state court case. At oral
argument, Defendant agreed those exhibits may be considered in resolving the Motion.

1 Plaintiff and Defendant are of the opposite sex and cohabited for a lengthy period, during which time
2 they established a common-law domestic partnership. They did not seek to register their domestic
3 partnership under Oregon law.

4 On or about January 31, 2013, Defendant (as Petitioner) filed a “Petition for Dissolution of a
5 Domestic Partnership” against Plaintiff (as Respondent) in Marion County Circuit Court.⁴ The Petition
6 alleged the parties’ domestic partnership had ended and prayed that it be dissolved and that the parties’ real
7 and personal property be divided “in a just and equitable manner.” Ex. 2 to Comstock Declaration.

8 During the dissolution proceeding, Plaintiff/Respondent served discovery requests. After several
9 instances of Defendant/Petitioner’s non-compliance, and on Plaintiff/Respondent’s motion, the court on or
10 about April 8, 2015, entered an Order granting discovery sanctions. The sanctions included striking
11 Defendant/Petitioner’s pleadings, granting judgment by default (to be entered separately), and awarding
12 Plaintiff/Respondent her reasonable attorney fees using the procedures set forth in ORCP 68.

13 On or about April 8, 2015, a “General Judgment By Default” was entered against
14 Defendant/Petitioner. On or about May 26, 2015, a Supplemental Judgment was entered awarding
15 Plaintiff/Respondent attorney fees and costs of \$41,933, to bear interest at 9% per annum from the date of
16 the Judgment’s entry.

17 Defendant filed his Chapter 7 petition on December 16, 2015.

18 Discussion:

19 As asserted by Plaintiffs the applicable statute is § 523(a)(15) which provides an exception to a
20 Chapter 7 discharge for “any debt”:

21
22 ⁴The Complaint alleges the Petition was filed “under ORS Chapter 106.” Complaint at
23 ¶ 6. The actual Petition is attached to Comstock’s Declaration as Exhibit 2. Nowhere therein is ORS
24 Chapter 106 cited. As discussed below, the applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 106 concern same-sex
25 couples only. As such, the Court cannot infer the Petition was filed under Chapter 106 and is thus treating
26 Plaintiff’s allegation as a legal conclusion which need not be taken as true. Taylor, 2012 WL 1957984, at *2.
The Complaint further quotes ORS 106.340(1), Complaint at ¶ 9, which, as discussed below, gives registered
domestic partners the same privileges as married persons. By inference, Plaintiff is alleging ORS 106.340(1)
applies to her, again a conclusion of law which the Court need not accept as true.

1 to a spouse, former spouse, or child of the debtor and not of the kind described
2 in paragraph (5) that is incurred by the debtor in the course of a divorce or
3 separation or in connection with a separation agreement, divorce decree or
other order of a court of record, or a determination made in accordance with
State or territorial law by a governmental unit. (Emphasis added.)

4 Statutorily Designated Payees:

5 As noted, the debt must be owed to a “spouse, former spouse, or child of the debtor.” For ease of
6 reference, the Court will refer to those parties as “designated payees.” Defendant argues Plaintiff is not a
7 designated payee, and thus no cause of action lies. Plaintiff argues the designated payees are merely
8 “prefatory” and that the real inquiry is whether or not the debt was incurred in the type of proceeding
9 enumerated in the statute.

10 Plaintiff is correct but only to a point. Indeed, the caselaw has widened recovery to non-designated
11 payees. Beaupied v. Chang (In re Chang), 163 F.3d 1138, 1141 (9th Cir. 1998). In Chang, the debts were
12 owed to a court-appointed guardian ad litem and to the father of the debtor’s out-of-wedlock child. Neither
13 the guardian nor the father fits strictly into the designated payees under the former version § 523(a)(5),
14 which excepted support debt from discharge.⁵ Nevertheless, the Court allowed them to pursue their claims,
15 reasoning “the identity of the payee is less important than the nature of the debt.” Id. Since then, and
16 drawing from Chang’s holding, non-designated payees have been permitted claims under either § 523(a)(5)
17 or (15) when the bounty of the debt flowed to, or if discharge of the debt would adversely impact the
18 finances of, a designated payee. Bendetti v. Gunness (In re Gunness), 505 B.R. 1, 6 (9th Cir. BAP 2014).

19 Plaintiff cannot take advantage of the above line of authority. It applies to third persons having
20 connection to a designated payee. Plaintiff is not such a third person. She simply wants the Court to carve
21 out an exception to the named class of designees or extend the meaning of “spouse.” Gunness, however,
22 emphasized that the class of designated payees is to be narrowly construed. Id. at 7-8. There, the court
23 refused to extend § 523(a)(15) protection to the debtor’s husband’s ex-wife and the ex-wife’s attorney,

24
25 ⁵When Chang was issued, § 523(a)(5) listed the same designated payees as current § 523(a)(15). It
26 now simply incorporates the definition of “domestic support obligation” in § 101(14A), which expanded the
class of designated payees.

1 holding prior precedent would not “in any way . . . support our imputing a familial relationship between two
2 unrelated parties.” Id. at 7. Thus, § 523(a)(15)’s designated payees are far from “prefatory”; they are in fact
3 crucial in determining who qualifies under the statute.

4 Plaintiff cites Francis v. Wallace (In re Francis), 505 B.R. 914 (9th Cir. BAP 2014) in support of her
5 argument. There, the court held the debtor’s obligation under his stipulated divorce decree to pay certain
6 creditors, and hold his ex-wife harmless therefrom, fit within § 523(a)(15) even though the debtor’s
7 obligation was to pay the creditor instead of his ex-wife directly. The court noted that California law
8 allowed the ex-wife to obtain an order compelling such payment, and that, in any event, the debtor had
9 impliedly agreed to indemnify her, both of which formed the basis for the debtor owing a “debt” to the ex-
10 wife. Id. at 921-922. The opinion did not recognize any right of the third party creditors themselves to sue
11 debtor directly under § 523(a)(15), and can in no way be read to open up the class of permissible payees to
12 those with no connection to the statute’s designated payees.

13 Plaintiff’s Status:

14 In light of the foregoing, the Court’s inquiry is confined to whether Plaintiff was Defendant’s
15 “spouse.” The Bankruptcy Code does not define that term. Until fairly recently the “Defense of Marriage
16 Act” (DOMA) defined “spouse” for purposes of all federal statutes, as “only . . . a person of the opposite sex
17 who is a husband or wife.” 1 U.S.C. § 7. However, in 2013, DOMA was ruled unconstitutional. United
18 States v. Windsor, 510 U.S. ___, 133 S. Ct. 2675, 2693, 2695-2696 (2013) (surviving spouse of legal same-
19 sex marriage was entitled to the Internal Revenue Code’s marital exemption for estate tax purposes).

20 Post-Windsor, most bankruptcy courts have looked to state law for the definition of “spouse” as used
21 in the Bankruptcy Code. See, e.g., In re Cusimano, 2013 WL 9736597, *2 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2013)
22 (California law defined “spouse” for purposes of § 523(a)(15)); In re Matson, 509 B.R. 860, 863 (Bankr.
23 E.D. Wisc. 2014) (state law where marriage ceremony is performed controls for purposes of eligibility to file
24 a joint petition under § 302(a)).⁶ One court, however, still reasoned the definition of “spouse” was a matter

25
26 ⁶Section 302(a) provides “[a] joint case under a chapter of this title is commenced by the filing . . . of
(continued...)

1 of federal law, and examined the dictionary’s ordinary meaning of that term. In re Villaverde, 540 B.R. 431,
2 434 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2015). Because the dictionary simply defined “spouse” as a husband, wife and/or
3 married person, the court ultimately looked to state (there, California) law to determine if the debtors fit
4 within those terms. Thus, even if this Court were to begin with the dictionary, it would eventually look to
5 Oregon law in defining “spouse” for purposes of § 523(a)(15).

6 The Complaint’s allegations indicate Plaintiff and Defendant never participated in a solemnized
7 marriage ceremony, as required by ORS 106.010, 106.150(1).⁷ Therefore, and because Oregon does not
8 recognize common-law marriage, Huard v. McTeigh, 113 Or. 279, 295-296, 232 P. 658, 663 (1925);
9 Johnston v. Georgia-Pac. Corp., 35 Or. App. 231, 233, 581 P.2d 108, 109 (1978), Plaintiff would not be
10 considered a “wife” or a “spouse” under Oregon law. At most she would be a common-law “domestic
11 partner” which would entitle her to a distribution of property according to the parties’ express or implied
12 intent, which may, under certain circumstances, require distribution according to equitable principles. See
13 Baker and Andrews, 232 Or. App. 646, 651-652, 223 P.3d 417, 420-421 (2009).

14 Contrary to Plaintiff’s conclusory argument, the Court could find no authority which holds that
15 common-law domestic partners are “married” or qualify as each other’s spouses. In fact, the caselaw is
16 directly to the contrary. See, e.g., Beal v. Beal, 282 Or. 115, 117-118, 577 P.2d 507, 507-508 (1978)
17 (describing domestic partners’ relationship as “meretricious” not marital, and concluding the parties were
18 never husband and wife); Himler and Katter, 220 Or. App. 411, 417, 186 P.3d 287, 291 (2008)
19 (distinguishing a domestic partnership from a marriage).

21
22 ⁶(...continued)

23 a single petition under such chapter by an individual that may be a debtor . . . and such individual’s spouse.”

24 ⁷To the extent ORS 106.010 and 106.150(1) prohibit same-sex marriages, they, as well as OR.
25 CONST., art. XV, § 5a which defined marriage as solely between a man and a woman, are unconstitutional.
26 Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 2584, 2604-2605 (2015); Geiger v. Kitzhaber, 994 F. Supp. 2d
1128, 1147 (D. Or. 2014). Geiger invalidated Oregon’s statutory and constitutional prohibitions on same-sex
marriage. Obergefell invalidated any state law which prohibited same-sex marriage or which failed to
recognize the legality of a same-sex marriage solemnized in another state.

1 Plaintiff cites Latham v. Latham, 274 Or. 421, 547 P.2d 144 (1976) for support. However, its holding
2 goes nowhere near so far as to hold unmarried cohabiting partners should be treated as married. The court
3 there merely held that a contract whereby one unmarried person agrees to split property equally in
4 consideration of the other cohabiting with him/her while engaging in the burdens and activities of married
5 life is not void as against public policy. Id. at 427, 547 P.2d at 147.

6 Despite the above authority, Plaintiff argues that, because Defendant took the position in the state
7 court dissolution suit that he was Plaintiff's domestic partner, he should be judicially estopped from arguing
8 here that he was not her partner and/or that he was not her spouse. Plaintiff's judicial estoppel argument is a
9 red herring. In limited circumstances, a party or the Court may invoke that doctrine to bar a party from
10 gaining an advantage by maintaining a position that is inconsistent with a position in an earlier judicial
11 proceeding. Ah Quin v. Cnty. of Kauai Dep't of Transp., 733 F.3d 267, 270-271 (9th Cir. 2013). Barring
12 Defendant from maintaining a position, however, is not the Court's focus at this stage of the proceeding.
13 Rather, its focus is on what Plaintiff has pled and whether, giving her all reasonable inferences, she has
14 stated a claim upon which relief can be granted. Plaintiff has complete control over what is pled, with the
15 limitation that the Court need not accept legal conclusions as true. At best, the Complaint and associated
16 exhibits allege Plaintiff was Defendant's domestic partner, and legally concludes she has the rights of a
17 registered domestic partner, a subject the Court turns to next.

18 As background:

19 In May 2007, the Oregon Legislative Assembly passed the Oregon Family
20 Fairness Act [FFA], which is now codified at ORS 106.300. The Act
21 established a domestic partnership system which provides legal recognition to
22 same-sex relationships and which is intended to ensure more equal treatment of
23 gays and lesbians and their families under Oregon law. ORS 106.305(6).

24 Two individuals of the same sex who are at least eighteen, who are otherwise
25 capable, and at least one of whom is an Oregon resident, may register to
26 become domestic partners with the county clerk. ORS 106.310(1); ORS
106.325. They may do so by filing a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with
the county clerk. ORS 106.325. The county clerk makes the forms of those
declarations available to the public. ORS 106.320(2). The county clerk
registers the declaration and returns a Certificate of Registered Domestic
Partnership to the registrants. ORS 106.325. The county clerk also collects a
fee which is turned over to the state. Registering as domestic partners ensures

1 the partners certain rights, privileges, benefits and immunities. ORS 106.340.
2 The domestic partnership law was intended to go into effect January 1, 2008,
but because of a court challenge, did not go into effect until February 4, 2008.

3 Slater v. Douglas Cnty., 743 F. Supp. 2d 1188, 1190 (D. Or. 2010) (bracketed highlighted text added).

4 The FFA was enacted to give same-sex couples the rights and responsibilities equivalent to those of
5 married couples, ORS 106.340(1),(2),⁸ because same-sex couples could not then legally marry because of
6 (now unconstitutional) section 5a, Article XV of the Oregon Constitution, which limited marriage to
7 opposite-sex couples. ORS 106.305(1)-(7). Plaintiff argues that, with the legalization of same-sex marriage,
8 same-sex and opposite-sex domestic partners are now similarly-situated and the FFA's grant of marriage
9 rights equivalency to the former discriminates against the latter, in violation of the privileges and immunities
10 clause of the Oregon Constitution⁹ and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S.

11
12 _____
13 ⁸ORS 106.340(1),(2) provide:

14 (1) Any privilege, immunity, right or benefit granted by statute, administrative
15 or court rule, policy, common law or any other law to an individual because
16 the individual is or was married . . . is granted on equivalent terms, substantive
and procedural, to an individual because the individual is or was in a domestic
partnership

17 (2) Any responsibility imposed by statute, administrative or court rule, policy,
18 common law or any other law on an individual because the individual is or was
19 married . . . is imposed on equivalent terms, substantive and procedural, on an
individual because the individual is or was in a domestic partnership

20 Registered domestic partners are also given the same rights of spouses concerning a child of either of
21 the partners. ORS 106.340(3),(4).

22 The above provisions incorporate by reference a multitude of statutes governing married persons
23 (including ORS Chapter 107 as to dissolution) that are simply inapplicable to common-law domestic
24 partnerships. This makes clear that a registered domestic partnership and a common law domestic
partnership are not the same animal. In fact, they are barely the same genus.

25 ⁹Oregon's Constitution provides that "[n]o law shall be passed granting to any citizen or class of
26 citizens privileges, or immunities, which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens. OR.
CONST. art. I, § 20.

1 Constitution.¹⁰ She asks the Court to open up the rights attendant to a registered domestic partnership (**RDP**)
2 to opposite-sex couples, and then apply those rights in the context at bar. To buttress her argument,
3 presumably to show she and Defendant were similarly situated to unmarried same-sex couples, Plaintiff first
4 asks the Court to construe the RDP scheme to include unregistered same-sex couples.

5 ORS 106.325(1) provides that “[t]wo individuals wishing to become partners in a domestic
6 partnership may complete and file a Declaration of Domestic Partnership with the county clerk.” Plaintiff
7 argues the term “may” indicates registration is optional. In construing a statute, the Court must determine
8 the legislature’s intent, ORS 174.020(1)(a); State v. Gaines, 346 Or. 160, 164, 206 P.3d 1042, 1046 (2009),
9 and in doing so must first examine the statute's text and context. Id. at 171, 206 P.3d at 1050. “Statutory
10 context includes other provisions of the same statute and . . . and the statutory framework within which the
11 statute was enacted.” Fresk v. Kraemer, 337 Or. 513, 520–521, 99 P.3d 282, 286 (2004).

12 Plaintiff’s argued construction ignores ORS 106.325(1)’s introductory phrase limiting the universe of
13 persons completing and filing a Declaration of Domestic Partnership to those “wishing to become partners.”
14 It also ignores ORS 106.325(5) which sets forth the necessary contents of the Declaration for “each
15 individual who wants to become a partner in a domestic partnership.” (Emphasis added). See Alfieri v.
16 Solomon, 358 Or. 383, 408, 365 P.3d 99, 113 (2015) (statutes should be construed to give effect to all their
17 provisions). Further, the legislature has expressly stated it is the RDP scheme, (i.e., “ORS 106.300-
18 106.340”), which includes registration, which “extend[s] benefits, protections and responsibilities to
19 committed same-sex partners,” ORS 106.305(5), and which composes a “system” to “provide legal
20 recognition to same-sex relationships.” ORS 106.305(6). Finally, ORS 106.325(3) prohibits domestic
21 partnership declarants from entering into a new domestic partnership until their most recent partnership has
22 been annulled or dissolved by judgment (or upon death of one of the partners), further evidencing the
23 legislature’s intent that only those who declare and register are entitled to the benefits the law provides. All
24

25
26 ¹⁰The 14th Amendment prohibits any state from denying “to any person . . . the equal protection of the laws.” U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1.

1 of these statutes make clear that registration is required to gain the privileges of the RDP scheme. See
2 generally Slater, 743 F. Supp. 2d at 1190.

3 Plaintiff nevertheless argues ORS 106.310(1) is unconstitutional, and should thus be expanded to
4 same-sex couples. However, to have standing to mount a retrospective equal protection challenge, Plaintiff
5 must plead and prove that she suffered a particularized injury, i.e., she was personally denied equal
6 treatment, Braunstein v. Ariz. Dep't of Transp., 683 F.3d 1177, 1185 (9th Cir. 2012), which at minimum
7 would appear to require allegations and proof that she and Defendant were prepared to register, and/or
8 attempted to register, but for the law's prohibition. Likewise, for a privileges and immunities challenge, it
9 appears Plaintiff must plead and prove that she and Defendant would have registered had the law allowed.
10 Madrone and Madrone, 271 Or. App. 116, 127-128, 350 P.3d 495, 500-501 (2015). No such allegation
11 appears in the Complaint. Further, at no point so far has Plaintiff argued she and Defendant would have
12 registered had they been permitted to do so. These failings would appear to be fatal to Plaintiff's standing on
13 these claims.

14 Further, as stated, Plaintiff's injury must have involved denial of equal treatment, Braunstein, 683
15 F.3d at 1185 (equal protection clause), and/or denial of a privilege or immunity, State v. Scott, 96 Or. App.
16 451, 455, 773 P.2d 394, 396 (1989) (privilege and immunities clause), within the relevant time-frame. The
17 purpose of the RDP statutes was to enable people who could not then get legally married to have the rights of
18 married persons. ORS 106.305(1)-(7). It set up no barriers for opposite-sex couples to gain those rights the
19 old-fashioned way, that is, by actually getting married. As such, the Court has serious doubts whether
20 Plaintiff suffered an injury so as to have standing.

21 Finally, there is an issue as to whether Plaintiff is now precluded from mounting a constitutional
22 challenge because she did not do so in the now-completed dissolution suit.

23 Despite such doubts and lingering threshold issues, the Court is not at this juncture prepared to rule
24 on the constitutional challenge because, as Plaintiff admits, she has not complied with FRCP 5.1
25 (incorporated by FRBP 9005.1), and LBR 9005-1.1, which set out the procedures to give Oregon's Attorney
26

1 General an opportunity to intervene on the constitutional issue.¹¹ Therefore, Plaintiff will have (fourteen) 14
2 days from entry of this Amended Opinion to comply with the applicable Rules, absent which she will be
3 deemed to have abandoned her constitutional challenge and/or it will be stricken for failure to prosecute. If
4 the challenge is abandoned and/or stricken, an order will be entered granting Defendant's motion, and
5 judgment will be entered dismissing the Complaint with prejudice, and awarding Defendant his reasonable
6 costs and disbursements under FRBP 7054(b)(1), to be determined in supplemental proceedings under LBRs
7 7054-1, 9021-1(d).

8 This Amended Opinion constitutes the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law under FRBP
9 7052.

10
11 

12 THOMAS M. RENN
13 Bankruptcy Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 ¹¹Even assuming *arguendo* that Plaintiff is entitled to RDP rights, an issue remains whether they
23 would equate to those of a "spouse" for purposes of § 523(a)(15). The Court is aware of the general maxim
24 that cases should be decided on non-constitutional bases if possible. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v.
25 Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579, 584, 72 S. Ct. 863, 865 (1952). However, given that the law on RDP status under the
26 Bankruptcy Code appears unsettled, compare Cusimano, 2013 WL 9736597 at *2-3 (registered domestic
partner under analogous California scheme is a "spouse" for purposes of § 523(a)(15)), with Villaverde, 540
B.R. at 436 (registered domestic partner under California scheme not a "spouse" for purposes of § 302(a)),
the Court surmises that the apparent threshold (and dispositive) defects to Plaintiff's constitutional challenge
may be more expeditiously resolved.