

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 17 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

RICK NEGRETTE,

Appellant,

v.

PHU V. PHAM; UNITED STATES
TRUSTEE,

Appellees.

No. 24-1053

D.C. No. 5:23-cv-01732-RGK

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
R. Gary Klausner, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 15, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Rick Negrette appeals pro se from the district court's judgment affirming the bankruptcy court order imposing fines and damages under 11 U.S.C. § 110. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(1). We review de novo a district

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

court's decision on appeal from a bankruptcy court and apply the same standards of review applied by the district court. *Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)*, 677 F.3d 869, 879 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The bankruptcy court properly found that Negrette was a bankruptcy petition preparer ("BPP") within the meaning of 11 U.S.C. § 110(a)(1) and that he had failed to comply with § 110's disclosure requirements and practice prohibitions for BPPs. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 110(a)(1), (2) (defining a BPP as "a person, other than an attorney for the debtor or an employee of such attorney under the direct supervision of such attorney, who prepares for compensation" a "petition or any other document prepared for filing by a debtor in a United States bankruptcy court . . . in connection with a case under this title"); 110(b)(1) (requiring BPPs to sign and print their name and address on documents for filing); 110(c)(1), (c)(2)(A) (requiring BPPs to provide their Social Security account number on documents for filing); 110(f) (prohibiting BPPs from using the word "legal" in advertisements); 110(g) (prohibiting BPPs from collecting or receiving payment from the debtor for court fees in connection with filing a bankruptcy petition); *Frankfort Digit. Servs. v. Kistler (In re Reynoso)*, 477 F.3d 1117, 1120 (9th Cir. 2007) (setting forth standard of review).

The bankruptcy court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the maximum

penalty allowed under 11 U.S.C. § 110(l) for Negrette’s violations of § 110’s disclosure requirements and practice prohibitions. *See* 11 U.S.C. §§ 110(l)(1) (providing that a BPP “who fails to comply with any provision of [11 U.S.C. § 110] subsection (b), (c), . . . (f) [or] (g) . . . may be fined not more than \$500 for each such failure”); 110(l)(2)(D) (providing that “[t]he court shall triple the amount of a fine assessed under [11 U.S.C. § 110(l)(1)] in any case in which the court finds that a bankruptcy petition preparer . . . prepared a document for filing in a manner that failed to disclose the identity of the bankruptcy petition preparer”); *Frankfort Digit. Servs., Ltd. v. Neary (In re Reynoso)*, 315 B.R. 544, 550 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2004), *aff’d*, 477 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2007) (setting forth standard of review).

AFFIRMED.