

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
FORT WAYNE DIVISION

IN RE: CASE NO. 15-11855 )  
)  
PAUL FRANCIS TWEDT )  
)  
Debtor )  
)  
)  
GREASE MONKEY INTERNATIONAL, )  
INC. )  
)  
Plaintiff )  
)  
vs. ) PROC. NO. 15-1131  
)  
PAUL FRANCIS TWEDT )  
)  
Defendant )

**DECISION AND ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

On August 15, 2016.

Debtor's obligation to the plaintiff is represented by an arbitration award and a state court judgment, based upon the breach of a franchise agreement. The plaintiff has asked this court to declare the obligation non-dischargeable, pursuant to various portions of § 523(a) of the United States Bankruptcy Code. The matter is before the court on the defendant's partial motion for summary judgment and the plaintiff's response thereto.

The defendant first argues that the arbitration is somehow a nullity; but nowhere in the brief does he provide any authority to support the proposition – such as a legal standard for when an arbitration award is null or how that standard might be satisfied in this case, see, In re King, 2006 WL 1994679, 2006 Bankr. LEXIS 1416 (Bankr. N.D. Ind. 2006) – and the authority he does provide stands for an entirely different proposition. The court has no need to consider such an unsupported

and undeveloped argument any further. See, Spath v. Hayes Wheels Intern.-Indiana, Inc., 211 F.3d 392, 397 (7th Cir. 2000) (collecting cases); Thompson v. Boggs, 33 F.3d 847, 856 (7th Cir. 1994) (Failure to cite any legal authority in support of an argument waives the argument); U.S. v. Berkowitz, 927 F.2d 1376, 1384 (7th Cir. 1991) (“We repeatedly have made clear that perfunctory and undeveloped arguments, and arguments that are unsupported by pertinent authority, are waived (even where those arguments raise constitutional issues).”).

Defendant’s second argument is that once the state court judgment was entered, the character of his liability changed, becoming new and distinct, and all of Plaintiff’s claims were merged into the judgment, Memorandum in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, pg. 5, so that the doctrine of res judicata somehow bars this litigation concerning whether the debt is dischargeable. That argument has already been rejected by the Supreme Court. See, Brown v. Felsen, 442 U.S. 127, 99 S.Ct. 2205 (1979).

Defendant’s motion for partial summary judgment is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Robert E. Grant  
Chief Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court