MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT
OPINION SUMMARY

ERIC DIECKMANN,	)	No. ED108670
	)	
Respondent,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of St. Louis County
vs.	)	
	)	Honorable Nancy Watkins
	)	McLaughlin
JH CONSTRUCTION 2, LLC, D/B/A JH EXTERIORS, et al.,	)	
	)	
Appellants.	)	FILED: March 9, 2021

Appellants JH Construction 2, LLC ("JH Construction"), JH Exteriors, LLC, JH Exteriors Series-LLC, JH Exteriors1, LLC, Joshua and Chalsea S. Hudson, and Heather N. Killian (collectively, "Appellants") appeal from the judgment of the trial court following a bench trial. The trial court found Appellants jointly and severally liable to plaintiff-respondent Eric Dieckmann for violations of Missouri's Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act ("MUFTA") and awarded $101,283.63 in compensatory damages and $50,000 in punitive damages.

In their first point on appeal, Appellants allege the trial court erred in entering judgment against them based on a void default judgment entered in a previous case in violation of a bankruptcy stay. In their second point on appeal, Appellants argue the trial court erred in denying their motion to set aside the judgment because the judgment was entered in violation of a second bankruptcy stay. In their third point on appeal, Appellants challenge the judgment entered against them on the counts concerning piercing the corporate veil because the claims were barred by the statute of limitations, claim splitting, and Section 347.141, which governs the disposition of claims against limited liability corporations following their dissolution. Appellants also argue there was insufficient evidence to support the judgment on these claims. In their final point on appeal, Appellants allege the trial court erred in entering judgment against them under MUFTA because not all Appellants were debtors under MUFTA and because the award of damages was not supported by the evidence.

AFFIRMED.

DIVISION THREE HOLDS: Because the first bankruptcy stay in effect when the default judgment was entered in the previous case stayed only personal claims against Joshua Hudson, the judgment entered against JH Construction did not violate the first bankruptcy stay. In addition, the judgment in the present case was not entered while the second bankruptcy stay was in effect, and nothing that occurred while the stay was in effect voided the judgment entered against Appellants. Because Point Three raises at least four distinct claims of error, we dismiss Point Three for failing to comply with Rule 84.04(d). Lastly, the Appellants are properly deemed debtors under MUFTA because of the trial court's ruling piercing the corporate veil of the business entities and the award of damages was supported by sufficient evidence in the record. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Opinion by: Kurt S. Odenwald, J.
Angela T. Quigless, P.J., and James M. Dowd, J., concur.

Attorneys for Appellants:	Patricia S. Williams, Katrina L. Smeltzer and Timothy C. Sansone
Attorneys for Respondent:	Nicholas K. Meador and Gregory E. Anderson

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.