For the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, this Order to Show Cause is discharged.
February 18, 2026
Brian C. Walsh
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

In re:	**Case No. 25-40976-357**
CHROME HOLDING CO. (f/k/a 23ANDME HOLDING CO.),	**Chapter 11**
Wind-Down Debtor.	

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE COURT AND ITS PERSONNEL SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED ON CREDITOR JUDITH L. MAY

Judith May is a creditor of one or more of the Debtors. Correspondence in the record suggests that she has been involved, and may still be involved, in a dispute regarding the paternity of her son.[1] For reasons that are not clear from the limited information I have, she claims that 23andMe is responsible for an adverse outcome in that dispute and owes her compensation.

Neither the Debtors nor any other party in interest has yet objected to May's claims (nor to the claims of any other customers of 23andMe). Thus, I have had no occasion to determine the validity, priority, or amount of her claims. It follows that I have not ordered the Debtors, nor the Plan Administration Trust that serves as their successor, to pay any amounts to May.

For some time, May has included one of the Court's deputy clerks in email communications regarding her dispute with the putative father of her child. The other recipients of these messages vary, but they include law-enforcement agencies, the putative father or his representatives, attorneys involved in these cases, the claims and noticing agent,

[1] May filed a 44-page document with the Court on October 3, 2025 that appears to relate to her claim (Doc. 1459). Because it includes personally identifiable information about a minor, the Court restricted public access to the filing and directed May to file a redacted version. She has not done so.

and others who are not readily identifiable. The deputy clerk first asked May to refrain from including him in these messages, and he later directed her to cease. She has not done so.

More recently, May has begun telling broad groups of email recipients that I have ordered 23andMe to make payment to her and that the company has not done so. In particular, she has represented that I entered an order on December 20, 2025, to this effect. That is not true. As discussed above, I have had no occasion to adjudicate May's claims in any respect. A simple review of the docket also would reveal that I did not enter any orders in this case on December 20, nor for several days before or after that date.

At a hearing on unrelated matters on January 20, 2026, May, who was appearing by Webex transmission, interrupted the proceedings to complain that the Debtors had not made payment in accordance with my order of December 20. I advised her, on the record and in the presence of dozens of other participants, that I had entered no such order.

That rebuke apparently did not have the desired effect. May has resumed her email campaign, copying the deputy clerk, and has continued to refer to a non-existent December 20 order requiring payment of her claim. She also identifies me at times as a justice of the Supreme Court, apparently in an effort to give my order more significance than it might otherwise merit, assuming that it existed in the first place.[2]

This behavior must stop. The Court permits counsel and unrepresented parties to communicate with certain personnel by email about scheduling matters, procedural questions, continuances, last-minute settlements of disputes, and similar issues. But counsel and parties also may address these matters in a telephone call or by visiting the Clerk's office in person. Email communication with the Court is a privilege, not a right.

It should not be necessary for me to point out that it is not acceptable to copy the Court's employees on communications with third parties unrelated to court proceedings, particularly if the goal of the sender is to imply that her arguments or demands are backed by the authority of the Court. And falsely claiming the existence of a court order is simply beyond the pale.

For the reasons discussed above, the Court **ORDERS** Creditor Judith May to appear on **February 18, 2026** at **10:00 a.m. Central time** in Courtroom 5 North of the Thomas F.

---

[2] May resides in Ireland. A judge named Brian Walsh served on the Supreme Court of Ireland from 1961 to 1990, but he passed away in 1998. It is exceedingly unlikely that May has confused the two of us.

Eagleton United States Courthouse, 111 South Tenth Street, St. Louis, MO 63102 and to **SHOW CAUSE** why:

(a) she should not be required to communicate with the Court and its personnel only by telephone or by postal mail; and

(b) the Court should not configure the email inboxes of relevant personnel to reject incoming messages from her, to delete them as unread, and/or to reply to all recipients of an inbound message that the Court does not accept email communications from her.

May will be permitted to appear at this hearing by Webex transmission. She is advised, however, that further interruptions of court proceedings with statements or outbursts that are not germane may result in restrictions or conditions on her ability to appear by Webex. The Court will provide further notice and an opportunity to be heard before imposing any restrictions of this sort.

In addition to serving this Order by the usual means, the deputy clerk is directed to reply to all recipients of one or more of May's recent email messages, attaching a PDF copy of the Order.

Dated: January 29, 2026
St. Louis, Missouri
cjs

Brian C. Walsh
United States Bankruptcy Judge

Served On:

Judith L. May
107 Crofters Quarters
Deansgrange Road
Blackrock Dublin
A94H4F4 Ireland