2 3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

FILED & ENTERED JUL 02 2013 **CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT Central District of California** BY bakchell DEPUTY CLERK

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA** LOS ANGELES DIVISION

In re	
MARTIN PEMSTEI PEMSTEIN,	N and DIANA Debtors.

MARTIN PEMSTEIN, Plaintiff, VS. HAROLD PEMSTEIN,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:12-bk-15900-RK

Chapter 11

Adv No. 2:12-ap-02467-RK

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR **EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A** NOTICE OF APPEAL

Hearing Date: July 2, 2013 Time: 2:00 p.m.

Courtroom: 1675

On June 27, 2013, Plaintiff Martin Pemstein ("debtor") filed a motion for extension of time to file a notice of appeal of this court's order dismissing debtor's complaint in this adversary proceeding, entered on May 30, 2013 (the "Motion"). The court granted debtor's separate application for order shortening time, setting the Motion for hearing on

July 2, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. On July 1, 2013, the Defendant filed an Opposition to the Motion. After carefully considering the moving and opposing papers, the court takes the Motion under submission, takes the hearing off calendar, and grants the Motion based on debtor's showing of excusable neglect pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure (FRBP) 8002(c)(2).

Pursuant to FRBP 8002(a), debtor had 14 days to file a notice of appeal of the dismissal order entered on May 30, 2013, or until June 13, 2013. Debtor did not file a timely notice of appeal by the expiration date of June 13, 2013 for filing a timely notice of appeal.

Debtor filed a motion to extend time to file a notice of appeal pursuant to FRBP 8002(c)(2), which provides: "A request to extend the time for filing a notice of appeal must be filed before the time for filing a notice of appeal has expired, except that such a motion filed not later than 21 days after the expiration of the time for filing a notice of appeal may be granted upon a showing of excusable neglect." Although debtor did not file the motion to extend time to appeal by the expiration date for filing a notice of appeal, on June 27, 2013, he filed a timely motion to extend time to appeal based on excusable neglect since the motion was filed within 21 days of the expiration of the normal appeal period, or July 4, 2013.

The issue before the court is whether debtor has shown excusable neglect for not filing a timely notice of appeal under the normal 21-day deadline under FRBP 8002(b). FRBP 8002(c)(2); 10 Resnick and Sommer, *Collier on Bankruptcy*, ¶ 8002.10.2[2] at 8002-16 – 8002-17 (16th ed. 2012), *citing Pioneer Investment Services Co. v. Brunswick Associates Limited Partnership*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993). In *Pioneer*, the Supreme Court held that the determination of whether neglect is "excusable" is "at bottom an equitable one, taking account of all relevant circumstances surrounding the party's omission" and stated that a court should consider such circumstances, including: (1) the danger of prejudice to the opposing party, (2) the length of the delay and its potential impact on the proceedings, (3) the reason for the delay, and (4) whether the movant

1

5

4

6 7

9 10

8

12

11

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27 28 acted in good faith. 507 U.S. at 395. While *Pioneer* addressed excusable neglect for enlargement of time under the FRBP in general pursuant to FRBP 9006(b)(1), Collier on Bankruptcy suggests that there is no good reason why the rationale in *Pioneer* should not apply to FRBP 8002(c)(2) governing time to extend time to appeal. 10 Resnick and Sommer, Collier on Bankruptcy, ¶ 8002.10.2[2] at 8002-17, citing Pioneer Investment Services Co. v. Brunswick Associates Limited Partnership, 507 U.S. at 395.

As attested to by debtor in his declaration in support of the motion, debtor as a layperson in this adversary proceeding did not receive notice of the court's dismissal order in time to file a timely notice of appeal because of the sale of his residence (2516 Vista Baya, Newport Beach, CA 92660-3636) and his moving to a new address, which was his mother-in-law's address (38 Calle Aragon, Unit F, Laguna Woods, CA 92637). According to the debtor (in the points and authorities for the motion, but not in his declaration in the motion), he was in the process of moving when the court entered its dismissal order on or about May 23, 2013, and that the United States Postal Service put a hold on mail sent to the old address on or about May 27, 2013 with a 15-day lead time before forwarding mail to a new address. Thus, according to debtor, he only received a copy of the dismissal order on June 12, 2013 forwarded by USPS from the old address, which did not give him sufficient time to file a timely notice of appeal, and no copy of the dismissal order was directly delivered to him at the new address.

The notice of entered order and service list for the dismissal order indicated both debtor's old and new addresses, but the certificate of notice of mailing of the dismissal order issued for the court by the Bankruptcy Noticing Center filed on June 1, 2013 (Docket No. 40) indicates that debtor was only served at the old address and not at the new address.

It appears that debtor may have neglected to notify the court of his new address by formal notice of change of address, thinking that listing his new address on his subsequent pleadings was sufficient, which is not (see FRBP 4002(a)(5)), and thus, it further appears that the Bankruptcy Noticing Center only mailed a copy of the dismissal

order to debtor at the old address. This fact corroborates debtor's factual contentions that no copy of the dismissal order was directly mailed to him at the new address, but that the only copy of the dismissal order mailed to him was substantially delayed because it was sent to the old address with a USPS forwarding hold.

Debtor said that he learned about the dismissal order when he logged onto the court's tentative ruling calendar on June 11, 2013 for June 12, 2013 and saw that the status conference on June 12 was vacated due to the dismissal, but did not receive an actual copy of the dismissal order until it was forwarded to the new address and delivered on June 12. (However, the court does not agree with debtor's contention that no hearings were conducted on the merits of the motion to dismiss, which contention is not supported by the record of the hearing on April 23, 2013, at which hearing the merits of the motion were extensively argued, and not just on bankruptcy court jurisdiction.).

These circumstances show excusable neglect because the debtor did not actually receive a copy of the dismissal order until the day before the time to appeal expired and had insufficient time to file a timely notice of appeal (the court notes that debtor does not explicitly argue that receiving an actual copy of the dismissal order the day before the appeal expiration date was insufficient, but this is implicit from the motion in general). These facts indicate the reason for debtor's delay in filing a notice of appeal and his acting in good faith regarding filing a notice of appeal, which are two of the four *Pioneer* factors. The other two *Pioneer* factors of the danger of prejudice to the opposing party and the length of the delay and its potential impact on the proceedings do not negate excusable neglect in this court's view. There is no prejudice to the defendant as the opposing party because the delay of debtor in filing a notice of appeal is not more than a few weeks, and given the debtor's vigorous opposition to the motion to dismiss, defendant expected and knew or should have reasonably expected and known that debtor would take an appeal of the dismissal order. For the foregoing reasons, the court in considering the *Pioneer* factors finds that debtor has shown excusable neglect to

Case 2:12-ap-02467-RK Doc 54 Filed 07/02/13 Entered 07/02/13 17:50:04 Desc Main Document Page 5 of 6