

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 18 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

In re: PETER F. BRONSON; SHERRI L.
BRONSON, husband and wife,

Debtors,

PETER F. BRONSON; SHERRI L.
BRONSON,

Debtors-Appellants,

v.

DALE D. ULRICH, Chapter 7 Trustee,

Trustee-Appellee.

No. 14-16420

D.C. No. 2:14-cv-00774-SRB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Arizona
Susan R. Bolton, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted July 11, 2017**

Before: CANBY, KOZINSKI, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Peter F. Bronson and Sherri L. Bronson appeal pro se from the 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 order dismissing as moot their appeal from the bankruptcy court's order approving the final distribution of the bankruptcy estate. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). We review de novo a district court's determination that a bankruptcy appeal is moot. *Nat'l Mass Media Telecomm. Sys., Inc. v. Stanley (In re Nat'l Mass Media Telecomm. Sys., Inc.)*, 152 F.3d 1178, 1180 (9th Cir. 1998). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the Bronsons' appeal as moot because the Bronsons failed to request a stay of the bankruptcy court's order and the bankruptcy estate has been fully administered. *See Trone v. Roberts Farms, Inc. (In re Roberts Farms, Inc.)*, 652 F.2d 793, 798 (9th Cir. 1981) ("Appellants have failed and neglected diligently to pursue their available remedies to obtain a stay of the objectionable orders of the Bankruptcy Court and have permitted such a comprehensive change of circumstances to occur as to render it inequitable for this court to consider the merits of the appeal.").

Because the Bronsons' appeal is moot, we do not consider their contentions addressing the underlying merits of the appeal.

We reject as meritless the Bronsons' contentions of judicial bias.

AFFIRMED.