(BK) In Re: SK Foods, LP

Doc. 11

this court unable to decipher what appellants want, or how the relief they seem to want could afford them any relief.

2.1

- 1. Appellants purport to appeal from a March 21, 2012 "Tentative ruling" of the Bankruptcy Court. See Dkt. No. 1 at p.34. (That order, in turn, denied appellant's motion to reconsider its February 1, 2012 order compelling their production of documents.) Appellants may appeal as of right only from a "final" judgment, order or decree of the Bankruptcy Court. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a). 2
- 2. Appellants seem to want "emergency" relief from the Bankruptcy Court's contempt order, yet they do not seek a stay of that order.³ Instead they seek a stay of a tentative ruling denying a motion for reconsideration. Appellants do not explain how ruling on this motion will grant them any relief.
- 3. Appellants seem to believe that if they can overturn the Bankruptcy Court's February 1, 2012 order (compelling production of documents), they will no longer be subject to that court's \$1,000 per day fine. However, the Bankruptcy Court's contempt

 $^{^{\}mbox{\tiny 1}}$ "p.___" refers to the page number assigned by the CM/ECF system.

² Interlocutory appeals are permitted, but only with leave of the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 158(a)(3). Appellants have not sought leave to file an interlocutory appeal.

³ Appellants have separately appealed the contempt order. <u>See Collins v. SSC Farms I, LLC (In re SK Foods, L.P.)</u>, Civ. No. 2:12-cv-655 LKK. However, appellants have not moved to stay that order. An appeal of the contempt order has also been filed by SSC Farming, LLC. <u>SSC Farms I, LLC v. Sharp (In re SK Foods, L.P.)</u>, Civ. No. 2:12-cv-894 LKK.

order fines them for violating its November 16, 2011 stipulation and order (in addition to violating the February 1st order). See Bankr. Dkt. No. 666 ¶¶ 1-2. Appellants do not explain how granting them the relief they seek will purge this separate contempt (and if it is not a separate contempt, appellants do not explain why not).

4. Appellants seek an emergency stay pending appeal, but they do not disclose that their request for a stay has already been denied by the Bankruptcy Court, nor explain why, in their view, that decision was in error.

Accordingly, it is ordered that:

2.4

- 1. Appellants' emergency application (Dkt. No.4) is **DENIED** and the April 18, 2012 hearing date is **VACATED**;
- 2. Appellants shall, within seven (7) days of the date of this order, amend their Notice of Dismissal to reflect that they are appealing a final order of the Bankruptcy Court. If appellants fail to do so, the Clerk of the Court is directed to **DISMISS** this appeal, and all stays issued by this court are **VACATED**, without further order of this court.
- 3. If appellants wish to renew their request for a stay pending appeal, they may do so by filing a noticed motion for such relief no later than fourteen (14) days from the date of this order for the earliest available hearing date;
- 4. Any renewed request shall comply with the local rules of the district court, including Local Rule 230, and the Bankruptcy Rules governing requests for stays on appeal;

- This court's temporary stay (Dkt. No. 8), and any continuance thereof, is VACATED;
- The bankruptcy court's order or orders imposing a \$1,000 per day fine on appellants is temporarily STAYED until further order of this court. If appellants do not file a timely renewal of their request, this temporary stay is VACATED without further order of this court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 12, 2012.

SENIOR JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT