

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM CHENG and JANET CHENG,  
Appellants,  
v.  
ARTHUR OSTERBACK, et al.  
Appellees.


No. 2:15-cv-01617-TLN

**ORDER DENYING APPELLANTS’  
MOTION TO SET ASIDE THIS COURT’S  
ORDER DISMISSING APPELLANT’S  
BANKRUPTCY APPEAL**

This matter is before the Court pursuant to Appellants William and Janet Cheng’s (“Appellants”) motion to set aside this Court’s order dismissing Appellant’s bankruptcy appeal. (ECF No. 28.) Under Local Rule 230(j), when a motion for reconsideration is made, the party must provide the court with “what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion; and why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.” L.R. 230(j)(3)–(4). Appellants have failed to allege as such. Appellants briefing is thus deficient and their motion (ECF No. 28) is thus **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 11, 2016

  
Troy L. Nunley  
United States District Judge