

Before the Court is appellant Randall Whitney's ("Whitney") "Renewed Motion for
Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause Why Stay Pending Appeal Should
Not Issue," filed November 20, 2014, by which appellant seeks a stay pending his appeal of
the Bankruptcy Court's order directing appellant to expunge certain notices of lis pendens
by November 20, 2014. The Court denied Whitney's original motion, on the ground Whitney
failed to first seek such relief from the Bankruptcy Court. (See "Order Denying Appellant's
Motion for Temporary Restraining Order," filed November 18, 2014.)

In support of the instant motion, appellant states he has now sought such relief from
the Bankruptcy Court, and that his request was denied. Assuming appellant's description
of the events occurring at the bankruptcy court is correct, the Court now turns to the merits
of the motion and rules as follows.

Having read and considered the above-referenced filings, the Court finds Whitney
has failed to show good cause for the relief sought thereby. In particular, Whitney has

For the Northern District of California

| 1 | failed to show the Bankruptcy Court's denial of his request for a stay was an abuse of |
|----------|---|
| 2 | discretion. See In re Wymer, 5 B.R. 802, 803-04 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1980) (finding appellant |
| 3 | failed to demonstrate abuse of discretion by trial judge; noting all stays other than those |
| 4 | staying enforcement of money judgment are discretionary). |
| 5 | Accordingly, Whitney's renewed motion is hereby DENIED. |
| 6 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 7 | the second se |
| 8 | Dated: November 20, 2014 |
| 9 | United States District Judge |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 19 | |
| 19 20 | |
| 20 21 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| _0 | 2 |