

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
28IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE EDWARD COTRELLE TIDWELL

No. C 16-06149 WHA

**ORDER DISCHARGING
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

A prior order dated March 3 required debtor and appellant Edward Tidwell to show cause by March 24 why this bankruptcy appeal should not be dismissed for failure to perfect the record on appeal (Dkt. No. 16). Debtor failed to timely respond. On April 28, however, the bankruptcy court transmitted the record on appeal.


On May 22 — approximately two months after the deadline to show cause — debtor filed a document titled “Appellant’s Response to Order to Show Cause; Appellant’s Request for Judicial Notice; and Appellant’s Scheduling Order” (Dkt. No. 19). The document, to the extent comprehensible, seems to argue the merits of debtor’s appeal (*see id.* at 3–6) and seek a hodgepodge of miscellaneous relief. As just two nonexhaustive examples, debtor asks to withdraw his stipulated voluntary dismissal with prejudice previously filed in a different bankruptcy appeal (*id.* at 7) and proposes that the Court reconsider a previous order denying his motion for appointment of pro bono counsel in a related civil action (Dkt. No. 19-1).

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

Because the record on appeal has been transmitted, this order **DISCHARGES** the order to show cause dated March 3. Any and all relief arguably sought in debtor’s May 22 filing is **DENIED** without prejudice to renewed request via proper motion. Debtor is reminded that, under the initial case management scheduling order, the briefing schedule for this bankruptcy appeal began upon “docketing of notice that the record has been transmitted or is available electronically on the District Court’s docket” (Dkt. No. 2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 25, 2017.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE