1 1 2 3 3 4 5 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 Appeal Reference #: 19-07 8 IN RE: 9 RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. 10 MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, 11 Debtors 12 13 SETERUS, INC., 14 Appellant 15 v. 16 v. 17 RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. 18 Appellant 19 MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, 19 Appellees 20 Appellees					
3 4 4 5 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 Appeal Reference #: 19-07 8 IN RE: 9 RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, 10 Debtors 11 Debtors 12 Debtors 13 SETERUS, INC., 14 Appellant 15 v. 16 v. 17 RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, 18 Appellees					
456UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA7Appeal Reference #: 19-078Appeal Reference #: 19-079USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH9Debtors10Debtors11Debtors12Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada13SETERUS, INC.,14Appellant15V.16V.17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,18Appellees					
56UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA7111811191119111101111111112111131114111511161117111811911911011111211311411511611711811911011111211311411511611711811911011121314151617171819191011121314151617171819191910101112131415161717					
6UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA8IN RE:Appeal Reference #: 19-079RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH10DebtorsUSDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH12					
7FOR THE DISTRICT COORT8IN RE:Appeal Reference #: 19-079RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH10DebtorsUSDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH11DebtorsAppeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada13SETERUS, INC.,STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE BRIEFING SCHEDULE14AppellantFirst Request]15v.[First Request]16v.First Request]17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,First Request]18Appellees					
78IN RE:Appeal Reference #: 19-079RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH10DebtorsUSDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH11DebtorsAppeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada12					
IN RE:Appeal Reference #: 19-079RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH11DebtorsBk. Case No.: 10-50597-BTB12					
10RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,USDC Case No.: 3:19-cv-00089-LRH11DebtorsBk. Case No.: 10-50597-BTB12Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada13SETERUS, INC.,STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE BRIEFING SCHEDULE14AppellantIfirst Request]15v.Ifirst Request]16v.Ifirst Request]17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,Appellees					
Infertive F are solar operations Bk. Case No.: 10-50597-BTB 11 Debtors Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada 13 SETERUS, INC., STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE BRIEFING SCHEDULE 14 Appellant If is the context of					
12Debtors1213SETERUS, INC.,14Appellant15V.16V.17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,18Appellees					
13 SETERUS, INC., 14 Appellant 15 v. 16 v. 17 RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, 18 Appellees					
14AppellantSTIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE BRIEFING SCHEDULE15v.[First Request]16v.[First Request]17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,[Appellees18Appellees[First Request]					
15V.[First Request]16V.[First Request]17RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E. MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,[Appellees18Appellees[First Request]					
16 Image: Constraint of the second					
MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE, Appellees					
18 Appellees					
Appellant, Seterus, Inc. and Appellees, Ronnie C. McKinney and Joan E. McKinney aka					
Joan Blake (collectively the "Parties"), by and through they undersigned attorneys of record,					
hereby submit the following Stipulation and Order to continue briefing schedule.					
1. This is the Parties' first request for the extension after the Court issued the Minute Order					
("Order") on February 19, 2019 [ECF No. 2] and is submitted in good faith and not					
26272727					
28					
1					
Dockets.Justi					

1	2	2.	On April 10, 2019 this Court issued its minute order setting its briefing schedule, with				
2			the opening brief due on April 24, 2019. The underlying proceeding took six days of				
3			testimony and hundreds of pages of relevant documents.				
4	3	3.	This appeal arises from Seterus, Inc.'s Notice of Appeal [Doc. 249] filed February 14,				
5		2019 from the "Order Regarding Amended Motion for Contempt" [Doc. 243] and is					
6 7			assigned Appeal Reference No. 19-07 and Case No. 3:19-cv-00089-LRH				
7 8	2	 Seterus, Inc. also filed a Notice of Appeal [Doc. #280] arises from the "Order Granting 					
9			Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs Against Seterus, Inc." [Doc. #270]. That appeal is				
10							
11			assigned Appeal Ref. No. 19-14 and Case No. 3:19-cv-00187MMD.				
12	5	5.	On April 23, 2019, Appellant filed its motion to consolidate the two appeals. A courtesy				
13			copy is attached as Exhibit A. Both appeals arise from the same proceeding, two				
14			different motions. As both orders were rendered in the same proceeding, the matters				
15			should be consolidated, thereby saving judicial resources and the parties' time and				
16			resources. The appeal will otherwise address many of the same issues with the latter				
17 18			appeal based on the reasons set forth in the original appeal.				
19	6	5.	The parties stipulate to move the briefing schedules out until after the Court has ruled on				
20			the Motion, with the parties proposing new briefing dates beginning in 3-4 weeks from				
21			today, as the court so directs.				
22	_	7					
23	,	7.	The opening brief in the related proceeding, Appeal Ref. #19-14 is due on May 17,				
24			2019.				
25	8	3.	The parties have not previously sought an extension of time for briefing.				
26 27	///						
27 28	///						
20							
			2				

1	WHEREFORE, the parties so stipulate and agree.				
2	DATED this 16 th day of May, 2019. DATED this 16 th day of May, 2019.				
3	WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP				
4	/s/ Edgar C. Smith /s/ Christopher P. Burk				
5	Edgar C. Smith, Esq.Christopher P. Burke, Esq.Nevada Bar No. 5506Nevada Bar No. 004093				
6	7785 W. Sahara Ave., Ste. 200 702 Plumas Street				
7	Las Vegas, NV 89117Reno, NV 89509Attorneys for Appellant, Seterus, Inc.Attorney for Appellees, Ronnie C. McKinney				
8	and Joan E. McKinney aka Joan Blake				
9 10					
10	Case No. 3:19-cv-00089-LRH				
12	ORDER				
13	The Court, having considered the Stipulation of the Parties, and good cause appearing;				
14	Ordered, the current briefing schedule is vacated, pending a ruling on the Motion to				
15	Consolidate. Opening Brief in the instant appeal shall be filed and served _June 24 _, 2019,				
16	with the Answering Brief to be filed and served July 24, 2019 and the Reply Brief to be filed				
17	and served <u>August 5</u> 2019.				
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
19 20	Dated this 21st _ day of _May, 2019				
20 21					
22	HON LAPPYP HICKS				
23	HON. LARPY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE				
24					
25					
26	EXHIBIT LOG				
27	Exhibit A Motion to Consolidate				
28					
	3				

Exhibit A: Motion to Consolidate

Exhibit A: Motion to Consolidate

1	WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP				
2	Edgar C. Smith, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5506				
2	7785 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200				
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 (702) 475-7964; Fax: (702) 946-1345				
5	esmith@wrightlegal.net Attorneys for Appellant Seterus, Inc.				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
8	IN RE:	Appeal Reference #: 19-07			
9 10	RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E.	District Court Case #: 3:19-cv-00089			
10	MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,	Bk. Case No.: 10-50597-BTB			
11	Debtors	Appeal from the United States Bankruptov			
12	SETERUS, INC.,				
13					
15	Appellant	APPEALS AND TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING OPENING BRIEF			
16	V.				
17	RONNIE C. MCKINNEY, and JOAN E.				
18	MCKINNEY aka JOAN BLAKE,				
19	Appellees				
20					
21	Appellant Seterus, Inc., by and through their attorney of record, Edgar C. Smith, Esq. of				
22	the law offices of Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP, moves to consolidate two related appeals from				
23	orders entered by Hon. Bruce T. Beesley of the United States Bankruptcy Court, District of				
24	Nevada and grant Appellant an extension of time to file the Opening Brief, based on the				
25	following:				
26	///				
27					
28					
	1				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1			

1		MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE
2	1.	On February 1, 2019, the Bankruptcy Court filed the "Order Regarding Amended
3		Motion for Contempt, Motion for Sanctions for Violation of the Automatic Stay,
4		Motion for Sanctions for Violation of the Discharge Injunction, Motion for Damages
5		for Creditor Misconduct" [Doc. #243]. Seterus timely filed its Notice of Appeal on
6		
7		February 15, 2019. Seterus elected to have the appeal heard in the United States
8		District Court, District of Nevada and the case has been assigned Case No. 3:19-cv-
9		00089 [Appeal #19-07].
10	2.	On March 20, 2019, the Bankruptcy Court filed the "Order Granting Motion for
11 12		Attorney Fees and Costs Against Seterus, Inc." [Doc. #270]. Seterus timely filed its
12		Notice of Appeal on April 4, 2019 and the case has been assigned Case No. 3:19-cv-
14		00187, the instant case [Appeal #19-14]
15	3.	Although the orders were issued on separate dates, both appeals arise out of the same
16		underlying bankruptcy proceeding, the Debtors' motion to seek sanctions against
17		
18		Appellant. The basis for the second order [Doc. #270] is found in the first [Doc.
19		#243] wherein the Bankruptcy Court held, inter alia, that Debtors should file a
20		separate motion for attorney's fees. The appeals share a nearly identical procedural
21		and factual history.
22	4.	Because these appeals are closely related, the second appeal [#19-14] should be
23		designated as a companion case to the first, and its case no. reassigned to the first, so
24 25		that the appeals may be heard by the same district court judge.
23 26		
20 27	5.	
28		appeals into one district court case is appropriate. Because of the significant factual,
		2

1	procedural and legal overlap on the issues appealed, it would create efficiencies for
2	the parties, eliminate the risk of conflicting outcomes, and would create efficiencies
3	for the parties and reduce the burden on the district court and its staff.
4	6. Among other things, consolidation will (i) allow each of the parties to the appeal to
5	file one comprehensive appeal brief rather than attempting to file separate briefs, (ii)
6 7	simplifies procedures for motion filing and oral argument, and (iii) reduce needless
8	waste and duplication of effort.
9	MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING BRIEFS
10	
11	Appellant Seterus, Inc. by and through their attorney of record, Edgar C. Smith, Esq. further
12	moves the Court for an order vacating the current briefing schedule until after the within Motion
13	is ruled upon, and re-set the briefing schedule for not less than thirty (30) days from entry of the
14	order on this Motion.
15	1. No previous extensions have been requested.
16	2. This court has the authority to issue procedural orders relating to appeals from the
17 18	bankruptcy court under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8013(b).
19	3. On April 10, 2019, this Court issued a briefing schedule so that Appellant's Opening
20	Brief must be filed by April 24, 2019. This Motion is brought before the time Appellant
21	must file its brief.
22	4. Seterus, Inc. has filed its designation of record and statements of issue on appeal in both
23	appellate proceedings.
24	
25	5. If the court grants consolidation, a new briefing schedule should issue, as the procedural
26	posture of both appeals will be substantially changed, and Appellant's Motions will be
27	
28	
	3

1	moot if the deadline is not changed, as the Opening Brief will be due before or near the					
2	date the Court determines whether consolidation is appropriate.					
3	6. The evidentiary hearing in this case took six (6) days to complete, and involved the					
4	testimony of numerous witnesses and two experts. The exhibits in this case cover					
5	thousands of pages.					
6	 Because this Motion presents no novel issues of law, Seterus, Inc. requests that this Court 					
7 8						
o 9	waive the filing of a brief.					
10	This Motion is brought pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. Proc. Rule 8018(a) and Fed. R. App. Proc.					
11	Rule 27(a).					
12	Dated: April 23, 2019 Wright, Finlay & Zak, LLP					
13	/s/ Edgar C. Smith					
14	Edgar C. Smith, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5506					
15	7785 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117					
16	(702) 475-7964; Fax: (702) 946-1345 <u>esmith@wrightlegal.net</u> Attorney for Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC					
17						
18						
19 20	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE					
20 21	I HEREBY CERTIFY that I am an employee of WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP and					
22	that I electronically served on the 23 rd day of April, 2019, the foregoing MOTION TO					
23	CONSOLIDATE APPEALS AND TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING OPENING BRIEF					
24	to all parties and counsel as identified on the Court-generated Notice of Electronic Filing.					
25	to an parties and counsel as identified on the Court-generated Notice of Electronic Filling.					
26						
27	<u>/s/ Tonya Sessions</u> An Employee of WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP					
28						
	4					