

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

STELLA SIOMKOS,

Appellant,

v.

TRINITY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Appellee.

24-CV-8361 (DEH)

ORDER

DALE E. HO, United States District Judge:

On March 3, 2025, the Court denied Appellant Stella Siomkos's emergency motion for a stay of bankruptcy proceedings pending appeal.<sup>1</sup> On March 3, 2025, Appellant filed a letter styled as a "Reply to Trustee's Response, Motion to Remand to State Court, and Urgent Request for Relief."<sup>2</sup> On March 4, 2025, Appellant filed a letter styled as a "Response to Defendants' February 28, 2025, Filing and Objection to their Request to Deny Relief."<sup>3</sup>

To the extent that Appellant's letters present additional arguments in support of her emergency motion for a stay of bankruptcy proceedings, the Court has reviewed the submissions and concluded that nothing therein changes the conclusions it reached in its prior Order.<sup>4</sup> In particular, because Appellant does not identify any order of the Bankruptcy Court setting a specific date on which Appellant will be removed from her home, Appellant has not shown actual and imminent irreparable harm.

---

<sup>1</sup> See ECF No. 13.

<sup>2</sup> See ECF No. 14.

<sup>3</sup> See ECF No. 15.

<sup>4</sup> See Order of March 3, 2025 at 2-3, ECF No. 13.

To the extent that Appellant's March 3, 2025 letter presents requests for new forms of relief,<sup>5</sup> Appellee is directed to respond, in a letter not to exceed three pages, by **March 17, 2025**. In its letter, Appellee shall state its position on whether any of Appellant's additional requests are properly before this Court at this stage of proceedings. Appellant may submit a reply, not to exceed one page, by **March 24, 2025**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 10, 2025  
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dale Ho", is written above a horizontal line.

DALE E. HO  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., ECF No. 14 at 3 (requesting that this Court “remand . . . to [s]tate [c]ourt, “[v]oid the [alleged] predatory loan,” “[d]ismiss [the] bankruptcy case entirely,” and “[i]nvestigate [alleged] coordinated misconduct”).