

do not constitute a basis for a bias or partiality motion unless they display a deep-seated favoritism or antagonism that would make fair judgment impossible.” Id.

Here, the Debtor asserts that the undersigned has “prejudged this case” and has “condone[d] the massive corruption of the Courts....” [DE-438 at 1]. While couched in terms of bias and corruption, the Debtor clearly takes issue with the Court’s rulings that were adverse to her. The Debtor’s dissatisfaction with the Court’s prior rulings, however, is not a sufficient grounds for recusal. The Debtor has not articulated any basis to find that the undersigned’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Accordingly, the motion for recusal is denied.

The Court notes that the Debtor has filed a Notice of Appeal, apparently seeking to appeal the setting of the September 22, 2017 status conference. The propriety of the filing of this Notice of Appeal shall be addressed at the September 22, 2017 status conference. Accordingly, the Debtor is advised that the status conference scheduled for September 22, 2017 shall proceed as scheduled.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Debtor’s “Notice and Motion” [DE-438] is **DENIED**. The status conference scheduled for September 22, 2017 shall proceed as scheduled.

Entered this day the 13 day of September, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin Reiding", written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN REIDINGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE