

WARNING: AT LEAST ONE DOCUMENT COULD NOT BE INCLUDED!

You were not billed for these documents.

Please see below.

Selected docket entries for case 22-55934

Generated: 08/30/2024 10:51:44

Filed	Document Description	Page	Docket Text
06/03/2024	<u>22</u>		FILED MEMORANDUM (MICHELLE T. FRIEDLAND, MARK J. BENNETT and GABRIEL P. SANCHEZ) Appellee's request for summary affirmance, set forth in the answering brief, is denied.DISMISSED. FILED AND ENTERED JUDGMENT. [12888966] (MM)
	<u>22</u> Memorandum	2	
	22 Post Judgment Form DOCUMENT COULD NOT BE RETRIEVED!		

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 3 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS,

No. 22-55934

Debtor.

D.C. No. 8:22-cv-00329-SB

ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS,

MEMORANDUM*

Appellant,

v.

RICHARD A. MARSHACK, Chapter 7
Trustee,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 29, 2024**

Before: FRIEDLAND, BENNETT, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Chapter 7 debtor Alicia Marie Richards appeals pro se from the district

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

court's judgment affirming the bankruptcy court's order holding her in civil contempt for failure to obey the court's order to turn over real property. We dismiss this appeal as moot.

This appeal is moot because during the pendency of her appeals, the bankruptcy court adjudged Richards to be no longer in contempt, and thus no live case or controversy remains for adjudication. *See Thomassen v. United States*, 835 F.2d 727, 731 (9th Cir. 1987) (recognizing that “the purging of the contempt ordinarily renders the controversy moot” because “in most instances the court has no remedy to afford the party contesting the now purged contempt”).

Because Richards's appeal is moot, we do not consider her arguments addressing the underlying merits of the appeal.

Appellee's request for summary affirmance, set forth in the answering brief, is denied.

DISMISSED.