

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: CV 20-02149-AB

Date: February 24, 2021

Title: *Mary Katherine Cummins-Cobb v. Konstantin Khionidi*
In re: Cummins-Cobb, 2:17-bk-24993-RK

Present: The Honorable **ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR., United States District Judge**

Carla Badirian
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Appearing

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Appearing

**Proceedings: [In Chambers] ORDER DENYING APPELLANT'S MOTIONS
FOR RECONSIDERATION AND FOR REHEARNG**

On January 8, 2021 the Court entered an Order Affirming the Bankruptcy Court's Judgment. *See* Order (Dkt. No. 40). On January 22, 2021, Appellant pro se Mary Katherine Cummins-Cobb ("Cummins," or "Appellant") filed a Petition to Rehear. (Dkt. No. 42.) Since then, Appellant has filed the same document (referred to as Petition to Rehear on the face page, and as a Motion or Petition for Reconsideration in the docket text) three more times. *See* Dkt. Nos. 44, 46, 48. It appears Appellant filed this document multiple times in response to Notices of Deficiency entered by the Court.

DISCUSSION

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("FRBP") 8022, Motion for Rehearing, provides that a motion for rehearing "must state with particularity each point of law or fact that the movant believes the district court or BAP has overlooked or misapprehended and must argue in support of the motion. Oral argument is not permitted." FRBP 8022(a)(2).

Here, although the Petition argues that the Court misstated the record, it is not clear what exactly Appellant thinks this Court got wrong or, more importantly, why any such points were material given the Court's disposition of the appeal. Appellant also asserts that there were misinterpretations of the law, but her assertions all attack the Bankruptcy Court's analysis of the law, and not this Court's analysis of the law as reflected in its Order. In sum, the Petition does not "state with particularity" the points Appellant claims merit a rehearing

Insofar as the filings can be construed as Motions for Reconsideration, they do not meet any of the standards for reconsideration. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), 60(b); Local Rule 7-18(c).

CONCLUSION

Appellant's Petitions for Rehearing (Dkt. Nos. 42, 44, 46, 48) are **DENIED**. Any hearings are **VACATED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Cc: BK Court