

INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I

Psak v. Kardash

Psak · No. CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX · Decided April 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The Hawai‘i Intermediate Court of Appeals denied Keith Kardash's motion for reconsideration, which it construed as seeking consolidation and reconsideration under Hawai‘i Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 40. The court found that Kardash did not identify a point of law or fact overlooked or misapprehended in the prior summary disposition order and dismissed all other pending motions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Intermediate Court of Appeals of the State of Hawai‘i
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Katherine G. Leonard; Keith K. Hiraoka; Sonja M.P. McCullen
JURISDICTION	Intermediate Court of Appeals of the State of Hawai‘i
DECIDED	April 9, 2026
DOCKET	CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Respondent-Appellant Keith Kardash moved for reconsideration of the court's March 31, 2026 summary disposition order and for consolidation with a related appeal.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration under Hawai‘i Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 40 requires the movant to demonstrate a point of law or fact that the court overlooked or misapprehended.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Keith Kardash v. Jerre Psak

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Kardash demonstrated a point of law or fact that the court overlooked or misapprehended in its March 31, 2026 summary disposition order.
2. Whether the pending matter should be consolidated with the related appeal.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration was not warranted because Kardash failed to demonstrate a point of law or fact that the court overlooked or misapprehended in its March 31, 2026 summary disposition order.
2. The motion for consolidation was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“it appears that Kardash fails to demonstrate a point of law or fact that the court overlooked or misapprehended in the March 31, 2026 summary disposition order.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a post-disposition appellate motion rather than the underlying dispute. Keith Kardash filed a self-represented motion seeking to vacate the March 31, 2026 summary disposition order as premature and to consolidate the case with a related appeal. The court concluded that he had not shown that it overlooked or misapprehended any point of law or fact.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The appeal arose from the District Court of the First Circuit, Honolulu Division. After the Intermediate Court of Appeals entered a summary disposition order, Kardash sought reconsideration and consolidation. The court construed his filing as motions under Hawai‘i Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 40 and denied reconsideration, dismissing all other pending motions.

DISPOSITION

other

OPINION

Psak v. Kardash

PER CURIAM.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION IN WEST'S HAWAI'I REPORTS AND PACIFIC REPORTER

Electronically Filed Intermediate Court of Appeals

CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX

09-APR-2026

08:41 AM Dkt. 90 ODMR

NO. CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS

OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I

JERRE PSAK, Petitioner-Appellee, v. KEITH KARDASH, Respondent-Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

HONOLULU DIVISION

(CIVIL NO. 1DSS-XX-XXXXXXX)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

(By: Leonard, Presiding Judge, Hiraoka and McCullen, JJ.) Upon consideration of self-represented Respondent- Appellant Keith Kardash's March 31, 2026 "Motion to Vacate Summary Disposition Order Dated March 31, 2026 for Being Premature and Motion to Consolidate this Case with Keith Kardash v. Jerre Psak, Case No. CAAP-24-00000315," which the court construes as a motion for consolidation and for reconsideration under Hawai‘i Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 40, the papers in support, and the records in case numbers CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX and

NOT FOR PUBLICATION IN WEST'S HAWAI‘I REPORTS AND PACIFIC REPORTER

CAAP-XX-XXXXXXX, it appears that Kardash fails to demonstrate a point of law or fact that the court overlooked or misapprehended in the March 31, 2026 summary disposition order. IT IS ORDERED that the motion is denied. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other pending motions are dismissed. DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, April 9, 2026. /s/ Katherine G. Leonard Presiding Judge /s/ Keith K. Hiraoka Associate Judge /s/ Sonja M.P. McCullen Associate Judge 2