

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

In re Alicia Marie Richards

No. 8:25-cv-02304-SB (C.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2025) · No. 8:25-cv-02304-SB · Decided December 10, 2025

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Case No. 8:25-cv-02304-SB IN RE ALICIA MARIE RICHARDS ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL Bankruptcy No: 8:21-bk-10635-SC On October 11, 2025, Alicia Marie Richards and Lawrence Remsen filed this appeal challenging bankruptcy court orders (1) approving final professional fees and expenses; (2) approving the estate trustee’s final report and application for fees; (3) approving September 2022 and May 2023 applications for interim fees and expenses; (4) granting the trustee’s application to employ a general counsel; (5) authorizing interim fee distributions in December 2024; (6) denying a motion to remove the trustee; (7) denying a motion to strike a portion of the trustee’s opposition to the removal motion; and (8) approving the trustee’s interim report and authorizing interim fee distributions in January 2025.¹ The bankruptcy court issued a deficiency notice on October 11, 2025, stating that Appellants had not paid the filing fee for this appeal.

Dkt. No. 3. They were 1 Most of these orders were already reviewed by this Court in separately filed appeals. See Case No. 8:25-cv-01920-SB (holding that Appellants lacked standing to challenge the September 2022 order approving interim fees and the order authorizing December 2024 fee distributions); Case No. 8:25-cv-01917-SB Dkt. No. 10 (holding that Appellants lacked standing to challenge the January 2025 fee distributions and the approval of final fees and expenses; and that, as of October 21, 2025, the orders (1) approving the trustee’s reports, (2) denying Richards’s motion to remove the trustee, and (3) denying the related motion to strike, were not final appealable orders); *Ferreira v. Borja*, 93 F.3d 671, 674 (9th Cir.

1996) (explaining that a new appeal “is not the place to redetermine what was decided on [a] prior appeal” barring changes in circumstances, intervening decisions of controlling law, or a showing of manifest injustice). ordered to pay the required fee within 14 days but have failed to pay.

The parties have also failed to file the required certification of interested parties, notice of related cases, designation of record, statement of issues on appeal, and notice regarding transcripts. See Dkt. No. 4 (describing the required filings and deadlines to proceed with a bankruptcy appeal).

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8003(a)(2), (3)(C) (specifying that a notice of appeal must be accompanied by the prescribed fee and authorizing dismissal for failure to pay); Dkt. No. 4 (warning that failure to timely file required documents may result in the

dismissal of the appeal). Date: December 10, 2025 Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr. United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/in-re-alicia-marie-richards-o2fwtjm0>