Opinion Title: 05/08/2014 UNPUBLISHED West v. Christensen (In re Christensen), 13-2248, Judge Thurman.

Body:

In this adversary proceeding, the Court addressed the parties' compliance with new Local Rule 7056-1 [1]. It ruled that the Plaintiff's opposition to the Defendant's motion for summary judgment was not untimely because the Defendant had not filed a Notice of Summary Judgment Motion and Notice of Hearing. Nor did the Defendant set an opposition deadline as required by Local Rule 7056-1(c) [1]. The Court also ruled that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment was not in compliance with Local Rule 7056-1(b) [1] as it was not contained in one document and was not organized as required by that rule. The Court cautioned the parties to hew to the rule in the future. As to the merits, the Court held that a debtor's spouse is related to the debtor by affinity and therefore an insider of the debtor under § 101(31) for this avoidance action.

File: 575.pdf [2]
Judge: Judge William T. Thurman [3]
Date: Thursday, May 8, 2014

Source URL: https://www.utb.uscourts.gov/opinions/opinion-575

Links
[1] https://www.utb.uscourts.gov/local-rules/2013/7056/1
[2] https://www.utb.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/opinions/575.pdf
[3] https://www.utb.uscourts.gov/content/judge-william-t-thurman