The order below is hereby signed.

Signed: June 29 2011



S. Martin Teel, Jr.

United States Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In re)	
)	
JEFFREY N. COHEN and)	Case No. 91-00306
FRANCINE G. COHEN,)	(Chapter 7)
)	Not for Publication in
Debtors.)	West's Bankruptcy Reporter

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER REQUIRING SUPPLEMENTATION OF APPLICATION FOR RELEASE OF UNCLAIMED FUNDS

On February 22, 2011, Nicholas T. Filloramo, through an authorized representative, Dilks & Knopik, LLC, filed an application for release of unclaimed funds in the amount of \$5,691.03 (Dkt. No. 291). The chapter 7 trustee in the above-captioned bankruptcy case distributed the dividend by check to Filloramo, but the check remained unpaid ninety days after the final distribution. The application states that the check was not cashed because the trustee had mailed it to Filloramo's attorney, and not Filloramo personally.

On May 12, 2011, the chapter 7 trustee deposited the funds attributable to the unclaimed dividend into the court's registry

pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 347(a), and the funds remain on deposit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2041 and 2042. Absent a showing by Filloramo that the debt payable to Filloramo has not been previously satisfied, the court will not grant the relief sought.

The burden is on the Filloramo to demonstrate entitlement to the funds sought. Hansen v. United States, 340 F.2d 142, 144 (8th Cir. 1965). Although the record before the court demonstrates that Filloramo was at one time entitled to the funds, Filloramo has not demonstrated a present entitlement.

Dilks & Knopik submitted the application for release of unclaimed funds certifying that Filloramo's claim had "not been satisfied from other sources, and the amount of the claim that remains unpaid is equal to or exceeds the amount of unclaimed funds."

The application, however, was signed by Brian J. Dilks, not Filloramo, the individual with personal knowledge of the debt and, accordingly, the person competent to make the certification. An application properly executed by Filloramo would have been sufficient to entitle Filloramo to the release of funds.² Thus,

^{1 11} U.S.C. § 347(a) provides, in relevant part:

Ninety days after final distribution under section . . . 1326 of this title in a case under chapter . . . 13 of this title . . . the trustee shall stop payment on any check remaining unpaid, and any remaining property of the estate shall be paid into the court and disposed of under chapter 129 of title 28 [28 USC §§ 2041 et seq.].

² An application for Filloramo to execute is attached to this order.

the court will require pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2042³ that the withdrawal of the funds and payment to the Filloramo be ordered only upon a demonstration by Filloramo, not Dilks and Knopick, of a **present** right to the funds. See Willametz v. Susi, 489 F.2d 364, 366 (1st Cir. 1973).

Moreover, although the funds were originally distributed by check made payable to Filloramo pursuant to an allowed claim, the court is not willing to deem this satisfactory evidence, standing alone, of Filloramo's present entitlement to the funds. See Willametz, 489 F.2d at 366 (funds originally deposited with district court on condition that such court enjoin enforcement of previously entered but potentially duplicative state court judgment could be distributed to creditor of prevailing party despite absence of provision for such payment upon change in circumstances justifying such payment). If Filloramo's claim

³ 28 U.S.C. § 2042 provides:

No money deposited under section 2041 of this title shall be withdrawn except by order of the court.

In every case in which a right to withdraw money deposited in court under section 2041 been adjudicated or is not in dispute and such money has remained so deposited for at least five years unclaimed by the person entitled thereto, such court shall cause such money to be deposited in the Treasury in the name and to the credit of the United States. Any claimant entitled to such money may, on petition to the court and upon notice to the United States attorney and full proof of right thereto, obtain an order directing payment to [Emphasis added.] him.

that was the basis for the issuance of the distribution has already been satisfied, circumstances have changed such that the Filloramo is no longer entitled to the funds. *Id.* at 367 (quoting Harris v. Balk, 198 U.S. 215, 226 (1905) ("It ought to be and is the object of courts to prevent the payment of any debt twice over.")).

Any overpayment that might result from payment of the unclaimed funds to Filloramo is not simply a matter to be resolved by Filloramo and the debtors. Instead, § 2042 requires that the court determine Filloramo's entitlement to the funds.⁴ It is thus

ORDERED that within 28 days of the entry of this order

Filloramo shall supplement the application for release of

unclaimed funds with an affidavit (or declaration under penalty

of perjury) based on personal knowledge showing that the debt

that was owed Filloramo has not been previously paid to Filloramo

from some other source, and that if such an affidavit or

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 2042 requires that the funds be withdrawn only upon order of the court, and even after five years have passed and moneys have been deposited in the treasury, a claimant must be "entitled to any such money." Further, funds deposited in the Treasury may only be paid to the rightful owners as determined by the court. Hansen, 340 F.2d at 144. The court does not address which entity or entities—the debtor, the unsecured creditors in the case (assuming their allowed claims were never paid), or the trustee as a representative of the unsecured creditors—are entitled to the funds in the event that Filloramo is not entitled to the funds. Although it would seem that someone ought to be entitled to the funds, the court need not resolve at this juncture the question of who is entitled to the funds.

declaration is not timely filed, the court will deny the Application without prejudice.

[Signed and dated above.]

Copies to:

Nicholas T. Filloramo 5225 Pooks Hill Rd. #1601 S. Bethesda, MD 20814-2052

Dilks & Knopik, LLC PO Box 2728 Issaquah, WA 98027-0125

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

INI DE.		CT OF COLUMBIA
IIN KE		Case No.:(Chapter)
	TO 28 U.S.C. § 2042 AND	F UNCLAIMED FUNDS PURSUANT BANKRUPTCY RULE 3011 Y TO OPPOSE THE APPLICATION
	uant to 28 U.S.C. § 2042 and Fe, Apj	deral Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3011, plicant, reports as follows:
Applicant is were depos	n this case in the amount of \$	rt pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 347 after a
2. Tl	ne reason why the funds went un	claimed is that
unclaimed i creditor has remains un	funds. If the payee on the check s not been satisfied from other so paid is equal to or exceeds the ar n account record regarding amou [] was not maintained;	of the page stating the balance currently
	but I can certify that the de	bt remains unpaid because
5. I l	nave attached hereto page	(s) (if any) further explaining my

(01/11)	
document is a true copy	page(s) of documents in support of this Application ¹ . Each of a genuine document. I am additionally separately filing a urity Number or Taxpayer Identification Number in Support of of Unclaimed Funds.
	t requests that the said unclaimed funds be returned to:
this day of	of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
Telephone No.:	Printed Name:

¹ See the instructions contained in the court website's Information Regarding Unclaimed Funds for the documents that must accompany application.

(01/11)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT ANY OBJECTION TO THIS APPLICATION MUST BE FILED WITHIN 21 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF SERVICE NOTED BELOW.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies	of the foregoin	ng Application v	were mailed, postage
prepaid, thisday of	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, to:	
United States Attorney's Office 555 4th Street, N.W 5th Floor Washington, DC 20001			
Office of United States Trustee 115 South Union Street Suite 210 Alexandria, VA 22314			
	Signature		
	Printed Name		