

The document below is hereby signed.

Signed: October 18, 2018



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "S. Martin Teel, Jr." with a stylized flourish at the end.

S. Martin Teel, Jr.
United States Bankruptcy Judge

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

| | | |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| In re |) | |
| |) | |
| WILLIAM MCKINNEY, |) | Case No. 15-00309 |
| |) | (Chapter 7) |
| Debtor. |) | Not for publication in |
| |) | West's Bankruptcy Reporter. |

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER DENYING MOTION
TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE FORM B423 AND MOTION TO REOPEN CASE

On September 27, 2018, the court entered a *Memorandum Decision and Order* (Dkt. No. 27) directing the debtor within 17 days to file a supplementation of his *Motion to Extend Time to File Form B423* (Dkt. No. 25) to provide detailed information as set forth in that *Memorandum Decision and Order*. The 17th day fell on Sunday, October 14, 2018, making Monday, October 15, 2018, the deadline for filing the supplementation. The debtor has not filed the required supplementation by that deadline. Without that supplementation, the debtor has not established that he is entitled to an enlargement of the time to file an Official

Form B423 in order to obtain a discharge.¹ Without having established cause to enlarge the time to file an Official Form B423, there is no reason to reopen the case. It is thus

ORDERED that the *Amended Motion to Reopen Chapter 7 Case and [for] Entry of an Order of Discharge* (Dkt. No. 24) and the *Motion to Extend Time to File Form B423* (Dkt. No. 25) are DENIED.

[Signed and dated above.]

Copies to: Debtor; Debtor's attorney; Office of United States Trustee; all entities on BNC mailing list.

¹ Even if a supplementation had been filed, the requested extension might have been denied (regardless of what the supplementation set forth) if the court followed stringent tests that some courts have adopted for addressing such extension requests. I need not address the precise test that should apply. What is clear is that, regardless of what test should apply, the representations the debtor has made (without supplementing those representations) do not suffice to warrant granting an extension.