

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE PANEL  
OF THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

---

IN RE STEVEN WAYNE NORWOOD,  
Debtor.

---

BAP No.    CO-12-101

STEVEN WAYNE NORWOOD,  
Appellant,

Bankr. No.    12-23027  
Chapter    7

v.

DISMISSAL ORDER

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE, SIMON  
E. RODRIGUEZ, Chapter 7 Trustee,  
HARVEL 821HUMMER LLC,  
SIGTECH, INC., KERMIT HARVEL  
and CAROLYN HARVEL,

June 26, 2013

Appellees.

---

Before THURMAN, Chief Judge, CORNISH, and KARLIN, Bankruptcy Judges.

---

The matter before the Court is the pro se Appellant Steven Wayne Norwood's Motion for Continuance to Extend Response Deadline for 10 Days, filed June 18, 2013 (the "Motion"). On June 20, 2013, the Appellee Simon E. Rodriguez, Trustee, filed a Response in Opposition to the Motion.


Appellant's opening brief was originally due March 22, 2013. The Appellant's first request for an extension of time was granted by Order entered April 2, 2013 ("April 2 Order"). The April 2 Order required the Appellant's opening brief and appendix to be filed by June 17, 2013, and provided that "[b]ecause of the length of the extension, however, further extensions of this deadline are not likely to be granted." The April 2 Order also warned that "[n]o further extensions of this deadline will be granted absent extraordinary circumstances," and that "[f]ailure to comply with the terms of this Order will

result in the dismissal of this appeal for failure to prosecute. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8001(a); 10th Cir. BAP L.R. 8018-4(c).”

The Motion is Appellant’s second request for an extension of time. However, it does not set forth any extraordinary circumstance to justify the granting of a further extension. Appellant cites computer issues as the basis for his need for additional time; however, he had access to the very documents he says he needs to prepare and file his opening brief. The Motion “requests a court order that orders [PACER] to allow [Appellant] to have limited access to the [PACER] system.” However, Appellant has previously been accorded electronic access to the BAP docket. At Appellant’s request, his email address was added to this Court’s records as of April 13, 2013. Since that date, all BAP documents have been transmitted to him electronically at no charge. The Motion should be denied due to Appellant’s failure to proffer any extraordinary circumstance that would warrant any further extension.

Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED** and this appeal is **DISMISSED**.

For the Panel:



Blaine F. Bates  
Clerk of Court