THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

FIL	ED
99 MAR 22	
EORTPEAR DIST	TRICT OF SHIP ELAND

In re:) Case No. 98-11222	
SCOTT K. ISAACSON and BARBARA M. ISAACSON,) Chapter 7	
Debtors.) Judge Pat E. Morgenstern-Clarren)	
SAUL EISEN, TRUSTEE,) Adversary Proceeding No. 98-1386	
Plaintiff,)	
v.) MEMORANDUM OF OPINION	
SCOTT ISAACSON, et al.,)	
Defendant.)	

The Plaintiff, Saul Eisen, Trustee ("the Trustee") filed this Complaint to Revoke and Deny Discharge against the Debtors Scott and Barbara Isaacson ("the Debtors") under 11 U.S.C. § 727(d) and § 727(a)(6). The Trustee has now moved for summary judgment on his Complaint and the Debtors filed a response. (Docket 7, 8).

JURISDICTION

The Court has jurisdiction to determine this matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and General Order No. 84 entered in this District on July 16, 1984 by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. This is a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2).

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION FACTS

These are the undisputed material facts based on admissions in the pleadings:

By letter dated April 15, 1998, the Trustee asked the Debtors to provide him with copies of their 1997 federal and state tax returns. When time passed and they had not complied, the Trustee moved for and obtained an order directing the Debtors to appear for examination and produce the returns. The Trustee postponed the examination three times because the Debtors said they had not yet filed their returns as they were waiting for a W-2 from an employer. The examination finally took place on October 20, 1998, at which time Mr. Isaacson appeared and said that he still did not have the W-2. The Trustee advised him to file an estimated return and to appear for further examination on November 3, 1998. Neither of the Debtors appeared on that date.

The Debtors were granted a discharge on June 18, 1998. (Answer ¶ 1 admitting ¶¶ 1-12 of the Complaint). (Docket 4). The Trustee filed his Complaint to revoke and deny their discharge on November 13, 1998.

DISCUSSION

I.

The Positions of the Parties

The Trustee's Motion for Summary Judgment recites the admitted facts from his

Complaint and asks that the discharge be revoked because the Debtors failed to obey a lawful

order of the Court. In response, counsel for the Debtors states that he has repeatedly attempted to

communicate to the Debtors the importance of complying with the Trustee's request, but has

been unable to reach them. This leaves their counsel in the position of being unable to respond

substantively to the motion.

2

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION II.

Summary Judgment Standard

Summary judgment is appropriate only where there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c), made applicable by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7056; Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242 (1986); Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574 (1986). The movant must initially demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. at 323. The burden then is on the nonmoving party to show the existence of a material fact which must be tried. Id. The nonmoving party must oppose a proper summary judgment motion "by any of the kinds of evidentiary material listed in Rule 56(c), except the mere pleadings themselves . . . "Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477

U.S. at 324. All reasonable inferences drawn from the evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *Hanover Ins. Co. v. Am. Eng'g Co.*, 33 F.3d 727, 730 (6th Cir. 1994). The issue at this stage is whether there is evidence on which a trier of fact could reasonably find for the nonmoving party. *Street v. J.C. Bradford & Co.*, 886 F.2d 1472, 1477 (6th Cir. 1989).

DISCUSSION

The Bankruptcy Code provides:

§ 727. Discharge

- (a) The court shall grant the debtor a discharge, unless -
 - (6) the debtor has refused, in the case –

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION

(A) to obey any lawful order of the court, other than an order to respond to a material question or to testify;

* * * * *

- (d) On request of the trustee, . . . after notice and a hearing, the court shall revoke a discharge granted under subsection (a) of this section if
 - (3) the debtor committed an act specified in subsection (a)(6) of this section.

The Trustee may make this request at any time before the later of (1) one year after the granting of the discharge; and (b) the date the case is closed. 11 U.S.C. § 727(e)(2).

The Debtors admitted that they did not appear for the continued examination and produce their 1997 federal and state tax returns. They were required to do so by a lawful court order.

The Trustee filed a timely complaint, proved his case, and is entitled to summary judgment in his favor.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, summary judgment will be entered in favor of the Plaintiff Saul Eisen, Trustee and against the Defendant-Debtors Scott and Barbara Isaacson. A separate order will be entered in accordance with this decision revoking and denying the Debtors' discharge.

Date: 22 May 1999

Pat E. Morgenstern-Clarren

United States Bankruptcy Judge

Served by mail on:

Saul Eisen, Esq.

Michael Ibold, Esq.

Date: 3/22

4

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

FILED 99 MAR 22 PM 3: 32

HORTHLAN DISTRICT OF OHIO CLEVELAND

In re:) Case No. 98-11222
SCOTT K. ISAACSON and BARBARA M. ISAACSON,) Chapter 7
Debtors.) Judge Pat E. Morgenstern-Clarren)
SAUL EISEN, TRUSTEE,) Adversary Proceeding No. 98-1386
Plaintiff,)
v.)) <u>JUDGMENT</u> \
SCOTT ISAACSON, et al.,)
Defendant.)
	andum of Opinion filed this date, summary judgment a, Trustee and against the Defendant-Debtors Scott ge is revoked and denied.
Date: 12 Maru 199	Pat E. Morgenstern-Clarren United States Bankruptcy Judge
Served by mail on: Saul Eisen, Esq. Michael Ibold, Esq.	
By: Joyce L Gordon, Secret	eng T

THIS OPINION IS NOT INTENDED