

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

In re:	Case No. 13-53846
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,	Chapter 9
Debtor.	Judge Thomas J. Tucker

_____ /

**ORDER DENYING MOTION BY LORENZO RIPPY
TO FILE A RESPONSE TO THE CITY OF DETROIT’S MOTION**

This case is before the Court on a motion by Lorenzo Rippy, filed July 9, 2025, entitled “Lorenzo Rippy’s[] Motion . . . to Allow His Counsel to File a Response to the City of Detroit’s Motion” (Docket # 13975, the “Motion”). The Motion seeks permission from this Court for Lorenzo Rippy’s attorney to file an untimely response to a motion that was filed by the City of Detroit on June 12, 2025 (Docket # 13967), even though the Court already granted the City’s motion on July 1, 2025, after no timely response was filed to the City’s motion (Docket # 13973).¹

In his Motion, Lorenzo Rippy does not seek reconsideration of, or relief from, the Court’s July 1, 2025 Order.² Rather, the Motion only seeks permission to file an untimely response to the City’s motion, well after the June 30, 2025 deadline for any response to the City’s motion, and even though the Court already granted the City’s motion on July 1, 2025.

The Court sympathizes with the Debtor’s attorney for the recent circumstances that have befallen her. But it will serve no useful purpose for the Court merely to allow her to file an untimely response to a motion that was already granted. So the Motion will be denied.

¹ The City of Detroit’s June 12, 2025 motion was entitled “City of Detroit’s Motion for the Entry of an Order Enforcing the Confirmation Order and the City’s Confirmed Plan Against Lorenzo Rippy” (Docket # 13967). The July 1, 2025 Order granting the City’s motion is entitled “Order Granting City of Detroit’s Motion for the Entry of an Order Enforcing the Confirmation Order and the City’s Confirmed Plan Against Lorenzo Rippy” (Docket # 13973).

² For example, the Motion states:

While counsel for Respondent does not expect that the Court’s [July 1, 2025] Order will change in any material manner, counsel does not want the record to appear that she neglected her client’s case by failing to file a response.

(Motion (Docket # 13975) at ¶ 6).



Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion (Docket # 13975) is denied.

Signed on July 10, 2025



/s/ Thomas J. Tucker

**Thomas J. Tucker
United States Bankruptcy Judge**