

## INDEX TO APPENDIX

	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Notices of Appeal Docket Date 04/01/2024 & DEBTOR'S ELECTRONIC NOTICING REQUEST (DeBN) 04/15/2024.....	1-8
2. MOTION FOR ENTRY OF ORDER THAT NO STAY IS IN EFFECT Filed 05/02/2024.....	9-11
3. Judge Edward Godoy entered an ORDER (Entered: 05/22/2024) granting Planet Home Lending's motion that no stay was in effect.....	11-13
4. Email records and court docket that electronic notices from the Bankruptcy Court stopped arriving between April 18, 2024 and May 21– 22, 2024 the day of the Order.....	13-15
5. 11 U.S. Code § 341 transcript (pp. 21–22) confirms this error.....	15-20
6. Order of August 9, 2024 (Case No. 24-01333- EAG13).....	20-22

7. BAP Notice of Appeal Docket Filling	
08/20/20.....	<b>22-24</b>
8. BAP, Judge Katz dismissed Petitioner's	
emergency stay motions on March 12, 2025.....	<b>24-28</b>
9. Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal	
Pursuant to FRAP 8(a)(2) filings on March	
12,2025.....	<b>28-30</b>
10. NOTICE REGARDING TRANSMISSION OF	
COMMUNICATIONS March 13,202.....	<b>30-33</b>
11. United States Court of Appeals for the First	
Circuit "Notice of Appeal" on March 10, 2025...	<b>33-34</b>
12. 2nd "Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal	
Pursuant to FRAP 8(a) (a) " March 25,2025.....	<b>34-36</b>
13. First Circuit responded to Petitioner's direct	
Emergency Motion by ordering Appellees to respond	
within five days On March 26, 2025.....	<b>36-38</b>
14. Order in Case No. 25-9001 via judgment dated	
April 10, 2025.....	<b>38-43</b>

15. Foreclosure and judicial sale on July 1, 2024.....	44-49
16. Petitioner’s eviction by March 26, 2025.....	49-54
17. Petitioner’s address, as evidenced by a returned notice filed in the docket on June 25, 2025, in Case No. 25-9001 (17Document: 00118307999, Entry ID: 6733003).....	54-55
18. Motion for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc on April 22,2025, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 40 &41.....	55-57
19. First Circuit denied both motions in a consolidated order issued on Order May 14,2025.....	57-60
20-20.1. Mandate on March 16,2025.....	60-63
21. Comparable by Luis Abreu & Asoc.....	64-68
Certificate of Service;Certificate of Compliance..	69-71

THE COURT: “I don’t know what you’re talking about.”

MR. DÍAZ: “The last—like, the motion—”

THE COURT: “It’s you—I don’t know, you seem to—I seem to be having difficulty communicating with you...”

**6. Order of August 9, 2024 (Case No. 24-01333-EAG13), Barring Refiling for Six Months**

Case: 24-01333-EAG13    Doc#: 60    Filed:  
08/09/24    Entered: 08/09/24 11:07:29    Desc:  
Main Document    Page 1 of 1

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY  
COURT**

**FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

IN RE:

RAY LEONERDIRT DÍAZ SANTIAGO

SSN: xxx-xx-6979

Debtor

CASE NO.: 24-01333-EAG13

Chapter 13

---

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE**

Upon the trustee's motion for dismissal of the above-captioned case (docket number 24), and the trustee's motion requesting entry of order (docket number 56), it is now

ORDERED that this case be and hereby is dismissed with a bar to refiling for six (6) months; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk shall dismiss and close any contested matter or adversary proceeding related to the instant case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Entry: Opening Letter: Notice to all parties RE: BAP  
No. PR 24-019 assigned.

Entered: 09/18/2024 11:16 AM

**8. BAP — Judge Katz Denied Petitioner's  
Emergency Stay Motions — March 12, 2025**

Case: 24-19 Document: 001151493 Page: 1–2

Date Filed: 03/12/2025 Entry ID: 2188589

---

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE  
PANEL**

**FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

BAP No. PR 24-019

Bankruptcy Case No. 24-01333-EAG

Ray Leonerdirt Díaz Santiago, Debtor and Appellant

v.

José R. Carrión, Chapter 13 Trustee, and

Planet Home Lending, LLC, as Servicer for Luna  
Residential III, LLC, Appellees

Katz, U.S. Bankruptcy Appellate Panel Judge.

---

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR STAY  
PENDING APPEAL FILED BY APPELLANT ON  
MARCH 11 AND 12, 2025

By the above-captioned appeal, Ray Leonerdt Díaz Santiago (“Appellant”) seeks review of the bankruptcy court’s order dismissing his bankruptcy case. The Appellant has appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (“Court of Appeals”) from the Panel’s February 27, 2025 order denying his request for a stay pending appeal with respect to the dismissal order (“BAP’s Order Denying Stay”).

Presently before the Panel are the “Motion for Stay Pending Appeal With Affidavit” filed by the Appellant on March 11, 2025, and the “Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal Pursuant to FRAP 8(a)(2)” filed by the Appellant on March 12, 2025

(collectively, the “Motions”). In the Motions, the Appellant seeks an emergency stay of the BAP’s Order Denying Stay while his appeal of that order is pending before the Court of Appeals.

---

It is not entirely clear, however, whether the Appellant is seeking a stay pending appeal from the Panel or from the Court of Appeals, as the Motions were filed with the Panel but bear a caption of the Court of Appeals and reference Fed. R. App. P. 8(a)(2) (which pertains to motions to the Court of Appeals for a stay pending appeal).

To the extent the Appellant is seeking a stay pending appeal from the Panel, these are the second and third motions filed by the Appellant seeking such relief. As the Panel has denied the Appellant’s first motion for stay pending appeal (which was filed on



March 7, 2025), the subject Motions are moot, and are hereby DENIED. To the extent the Appellant seeks a stay pending appeal from the Court of Appeals, he has presented the Motions to the wrong court, and they are therefore DENIED without prejudice to the Appellant filing a motion for a stay pending appeal with the Court of Appeals.

Further, the Appellant's repetitious and redundant filings are vexatious and constitute an abuse of process. As such, the Appellant is placed on notice that future frivolous or vexatious filings will expose him to the imposition of sanctions, such as filing restrictions in this court and/or dismissal of his appeal.

See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8020(b); 1st Cir. BAP L.R. 8020-1(c).

---

Dated: March 12, 2025

FOR THE PANEL:

/s/ Leslie C. Storm

Leslie C. Storm, Clerk

cc:

- Ray Leonerdirty Díaz Santiago
- José R. Carrión, Esq.
- Alexandra Rodríguez Díaz, Esq.
- Sergio Ramírez Arellano, Esq.
- Monista Lecaroz Arribas, Esq.

**9. Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal  
Pursuant to FRAP 8(a)(2) — Filed on March 12,  
2025**

Case: 24-19      Document: 001151465      Page: 1

Date Filed: 03/12/2025      Entry ID: 2188580

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

position(s) within the same time frame as to whether this court has jurisdiction over this appeal and to provide appropriate support for their position(s) on the jurisdictional question.

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Peter Cole

Lane N. Goldberg

14. Judgment – U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit

**14. ORDER Docket Entry Date: April 10, 2025**

Case: 25-9001 Document: 00118271098

Pages: 1–2 Date Filed: 04/10/2025 Entry ID:  
6712994

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**For the First Circuit**

No. 25-9001

IN RE: RAY LEONERDIRT DÍAZ SANTIAGO,

Debtor,

---

RAY LEONERDIRT DÍAZ SANTIAGO,

Appellant,

v.

JOSÉ RAMON CARRIÓN MORALES, Chapter 13  
Trustee; PLANET HOME LENDING, LLC, Servicer  
for Luna Residential III, LLC,

Appellees.

Before

Montecalvo, Kayatta, and Aframe,

Circuit Judges.

---

## **JUDGMENT**

Entered: April 10, 2025

Debtor–Appellant Ray Leonerdirt Díaz Santiago filed this interlocutory appeal challenging the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel for the First Circuit’s (“BAP”) February 27, 2025 order denying Appellant’s motions seeking a stay pending the BAP appeal. On March 25, 2025, six days after this appeal opened, Appellant filed an “Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal Pursuant to FRAP 8(a)(2)” to stay foreclosure and eviction, without elaborating whether such proceedings were ongoing or identifying any date(s) of importance. This court’s March 26, 2025 order directed the Appellees to file a response within five days and directed the parties to state their

position(s) as to whether this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction within that same time frame.

The Appellees filed timely responses, informing that the foreclosure and judicial sale had taken place on July 1, 2024, and the Appellant has been evicted. Appellant filed various motions seeking, inter alia, to void the sale and vacate the bankruptcy court's order that lifted the automatic stay, to strike the responses, and to consolidate this appeal with Appeal No. 24-1256.

This court carefully reviewed the relevant portions of the record and the parties' filings. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c), the bankruptcy court's May 22, 2024 order confirmed that the automatic stay had terminated by operation of law under § 362(c)(3)(A).

Appellant admitted during the August 8, 2024

hearing that the foreclosure occurred on July 1, 2024. The eviction also occurred, and the bankruptcy court's six-month injunction against Appellant filing an additional bankruptcy petition has expired. In light of these events, this appeal is moot. See *Harris v. Univ. of Mass. Lowell*, 43 F.4th 187, 189, 191–92 (1st Cir. 2022) (noting that Article III of the U.S. Constitution restricts our jurisdiction to live cases or controversies; thus, where the court cannot grant any effectual relief, “we dismiss the appeal without reaching the merits,” explaining that “[u]nless an exception to the [mootness] doctrine applies, to do otherwise would be to render an advisory opinion, which Article III prohibits”); see also *Fin. Oversight & Mgmt. Bd. for P.R. v.* 52 F.4th 465, 471 (1st Cir. 2022) (“And when appellate jurisdiction has been called into question ... this court will generally

consider only the rationales offered by the party invoking the court's jurisdiction.").

Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed as moot. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c) (permitting the court to dismiss the appeal at any time when appellate jurisdiction is lacking). Appellant's emergency motion for a stay pending appeal, and his other pending motions, are denied as moot.

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

cc:

Ray Leonerdt Díaz Santiago

Alexandra Milagros Rodríguez-Díaz

Sergio A. Ramírez

Monista Lecaroz-Arribas



---

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**For the First Circuit**

No. 25-9001

IN RE: RAY LEONERDIRT DÍAZ SANTIAGO,  
Debtor

v.

JOSÉ RAMÓN CARRIÓN MORALES, Chapter 13  
Trustee; PLANET HOME LENDING, LLC, Servicer  
for Luna Residential III, LLC, Appellees.

---

Before: Barron, Chief Judge; Kayatta, Gelpí,  
Montecalvo, Rikelman, and Aframe, Circuit Judges.

---

**ORDER OF COURT**

**Entered: May 14, 2025**

Debtor-Appellant Ray Leonerdirt Díaz Santiago has  
filed a petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en  
banc, as well as a motion titled “Emergency Motion  
to Stay the Mandate and for Immediate Restitution

Pending Petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing  
En Banc.”

The Court has carefully considered each of the  
arguments developed in the petition and motion.

The petition for rehearing having been denied by the  
panel of judges who decided the case, and the  
petition for rehearing en banc having been submitted  
to the active judges of this court and a majority of the  
judges not having voted that the case be heard en  
banc, it is ordered that the petition for rehearing and  
petition for rehearing en banc be denied.

---

Page 2

The motion to stay mandate and for immediate  
restitution, and any other requests for relief, are  
denied.

By the Court:

v.

JOSÉ RAMON CARRIÓN MORALES, Chapter 13 Trustee;  
PLANET HOME LENDING, LLC, Servicer for Luna  
Residential III, LLC,

Appellees.

**ORDER OF COURT**

Entered: May 16, 2025

Debtor–Appellant Ray Leonerdt Díaz Santiago’s pro se motion to stay entry of the mandate is DENIED. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(d) (standard); see also 1st Cir. R. 41.0 (stating that this court will deny requests to stay entry of mandate “in cases where the court believes that the only effect of a petition for certiorari would be pointless delay”). Appellant’s attention is directed to Supreme Court Rule 13(3).

Mandate shall enter forthwith. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b) (court may hasten entry of mandate). Appellant is strongly discouraged from making further filings in this fully adjudicated matter.

By the Court:

Anastasia Dubrovsky, Clerk

**20.1. MANDATE**

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**