

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 7 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

SPIRO GEORGE JANNINGS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PG&E CORPORATION; PACIFIC GAS &
ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 24-1871

D.C. No. 4:23-cv-01735-HSG

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2026**

Before: LEE, DESAI, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Spiro George Jannings appeals pro se from the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order denying Jannings's renewed motion for reconsideration. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 158(d). We review de

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

novo the district court's decision on appeal from the bankruptcy court and apply the same standards of review applied by the district court. *Motor Vehicle Cas. Co. v. Thorpe Insulation Co. (In re Thorpe Insulation Co.)*, 677 F.3d 869, 879 (9th Cir. 2012). We affirm.

The bankruptcy court did not abuse its discretion by denying Jannings's renewed motion for reconsideration because Jannings failed to file the motion within a reasonable time. *See* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024 (making Fed. R. Civ. P. 60 applicable to bankruptcy cases); Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1) (explaining that a Rule 60(b) motion must be made within a reasonable time); *Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*, 116 F.3d 379, 380 (9th Cir. 1997) (setting forth standard of review); *Ashford v. Steuart*, 657 F.2d 1053, 1055 (9th Cir. 1981) (setting forth factors to determine whether a Rule 60(b) motion was filed within a "reasonable time" and explaining that where the time for a direct appeal has passed, "the interest in finality must be given great weight").

We reject as unsupported by the record Jannings's contention that the bankruptcy court was biased.

We do not consider Jannings's challenges to the bankruptcy court's orders denying Jannings's application to enlarge time and granting defendants' request for default because these orders are outside the scope of this appeal.

AFFIRMED.