Minutes of the Bankruptcy Bench Bar Committee
Topeka Courthouse
June 1, 2017

Members Present:	Hon. Dale L. Somers, Judges Representative Emily B. Metzger, Chair Jordan Sickman, U.S. Trustee's Office Bill Griffin, Chapter 13 Trustee Christopher Redmond, Chapter 7 Trustee (via telephone) January Bailey Scottie Kleypas Eric Lomas David Lund Jill A. Michaux Luke Sinclair
Court Staff Present:	David Zimmerman, Clerk of Court Stephanie Mickelsen, Chief Deputy Clerk
Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Colin Gotham, incoming member effective July 1, 2017

The meeting commenced at 10:07 am. Emily Metzger conducted the meeting and all attendees introduced themselves. The Committee had approved the minutes of the previous meeting via e-mail and the minutes are posted on the Court's public website.

Judge Somers thanked the outgoing committee members, Jill Michaux and David Lund. Judge Somers also welcomed Colin N. Gotham as an incoming member and announced that W. Thomas Gilman is also an incoming member.

Old Business

A. Update about the status of the local Chapter 13 Plan form.

David Zimmerman reported that a draft plan had been prepared and the Judges were reviewing it before publishing it for public comment. Judge Somers anticipated that significant changes to the published draft plan would be made only if serious concerns were raised.

B. Proposed Amendment to LBR 5005.1, Appendix 1-01, Section VI (Sealed Documents)

Based on the feedback provided during the November Bench Bar Meeting, David Zimmerman and Scottie Kleypas redrafted the proposed changes to Section VI of Appendix 1-01 to LBR 5005.1. He was careful to craft it as a "how to" guide, as requested by the Committee

during the prior meeting. The drafted language also avoids setting any substantive standards that would determine what may be sealed.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that the CM/ECF events would be designed to make the motion public, but the event for submitting sensitive or confidential exhibits would protected those filings from public view. He also explained that the proposed procedure would allow the movant to propose to the court that confidential materials (i.e., the documents that were proposed to be filed under seal) should be served on fewer than all case participants. If another party did not receive the confidential materials, they would still be aware that the motion to seal was filed because the motion is a publicly filed event. Thus, the other party would know that there was a motion to seal and it could object and assert that they should be given a copy of the confidential materials. The judge could then decide how broadly to grant access to the confidential documents.

At January Bailey's suggestion, there was a minor change in the language to add the word "must" to the end of Section VI.B and remove the word "must" as the first word of the numbered paragraphs in Section VI.B. The new language follows:

VI. Sealed Documents

A. Mode of Filing Motion. A motion for leave to file under seal must be filed electronically by using the "Motion to File Under Seal" event in the Electronic Filing System, which files the motion and its attachments as publicly visible documents.

B. Contents of the Motion. The motion for leave to file under seal must:

1. Briefly describe the documents and non-document items (e.g., computer hard drives) that movant seeks to file under seal,

2. Explain why the Court should exercise its authority to seal the documents and non-document items at issue,

3. Explain, if applicable, the reasons why access to the documents or non-document items should be denied to

a. Some or all parties, if the case is an adversary proceeding or

b. Some or all parties listed in the matrix, if the case is not an adversary proceeding,

4. Explain, if applicable, the reasons why the motion and/or the sensitive or confidential exhibits in support of the motion should be served upon fewer than:

a. All parties, if the case is an adversary proceeding, or

b. All parties listed in the matrix, if the case is not an adversary

proceeding, and

5. *Not* attach to the publicly filed motion a copy of documents that the movant seeks leave to file under seal, and must *not* disclose the sensitive or confidential information that the movant seeks leave to file under seal. Affidavits and declarations in support of the motion may be attached to the publicly filed motion if they do not disclose the sensitive or confidential information that the movant seeks leave to file under seal.

C. Sensitive or Confidential Exhibits Must Be Filed Separately From the Motion.

1. Movant must mark the following documents as "Sensitive or Confidential Material in Support of Motion for Leave to File Under Seal" and electronically file them separately from the motion by using the "Confidential Material in Support of Motion" event in the Electronic Filing System:

   a. A copy of each document that the movant requests leave to file under seal; and

   b. A document containing a description of each non-document item that the movant requests leave to file under seal.

2. Documents filed using the "Confidential Material in Support of Motion" event in the Electronic Filing System are placed under seal until the Court orders otherwise.

The Committee unanimously recommended this language be submitted to the Judges for adoption.

C. Harmonizing LBRs Governing Dispositive Motions – Jordan Sickman

This item was carried forward from last meeting.

Discussion of this topic was tabled. Jordan Sickman may raise the issue at a future meeting.

D. Proposed Amendment to LBR 1007.1(a) – January Bailey

January Bailey proposed that it would make LBR 1007.1(a)(1) easier to read if the rule was formatted as a table. Committee members preferred the table format. Ms. Bailey offered to reformat LBR 1007.1(a)(2) in a similar fashion.

The Committee unanimously supported reformatting LBR 1007.1(a)(1) and (a)(2) to be in table format. January Bailey will finish reformatting LBR 1007.1(a)(2) so it can be

circulated for final Committee review. [Editor's Note: Ms. Bailey's reformatted version of the rule is attached.]

E. Proposed Amendment to LBR 1009.1 – David Zimmerman

During the last meeting, the Committee considered whether amendments to schedules and other documents (such as adding creditors or correcting information about assets) should be made using official forms or whether the court should permit them to be filed in pleading form. The Committee asked David Zimmerman to investigate whether there was any perceived adverse impact on the Clerk's Office if amended forms are filed in pleading form rather than using official forms. Mr. Zimmerman reported the Clerk's Office's feedback:

1. The rules sometimes govern the format and content of schedules and other documents for which official forms have been created. For example, the rules require debtors to verify and sign some forms, perhaps even using specific language. If everyone shares the same understanding that parties will police the adequacy of the content of the documents, and that the Clerk's Office does not tacitly approve the legal adequacy of an amendment by not issuing a notice of deficiency, then it does not matter to the Clerk's Office whether an amendment is filed on an official form or as a pleading-style document. The parties can police the adequacy of a document (and the adequacy of notice) by filing objections to documents that they consider incomplete or inadequate. The Clerk's Office may still issue notices of deficiency when it identifies deficiencies (such as a missing or improperly formatted matrix), but the absence of a notice of deficiency does not mean an amended document is legally sufficient.

2. The Clerk's Office does have an interest in collecting appropriate fees, but that will be accomplished when attorneys use the correct CM/ECF events to file documents, regardless of whether the uploaded pdf document contains an official form or a pleading-style document. If a party mistakenly files a pleading-style document using a "fee free" event to amend a schedule or other document for which a fee should have been charged, the Clerk's Office would contact the party and direct them to refile the document using the proper event so the proper fee may be collected.

3. The Clerk's Office recognizes that there are occasions when using a pleading-style document has its benefits, such as highlighting the few changes in a simple fashion, requiring fewer pages to identify small changes in lengthy forms, and the relative ease with which the preparer can draft a pleading-style document rather than trying to prepare an amended form using certain form preparation software.

Overall, the Clerk's Office does not have any general opposition to attorneys filing amendments in pleading-style documents rather than on official forms, so long as filers use the

right dictionary events and pay the requisite fees, and the parties understand that they police the adequacy of the documents' contents.

Judge Somers said his impression was that the Judges overall preferred a pleading-style document that explains specifically what information is being changed. January Bailey observed that some forms must be filed under penalty of perjury. Jill Michaux advised that in December, amended Rule 9009 will require the use of official forms. She also noted that the long-term national goal is to be able to extract data that is entered into the official forms, but amendments filed in pleading form would not allow such extraction. However, that goal is likely years away. Some Committee members said they appreciated it when amendments are filed in pleading form and specifically explain what information has changed.

The Committee unanimously recommended that there should be no change to the local rules governing amendments. However, they recommended that, if it is technologically possible, the CM/ECF event(s) used to file amended schedules should be changed so they prompt the filer to briefly explain the nature of the amendment(s). The brief description would then appear as part of the docket text.

Judge Somers commented that public noticing would not be necessary to make this change.

F. Proposed Amendments to LBR 2002.2 – January Bailey/Jill Michaux/Emily Metzger

January Bailey had posed the questions should child support office addresses in the local rule be statewide or by county, and is notice required to the United States? The underlying concern was that the county office is not always filing a proof of claim for domestic support obligations, even when notice of the bankruptcy is sent to the specific county office.

Emily Metzger reported that since the last meeting she had spoken with Dennis Depew of the State Attorney General's Office. She was told that if the claim has not been assigned to the State for enforcement then they do not have any involvement in the claim. This means the claim remains at the county level. He said that it could be helpful if the Attorney General's Office did receive notice (in addition to the notice sent to the Kansas Department of Children and Families) because they separately forward notice to the local office, providing a further backup in case the State office did not forward the notice to the county.

Committee members observed that every locale seems to handle issues differently. Some counties are quite active and file claims, while others do not.

It was observed that there was no remedy that could be instituted by a change to the local rules. Judge Somers asked whether there might be a legislative fix to this problem by a change to State law.

Jill Michaux observed that the U.S. Trustee's website lists the contact information for all of the domestic support agencies for the country. But it was observed that noticing those addresses will not necessarily prompt the filing of a claim.

The Committee tabled this issue, subject to being raised again if someone discovers a solution.

Emily Metzger noted that in the past the U.S. Attorney's Office appreciated receiving notice when a federal agency is involved because they could serve as a backup to make sure the agency received notice. When it was noted that the U.S. Attorney's Office receives notice in paper form, she offered to work with David Zimmerman to investigate the option of signing up to receive notices using Electronic Bankruptcy Noticing (EBN).

G. D. Kan. Rule – 5.4.7 – January Bailey/Jordan Sickman/Emily Metzger

January Bailey posed the question whether the six-year requirement to retain original signatures could be shortened.

Jordan Sickman reported that Oklahoma and New Mexico have local rules that require the attorney to retain the original signature for one year. Emily Metzger said she had consulted some criminal Assistant United States Attorneys who said that it would be less of a concern than originally expected if the retention period was shorter than six years. However, she indicated that she wanted to follow up with the FBI. Judge Somers observed that this is a District Court rule. The Committee recognized that it would, at most, refer the issue to the District Court Bench Bar Committee.

Emily Metzger and Jordan Sickman will investigate this further.

H. Issuance of Summons by Plaintiffs – Jordan Sickman

Jordan Sickman had asked whether a plaintiff in an adversary case could issue a summons, as had been done in other districts. As requested during the November meeting, David Zimmerman reviewed Fed. R. Civ. P. 4, which is made applicable to adversary proceedings by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(a)(1). He noted that Rule 4(b) requires the Clerk to sign, seal, and issue a summons "if the summons is properly completed." The required elements for a summons are outlined in Rule 4(a)(1). As Clerk, David Zimmerman indicated he was not comfortable having a summons issued automatically by the plaintiff without prior review by the deputy clerks to assure that the "summons is properly completed."

The Committee took no action on this issue.

I. Clerk's Entry of Default – Jordan Sickman

Jordan Sickman had asked whether, in adversary proceedings, when the time to answer has expired, could the Clerk's Office generate the Clerk's Entry of Default without requiring the Plaintiff to request it?

This issue was tabled until Mr. Sickman could consult with the Chief Judge about it.

New Business

A. 2004 Exams by Telephone Conference Call – January Bailey

January Bailey received the following inquiry from a bankruptcy practitioner:

> 2004 exams. Can be done by telephone conference call. Trustees must disclose the questions in the notice of 2004 exam and/or the necessity of having a face-to-face exam instead of by telephone conference. We are asked to often to go over to a trustees office for just an explanation of something which is a huge waste of time. If the trustee wants to ask questions about a document, they could email them in advance. If they are going to have a court reporter and get serious, they can state that in the notice that a personal appearance is required.

It was observed that 341 Meetings and depositions can both be conducted by telephone, so it appeared permissible for a 2004 examination to be conducted telephonically, as well. Committee members opined that a party might seek to quash the 2004 examination or seek a protective order if the 2004 examination was considered objectionable. Chris Redmond related that he had been a trustee since 1978 and he had never had a debtor appear in his office to answer questions. He typically asked questions by letter or subpoenaed documents. He used a 2004 examination as a last resort with a court reporter present, which would be complicated if the 2004 examination was conducted by phone.

Judge Somers noted that the Bankruptcy Rules say that 2004 examinations may be ordered on a party in interest, but our local rules say no order is necessary. Judge Somers then asked how that came about. No one could recall how. Judge Somers said he would ask why a Rule 2004 examination can occur without a court order.

The suggestion was made that a better practice might be for a trustee to continue a 341 meeting to obtain documents if needed, rather than scheduling a 2004 examination. However, Committee members observed that no specific recommendation could be made without knowing the specific facts.

B. Rule 2004 Examinations: Should the Court adopt an amendment to LBR 2004.1 to add a proportionality element?

Chris Redmond provided materials from the American Bar Association, Business Bankruptcy Committee, which propose an amendment to the national bankruptcy rules to explicitly include proportionality as a standard to govern Rule 2004 examinations. This would parallel Rule 26(b)(1) as it was recently amended. Jill Michaux asked whether proportionality already applies for purposes of Rule 2004. Jill Michaux explained that if a change to the national

rules is recommended to the Rules Committee, it would take at least three years to become effective. Several Committee members expressed support for the concept of adding proportionality to our local rules. No specific change to the local rules was recommended during the meeting.

This item was continued to the Fall 2017 meeting to allow Committee members to consider whether the local rules should be amended to include proportionality until a national rule change eventually is adopted.

C. Funding for Mediation Expenses: Does the Committee support a pilot program to use Bench Bar funds to pay the mediation costs of bankruptcy litigants who cannot afford mediation?

Judge Somers introduced a recommendation from Chief Judge Karlin. She successfully worked to obtain the support of the District Court Bench Bar Committee to use $10,000 from the Bar Registration and Disciplinary Fund for a one year pilot program to pay mediators in smaller consumer cases where the parties have little money to resolve the disputes by mediation. Assuming the District Court approves this pilot program we will see if, during the pilot program, the program is used, whether it is effective and if any adjustments are needed. To implement the pilot program would require adoption of standing orders by both the District Court and Bankruptcy Court. The text of the draft orders is attached.

Several members commented that the draft rules use the term "reimbursed," raising the question of whether the parties must pay the mediator first and then seek reimbursement from the fund.

The draft rules require the presiding judge to approve all payments and also requires the chief judge to approve payments that exceed $3,000. Judge Somers opined that the $3,000 threshold amount ought to be lowered to an amount such as $1,000 to avoid setting that threshold amount as a "goal" for mediators to attain. Others agreed but suggested the amount should be as low as $400.

Jordan Sickman shared his experience in a different district where each party paid $200 to the mediator to mediate the case.

On behalf of creditors, Scottie Kleypas asked how this program would benefit creditors. Acknowledging that creditors are not generally incapable of affording their share of the mediation expenses, Committee members responded that the pilot program would not mandate mediation, but would make it available in cases where it might previously have been unaffordable to debtors. Therefore, if the pilot program is adopted then creditors may enjoy more of the benefits of mediation, such as expedited resolution of difficult issues and reduced litigation costs.

Judge Somers explained that the District Court Judges will meet on June 23 and he invited Committee members to email him any other comments about the proposed pilot program

before that meeting. The Judges of the District Court and the Bankruptcy Court will need to approve the respective standing orders before the pilot program could be implemented.

Judge Somers noted that attorneys who serve as mediators in bankruptcy proceedings will, to some extent, be providing a public service, and if the pilot program is adopted, it would be important to compile a list of attorneys who could serve as bankruptcy mediators. He further noted that the judge would probably be the one to identify issues that could be mediated under this policy and that prior judge approval before commencing mediation under this policy might be a good idea.

Chris Redmond commented that he supports the concept of mediation and will submit some additional comments to Judge Somers. He thought having mediators experienced in bankruptcy is essential to the program.

The Committee unanimously endorsed the concept proposed and the adoption of Standing Orders that would implement a one-year pilot program to fund mediation in bankruptcy cases where parties cannot afford the costs of mediation. Judge Somers invited Committee members to submit further comments to him before June 23 and said he would recirculate the proposed Standing Orders to the Committee if they were revised in response to comments.

D. Additional Information.

Jill Michaux shared that the rules governing the Chapter 13 plan are expected to take effect on December 1, 2017. The Supreme Court promulgated the rules to Congress and it would require action by Congress to prevent them from taking effect as promulgated.

Kansas expects to opt out and have a local Chapter 13 plan.

The meeting concluded at 12:13 pm.

Attachments:
Draft rules governing mediation expenses.
Revised LBR 1007.1 submitted after the meeting by January Bailey.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

STANDING ORDER NO. xx-xx
AUTHORITY TO USE BAR REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY FUNDS FOR BANKRUPTCY MEDIATION ONE-YEAR PILOT PROGRAM

The Bankruptcy Court and District Court Bench Bar Committees have recommended the adoption of this Order to use up to $10,000 of Bar Registration and Disciplinary Funds to create a one-year pilot program that will subsidize the mediation expenses of litigants who, although not necessarily proceeding *in forma pauperis*, are without adequate funds to pay bankruptcy mediation expenses themselves. In consideration of the foregoing, and pursuant to D. Kan. Rule 83.1.2(a), the Court orders that the following changes be made [beginning [start date] and ending [end date]], to the District of Kansas Local Rules:

(1) Amend D. Kan. Rule 83.5.3(e) as follows:

(e) Disbursements. Disbursements from the Bar Registration and Disciplinary Fund are permitted only for the following purposes:

(1) [no change]

(2) [no change]

(3) As set forth in paragraph (g) of this rule and D. Kan. LBR 9019.2(b), to reimburse mediators in bankruptcy cases for approved expenditures that parties are reasonably compelled to incur, that the party is unable to pay, and that are not otherwise recovered in the action.

~~(3)~~(4) [no change]

~~(4)~~(5) [no change]

(f) Reimbursement Procedures for Court-Appointed Counsel in Civil Cases. [no change]

(g) Reimbursement Procedures for Court-Approved Mediation in Bankruptcy Cases One-Year Pilot Program.

(1) Allowable Expenses. Allowable expenses include the cost of the mediation session at the rate negotiated by counsel and the mediator, plus mileage expenses if the mediator is required to travel, that the party is unable to pay, and that are not otherwise recovered in the action. The mediator's negotiated fee (including mileage) shall be divided equally between the parties unless otherwise agreed to and approved by the court.

(2) Reimbursement Procedure. To qualify for reimbursement, all expenditures must be approved in advance by the bankruptcy court. Before incurring any reimbursable expense, the party must:

(A) complete a reimbursement form, which is available from the bankruptcy clerk; and

(B) secure the requisite prior approval, in writing, by the bankruptcy judge to whom the case is assigned and, where required, by the chief bankruptcy judge.

(3) Who Must Approve Expenditures. The presiding bankruptcy judge may approve expenditures that total less than $3,000 for the entire mediation. The chief bankruptcy judge must approve expenditures that reach or exceed $3,000.

(4) Amount of Reimbursement. The District Court Clerk will reimburse parties such amount as the court approves. (assume d.ct clerk makes pmt

(5) Any reimbursements paid from the Bar Registration and Disciplinary Fund must be repaid if money is recovered in the settlement, unless waived by the court.

~~(g)~~**(h) Suspension.** [no change]

~~(h)~~**(i) Reinstatement.** [no change]

~~(i)~~**(j) Criminal Charges, Potential Criminal Charges, and Disciplinary Proceedings.** [no change]

==========

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS
STANDING ORDER xx-xx
AUTHORITY TO USE BAR REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY FUNDS FOR BANKRUPTCY MEDIATION ONE-YEAR PILOT PROGRAM

The Bankruptcy Court and District Court Bench Bar Committees have recommended the adoption of this Order to use up to $10,000 of Bar Registration and Disciplinary Funds to create a one-year pilot program that will subsidize the mediation expenses of litigants who, although not necessarily proceeding *in forma pauperis*, are without adequate funds to pay bankruptcy mediation expenses themselves. In consideration of the foregoing, and pursuant to D. Kan. Rule 83.1.2(a) and D. Kan. LBR 9019.2, the Court orders that the following changes be made [beginning [start date] and ending [end date]], to the District of Kansa Local Bankruptcy Rules:

(1) Amend D. Kan. LBR 9019.2 as follows:

(a) General Guidelines for Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes. [no change]

(b) Reimbursement Procedures for Court-Approved Mediation in Bankruptcy Cases One-Year Pilot Program.

(1) Allowable Expenses. Allowable expenses include the cost of the mediation session at the rate negotiated by counsel and the mediator, plus mileage expenses if the mediator is required to travel, that the party is unable to pay, and that are not otherwise recovered in the action. The mediator's negotiated fee (including mileage) shall be divided equally between the parties unless otherwise agreed to and approved by the court.

(2) Reimbursement Procedure. To qualify for reimbursement, all expenditures must be approved in advance by the court. Before incurring any reimbursable expense, the party must:

(A) complete a reimbursement form, which is available from the clerk; and

(B) secure the requisite prior approval, in writing, by the bankruptcy judge to whom the case is assigned and, where required, by the chief bankruptcy judge.

(3) Who Must Approve Expenditures. The presiding judge may approve expenditures that total less than $3,000 for the entire mediation. The chief judge of the court must approve expenditures that reach or exceed $3,000.

(4) Amount of Reimbursement. The The District Court Clerk will reimburse parties such amount as the court approves.

(5) Any reimbursements paid from the Bar Fund must be repaid if money is recovered in the settlement, unless waived by the court.

***

LBR 1007.1

INITIAL FILINGS

(a) Assembly of Petition and Accompanying Documents. Petitions and accompanying documents not filed electronically (e.g., by unrepresented debtors) must conform to the Official Bankruptcy Forms and must be printed on only one side of the paper. Original documents and pleadings filed with the court may not be stapled.

(1) Parties must assemble petitions and accompanying documents, if applicable, in the following order:

	Name of Document	Official Form for Individual (Non-Individual)
(A)	Petition	101 (201)
(B)	List of Creditors with the 20 Largest Unsecured Claims Who Are Not Insiders	104 (204)
(C)	Schedules	
(i)	Schedule A/B: Property	106A/B (206A/B)
(ii)	Schedule C: Exempt Property	106C
(iii)	Schedule D: Secured Claims	106D (206D)
(iv)	Schedule E/F: Unsecured Claims	106E/F (206E/F)
(v)	Schedule G: Executory Contracts and Unexpired Leases	106G (206G)
(vi)	Schedule H: Codebtors	106H (206(H)
(vii)	Schedule I: Income	106I
(viii)	Schedules J And J-2: Expenses	106J, 106J-2
(D)	Summary of Assets and Liabilities and Certain Statistical Information	106Sum (206Sum)
(E)	Declaration About an Individual Debtor's Schedules or Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury For Non-Individual Debtors	106Dec (202)
(F)	Statement of Financial Affairs	107 (207)
(G)	Statement of Intention for Individuals Filing Under Chapter 7	108
(H)	Bankruptcy Petition Preparer's Notice, Declaration, and Signature	119
(I)	Means Test Calculation	
(i)	Chapter 7 Statement of Current Monthly Income	122A-1

(ii)	Statement of Exemption From Presumption Of Abuse	122A-1Supp
(iii)	Chapter 7 Means Test Calculation	122A-2
(iv)	Chapter 11 Statement of Current Monthly Income	122B
(v)	Chapter 13 Statement of Current Monthly Income and Calculation Of Commitment Period	122C-1
(vi)	Chapter 13 Calculation of Disposable Income	122C-2
(J)	Rule 2016(B) Disclosure of Compensation of Attorney for Debtor	B2030
(K)	For a Small Business Case Filed Under Chapter 11, the Most Recent: Balance Sheet, Statement of Operations, Cash-Flow Statement, And Federal Income Tax Return; Or A Statement Made Under Penalty of Perjury If None Prepared or Filed	
(L)	Matrix and Matrix Verification	

(2) The following documents, if applicable, must **not** be attached to the petition AND MUST BE FILED SEPARATELY, IF APPLICABLE:

	Name of Document	Official Form
(A)	Application for Individuals to Pay the Filing Fee in Installments	103A
(B)	Application to Have the Chapter 7 Filing Fee Waived	103B
(C)	The Plan (If Submitted When Petition Is Filed In Chapters 11, 12, And 13)	
(D)	Statement About Social Security Numbers	121
(E)	Declaration Regarding Payment Advices or Evidence of Payment Under 11 U.S.C. § 521(A)(1)(B)(Iv)	Appendix 1-01 to D. Kan. LBR 1007.1
(F)	A Record of Any Interest That the Debtor Has in an Account or Program of the Type Specified in § 521(C);	

(G)	A Certificate for Credit Counseling and Debt Repayment Plan, If Any, a Certification Under § 109(H)(3), or a Request For Determination By the Court Under § 109(H)(4)	
(H)	A Debtor's Electronic Noticing Request (Debn Request) Form	SUGGEST Appendix 1-02 to D. Kan. LBR 1007.1
(I)	A Statement About Payment of an Eviction Judgment	101B

(3) Electronically filed petitions must follow the same order as listed in paragraph (a)(1) above, except that counsel must conventionally submit the Declaration Re: Electronic Filing (form available from the Clerk of the Bankruptcy Court) in lieu of Official Form 121.

(b) Creditors' Schedules. Debtors must list creditors alphabetically with the full address of each, including post office box or street number, city or town, state and zip code. If the debtor knows that an account or debt, including any applicable domestic support obligation, as that term is defined in § 101(14A), has been assigned or is in the hands of an attorney or other agency for collection, the full name and address of the assignee or agent must be listed, but without twice extending the dollar amount of the debt. Each entry required by this subsection must be separated by two spaces from the next entry. If an agency of the United States or the State of Kansas is listed as a creditor, the agency must be listed as D. Kan. LBR 2002.2 provides.

* * *

As amended 3/17/16, 3/17/08, 3/17/07, 10/17/05, 3/17/05.