**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | |
|---|---|
| In re:<br><br>IMPAC MORTGAGE HOLDINGS, INC., *et al.,*<br><br>Reorganized Debtors. | Chapter 11<br><br>Case No. 26-10593 (CTG)<br><br>**Related Docket No. 171** |

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL**

On May 29, 2026, the Court confirmed the debtors' chapter 11 plan.[1] No party objected to confirmation, so the hearing on confirmation was a fully consensual one.[2] On June 10, 2026, the plan became effective.[3] Two days later, on June 12, 2026, Waseem Naik filed a notice of appeal from the confirmation order.[4] Naik thereafter moved this Court for stay pending appeal.[5] The debtors oppose the motion.[6] For the reasons described below, the motion for a stay is denied.

In considering a motion for stay pending appeal, courts apply a four-factor test: (1) whether the appellant has made a strong showing that they are likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the appellant will be irreparably injured absent a stay;

[1] D.I. 165.

[2] *See* May 28, 2026 Hr'g Tr. at 4-6 (debtors' counsel describing resolution of all informal objections); *id.* at 16-17 (Court asks whether there is "[a]ny other party in interest [that] wish[es] to be heard," and hearing no response, stating that "I view my job as resolving disputes and it doesn't look like you have given me any disputes to resolve.").

[3] D.I. 169 (notice of effective date).

[4] D.I. 170.

[5] D.I. 171.

[6] D.I. 180.

(3) whether the stay will substantially harm other interested parties in the litigation; and (4) whether the stay is in the interest of the public.[7] The Supreme Court and the Third Circuit have explained that the most important factors are the first two – the likelihood of success on the merits and risk of irreparable injury.[8] If a movant does not satisfy both of these first two factors, "the inquiry into the balance of harms and the public interest is unnecessary, and the stay should be denied without further analysis."[9]

The Third Circuit has held that the likelihood of success on the merits will be satisfied when there is "a reasonable chance, or probability, of winning."[10] Here, likelihood of success on the merits is not satisfied. Naik forfeited his right to appeal by failing to object to confirmation of the chapter 11 plan. As the Third Circuit has explained, under the "party presentation principle," courts typically resolve disputes that are presented to them by the parties.[11] A party's failure to present an issue to a trial court therefore typically operates as a forfeiture of its right to present the issue on appeal.[12] Naik accordingly has not established a likelihood of success on the merits.

---

[7] *In re Revel AC, Inc.*, 802 F.3d 558, 565 (3d Cir. 2015). *See also Republic of Philippines v. Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*, 949 F.2d 653, 658 (3d Cir. 1991).

[8] *Revel,* 802 F.3d at 568; *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009).

[9] *Revel,* 802 F.3d at 571 (internal brackets omitted).

[10] *Id.* at 568.

[11] *United States v. Dowdell*, 70 F.4th 134, 140-141 (3d Cir. 2023) ("The policy supporting waiver and forfeiture is the party presentation principle, which applies in both civil and criminal cases, in the first instance and on appeal.") (internal quotation and citation omitted).

[12] *Id.* at 141. While the failure to provide notice on a party would of course operate as an exception to this principle, the record here contains evidence of the debtors effecting on

To prove irreparable harm, "a stay movant must demonstrate an injury that is neither remote nor speculative, but actual and imminent."[13] The Third Circuit has held that if the harm was self-inflicted, it does not qualify as irreparable harm.[14] Naik failure to object to confirmation, however, is the cause of his harm. Naik accordingly has failed to demonstrate irreparable injury. Under the principles described in *Nken* and *Revel*, that is the end of the analysis and the Court need not address the balancing of the four-factors.[15]

---

defendant. D.I. 101, Ex. D., at 85 of 87 (certificate of service, attesting to service on Waseem Naik, by first-class mail, on April 29, 2026). Naik's motion for a stay asserts that the notice was not received until after the Court entered the confirmation order on May 29, D.I. 171 at 4 of 8, but points to no evidence in support of that naked assertion. In the absence of such evidence, Naik has not met his burden of rebutting the debtors' sworn certification.

[13] *Revel,* 802 F.3d at 571.

[14] *Caplan v. Fellheimer Eichen Braverman & Kaskey,* 68 F.3d 828, 839 (3d Cir. 1995) ("Because defendants have acted to permit the outcome which they find unacceptable, we must conclude that such an outcome is not an irreparable injury. If the harm complained of is self-inflicted, it does not qualify as irreparable.") (citing 11A Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller and Mary Kay Kane, *Federal Practice & Procedure* § 2948.1 pp. 152-53 (1995)).

[15] The debtors also argue that the consummation of the plan renders the motion for a stay moot. D.I. 180 at 7-8. The Court understands this to be an argument that because the action Naik seeks to have stayed has already occurred, the motion for a stay is constitutionally moot, rather than an argument that his appeal is mooted under the equitable mootness doctrine. *Id.* at 8 (describing the argument as one grounded in "'real mootness' rather than equitable mootness") (quoting *In re Container Store Grp., Inc.*, No. 24-90627, 2025 WL 4226766, at *10 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. Apr. 7, 2025). A matter is constitutionally moot, however, only when it is literally impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief to the prevailing party. *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165 (2013). In view of the breadth of federal courts' equitable authority to craft appropriate remedies, the Court does not conclude it is unable to provide *any* relief in these circumstances, and therefore does not rest this holding on mootness grounds.

For the foregoing reasons, the motion to stay pending appeal is hereby DENIED.

Dated: June 26, 2026

CRAIG T. GOLDBLATT
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

United States Bankruptcy Court
District of Delaware

In re:
Impac Mortgage Holdings, Inc.
Debtor

Case No. 26-10593-CTG
Chapter 11

# CERTIFICATE OF NOTICE

District/off: 0311-1 User: admin 
Date Rcvd: Jun 26, 2026 Form ID: pdfgen Total Noticed: 1

The following symbols are used throughout this certificate:

| Symbol | Definition |
|---|---|
| + | Addresses marked '+' were corrected by inserting the ZIP, adding the last four digits to complete the zip +4, or replacing an incorrect ZIP. USPS regulations require that automation-compatible mail display the correct ZIP. |

**Notice by first class mail was sent to the following persons/entities by the Bankruptcy Noticing Center on Jun 28, 2026:**

| Recip ID | | Recipient Name and Address |
|---|---|---|
| 21084799 | + | Waseem Naik, 22 Hanover Court, Princeton, NJ 08540-7067 |

TOTAL: 1

**Notice by electronic transmission was sent to the following persons/entities by the Bankruptcy Noticing Center.**
Electronic transmission includes sending notices via email (Email/text and Email/PDF), and electronic data interchange (EDI).

NONE

# BYPASSED RECIPIENTS

**The following addresses were not sent this bankruptcy notice due to an undeliverable address, *duplicate of an address listed above, *P duplicate of a preferred address, or ## out of date forwarding orders with USPS.**

NONE

# NOTICE CERTIFICATION

**I, Gustava Winters, declare under the penalty of perjury that I have sent the attached document to the above listed entities in the manner shown, and prepared the Certificate of Notice and that it is true and correct to the best of my information and belief.**

**Meeting of Creditor Notices only (Official Form 309): Pursuant to Fed .R. Bank. P.2002(a)(1), a notice containing the complete Social Security Number (SSN) of the debtor(s) was furnished to all parties listed. This official court copy contains the redacted SSN as required by the bankruptcy rules and the Judiciary's privacy policies.**

Date: Jun 28, 2026 Signature: /s/Gustava Winters

---

# CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

**The following persons/entities were sent notice through the court's CM/ECF electronic mail (Email) system on June 26, 2026 at the address(es) listed below:**

| Name | Email Address |
|---|---|
| Albert Kass | on behalf of Claims Agent Kurtzman Carson Consultants LLC dba Verita Global ECFpleadings@kccllc.com, ecfpleadings@kccllc.com |
| Alexis Sullivan | on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 asullivan@morrisnichols.com |
| Brittany M. Clark | on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 bclark@lowenstein.com, dclaussen@lowenstein.com;lsklar@lowenstein.com |
| Curtis S. Miller | on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Holdings Inc. csmefiling@mnat.com, curtis-miller-4921@ecf.pacerpro.com;jlawrence@morrisnichols.com;john-lawrence-0804@ecf.pacerpro.com;rchevli@morrisnichols.com;radha--chevli--2257@ecf.pacerpro.com |
| Curtis S. Miller | on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 csmefiling@mnat.com, |

curtis-miller-4921@ecf.pacerpro.com;jlawrence@morrisnichols.com;john-lawrence-0804@ecf.pacerpro.com;rchevli@morrisnichols.com;radha--chevli--2257@ecf.pacerpro.com

Daniel B. Besikof
on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 dbesikof@lowenstein.com

David Shim
on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Holdings Inc. david.shim@dentons.com

Dustin Parker Branch
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC branchd@ballardspahr.com carolod@ballardspahr.com;ZarnighianN@ballardspahr.com

Eric M. Sutty
on behalf of Creditor Enterprise Bank & Trust esutty@atllp.com mmillis@atllp.com

Erin L. Williamson
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC williamsone@ballardspahr.com

Hashim E. Elwazir
on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 helwazir@morrisnichols.com

Jason Daniel Angelo
on behalf of Creditor The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company National Association JAngelo@reedsmith.com, jason-angelo-3987@ecf.pacerpro.com;kcleveland@reedsmith.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Warehouse Lending Inc. ljones@pszjlaw.com, efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Funding Corporation ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Synergy Capital Mortgage Corp. ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Integrated Real Estate Service Corp. ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Commercial Capital Corporation ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Copperfield Financial LLC ljones@pszjlaw.com, efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Holdings Inc. ljones@pszjlaw.com, efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Warehouse Lending Group Inc. ljones@pszjlaw.com, efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor IMH Assets Corp. ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Copperfield Capital Corporation ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Secured Assets Corp. ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laura Davis Jones
on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Corp. ljones@pszjlaw.com efile1@pszjlaw.com

Laurel D. Roglen
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC roglenl@ballardspahr.com

Leslie C. Heilman
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC HeilmanL@ballardspahr.com brothmanb@ballardspahr.com

Lindsay Sklar
on behalf of Interested Party Hildene re SPC Ltd., acting for and on behalf of the account of SP 1 lsklar@lowenstein.com

Margaret A. Vesper
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC vesperm@ballardspahr.com

Matthew P. Milana
on behalf of Creditor The Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company National Association mmilana@reedsmith.com, rbgroup@rlf.com;ann-jerominski-2390@ecf.pacerpro.com;rebecca--speaker-6328@ecf.pacerpro.com

Nahal Zarnighian
on behalf of Creditor Newport Gateway Office LLC zarnighiann@ballardspahr.com CaroloD@ballardspahr.com;garciaej@ballardspahr.com

Reliable Companies

gmatthews@reliable-co.com

Tania M. Moyron

on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Holdings Inc. tania.moyron@dentons.com, kathryn.howard@dentons.com;docket.general.lit.los@dentons.com

U.S. Trustee

USTPRegion03.WL.ECF@USDOJ.GOV

Van C. Durrer, II

on behalf of Debtor Impac Mortgage Holdings Inc. van.durrer@dentons.com, christopher.heaney@skadden.com;andrea.bates@skadden.com;van-durrer-7974@ecf.pacerpro.com

TOTAL: 34