

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Modesto, California

August 10, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 23. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2), OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2009 AT 2:00 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 24, 2009, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 31, 2009. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON THE ITEMS IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR, ITEMS 24 THROUGH 57. INSTEAD, EACH OF THESE ITEMS HAS BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON AUGUST 24, 2009, AT 1:30 P.M.

August 10, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.

Matters called beginning at 2:00 p.m.

1. 09-90400-A-13G KEVIN/REBECCA SCHLITZ HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #3 CONFIRM SECOND AMENDED PLAN
6-29-09 [31]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained.

The plan is not feasible as witnessed by the failure of the debtor to make plan payments totaling \$505. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

2. 09-91402-A-13G BERNARD CLARK HEARING - OBJECTION TO
RDG #1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE
7-15-09 [28]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor is not eligible for bankruptcy relief because he did not receive a credit counseling briefing before filing the petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 109(h).

Second, the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with the tax return or transcript required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A)(i).

Section 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The court may decline to dismiss the case only if the debtor demonstrates that the failure to provide a copy of the return was due to circumstances beyond the control of the debtor. See Interim Rule 4002(b)(3) & (4) [permitting the debtor to provide a written statement that the return or other documentation does not exist]. The debtor has not provided any statement or evidence that the return is not available or that it is unavailable for reasons beyond her control.

The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. This failure also supports a conclusion that the debtor is attempting to confirm a plan in bad faith because she has failed to make

mandatory financial disclosures that are relevant to the confirmation of the plan. The return is relevant to the feasibility of the plan and whether the debtor is contributing all disposable income to her plan. Also, the amount of the debtor's income has an impact on the duration of the plan. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(d) and 1325(b). Finally, the failure to provide the return means that the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

Third, in violation of General Order 05-05 and an order entered in this case on the date of filing, the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition.

Fourth, the plan also provides for three Class 1 claims but fails to specify the ongoing payment and the monthly dividend to be paid on account of the pre-petition arrearage. This does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(5) and 1325(a)(5)(B).

Fifth, General Order 05-03 provides at paragraph 3(a): *"The chapter 13 plan shall be completed and filed within 15 calendar days of the filing of the petition as required by FRBP 3015(b) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(a). The debtor or the debtor's attorney shall serve the chapter 13 plan, all motions to value collateral, and all motions to avoid liens, as well as the statement of financial affairs and the schedules on the Trustee. These documents, together with the Domestic Support Obligation Checklist, Exhibit 3, and the Class 1 Claim Checklist and Authorization to Release Information required by subparagraph 5(c)(2) below, must be received by the Trustee no later than 15 calendar days after the filing of the petition."*

At paragraph 5(c)(2), the General Order provides: *"To assist the Trustee in making post-petition contract installment payments to Class 1 claim holders, the debtor shall complete the Class 1 Checklist and Authorization to Release Information, Exhibit 5, and deliver it to the Trustee within 15 calendar days of filing the petition. This document shall not be filed with the court."*

The debtor in this case has not given the trustee a checklist for the three Class 1 secured claims. So, even if the plan is modified to provide for payments on account of these claims, without the checklists, the trustee will not have the information to pay the creditors.

3. 09-91714-A-13G RITA ROSS
MBB #1

HEARING - OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY
BAC HOME LOANS SERVICING, LP
7-6-09 [16]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be overruled.

The objection asserts that because the plan does not provide for the objecting creditor's secured claim, it may not be confirmed.

11 U.S.C. § 1322(a) is the section of the Bankruptcy Code that specifies the mandatory provisions of a plan. It requires only that the debtor adequately fund the plan with future earnings or other future income that is paid over to the trustee (section 1322(a)(1)), provide for payment in full of priority claims (section 1322(a)(2) & (4)), and provide the same treatment for each claim in a particular class (section 1322(a)(3)). But, nothing in section 1322(a) compels a debtor to propose a plan that provides for a secured claim.

11 U.S.C. § 1322(b) specifies the provisions that a plan may, at the option of the debtor, include. With reference to secured claims, the debtor may not modify a home loan but may modify other secured claims (section 1322(b)(2)), cure any default on a secured claim, including a home loan (section 1322(b)(3)), and maintain ongoing contract installment payments while curing a pre-petition default (section 1322(b)(5)).

If a debtor elects to provide for a secured claim, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5) gives the debtor three options: (1) provide a treatment that the debtor and secured creditor agree to (section 1325(a)(5)(A)), provide for payment in full of the entire claim if the claim is modified or will mature by its terms during the term of the plan (section 1325(a)(5)(B)), or surrender the collateral for the claim to the secured creditor (section 1325(a)(C)). However, these three possibilities are relevant only if the plan provides for the secured claim.

When a plan does not provide for a secured claim, the remedy is not denial of confirmation. Instead, the claim holder may seek the termination of the automatic stay so that it may repossess or foreclose upon its collateral. The absence of a plan provision is good evidence that the collateral for the claim is not necessary for the debtor's reorganization and that the claim will not be paid. This is cause for relief from the automatic stay. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).

4. 08-92417-A-13G CHARLES/JULIET BLYMIER HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #2 CLAIM OF PATELCO CREDIT UNION
7-6-09 [28]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this objection to a proof of claim has been set for hearing on less than the 44 days' notice to the claimant required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1), it is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(2). Therefore, the creditor and any other party in interest need not file written opposition prior to the hearing and they may raise opposition orally at the hearing. If a colorable defense to the objection is raised, the court may assign a briefing schedule and a final hearing date and time or, if there is no need to develop the record further, consider the merits of the objection. If there is no opposition raised at the hearing, the court will consider the merits of the objection.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was March 31, 2009. The proof of claim was filed on April 20, 2009. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed

because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

5. 09-90330-A-13G ROBERT/JESSICA MATTES HEARING - MOTION TO
SDM #3 CONFIRM 2ND AMENDED PLAN
7-3-09 [25]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained.

The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because it is underfunded. The monthly plan payment of \$364.89 is less than the \$721 in monthly dividends and expenses the trustee is required to pay out.

6. 09-90037-A-13G PATRICIA KORSVALL HEARING - MOTION TO
VACATE DISMISSAL OF BANKRUPTCY
AND FOR PREJUDICE OF THE COURT
RECUSAL
7-6-09 [40]

- Telephone Appearance

Tentative Ruling: None. Appearances required.

7. 09-91939-A-13G JOEL VELASCO HEARING - MOTION FOR
EDH #1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
U.S. BANK, N.A., VS. 7-22-09 [21]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The automatic stay will be terminated pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). The debtor lost title to the subject property in a nonjudicial foreclosure that was completed prior to the filing of the petition. Under California law, once a nonjudicial foreclosure sale has occurred, the trustor has no right of redemption. Moeller v. Lien, 25 Cal. App.4th 822, 831 (1994). In this case, therefore, the debtor has no right to ignore the foreclosure and no right to reorganize the debt formerly secured by the property. As a result, the movant, the person purchasing the property at the foreclosure, is entitled to

possession of the property. The automatic stay will be modified to permit it to get that possession.

Because the movant is not a over-secured creditor, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered.

8. 09-91542-A-13G DAVID/MARIE HARTER HEARING - OBJECTION TO
RDG #2 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE
7-22-09 [22]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

9. 09-91853-A-13G EDNA WALLING HEARING - MOTION TO
DN #1 VALUE OF COLLATERAL GMAC MTG.
CORPORATION
7-27-09 [17]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$120,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by GMAC Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$229,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, GMAC Mortgage's other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the abovementioned treatment, violates In re Hobby, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining

whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$147,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

10. 09-90958-A-13G FERNANDO/MARIA LIZARRAGA RDW #1 HEARING - MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER APPROVING MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF AMERICAN GENERAL FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC. 7-9-09 [35]
- Telephone Appearance
 - Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted. Counsel was unable to appear at the hearing on the valuation motion because of a mix up with the court's conference call vendor. Mistake, surprise or excusable neglect as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) has been established.

At the hearing, the court will set a briefing schedule for the filing of opposition and a reply, and it will set a final hearing.

11. 09-91563-A-13G ROBERT/COLLETTE PLACIDO RDG #1 HEARING - OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE 7-22-09 [19]
- Telephone Appearance
 - Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

First, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (6) because, according to Schedules I and J, the debtor has not monthly net income with which to fund the plan.

Second, the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with the tax return or transcript required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(e) (2) (A) (i).

Section 521(e) (2) (B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days

2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$227,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

13. 09-91976-A-13G CHRISTOPHER SOUZA

HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-8-09 [9]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor failed to file a master address list with the petition as required by Fed. R. Bankr. R. 1007 and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(b), which provides: *"With every petition for relief under the Bankruptcy Code presented for filing, there shall be submitted concurrently a Master Address List which includes the name, address, and zip code of all of the debtor's known creditors. To accommodate modern technology, the Master Address List shall be prepared in strict compliance with instructions of the Clerk in a format approved by the Court."*

Because of this failure, creditors are unaware of the case because the court and the trustee cannot mail notice of the case to them. This has needlessly delayed the confirmation of a plan to the prejudice of creditors and is cause for dismissal of the petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

14. 09-92076-A-13G GEORGE/SANDY BAKUS
DN #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF CHASE
7-27-09 [17]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$350,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Chase. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$439,500 as of the petition date. Therefore, Chase's other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re

Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$350,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

15. 09-91980-A-13G ESTELA ILUSTRISIMO

HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-8-09 [6]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor failed to file a master address list with the petition as required by Fed. R. Bankr. R. 1007 and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(b), which provides: *"With every petition for relief under the Bankruptcy Code presented for filing, there shall be submitted concurrently a Master Address List which includes the name, address, and zip code of all of the debtor's known creditors. To accommodate modern technology, the Master Address List shall be prepared in strict compliance with instructions of the Clerk in a format approved by the Court."*

Because of this failure, creditors are unaware of the case because the court and the trustee cannot mail notice of the case to them. This has needlessly delayed the confirmation of a plan to the prejudice of creditors and is cause for dismissal of the petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

16. 09-91980-A-13G ESTELA ILUSTRISIMO
RDN #1
U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOC., VS.

HEARING - MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
7-15-09 [8]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The automatic stay will be terminated pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). The debtor lost title to the subject property in a nonjudicial foreclosure that was completed prior to the filing of the petition. Under California law, once a nonjudicial foreclosure sale has occurred, the trustor has no right of redemption. Moeller v. Lien, 25 Cal. App.4th 822, 831 (1994). In this case, therefore, the debtor has no right to ignore the foreclosure and no right to reorganize the debt formerly secured by the property. As a result, the movant, the person purchasing the property at the foreclosure, is entitled to possession of the property. The automatic stay will be modified to permit it to get that possession.

Because the movant is not a over-secured creditor, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered.

17. 06-90190-A-13G DAVID MACKLEY HEARING - MOTION TO
CFH #3 CONFIRM SECOND MODIFIED PLAN
6-29-09 [49]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled on condition that the plan is further modified to provide for a 37% dividend to be paid to Class 7 unsecured claims. This amount satisfies 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) and reflects the amount already paid to unsecured creditors by the trustee pursuant to the previously confirmed plan.

18. 09-91494-A-13G ELIAS/DELLA MERCADO HEARING - OBJECTION TO
RDG #1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE
7-22-09 [15]
- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

According to Form 22C, the debtor's current monthly income is under median. Therefore, projected disposable income is not calculated using the means test. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(3). Instead, the court must deduct from the debtor's monthly income as reported on Schedule I the debtor's reasonable and necessary expenses as reported on Schedule J.

According to the trustee, no problem arises in connection with the expenses deducted from monthly income. However, the debtor has understated his monthly income by \$1,695.34 a month. When this sum is added to the reported monthly net income of \$476.23 reported on Schedule J, the debtor has projected disposable income of \$2,171.57. This sum must be paid to holders of unsecured claims for a period of 36 months. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(d)(2), 1325(b)(4). The plan does not do this and so it cannot be confirmed.

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The debtor has a home mortgage that is owed to BAC (Countrywide). There is a pre-petition arrearage of approximately \$29,000. This mortgage will mature after the completion of the plan.

The debtor cannot modify this claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2); Nobelman v. American Savings Bank, 508 U.S. 324 (1993). Rather, the debtor is limited to maintaining contract installments that come due after the filing of the petition while curing the pre-petition arrearage. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(3) & (b)(5).

There is one other possible treatment. If BAC and the debtor can agree on a different treatment, such treatment can be included in the plan. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(A). However, as is clear from BAC's objection to confirmation, it does not agree to a modification of its claim.

The plan provides for this claim in Class 1. Class 1 is for long term secured claims that are in default when the case is filed. The debtor promises to maintain post-petition installments to the creditor while curing the pre-petition arrearage. However, the plan provides for no monthly dividend to be paid on account of the arrearage. Instead, the additional provisions indicate that the arrears will be paid via a modification to be entered into by the debtor and BAC.

However, there is no agreement regarding a modification. Therefore, the failure to provide for cure the arrearage means the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(3) and 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

The fact that the debtor is attempting to modify BAC's claim in a way that will cure the arrearage is no response to the objection. Unless and until the modification is agreed to by the debtor and the creditor, the plan must comply with sections 1322(b)(2), (b)(5) & 1325(a)(5)(B). Once there is agreement, the plan may be modified. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1325(a)(5)(A) & 1329.

There is no evidence that BAC has agreed to a loan modification not otherwise permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2), that the debtor has the right to modify the loan under the terms of the contract or applicable nonbankruptcy law, or,

assuming such a right, that the debtor is able to perform the terms of any such modification.

20. 09-91495-A-13G RODERICK/MARIA COUNTRYMAN HEARING - OBJECTION TO
RDG #1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE
7-22-09 [31]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The debtor is a jeweler. He has provided the trustee with financial records indicating that his inventory, valued at cost, was approximately \$198,000, less approximately \$8,000 sold since the inventory was compiled. However, the schedules report that this inventory had a value of just \$25,000. Given the contradictory information regarding the value of the inventory, the debtor has failed to prove that the plan pays unsecured creditors at least what they would receive in a chapter 7 liquidation. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

21. 09-91498-A-13G FRANCISCO/ESTHER SOLTERO HEARING - OBJECTION TO
SW #1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND
COLLATERAL VALUATION BY GMAC
7-22-09 [23]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and the related valuation motion was set pursuant to the procedure authorized by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The debtor has filed a valuation motion that accompanies a proposed chapter 13 plan. The valuation motion addresses the value of a 2006 Chevrolet Silverado pickup truck that secures GMAC Class 2 claim. While the debtor has opined that the vehicle has a value of \$17,530 based on the vehicle's model year. no specific information is given in the motion regarding equipment and

tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The objecting creditor holds a claim secured by a second deed of trust on the debtor's home. While the plan provides for the claim in Class 2, the proposed treatment requires the payment of nothing on account of the claim. This is permissible only after application of 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) as interpreted by the Ninth Circuit in In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). That is, this complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2) and 1325(a)(5)(B) only if the value of the property, after deducting the amount of the senior encumbrance, is \$0.

However, the debtor has not filed a motion to value the property pursuant to section 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012. Without such a motion, there is no evidence that the net value of the property is \$0. Therefore, the debtor has not carried the burden of proving that the plan is consistent with section 1322(b)(2) or that it complies with section 1325(a)(5)(B).

23. 09-91999-A-13G EVA MILLSAP

HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-8-09 [8]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor failed to file a master address list with the petition as required by Fed. R. Bankr. R. 1007 and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(b), which provides: *"With every petition for relief under the Bankruptcy Code presented for filing, there shall be submitted concurrently a Master Address List which includes the name, address, and zip code of all of the debtor's known creditors. To accommodate modern technology, the Master Address List shall be prepared in strict compliance with instructions of the Clerk in a format approved by the Court."*

Because of this failure, creditors are unaware of the case because the court and the trustee cannot mail notice of the case to them. This has needlessly delayed the confirmation of a plan to the prejudice of creditors and is cause for dismissal of the petition. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

24. 09-92000-A-13G PATRICK ADAMS HEARING - MOTION FOR
MDZ #1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY OR FOR
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., VS. ORDER CONFIRMING THAT AUTOMATIC
STAY DOES NOT APPLY
7-20-09 [12]

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

To the extent the motion seeks a determination that the "automatic stay does not apply," the motion will be denied because the motion refers to no facts or authority for the proposition that the automatic stay is not applicable in this case.

However, the automatic stay will be terminated pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). The debtor lost title to the subject property in a nonjudicial foreclosure that was completed prior to the filing of the petition. Under California law, once a nonjudicial foreclosure sale has occurred, the trustor has no right of redemption. Moeller v. Lien, 25 Cal. App.4th 822, 831 (1994). In this case, therefore, the debtor has no right to ignore the foreclosure and no right to reorganize the debt formerly secured by the property. As a result, the movant, the person purchasing the property at the foreclosure, is entitled to possession of the property. The automatic stay will be modified to permit it to get that possession.

Because the movant is not a over-secured creditor, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered.

25. 09-91806-A-13G MANUEL/BERTHA HERNANDEZ HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-21-09 [35]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the installment filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$75 installment when due on July 16, 2009. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

26. 09-91515-A-13G CHERIE DAVIS
FW #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF UNION BANK
6-30-09 [18]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$2,600 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$2,600 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$2,600 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

27. 09-91216-A-13G PHILLIP/PATTY MILLER
SDM #2

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF WELLS FARGO
7-3-09 [30]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$231,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Evergreen Note Service. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$234,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir.

2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$231,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

28. 08-90317-A-13G JOYCE PARK
FW #3

HEARING - MOTION TO
MODIFY CONFIRMED PLAN
7-2-09 [40]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

29. 09-91620-A-13G OLEVIA JONES
FW #2

HEARING - MOTION TO
CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED PLAN
6-29-09 [16]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed prior to confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(a), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. 11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits the debtor to amend the plan any time prior to confirmation. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is therefore confirmed.

30. 06-90523-A-13G EVA BRESHEARS
FW #4

HEARING - MOTION TO
MODIFY CONFIRMED CHAPTER 13 PLAN
7-6-09 [71]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

31. 09-92127-A-13G JOHN/SHANNON BILYEU HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-16-09 [6]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The debtor failed to file a master address list with the petition as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1007(a)(1) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1. The debtor later filed the list. Despite being filed late, it was received by the court in time to be used when serving the notice of the commencement of this bankruptcy case. As a result, creditors were notified in a timely fashion that the case had been filed and they received notice of the various deadlines for filing complaints, objecting to exemptions, objecting to the proposed plan, and filing proofs of claims. Because no prejudice was caused by the late filing of the list, the case shall remain pending.

32. 09-90533-A-13G BETEAB FISSIHA HEARING - MOTION TO
SDM #1 CONFIRM 2ND AMENDED PLAN
6-12-09 [32]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Comparison of the master address list with the certificate of service reveals that the motion and the proposed plan were served only on two of the nine creditor addresses. Service is deficient.

33. 09-91434-A-13G JAIME PADRON HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 VALUE COLLATERAL OF CITIMORTGAGE
6-25-09 [14]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$200,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Saxon Mortgage Services. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$381,473 as of the petition date. Therefore, CitiMortgage' claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is

secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$200,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock

34. 08-92848-A-13G RAYMOND/BROOK BAKER HEARING - MOTION FOR
PD #2 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
U.S. BANK N.A., VS. 7-8-09 [63]

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and to obtain possession of the subject real property following sale. The movant is secured by a deed of trust encumbering the debtor's real property. The debtor has proposed a plan that will surrender the subject property to the movant in satisfaction of its secured claim. That plan has not yet been confirmed. Nonetheless, the terms of the proposed plan makes two things clear: the movant's claim will not be paid and the real property securing its claim is not necessary to the debtor's personal financial reorganization. This is cause to terminate the automatic stay.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount of its claim, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered waived.

35. 09-91249-A-13G RENE/DIAHANN VILLALOBOS HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED PLAN
6-29-09 [15]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed prior to confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(a), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. 11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits the debtor to amend the plan any time prior to confirmation. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is therefore confirmed.

36. 09-91250-A-13G BEATRIZ SALAZAR
FW #2

HEARING - MOTION TO
CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED PLAN
6-30-09 [22]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed prior to confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(a), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. 11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits the debtor to amend the plan any time prior to confirmation. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is therefore confirmed.

37. 08-90152-A-13G JESUS/SUSAN VILLASENOR
PLG #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
CONFIRM MODIFIED CHAPTER 13 PLAN
6-26-09 [25]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 21126, Philadelphia, PA 19114; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was served only at the Philadelphia address.

38. 09-91655-A-13G MICHAEL BEYER
WGM #1

HEARING - OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN VALUATION OF
COLLATERAL BY HSBC MORTGAGE
SERVICES, INC.
7-29-09 [24]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed without prejudice to the creditor resetting the hearing on the correct date identified below.

As required by General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(a)-(c), the chapter 13 trustee served the proposed chapter 13 plan with the Notice of Chapter 13 Bankruptcy Case, Meeting of Creditors & Deadlines. That notice indicated that objections to confirmation of the plan had to be filed and served no later than July 29, 2009 and set for hearing at the confirmation hearing on August 24, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.

A review of the proof of service for the notice and the plan reveals that the trustee served the objecting creditor with both the notice and the plan on June 26, 2009.

The objecting creditor timely filed and served its objection to the proposed

plan. However, instead of setting it for hearing at the confirmation hearing on August 24, the creditor set the objection for hearing on August 10. This is before the date and time scheduled for confirmation. General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c) provides in relevant part: "Absent a timely objection and a properly noticed hearing on it, the court may confirm the chapter 13 plan and grant the motions without a hearing." The objection, therefore, will be dismissed.

39. 08-92659-A-13G MARIO/CONNIE RUELAS HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #4 CLAIM OF SAMUELS
6-26-09 [58]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Samuels has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was April 28, 2009. The proof of claim was filed on May 1, 2009. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

40. 09-90962-A-13G RONALD PANELLI HEARING - TRUSTEE' OBJECTION TO
RDG #1 DEBTOR'S CLAIM OF EXEMPTIONS
7-2-09 [29]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The objection will be dismissed because it is moot.

While the trustee is correct that the debtor failed to file the waiver required by CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 703.140(a)(2) from the debtor's nonfiling spouse when he first claimed exemptions under CAL. CIV. PROC. CODE § 703.140(b), the waiver was filed on July 29, 2009.

41. 09-91664-A-13G PEDRO/NANCY ALVARADO HEARING - MOTION TO
KAK #1 VALUE COLLATERAL OF DITECH
6-29-09 [14]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the

defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$103,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Ditech. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$197,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Ditech's other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and

heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$103,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

42. 09-91665-A-13G JUANA MELENDEZ
MEV #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF BANK OF
AMERICA
7-6-09 [15]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$162,105 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Washington Mutual. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$254,031.97 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing

the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$162,105. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

43. 09-92065-A-13G NANSI MASIHI

HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-9-09 [6]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The debtor failed to file a master address list with the petition as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1007(a)(1) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1. The debtor later filed the list. Despite being filed late, it was received by the court in time to be used when serving the notice of the commencement of this

bankruptcy case. As a result, creditors were notified in a timely fashion that the case had been filed and they received notice of the various deadlines for filing complaints, objecting to exemptions, objecting to the proposed plan, and filing proofs of claims. Because no prejudice was caused by the late filing of the list, the case shall remain pending.

44. 08-90066-A-13G EDWARD/LAURIE BORELLI HEARING - MOTION TO
JCK #6 MODIFY CONFIRMED PLAN
6-26-09 [58]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

45. 08-90068-A-13G RICHARD/HOLLY MATRANGA HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 MODIFY CONFIRMED PLAN
7-2-09 [42]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

46. 07-90971-A-13G JOHN/PATRICIA ADLER HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #2 MODIFY CONFIRMED PLAN
7-6-09 [38]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v.

Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

47. 09-91672-A-13G SALVADOR MURILLO HEARING - MOTION FOR
PPR #1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, VS. 7-1-09 [13]

Final Ruling: This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The automatic stay will be terminated pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). The debtor lost title to the subject property in a nonjudicial foreclosure that was completed prior to the filing of the petition. Under California law, once a nonjudicial foreclosure sale has occurred, the trustor has no right of redemption. Moeller v. Lien, 25 Cal. App.4th 822, 831 (1994). In this case, therefore, the debtor has no right to ignore the foreclosure and no right to reorganize the debt formerly secured by the property. As a result, the movant, the person purchasing the property at the foreclosure, is entitled to possession of the property. The automatic stay will be modified to permit it to get that possession.

Because the movant is not a over-secured creditor, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered.

48. 09-91074-A-13G ABEL/ALICIA VIGIL HEARING - AMENDED MOTION TO
SL #2 CONFIRM PLAN
6-19-09 [25]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed prior to confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(a), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. 11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits the debtor to amend the plan any time prior to confirmation. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is therefore confirmed.

49. 09-90977-A-13G DANIEL/RONDA KNIGHT HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #1 CLAIM OF CITIZENS FINANCIAL CO.
6-26-09 [21]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Citizens Financial Co. has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection is sustained and the claim is disallowed as a secured claim but allowed as a nonpriority unsecured claim. The claim is for an extension of credit used by the debtor to obtain medical care. Nothing was purchased with the plan than could be used as a security for the loan and the debtor did not grant other security to the claimant.

50. 09-90977-A-13G DANIEL/RONDA KNIGHT HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #2 CLAIM OF WELLS FARGO FIN'L
NATIONAL BANK
6-26-09 [25]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Wells Fargo Financial National Bank has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection is sustained and the claim is disallowed as a secured claim but allowed as a nonpriority unsecured claim. The claim was secured by an outboard motor. The debtor sold the motor before the filing of the petition. Hence, the debtor no longer has an interest in the collateral. Therefore, the claim is now unsecured vis a vis the debtor.

51. 07-91383-A-13G FRANCISCO/CYNTHIA ARRONA HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #2 MODIFY CONFIRMED PLAN
7-6-09 [55]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is

considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

52. 08-90786-A-13G WAYNE/FILLENE BAYS HEARING - MOTION TO
CFH #1 CONFIRM FIRST MODIFIED PLAN
6-26-09 [27]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1), General Order 05-03, ¶ 8(b), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

53. 09-90188-A-13G KAREN RYNO HEARING - MOTION TO
BSH #3 CONFIRM THIRD AMENDED PLAN
7-2-09 [46]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

The proof of service does not indicate that the proposed plan was served. Because the motion does not adequately summarize all plan terms, the plan must be served. Because it was not, notice and service are defective. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3015(d) & (g).

54. 09-91495-A-13G RODERICK/MARIA COUNTRYMAN HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 VALUE COLLATERAL OF SPECIALIZED
LOAN SERVICING, LLC
6-30-09 [16]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$265,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Countrywide. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$372,646.75 as of the petition date. Therefore, Specialized Loan Servicing's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobby, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11

U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$265,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

55. 09-91795-A-13G ANNER HERNANDEZ HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
7-16-09 [15]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged because it is moot. The case was previously dismissed.

56. 09-90596-A-13G SANDRA CARRANZA HEARING - MOTION TO
DRW #5 VALUE COLLATERAL OF BENEFICIAL
CALIFORNIA, INC.
7-13-09 [70]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$250,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by HSBC Mortgage Corp. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$366,179.72 as of the petition date. Therefore, Beneficial California's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the

claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$250,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

57. 09-91699-A-13G VICTOR/ELAIN LARA
MJH #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF SPECIALIZED
LOANS SERVICING
6-30-09 [16]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and

the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$249,500 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by CitiMortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$303,995 as of the petition date. Therefore, Specialized Loan Servicing's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Barte, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan

is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(i).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$249,500. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).