

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Modesto, California

December 8, 2008 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 13. 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 JANUARY 5, 2009 AT 2:00 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 22, 2008, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 29, 2008. 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 14 THROUGH 40. 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 DECEMBER 22, 2008, AT 2:30 P.M.

December 8, 2008 at 2:00 p.m.

Matters called beginning at 2:00 p.m.

1. 08-91713-A-13G SIMONE FRANK HEARING - MOTION TO
LLT #2 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-21-08 [31]

- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan fails to provide for a dividend to be paid to National City Mortgage on account of a claim secured only by the debtor's home. Therefore, this claim will not be paid in full in violation of 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b) (2) and 1325(a) (5) (B).

2. 08-91614-A-13G HARLAND/KATHERINE HUIT HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-22-08 [34]

- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan is not feasible as witnessed by the failure of the debtor to make plan payments totaling \$2,538. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (6).

Second, A review of the proposed plan reveals that America's Servicing Company holds a secured, long term claim that is provided for in Class 1 of the plan. There are pre-petition arrears on this claim that must be cured through the plan. The plan provides for this cure as well as the maintenance of post-petition contract installment payments by the trustee as permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b) (5).

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 Class 1 secured claim held by America's Servicing Company. By failing to provide this checklist, the debtor has deprived the trustee of the means necessary to implement the plan. The plan, then, is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

3. [08-91817](#)-A-13G JOSE FELIX AND ROSALINDA MUNOZ HEARING - MOTION TO CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13 PLAN 10-27-08 [21]
FW #1

- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan is not feasible as witnessed by the failure of the debtor to make plan payments totaling \$2,538. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Second, debtor Jose Felix 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).

4. [08-91618](#)-A-13G ANSELMO/ANITA MONTES HEARING - MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 11-14-08 [39]
KSF #1
ROGER CRAFT, ETC., VS.,

- 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 motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movants to proceed in a nonbankruptcy forum to liquidate personal injury and any other pendent claims against the debtors. Any judgment or settlement may be satisfied from any insurance coverages, if any. No other collection action, other than the filing of a proof of claim, may be taken against the debtors.

The 10-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) is ordered waived. The movants shall bear their own fees and costs.

5. [06-90337](#)-A-13G FRED/MEIKA QUILANTAG
FW #3

HEARING - MOTION TO
MODIFY DEBTORS' CONFIRMED
CHAPTER 13 PLAN
10-27-08 [[67](#)]

- 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 \$6,720. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

6. [08-90042](#)-A-13G LAWRENCE/EDEAN SIZAR
FW #3

HEARING - MOTION TO
SELL REAL PROPERTY
11-20-08 [[45](#)]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

The debtor seeks authority to make a "short sale" of real property. That is, the property will be sold for a price less than is owed to the holder of a claim secured by the property. The claim holder will consent to the sale. However, the benefit of such a sale to the debtor is not disclosed nor are the tax consequences of a sale. Without this information, it cannot be ascertained whether the sale is in the best interests of the debtor and the bankruptcy estate.

7. [08-91472](#)-A-13G LUKE McDOUGLE
PD #1
CHASE HOME FINANCE, LLC, VS.

HEARING - MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
AND CO-DEBTOR STAY
11-10-08 [[35](#)]

- 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 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 property following sale. The movant is secured by a deed of trust encumbering real property in which the debtor has an interest. The proposed

plan makes no provision for the movant's claim and four monthly post-petition installments have not been made to the movant. This breach of contract, combined with the fact that the plan makes no provision for this claim, is cause to terminate the automatic stay. See Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis), 60 B.R. 432, 434-435 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985).

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.

8. 08-91087-A-13G MICHAEL/STACY FRENCH HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #3 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-28-08 [64]

- 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 \$446. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

9. 08-91597-A-13G NIKONA JONES HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-22-08 [26]

- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan is not feasible as witnessed by the failure of the debtor to make plan payments totaling \$1,604. The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Second, even if the plan payments were current, the plan would not be feasible because the plan payments cannot fund all plan dividends. To do so, the amount paid to the debtor's attorney must be reduced by \$20 each month.

10. 08-91498-A-13G KERRI QUAGLINO HEARING - MOTION TO
BSJ #1 CONFIRM DEBTOR'S 2ND AMENDED
CHAPTER 13 PLAN
10-8-08 [36]

- Telephone Appearance
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan is not feasible as witnessed by the failure of the debtor to

claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

13. 08-92198-A-13G RUSSELL/VIVIAN JANTZ HEARING - MOTION FOR
SW #1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
GMAC, VS. 11-14-08 [20]

- 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 motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to repossess and to obtain possession of its personal property security, and to dispose of it in accordance with applicable nonbankruptcy law. The movant is secured by a vehicle. The debtor has proposed a plan that will surrender the vehicle 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 vehicle 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 due to the fact that the movant's collateral is being used by the debtor without compensation and is depreciating in value.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

14. 07-91400-A-13G JOSE/ROSELIA GARCIA HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #2 MODIFY DEBTORS' CONFIRMED
CHAPTER 13 PLAN
11-4-08 [44]

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.

15. 08-91701-A-13G JAMES/CLAUDIA ISAAC HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #2 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-21-08 [24]

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.

16. 08-91713-A-13G SIMONE FRANK HEARING - MOTION TO
LLT #3 VALUE COLLATERAL OF CHASE
10-31-08 [40]

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 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 National City Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$383,998.84 as of the petition date. Therefore, Chase'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. 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).

17. 08-92021-A-13G JOEY/TINA COSTA HEARING - MOTION TO
CJY #1 VALUE COLLATERAL OF CITIMORTGAGE
10-24-08 [13]

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 debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$220,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Wells Fargo Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$339,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Citimortgage'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 anytime 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. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$220,000. 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).

18. 07-90230-A-13G CARY DAVIS
FW #2

HEARING - MOTION TO
MODIFY DEBTOR'S CONFIRMED
CHAPTER 13 PLAN
11-4-08 [62]

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.

19. 08-91930-A-13G MARIO/MARIA ORDAZ
DCJ #2

HEARING - DEBTORS' MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF MOCSE FEDERAL
CREDIT UNION
11-3-08 [22]

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 \$6,055 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, \$6,055 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$6,055, 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.

20. 08-91930-A-13G MARIO/MARIA ORDAZ
DCJ #3

HEARING - DEBTORS' MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF MOCSE FEDERAL
CREDIT UNION
11-3-08 [26]

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 \$5,635 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, \$5,635 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$5,635, 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.

21. 08-91332-A-13G RICHARD/TONI ZUK
FW #2

HEARING - MOTION TO
CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-27-08 [53]

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.

22. 08-90938-A-13G DIANA REYNOLDS
MDE #1
CITIMORTGAGE, INC., VS.

HEARING - MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
10-30-08 [42]

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.

The loan documentation contains an attorney's fee provision and the movant is an over-secured creditor. The motion demands payment of fees and costs. The court concludes that a similarly situated creditor would have filed this motion. Under these circumstances, the movant is entitled to recover

reasonable fees and costs incurred in connection with prosecuting this motion. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(b). See also Kord Enterprises II v. California Commerce Bank (In re Kord Enterprises II), 139 F.3d 684, 689 (9th Cir. 1998).

Therefore, the movant shall file and serve a separate motion seeking an award of fees and costs. The motion for fees and costs must be filed and served no later than 14 days after the conclusion of the hearing on the underlying motion. If not filed and served within this deadline, or if the movant does not intend to seek fees and costs, the court denies all fees and costs. The order granting the underlying motion shall provide that fees and costs are denied. If denied, the movant and its agents are barred in all events and circumstances, in connection with this bankruptcy case or otherwise, from recovering any fees and costs incurred in connection with the prosecution of the motion.

If a motion for fees and costs is filed, it shall be set for hearing pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) or (f) (2). It shall be served on the debtor, the debtor's attorney, the trustee, and the United States Trustee. Any motion shall be supported by a declaration explaining the work performed in connection with the motion, the name of the person performing the services and a brief description of that person's relevant professional background, the amount of time billed for the work, the rate charged, and the costs incurred. If fees or costs are being shared, split, or otherwise paid to any person who is not a member, partner, or regular associate of counsel of record for the movant, the declaration shall identify those person(s) and disclose the terms of the arrangement with them.

Alternatively, if the debtor will stipulate to an award of fees and costs not to exceed \$750, the court will award such amount. The stipulation of the debtor may be indicated by the debtor's signature, or the debtor's attorney's signature, on the order granting the motion and providing for an award of \$750.

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

23. 07-90942-A-13G DAVID ZUEHLKE AND HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #2 MICHELE DURANTE MODIFY DEBTORS' CONFIRMED CHAPTER
13 PLAN
10-22-08 [47]

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.

24. 08-91242-A-13G RICARDO/GABRIELA SALVADOR HEARING - OBJECTION TO
JSZ #1 CONFIRMATION OF AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN BY AURORA LOAN SERVICES, LLC
11-20-08 [70]

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 overruled.

First, the objection apparently pertains to the plan filed on July 15, 2008. That plan, however, was withdrawn and replaced by a modified plan filed on October 21. If the objection pertained to the modified plan, this objection would have been filed as opposition to the debtor's motion to confirm the modified plan, docket control no. FW-4, and included a reference to that docket control number. Instead, the objection was given its own docket control number and set for hearing pursuant to General Order 05-03, ¶ 3(c). This procedure is applicable only in connection with the plan proposed by a debtor that is served with the notice of the commencement of the case.

Second, the plan requires payment in full of the objecting creditor's claim whether or not the plan correctly states the amount of the arrearage owed on the arrearage portion of the objecting creditor's claim. The plan provides:

"3.01. A timely proof of claim must be filed by or on behalf of a creditor, including a secured creditor, before a claim may be paid pursuant to this plan."

"3.04. The proof of claim, not this plan or the schedules, shall determine the amount and classification of a claim. If a claim is provided for by this plan and a proof of claim is filed, dividends shall be paid based upon the proof of claim unless the granting of a valuation or a lien avoidance motion, or the sustaining of a claim objection, affects the amount or classification of the claim."

Thus, in the absence of a further court order, the plan requires payment in full of whatever a secured creditor demands in its proof of claim.

Third, the plan requires the first plan payment be made by the debtor to the trustee by the 25th day of the month after the filing of the petition. The trustee in turn will make ongoing mortgage installments to the movant. There is no evidence with the objection that the debtor has not made the required payments or that the trustee has not made the required disbursements.

25. 08-91242-A-13G RICARDO/GABRIELA SALVADOR HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #4 CONFIRM SECOND AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-21-08 [60]

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 on condition that the plan payment is increased by \$42.30 more each month. The increase is necessary to pay the secured claim of Aurora in full during the duration of the plan as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B). 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.

26. 08-92042-A-13G RICHARD/CARRIE RAHAM
CJY #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF BANK OF
AMERICA

10-24-08 [13]

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 debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$340,000 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 \$425,719 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. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$340,000. 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).

27. 08-90546-A-13G EDWARD/BARBARA SOLAREZ HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-23-08 [40]

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.

28. 06-90452-A-13G ROBIN/ANGELA CARAVALHO HEARING - DEBTORS' MOTION TO
SLL #5 MODIFY A CONFIRMED CHAPTER 13 PLAN
11-3-08 [83]

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. 08-90059-A-13G HECTOR MACIAS HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #1 CLAIM NO. 15 OF OCWEN C/O
REAL TIME RESOLUTIONS, INC.
10-21-08 [30]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Ocwen, etc., 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 June 3, 2008. The proof of claim was filed on July 10, 2008. 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).

30. 08-92164-A-13G RAYMOND/CHERYL LABES HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
11-13-08 [20]

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

31. 08-91771-A-13G RAYMOND/NAOMI JAMES
JCK #1

HEARING - DEBTORS' MOTION TO
CONFIRM FIRST AMENDED CHAPTER 13
PLAN
10-28-08 [17]

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.

32. 08-92074-A-13G JAMES/JENNIFER HEFFERNAN
CFH #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF COUNTRYWIDE
HOME LOANS
11-12-08 [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 debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$130,000 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 \$240,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Countrywide'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. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$130,000. 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).

33. 08-90579-A-13G PEGGY COOK
RLB #1

HEARING - FIRST AMENDED
MOTION TO CONFIRM CHAPTER 13 PLAN
10-29-08 [21]

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.

34. 07-91383-A-13G FRANCISCO/CYNTHIA ARRONA HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #1 MODIFY DEBTORS' CONFIRMED
CHAPTER 13 PLAN
11-4-08 [36]

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.

35. 08-92185-A-13G SAMUEL MCINTOSH HEARING - ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE RE DISMISSAL OF CASE OR
IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS
11-13-08 [15]

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

36. 06-90689-A-13G YURI PEARSON HEARING - MOTION TO
FW #4 MODIFY DEBTOR'S CONFIRMED CHAPTER
13 PLAN
10-30-08 [67]

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.

37. 08-91994-A-13G TIMOTHY FAGER
CJY #1

HEARING - MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL OF COUNTRYWIDE
HOME LOANS
10-24-08 [12]

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 debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$165,000 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 \$260,412.01 as of the petition date. Therefore, Countrywide'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 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. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$165,000. 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).

38. 08-90198-A-13G NANCY CANNON HEARING - OBJECTION TO
FW #1 CLAIM OF CASH CENTRAL
10-28-08 [18]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Cash Central 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 July 1, 2008. The proof of claim was filed on July 10, 2008. 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).

39. 08-91698-A-13G DWAYNE/SHERYLL JOHNSON

HEARING - OPPOSITION TO
MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL BY
AMERICREDIT FINANCIAL SERVICES
11-5-08 [29]

Final Ruling: This objection pertains to the valuation included in the original plan. However, that motion was supplanted by a new valuation motion appended to the amended plan filed on October 20. Therefore, the objection will be dismissed without prejudice.

40. 07-91399-A-13G JORGE/DELIA GARCIA
APN #1
TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORP., VS.

HEARING - MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
11-6-08 [42]

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 motion will be dismissed as moot.

The court confirmed a plan on February 14, 2008. That plan provides for the movant's claim in Class 4. Class 4 secured claims are claims that are not modified by the plan and that were not in default prior to the filing of the petition. They are paid directly by the debtor or by a third party. The plan includes the following provision at section 3.15:

"Class 4 claims mature after the completion of this plan, are not in default, and are not modified by this plan. These claims shall be paid by Debtor or a third person whether or not the plan is confirmed. Entry of the confirmation order shall constitute an order modifying the automatic stay to allow the holder of a Class 4 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral in the event of a default under the terms of its loan or security documentation provided this case is then pending under chapter 13."

Because the plan has been confirmed and because the case remains pending under chapter 13, the automatic stay has already been modified to permit the movant to proceed against its collateral.

The court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).