

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

February 2, 2015 at 1:30 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 14. 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 LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], 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 MARCH 2, 2015 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY FEBRUARY 17, 2015, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY FEBRUARY 23, 2015. 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 ITEMS 15 THROUGH 29 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE 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 FEBRUARY 9, 2015, AT 2:30 P.M.

February 2, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 14-29211-A-13 HARMINDER KHANGURA MOTION TO
PLC-1 CONFIRM PLAN
12-16-14 [28]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

When demanded by the trustee or an unsecured creditor, a chapter 13 plan must pay unsecured creditors in full or at least all of the debtor's "projected disposable income."

For purposes of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b), the calculation of projected disposable income begins with "current monthly income." See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(2). Current monthly income is an average of the debtor's and the debtor's spouse's income, excluding Social Security benefits, for the six months prior to the filing of the petition. This income includes any amount regularly paid by someone other than the debtor (or the debtor's spouse in a joint case) for the household expenses of the debtor, the debtor's dependents, and (in a joint case) the debtor's spouse. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 101(10A), 707(b)(7).

Comparison of Form 22 to the debtor's payment advices reveals that the debtor has under-reported income during the 6 months prior to bankruptcy. The debtor earned an average of \$9,918.46 per month in the 6 months prior to bankruptcy. This must be reported as the debtor's current monthly income on Form 22. See 11 U.S.C. § 101(10A). However, the debtor has reported only \$8,636.

If \$9,918.46 no longer accurately reflects the debtor's ongoing monthly income, this does not give the debtor license to misrepresents the debtor's current monthly income by adjusting it downward. It must be accurately reported. If the trustee or a creditor demands payment of projected disposable income based on currently monthly, the debtor may respond to that demand by proving there has been a material known change to income. See Hamilton v. Lanning, 130 S.Ct. 2464 (2010).

2. 14-31540-A-13 MICHELE ANDES OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
1-15-15 [20]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. 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 and the case will be dismissed.

Second, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor failed to disclose two prior bankruptcy cases and the debtor failed to file a detailed statement of the income and expenses associated with the debtor's business and/or real estate rental income. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

4. 14-31065-A-13 DANNY/RENEE JOHNSON ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
1-14-15 [28]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of \$77 due on January 9 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

5. 14-23468-A-13 ROBERT/RHONDA WELCH MOTION TO
JME-2 MODIFY PLAN
12-18-14 [34]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, to pay the dividends required by the plan and the rate proposed by it will take 81 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Second, the debtor has failed to make \$200 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

6. 14-30268-A-13 NEERAJ/KALYANI KUMAR
DAO-4

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
12-22-14 [59]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has failed to make \$3,936.80 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the plan fails to state its duration. Hence, it cannot be determined whether the plan is no more than 60 months as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Third, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist*, or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Fourth, the plan does not incorporate the payment terms of an agreement with the Board of Equalization. Hence, its compliance with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2) cannot be proven.

Fifth, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the post-petition arrears owed on a Class 1 home loan. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying this home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

7. 15-20072-A-13 MARYLOUISE PADLO
SS-1

MOTION TO
EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
1-19-15 [11]

- 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 denied.

This case was filed on January 7, 2015. Because the debtor has had two prior cases pending but dismissed in the prior year, the filing of the most recent petition did not trigger the automatic stay. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4)(A) provides that when an individual debtor has filed 2 or more prior cases that were pending during the previous year, but were dismissed, the automatic stay never goes into effect.

The debtor may request that the court impose the automatic stay despite the filing and dismissal of multiple prior petitions. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4)(B). Such a request must be made with notice and a hearing and must be made within 30 days of the filing of the petition. To obtain the automatic stay, the party in interest must demonstrate that the latest case has been filed in good faith. If shown, the court may impose conditions on the imposition of the automatic stay.

Section 362(c)(4)(D) invokes a presumption that the case was "filed not in good faith," when 2 or more previous cases were pending for the same individual debtor within the one-year period.

The first problem with the motion to impose the automatic stay is that it admits that the debtor was unable to maintain plan payments in her first case. Actually, an examination of the record of the two prior cases indicates that the problems in the first case were more extensive. Not only did the debtor fall behind in plan payments, the debtor failed to maintain tax payments on her home.

Also, because the debtor voluntarily dismissed the first case following the filing of a motion for relief from the automatic stay, 11 U.S.C. § 109(g)(2), she was not eligible to file the second case because it was filed within 180 days of the dismissal of the first.

And, there were problems other than eligibility with the second case. The debtor failed to schedule an inheritance received in 2014.

In this motion, the debtor has not demonstrated an ability to make plan payments while paying her other expenses, nor has she explained her failure to be completely candid with the court in the second case. On this record the court cannot conclude this case is more apt to proceed than the prior cases.

8. 14-29074-A-13 TIMOTHY OTTONE MOTION TO
WW-2 CONFIRM PLAN
12-22-14 [26]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. 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 and the case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor is not eligible for chapter 13 relief. 11 U.S.C. § 109(h) prohibits an individual from being a debtor under any chapter unless that individual received a credit counseling briefing from an approved non-profit budget and credit counseling agency during the 180-day period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. In this case, the debtor has not filed a certificate evidencing that briefing was completed during the 180-day period prior to the filing of the petition. Hence, the debtor was not eligible for bankruptcy relief when this petition was filed.

Second, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, 11 U.S.C. § 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 failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fourth, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) because unsecured creditors would receive \$1,492 in a chapter 7 liquidation as of the effective date of the plan. This plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors.

Fifth, when Schedules I and J are totaled correctly and then deducted one from the other, the debtor has no monthly net income with which to fund any plan. No plan is feasible. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

12. 14-31487-A-13 LUELLA VAUGHN OBJECTION TO
MDE-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
CITIMORTGAGE, INC. VS. 1-7-15 [30]

- 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 required by

Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. 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.

Even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrearages owed on the Class 1 home loan. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

13. 13-36092-A-13 WOODROW POYNTER MOTION TO
GW-3 MODIFY PLAN
10-17-14 [47]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: None.

14. 14-31895-A-13 RUDY/LILIA DELUMPA OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
1-15-15 [36]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. 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 and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Bank of America in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. While a motion has been filed and served, and it was denied. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file,

serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

15. 14-31000-A-13 DAVID SHEDD MOTION TO
SER-1 CONFIRM PLAN
12-17-14 [24]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), 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 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 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 plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

16. 14-31200-A-13 SHERI ARNOLD MOTION TO
TLA-5 CONFIRM PLAN
12-18-14 [36]

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 granted and the objection will be overruled on the condition that either the plan payment is increased to cover the total monthly dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay or the dividend payable to counsel for the debtor is decreased such that the existing monthly payment equals the total monthly dividends. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

17. 14-31200-A-13 SHERI ARNOLD COUNTER MOTION TO
TLA-5 DISMISS CASE
1-8-15 [50]

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 denied on the condition that the plan is modified as required by the court's ruling on the trustee's objection to the confirmation of the plan.

18. 14-31902-A-13 ROY/CHERISE WHITAKER OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
1-15-15 [19]

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.

than \$43,000. At this higher level, the plan either is not feasible or it will not pay the objecting secured claim in full. The plan fails to comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1325(a) (5) (B) & (a) (6).

27. 14-30076-A-13 THOMAS/CYNTHIA MOORE MOTION TO
MWB-2 CONFIRM PLAN
12-18-14 [23]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c) (3) & (d) (1) and 9014-1(f) (1), 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 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 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 plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

28. 14-31378-A-13 DAVID/PATRICIA WEATHERBEE MOTION TO
SJS-1 CONFIRM PLAN
12-18-14 [20]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c) (3) & (d) (1) and 9014-1(f) (1), 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 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 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 plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

29. 14-31782-A-13 JAMES HOWARTH OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
1-15-15 [37]

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 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). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case but dismissal has not been requested. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).