UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein Bankruptcy Judge Sacramento, California

February 13, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

L .	<u>17-27100</u> -C-13	TROI NAVARRO	OBJECTION TO DISCHARGE BY DAVID
	DPC-1	Seth Hanson	P. CUSICK
			1-2-18 [<u>15</u>]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 2, 2018. 28 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Discharge has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4003(b). The failure of the Debtor and other parties 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 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 Debtor and the other parties in interest are entered, the matter will be resolved without oral argument and the court shall issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Objection to Discharge is sustained.

Chapter 13 Trustee ("Objector"), filed the instant Objection to Debtor's Discharge on January 2, 2018. Dckt. 15.

The Objector argues that the Debtor is not entitled to a discharge in the instant bankruptcy case because the Debtor previously received a discharge in a Chapter 7 case.

The Debtor filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy case on April 15, 2014. Case No. 14023860. The Debtor received a discharge on July 28, 2014.

The instant case was filed under Chapter 13 on October 27, 2017.

11 U.S.C. § 1328(f) provides that a court shall not grant a discharge if a debtor has received a discharge "in a case filed under chapter 7, 11, or 12 of this title during the 4-year period preceding the date of the order for relief under this chapter." 11 U.S.C. § 1328(f)(1).

Here, the Debtor received a discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727 on April 15, 2014, which is less than four-years preceding the date of the filing of the instant case. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1328(f)(1), the Debtor is not

eligible for a discharge in the instant case.

Therefore, the objection is sustained. Upon successful completion of the instant case (Case No. 17-27100), the case shall be closed without the entry of a discharge and Debtor shall receive no discharge in the instant case.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Discharge filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to Discharge is sustained.

IT IS ORDERED that, upon successful completion of the instant case, Case No. 17-27100, the case shall be closed without the entry of a discharge.

2. 13-27903-C-13 ELIZABETH KIMMONS CONTINUED DEFAULT JUDGMENT
17-2030 Peter Macaluso STATUS CONFERENCE RE: AMENDED
KIMMONS V. GLENN HUBBARD, INC. ET AL

6-13-17 [<u>12</u>]

Thru #3

NO TENTATIVE RULING PROVIDED

3. 13-27903-C-13 ELIZABETH KIMMONS PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE RE: 17-2030 Peter Macaluso AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR 1)
KIMMONS V. GLENN HUBBARD, INC. DECLARATORY RELIEF TO DE ET AL VALUE AND EXTENT OF LIEN

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE RE:
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR 1)
DECLARATORY RELIEF TO DETERMINE
VALUE AND EXTENT OF LIEN 2)
EXTINGUISHMENT OF THE THIRD
DEED OF TRUST CLAIM 3)
VIOLATION OF C.C.C. 2941 (D),
ETC.
6-13-17 [12]

NO TENTATIVE RULING PROVIDED

4. <u>16-25907</u>-C-13 RICHARD/JULIA WADE SDH-1 Scott Hughes

OBJECTION TO NOTICE OF POSTPETITION MORTGAGE FEES, EXPENSES, AND CHARGES 12-18-17 [27]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 18, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Objection to Notice of Postpetition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and Charges has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

Debtors object to a Notice of Post-Petition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and Charges filed by Freedom Mortgage Corporation on November 21, 2017. The claim is for \$250.00 for "FCL Sale Cancel."

Debtor objects to the \$250 fee for canceling a trustee's sale. The Trustee's sale was pending at the time the case was filed, which was September 2, 2016. Freedom had been postponing the sale since the case was filed and have now decided to cancel it on November 21, 2017. Debtors do not believe there is a statutory fee that can be charged for cancelling a trustee sale.

The court notes that there is no opposition to the motion. Debtor has shifted the burden to the creditor to prove such fees are reasonable. In the absence of such evidence, the court will sustain the objection.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection to Notice of Postpetition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and Charges is sustained and the \$250.00 in fees are disallowed.

5. <u>17-25308</u>-C-13 JESSICA BUN Mikalah Liviakis

MOTION TO SELL 1-19-18 [43]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

The Chapter 13 Debtor having filed a "Withdrawal of Motion" for the pending Motion to Sell, the "Withdrawal" being consistent with the opposition filed to the Objection, the court interpreting the "Withdrawal of Motion" to be an ex parte motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041 for the court to dismiss without prejudice the Motion to Sell, and good cause appearing, **the court dismisses the Chapter 13 Debtor's Motion to Sell**.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

A Motion to Sell, having been filed by the Chapter 13 Debtor, the Chapter 13 Debtor having filed an ex parte motion to dismiss the Objection without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, dismissal of the Motion being consistent with the opposition filed, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion to Sell is dismissed without prejudice.

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK 1-17-18 [13]

6.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 17, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -------

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor failed to appear at the Meeting of Creditors held on January 11, 2018. The continued Meeting of Creditors was set for February 8, 2018.
- B. Debtor lists a secured claim for State Board of Equalization in the amount of \$564.29. Debtor improperly lists the creditor in Class 1, whereas the claim will be paid in full during the life of the plan and should therefore be provided for in Class 2.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

7. <u>17-27612</u>-C-13 IRINA KOLESNIKOVA AP<u>-1</u> Pro Se

Thru #8

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY CREDITOR NRZ PASS-THROUGH TRUST X, U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION 1-18-18 [27]

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 18, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Creditor, NRZ Pass-Through Trust X, U.S. Bank National Association as trustee, objects to confirmation on the basis that the plan was not filed in good faith. This is the 8th bankruptcy since 2011 by debtors asserting an interest in the property, all have been filed with skeletal petitions. In all previous 7 cases, debtors were unable to obtain a discharge. The plan lists the creditor as having an unsecured claim of \$600 rather than a 6 figure secured claim on the residence. There was no motion to value and creditor's claim is being treated as unsecured rather than secured. Arrears are not being cured and the creditor's claim is not being paid in full. The plan is not feasible.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

8.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 17, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$100. Debtor has paid \$0 into the plan to date.
- B. Debtor filed a blank plan and does not propose to pay any claims to classes 1-6 or unsecured creditors.
- C. Debtor's plan may not be proposed in good faith as no secured claims are listed on Schedule D and only 1 debt is listed on Schedule E/F.
- D. Because debtor did not list any secured creditors, debtor has plenty of non-exempt equity to distribute to unsecured creditors.
- E. There are several additional issues stemming from the debtor's failure to adequately fill out the petition.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

9. <u>15-22313</u>-C-13 VONDA RILEY DDY-3 Daphne Yeldell

CONTINUED MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 12-30-17 [65]

Thru #10

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice NOT Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 30, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was NOT met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to xxxxxxxxxxx

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor only provided 31 days notice whereas the Local Rule 3015-1(d)(2) requires 35 days notice.
- B. The debtor has not used the required form plan that went into effect December 1, 2017.

The court continued the hearing to allow the debtor to make the appropriate changes. On February 2, 2018, debtor filed an amended plan.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice NOT Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 30, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was NOT met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to xxxxxxxxxxx

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor only provided 31 days notice whereas the Local Rule 3015-1(d)(2) requires 35 days notice.
- B. The debtor has not used the required form plan that went into effect December 1, 2017.

The court continued the hearing to allow the debtor to make the appropriate changes. On February 2, 2018, debtor filed an amended plan.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

11. <u>14-29214</u>-C-13 CLEVELAND BELLARD MET-4 Mary Ellen Terranella

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 12-29-17 [73]

Thru #13

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 29, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The debtor may not be able to make payments because it appears that a refinance of the property will be necessary, but debtor shares the property with another co-tenant and there is no evidence that a refinance is imminent.
- B. Debtor may not pay the post-petition tax payments owed. Debtor's counsel filed a claim for post-petition taxes that the trustee has objected to, and trustee does not believe that debtor will be able to make these payments where the debtor has failed to make them in the past.
- C. The debtor projects income for seasonal cattle grazing, but the debtor has listed no cattle on his schedules and no farming income was listed on the Statement of Financial Affairs. If income is understated or assets are undisclosed, the plan may not be debtor's best effort or proposed in good faith.
- D. Debtor claimed exemptions without a spousal waiver and the liquidation analysis may be effected.

CREDITOR'S OPPOSITION

Additionally, creditor Carole Rominger et al oppose conformation. Creditor asserts that the debtor has not met his burden of proving that the plan was proposed in good faith. The plan is not feasible where it relies upon a refinance that is unlikely to occur. Debtor's liquidation analysis is inadequate as it does not include all of the debtor's assets such as the cattle and an Impala that was not scheduled.

DEBTOR'S REPLIES

Debtor filed two replies, one for each opposition. Debtor asserts that the co-owner is friendly and has been cooperative in attempting to procure a loan modification. Debtor has contacted Yolo County and asserts that is has agreed to sign a proposed Order Modifying Plan that includes a provision for the post-petition taxes to be paid through the debtor's modified plan as a \$ 1305 claim. Debtor asserts that he rents land to graze cattle from other people, and that while he does own cattle, he didn't at the time of the filing of the petition so that is why they were not listed. Debtor's marriage was dissolved on September 5, 2012 rather than May 17, 2016, the date of the order, so a spousal waiver is not needed.

The debtor has a Motion for Order Approving Lease pending that was originally set for February 13, 2018, but has since been continued to March 6, 2018. Debtor requests that this hearing be continued to that date. Debtor additionally requests additional time to respond to the creditor's opposition because it was very long at 13 pages.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that xxxxxxxx

12. 14-29214-C-13 CLEVELAND BELLARD MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING MET-5 Mary Ellen Terranella LEASE 1-16-18 [81]

1-16-18 [<u>81</u>]

CONTINUED TO MARCH 6, 2018 AT 2:00 P.M.

13. <u>14-29214</u>-C-13 CLEVELAND BELLARD Mary Ellen Terranella

CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY 11-20-17 [48]

CHARLES HUFF TRUST VS.

Tentative Ruling: The 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 respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 20, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The 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 respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion for Relief From the Automatic Stay is xxxxxxxxx

Charles Huff Trust seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to the real property commonly known as 15454 County Road 44, Guinda, California. The moving party has provided the Declaration of Carole Rominger to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by the Debtor.

The Rominger Declaration states that the Debtor has not made property tax payments to Yolo County in the current amount of \$47,256.02 accruing at 18% annually. From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this property is determined to be \$142,660.58 (including \$142,660.58 secured by movant's first trust deed), as stated in the Rominger Declaration, while the value of the property is determined to be \$165,000.00, as stated in Schedules A and D filed by Debtor.

Trustee's Response

Trustee responds that the taxing authority has not filed a claim for the tax arrearages. Trustee affirms that no disbursements have been made to Yolo County Tax Collector. Trustee points out that debtor is delinquent under the plan and without a refinance of the property, debtor will be unable to complete the plan in 60 months.

Debtor's Opposition

Debtor asserts that the issue with the Yolo County is surprising, and debtor's counsel is getting in contact with Yolo County to ascertain the exact amount due and owing and then a modified plan will be filed. Debtor claims that the property is necessary for a reorganization as the debtor obtains income from the property. Debtor states that he is current on plan payments.

Trustee's Supplemental Response

Trustee points out that debtor's declaration states that he has not been paying on-going tax payments pursuant to the terms of the confirmed plan. Trustee asserts that the plan does not provide that the debtor will not make on-going tax payments.

Discussion

The court continued the Motion for Relief from Stay in order to give the debtor the opportunity to modify the plan to provide for property tax arrears. The court notes that a Modified Chapter 13 plan has been filed and is set for hearing on February 13, 2018.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Relief From the Automatic Stay filed by the creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion for Relief from Automatic Stay is xxxxxxxxx

17-27521-C-13 LUCIANO/MAGELIN VENTURA
APN-1 Mark Wolff

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION 12-20-17 [15]

14.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on December 20, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Creditor, Toyota Motor Credit Corporation, objects to the treatment of its claim under the plan. The plan essentially treats the claim as if the claim was valued at a lower amount than stated in the proof of claim. Creditor additionally objects to the amount of adequate protection payments being paid, as well as the interest rate proposed in the plan.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 17, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtors failed to file the correct standard form plan.
- B. The plan is illegible and the Trustee cannot determine the proposed plan payment.
- C. Debtors are delinquent under the plan as they have paid \$0 to date. How delinquent is unclear because the plan is illegible.
- D. Debtors apparently did not disclose all secured debts as there are claims relating to vehicles not disclosed on the schedules.
- E. Debtors have inaccurately reported their source of income.
- F. Debtors failed to provide the Trustee with a tax transcript or a copy of the Federal Income Tax Return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

16. <u>17-27331</u>-C-13 LA KEISHA STEWART Richard Kwun

Thru #17

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE, C/O AIS PORTFOLIO SERVICES, LP 1-11-18 [28]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 11, 2018. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Capital One Auto Finance, C/O AIS Portfolio Services, LP, "Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of a 2005 Mercedes-Benz E Class. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$2,600.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 701; *see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a balance of approximately \$28,060.53. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$2,600.00. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Capital One Auto Finance, C/O AIS Portfolio Sercies, LP secured by a purchasemoney loan secured against the Debtor's 2005 Mercedez-Benz E

Class, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$2,600.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan.

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE 1-11-18 [32]

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 11, 2018. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of the Internal Revenue Service is xxxxxxx

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. Debtor describes the collateral as "a motor vehicle commonly described as all real and personal property owned by the debtor." The court is unclear if this means that the IRS has a lien on a motor vehicle of the debtor or on all personal and real property of the debtor. The debtor does not appear to have scheduled a motor vehicle that lines up with this valuation. The Debtor seeks to value the property, whatever it is, at a replacement value of \$1,200.04 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 701; *see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The IRS has filed a proof of claim indicating that only \$1,200.04 of its claim is secured. As a result, it is unclear what relief the debtor is requesting. The debtor appears to be requesting a valuation by the court of an undisclosed or undefined asset where the creditor appears to not only agree with the valuation, but have submitted a proof of claim asserting as much.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause

IT IS ORDERED that xxxxxxxx

18.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Sell Property has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 30, 2018. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Sell Property has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties are entered.

The Motion to Sell Property is granted.

The Bankruptcy Code permits the debtor to sell property of the estate after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. §§ 363 and 1303. Here Movant proposes to sell the "Property" described as follows:

A. 5588 Dunlay Drive, Sacramento 95835.

The proposed purchaser of the Property is Kyle R Froling and Rose J Froling and the price of the sale will be \$480,000.00. The net proceeds from the sale to the debtor will be approximately \$148,590.54. This will provide for payment to all unsecured creditors. There appears to be secured claim(s) on the property, however the debtor does not discuss such claim(s) either in the motion, declaration, or exhibits. Presumably, the secured claim(s) will be paid off and the remainder will go to the debtor. The debtor asserts that there will be sufficient funds to pay the unsecured creditors 100% of their claims.

Based on the evidence before the court, the court determines that the proposed sale is in the best interest of the Estate.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Sell Property filed by the debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review

of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the debtor is authorized to sell pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 363(b) and (f)(3) to Kyle and Rose Froling or nominee ("Buyer"), the Property commonly known as 5588 Dunlay Drive, Sacramento 95835, on the following terms:

- 1. The Property shall be sold to Buyer for \$480,000.00, on the terms and conditions set forth in the Purchase Agreement, Exhibit B, Dckt. 128, and as further provided in this Order.
- 2. The sale proceeds shall first be applied to closing costs, real estate commissions, prorated real property taxes and assessments, liens, other customary and contractual costs and expenses incurred in order to effectuate the sale.
- 3. The debtor be, and hereby is, authorized to execute any and all documents reasonably necessary to effectuate the sale.

19.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 29, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Confirm the Plan.

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The plan will complete in 64 months rather than 60 months. This could possibly be a result of not including trustee fees.
- B. Debtors are reducing plan payments because Debtor is off work due to doctor's orders. However, the debtors do not propose increasing payments to correspond with join Debtor's return to work in March 2018.
- C. The plan has slightly confusing language that makes the payment for month 52 ambiguous.

DEBTOR'S REPLY

Debtor replies that (1) the payment will be increased slightly to allow the plan to be completed within 60 months; (2) debtors propose updating the trustee within 30 days of joint debtor returning to work, and this will be added to the order confirming; (3) this change will be made in the order confirming.

The debtors appear to have made the plan comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and the plan will be confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel,

and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on December 29, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

20.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 10, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -------

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$303.25. Debtor has paid \$0 into the plan to date.
- B. The plan relies upon a motion to value, but none has been filed and set for hearing.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 19, 2018. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to xxxxxxxxxxxxx

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor did not use the required form plan.
- B. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$3,099.62. Debtor has paid a total of \$189,356.10 into the plan to date.
- C. The plan states that the debtors will pay Ocwen the mortgage payments directly but does not indicate when the direct payments begin.

DEBTORS' REPLY

Debtors reply that FRBP 3015(h) only requires that the debtor file the proposed modification to the existing plan, therefore the new form is not required where the plan was previously confirmed. If the form is required, debtors request relief under FRBP 9029 so as not to lose their rights.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is xxxxxxxxxxx

.....

22.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 21, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors.

The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on December 21, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

23. $\underline{17-27666}$ -C-13 JOSE ACEVEDO DPC-1 Dale Orthner

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK 1-10-18 [16]

Thru #24

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 10, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$2,394.00. Debtor has paid \$0 into the plan to date.
- B. Debtor failed to appear at the Meeting of Creditors held on January 4, 2018. Debtor failed to appear to the continued Meeting of Creditors held on February 1, 2018.
- C. Debtors failed to provide the Trustee with a tax transcript or a copy of the Federal Income Tax Return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required.
- D. Debtor has failed to provide the Trustee with 60 days of employer payment advices received prior to the filing of the petition.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

24. <u>17-27666</u>-C-13 JOSE ACEVEDO Dale Orthner

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DITECH FINANCIAL, LLC 1-11-18 [20]

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on May 24, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -------

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Creditor, Ditech Financial LLC, opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the plan does not cure the pre-petition arrears owed to the creditor as it understates such amount. Therefore, the plan does not appear to be feasible if the creditor is paid the correct amount.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

25. 17-26667-C-13 MICHAEL/KIMBERLY GAINZA

DPC-3 Michael Hays

DEBTOR DISMISSED:

01/19/2018

JOINT DEBTOR DISMISSED:

01/19/2018

MOTION TO DISGORGE FEES 1-3-18 [33]

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Disgorge Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion. - Hearing required

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 3, 2018. Twenty eight days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Motion to Disgorge Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The court's decision is to issue an Order to Show Cause and continue the Motion to March 6, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

Chapter 13 Trustee requests that the court enter an order disgorging attorney fees in this case. Debtors' attorney discloses that he was paid \$1,500 prior to the filing of the case. The plan proposes no payments and no duration, and the case was admittedly filed for the sole purpose of staying a renewed foreclosure.

Discussion

The court will continue the hearing and issue an Order to Show Cause why debtors' counsel's fees should not be disgorged in this case.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Review of Fees filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion to Disgorge Fees is continued to March 6, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that debtors' counsel, Michael Hays, SHOW CAUSE in writing, by February 27, 2018 why the fees paid to him in this case should not be disgorged.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 5, 2018. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. 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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed. The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a limited opposition explaining that the Trustee inadvertently over paid creditor Travis Credit Union in the amount of \$89.22. The debtors filed a reply indicating that this overpayment was authorized.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtors' Chapter 13 Plan filed on January 4, 2018 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

27. <u>17-27779</u>-C-13 REINA MONTES
DPC-1 Peter Macaluso

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK 1-10-18 [24]

Thru #28 ****

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 10, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$300. Debtor has paid \$1,600 into the plan to date.
- B. The plan relies upon a Motion to Value (see matter #28). No party opposed the Motion to Value.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. 1-5-18 [17]

28.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 5, 2018. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., "Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 7754 McBride Way, Sacramento, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$200,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 701; *see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$203,000.00. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.'s second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$51,972.72. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); *Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Wells Fargo Bank,

N.A.'s, secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 7754 McBride Way, Sacramento, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$200,000.00 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

29. <u>16-20383</u>-C-13 GIANNE/RUBY -ROSE APURADO DPC-2 Steele Lanphier MOTION TO RECONSIDER DISMISSAL OF CASE 1-26-18 [96]

DEBTOR DISMISSED: 01/21/2018 JOINT DEBTOR DISMISSED: 01/21/2018

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Reconsider Dismissal was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on January 26, 2018. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Motion to Reconsider Dismissal is granted.

Debtor move the court to reconsider the motion dismissing this chapter 13 case. The case was dismissed for debtors' failure to make plan payments. The debtors made the delinquent payments but were not credited with such payments until after the hearing. As a result, the delinquency that caused the dismissal has been (and was at the time of the hearing) cured.

TRUSTEE'S RESPONSE

Trustee confirms that the debtors are now current and the Trustee does not oppose the motion.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Vacate Dismissal filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

30. <u>11-47587</u>-C-13 PRIMITIVO/GLORIA VILLARREAL

Steele Lanphier

DEBTOR DISMISSED: 04/03/2017 JOINT DEBTOR DISMISSED: 04/03/2017 CONTINUED MOTION TO VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE 12-15-17 [107]

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Vacate Dismissal has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 30, 2016. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Vacate Dismissal has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

The Motion to Vacate Dismissal is granted.

Debtor requests that the court vacate its dismissal order in this chapter 13 case and allow the debtor to make the payment necessary to complete the plan.

TRUSTEE'S RESPONSE

Trustee responds and explains the situation to the court. Debtor fell behind in plan payments in month 58 in September 2016. The Trustee filed a Motion to Dismiss due to the delinquency. Debtor eventually paid most of the delinquency but not all of it, and the case was dismissed on April 3, 2017. Subsequent to the dismissal, debtor attempted to make the delinquent payment but the Trustee did not accept it as the case had been dismissed.

There was also a misunderstanding about the amount due. The total amount that needs to be paid into the plan is \$4,100.00. Trustee recommends that the motion be granted if the \$4,100 is paid.

DISCUSSION

The court agrees that in the interest of justice and in the best interests of creditors, the motion to vacate dismissal should be granted if the debtor makes the payment of \$4,100 to the Trustee in full satisfaction of plan payments. However, in the absence of evidence that the debtor has made such payment, the court will deny the motion.

At the hearing on January 23, 2018, the Trustee could not confirm that payment had been made. The parties agreed to continue the hearing. The Trustee filed a declaration indicating that the payment had been made. As a result, the Motion to Vacate Dismissal will be granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Vacate Dismissal filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Motion to Vacate Dismissal is granted.

31. $\frac{17-27496}{APN}$ -C-13 DAVID TAYLOR Dale Orthner

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT CORPORATION 12-13-17 [$\underline{16}$]

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on December 13, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Creditor, Toyota Motor Credit Corporation opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that debtor has neither assumed or rejected the lease agreement entered into with the creditor.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

32.

17-26999-C-13 RADOSLAV DONKOV AND SVETLANA DONKOVA David Ritzinger

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF FV-1, INC., CLAIM NUMBER 3 1-3-18 [28]

Thru #33 ***

> **Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on the Creditor, Debtor, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 3, 2018.

The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(b)(1)(A) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the nonresponding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

The Objection to Proof of Claim is continued to a date to be determined at the hearing.

Debtor requests that the court disallow the claim of FV-1 Inc., Proof of Claim 3-1, Official Registry of Claims in this case. The Claim is asserted to be secured in the amount of \$164,902.55. Objector asserts that debtors modified the loan and the new interest rate was set at 0.0001%. Where the claim of FV-1 Inc. includes interest above 0.0001%, the claim should be disallowed.

Section 502(a) provides that a claim supported by a Proof of Claim is allowed unless a party in interest objects. Once an objection has been filed, the court may determine the amount of the claim after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). It is settled law in the Ninth Circuit that the party objecting to a proof of claim has the burden of presenting substantial factual basis to overcome the prima facie validity of a proof of claim and the evidence must be of probative force equal to that of the creditor's proof of claim. Wright v. Holm (In re Holm), 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991); see also United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie), 349 B.R. 204, 210 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

CREDITOR'S RESPONSE

Creditor responds and asserts that it is in the process of preparing a Motion for Authority to Enter into a Loan Modification Agreement, and when approval of that is attained, the creditor will file an amended Proof of Claim that will resolve debtors' objection.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Claim of FV-1 Inc., filed by the debtor, having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the objection to Proof of Claim is continued to a date to be determined at the hearing.

33. 17-26999-C-13 RADOSLAV DONKOV AND MDE-1

SVETLANA DONKOVA David Ritzinger

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY FV-1, 12-5-17 [22]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the February 13, 2018 hearing is required.

The Creditor, FV-1, Inc. having filed a "Withdrawal of Motion" for the pending Objection to Confirmation of Plan, the "Withdrawal" being consistent with the opposition filed to the Objection, the court interpreting the "Withdrawal of Motion" to be an ex parte motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041 for the court to dismiss without prejudice the Objection to Confirmation of Plan, and good cause appearing, the court dismisses the Creditor's Objection to Confirmation of Plan.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

An Objection to Confirmation of Plan having been filed by the Creditor, FV-1, Inc., the Creditor having filed an ex parte motion to dismiss the Objection without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, dismissal of the Motion being consistent with the opposition filed, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is dismissed without prejudice.
