

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
Eastern District of California

**Honorable Ronald H. Sargis**  
Chief Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

February 23, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.

---

**FINAL RULINGS**

1. [20-25057](#)-E-13      **DAVID FLETCHER**      **MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM**  
[MMJ-1](#)                      **Douglas Jacobs**                      **AUTOMATIC STAY**  
**FINANCIAL SERVICES VEHICLE**                      **1-26-21 [107]**  
**TRUST VS.**

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the February 23, 2021 hearing is required.

-----

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

Sufficient 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 January 20, 2021. By the court’s calculation, 34 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

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). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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 for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Financial Services Vehicle Trust (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2019 BMW 7 Series 740i Sedan 4D, VIN ending in #6874 (“Vehicle”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Ryan Cisco to introduce evidence to authenticate the

documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by David S. Fletcher (“Debtor”). Debtor is the lessee of the Vehicle.

Movant argues Debtor has not made two (2) post-petition payments, with a total of \$2,661.14 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 109. Movant also provides evidence that there are four (4) pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$5,322.28. *Id.*

Movant has also provided a copy of the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report for the Vehicle. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

## **DISCUSSION**

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$80,561.33 (Declaration, Dckt. 109), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$43,095.00, as stated on the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report.

According to Schedule G, Debtor intends to surrender the Vehicle. Dckt. 1.

### **11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause**

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

### **11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)**

The motion also requests relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Grounds for this type of relief include lack of equity and whether the property is necessary for an effective reorganization. However, Movant does not provide analysis or facts as to this request and as such the court denies relief under this subsection.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

## **Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement**

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Financial Services Vehicle Trust (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2019 BMW 7 Series 740i Sedan 4D VIN ending in #6874 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

2. [18-26565-E-13](#) RENE MULLINAX  
[APN-1](#) Gerald White  
TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT  
CORPORATION VS.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM  
AUTOMATIC STAY  
1-8-21 [37]

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the February 23, 2021 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Sufficient 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 January 8, 2021. By the court’s calculation, 46 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

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). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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 for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2017 Toyota Highlander, VIN ending in #1136 (“Vehicle”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Hillary Coffelt to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Renee Mullinax (“Debtor”).

Movant argues Debtor has not made a total of \$7,497.89 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 39. Additionally, Movant asserts they have been unable to verify Debtor's insurance coverage on the Vehicle. *Id.*

Movant has also provided a copy of the NADA Valuation Report for the Vehicle. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

### **Trustee’s Non-Opposition**

Trustee responds by informing the court that Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$14,000.00, approximately 5 payments; and asserts that according to Trustee’s records, Debtor is

delinquent in payments to the creditor in the amount of \$9,105.05 in principal payments and \$107.88 interest, to date. Dckt. 47. Trustee states having disbursed a total of \$45,430.00 to Movant. *Id.* at 2. Moreover, Trustee has filed a Motion to Dismiss which is set for hearing on March 3, 2021. *Id.*

## DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$9,141.01 (Declaration, Dckt. 39). At the time of filing in 2018, Debtor valued the Vehicle at \$51,160.00, as stated in Schedules A/B filed by Debtor. Dckt. 1. Movant's NADA Guide states \$28,550.00 as replacement value. Exhibit E, Dckt. 41.

Debtor filed a Non-Opposition on February 11, 2021 noting that, although Debtor does not object to the granting of relief, Movant should not repossess the Vehicle since the payments due on the loan since filing total \$23,087.40 but Movant has received \$45,430.00 through the Plan. Dckt. 50.

According to Movant's Proof of Claim 8, Debtor owed \$51,473.56 at the time of the filing of this bankruptcy case. Proof of Claim 8-1.

### 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because "cause" is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff'd sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2017 Toyota Highlander, VIN ending in #1136 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

No other or additional relief is granted.

3. [20-23670-E-13](#) **SONNY/PRISCILLA LE**  
[APN-1](#) **Gabriel Liberman**  
**TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT**  
**CORPORATION VS.**

**MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM**  
**AUTOMATIC STAY**  
**1-19-21 [18]**

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the February 23, 2021 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Sufficient 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 January 19, 2021. By the court’s calculation, 35 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

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). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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 for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2019 Toyota Camry, VIN ending in #7726 (“Vehicle”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Hillary Coffelt to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Sonny Viet Le and Priscilla Cruz Le (“Debtor”).

Movant argues Debtor has not made four (4) post-petition payments and one (1) partial month, with a total of \$2,083.88 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 20. Additionally, Movant asserts they have been unable to verify Debtor’s insurance coverage on the Vehicle. *Id.*

Trustee does not oppose the relief requested but notes that Debtor is current under the Plan and has not disbursed any payments to Movant, as Movant is listed as Class 4 under the confirmed Plan. Dckt. 24.

## **DISCUSSION**

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the

debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$37,125.28 (Declaration, Dckt. 20), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$19,824.00, as stated in Schedules A/B filed by Debtor.

### **11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause**

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2019 Toyota Camry, VIN ending in #7726 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

No other or additional relief is granted.

4. [20-25496-E-13](#)      **ANDRE SAINT-LOUIS**  
[APN-1](#)              **Mark Shorman**  
**TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT**  
**CORPORATION VS.**

**MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM**  
**AUTOMATIC STAY AND/OR MOTION**  
**FOR RELIEF FROM CO-DEBTOR STAY**  
**1-20-21 [17]**

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the February 23, 2021 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Sufficient 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 January 20, 2021. By the court’s calculation, 34 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

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). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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 for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2019 Toyota Rav4, VIN ending in #8817 (“Vehicle”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Hillary Coffelt to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Andre Saint-Louis (“Debtor”).

Movant asserts that Debtor is current in payments but requests termination of the stay according to Debtor’s intention to surrender the Vehicle. Declaration, Dckt. 20. Additionally, Movant asserts they have been unable to verify Debtor’s insurance coverage on the Vehicle. *Id.*

#### **Trustee’s Opposition**

Trustee does not oppose the relief requested but notes that Debtor is current under the proposed plan and Movant is listed as a Class 3 of the proposed plan. Dckt. 35. Trustee further noting that no disbursement of payment to Movant has been made. *Id.*

## DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$15,653.86 (Declaration, Dckt. 20), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$24,964.00, as stated in Schedules A/B filed by Debtor.

According to Debtor's proposed Plan, Debtor intends to surrender the Vehicle to satisfy this claim. Dckt. 3.

### 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because "cause" is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff'd sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

Here, Movant is requesting the court terminate the stay based on Debtor's intention to surrender the Vehicle to Movant as stated in Debtor's proposed Plan. *See* Dckt. 3.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Toyota Motor Credit Corporation ("Movant") having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)

are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2019 Toyota Rav4 VIN ending in #8817 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the request to terminate the co-debtor stay of Victoria Saint-Louis of 11 U.S.C. § 1301(a) is granted to the same extent as provided in the forgoing paragraph granting relief from the automatic stay arising under 11 U.S.C. § 362(a).

No other or additional relief is granted.