

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

March 7, 2017 at 2:00 P.M.

1. [14-20520](#)-C-13 MARTY/MARIA HUMBLICK MOTION FOR COMPENSATION BY THE
CYB-4 Candace Brooks LAW OFFICE OF BROOKS CARPENTER
FOR CANDACE Y. BROOKS, DEBTORS
ATTORNEY(S)
2-13-17 [[66](#)]

Tentative Ruling: The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees 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, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 13, 2017. 21 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(6), 21 day notice requirement.)

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). 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.

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.

Candace Brooks, the Attorney for Debtors, ("Applicant") for Marty and Maria Humlick, ("Clients"), makes a Motion for Approval of Additional Debtor's

Attorney Fees.

The period for which the fees are requested is for the period from approximately September 12, 2014 through April 20, 2015. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$3,500.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00.

STATUTORY BASIS FOR PROFESSIONAL FEES

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3),

In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to an examiner, trustee under chapter 11, or professional person, the court shall consider the nature, the extent, and the value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors, including-

(A) the time spent on such services;

(B) the rates charged for such services;

(C) whether the services were necessary to the administration of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of, a case under this title;

(D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task addressed;

(E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and

(F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation charged by comparably skilled practitioners in cases other than cases under this title.

Further, the court shall not allow compensation for,

(I) unnecessary duplication of services; or

(ii) services that were not--

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate;

(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A). The court may award interim fees for professionals pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 331, which award is subject to final review and allowance pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330.

Benefit to the Estate

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are "actual," meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must still demonstrate that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the

services provided as the court's authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney "free reign [sic] to run up a [professional fees and expenses] without considering the maximum probable [as opposed to possible] recovery." *Id.* at 958. According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

(a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

Id. at 959.

In this District the Local Rules provide consumer counsel in Chapter 13 cases with an election for the allowance of fees in connection with the services required in obtaining confirmation of a plan and the services related thereto through the debtor obtaining a discharge. Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 provides, in pertinent part,

"(a) Compensation. Compensation paid to attorneys for the representation of chapter 13 debtors shall be determined according to Subpart (c) of this Local Bankruptcy Rule, unless a party-in-interest objects or the attorney opts out of Subpart (c). The failure of an attorney to file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys, shall signify that the attorney has opted out of Subpart (c). When there is an objection or when an attorney opts out, compensation shall be determined in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, and 2017, and any other applicable authority."

...

(c) Fixed Fees Approved in Connection with Plan Confirmation. The Court will, as part of the chapter 13 plan confirmation process, approve fees of attorneys representing chapter 13 debtors provided they comply with the requirements to this Subpart.

(1) The maximum fee that may be charged is \$4,000.00 in nonbusiness cases, and \$6,000.00 in business cases.

(2) The attorney for the chapter 13 debtor must file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys.

(3) If the fee under this Subpart is not sufficient to fully and fairly compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. The fee permitted under this Subpart, however, is not a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a motion for additional fees. Generally, this fee will fairly compensate the debtor's attorney for all preconfirmation services and

most postconfirmation services, such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. Form EDC 3-095, Application and Declaration RE: Additional Fees and Expenses in Chapter 13 Cases, may be used when seeking additional fees. The necessity for a hearing on the application shall be governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(6)."

The Order Confirming the Chapter 13 Plan expressly provides that Applicant is allowed \$3,500.00 in attorneys fees, the maximum set fee amount under Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 at the time of confirmation. Applicant prepared the order confirming the Plan.

If Applicant believes that there has been substantial and unanticipated legal services which have been provided, then such additional fees may be requested as provided in Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(3). He may file a fee application and the court will consider the fees to be awarded pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330, and 331. In the Ninth Circuit, the customary method for determining the reasonableness of a professional's fees is the "lodestar" calculation. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996), *amended*, 108 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 1997). "The 'lodestar' is calculated by multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate." *Morales*, 96 F.3d at 363 (citation omitted). "This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer's services." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). A compensation award based on the lodestar is a presumptively reasonable fee. *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988).

In rare or exceptional instances, if the court determines that the lodestar figure is unreasonably low or high, it may adjust the figure upward or downward based on certain factors. *Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ.*, 827 F.2d 617, 620 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the court has considerable discretion in determining the reasonableness of professional's fees. *Gates v. Duekmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). It is appropriate for the court to have this discretion "in view of the [court's] superior understanding of the litigation and the desirability of avoiding frequent appellate review of what essentially are factual matters." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437.

FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED

Fees and Costs

Applicant seeks compensation for work performed (1) preparing a motion for approval of a short sale of debtor's primary residence, (2) filing a motion to modify chapter 13 plan due to debtors change of circumstances and default in plan payments, (3) correspondence associated with notice of default in payments and application to dismiss, (4) correspondence associated with motion for approval of short sale and motion to modify debtors' plan.

Total Hours: 28.55 total, 11.40 hours which were unanticipated

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$3,500.00
Costs	\$0.00

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a statement of nonopposition. Dkt 72.

A review of the application shows that the services provided by Applicant related to the estate enforcing rights and obtaining benefits. The court finds the services were unanticipated, and were beneficial to the Client and bankruptcy estate and reasonable.

The court shall issue an 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 Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed Candace Y. Brooks ("Applicant"), Attorney for the Chapter 13 Debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, Candace Y. Brooks is allowed the fees in the amount of \$3,500.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00 as a professional of the Estate.

2. [16-25526](#)-C-13 ANGELA SLAUGHTER
DPC-1 Michael Croddy

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
2-7-17 [[60](#)]

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 February 7 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.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

- A. Trustee believes that the debtor, who currently supports two households and is proposing to support two households for the 60 month duration, is being unreasonable.
- B. Trustee believes Debtor should reasonably project the ability to increase plan payment within a year from \$537 to \$1,500 per month. Dividend currently proposed to unsecured creditors is 0%.
- C. Debtor is delinquent on plan payments in the amount of \$537.00.
- D. Plan may not be debtor's best efforts. Trustee believes that several expenses are not necessary for the debtor.
- E. The plan fails to propose a plan payment increase effective July 2017 after her son graduates.

F. Debtor's plan will not complete within 60 months due to the IRS claim.

G. Debtor failed to timely provide Trustee with proof of income for the 60 days preceding filing of their conversion to chapter 13.

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.

3. [16-22838](#)-C-13 CHARLES/HARU GARRETT
ALF-1 James Pitner

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.
12-8-16 [[24](#)]

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, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 8, 2016. 44 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007(a) 30 day notice and L.B.R. 3007-1(b)(1) 14-day opposition filing requirement.) That requirement is met.

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 non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

The Objection to Proof of Claim Number 6-1 of Bank of America, N.A. is overruled.

Debtors request that the court reduce the arrearage portion of Bank of America's claim number 6-1 to \$0 as the debtors are currently paying the arrears outside of the plan. The debtors assert that the original arrears amount of \$1,413.09 has been paid off in the amount of \$1,339.11 leaving just \$73.98 which will be paid off in February 2017.

Bank of America responded to the objection and requests that the court overrule the objection on the basis that it is entitled to its arrears.

The court is mindful that arrears must be paid off and that amending the claim to reflect \$0 in arrears is improper at this time. As a result, the court continued this hearing until March 7, 2017 to see if the arrears have been paid off.

The court notes that nothing has been filed since the previous hearing

held on January 24, 2017. As a result, the objection will be overruled absent additional evidence before 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 Objection to Claim of Bank of America, N.A., Creditor filed in this case 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 objection to Proof of Claim Number 6-1 of Bank of America, N.A. is overruled.

4. [13-31739](#)-C-13 RODERICK DEAL
SDB-5 W. Scott de Bie

MOTION TO APPROVE LOAN
MODIFICATION
2-3-17 [[93](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 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 Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 3, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification 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 Approve Loan Modification is granted.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification filed by Roderick Christopher Deal ("Debtor") seeks court approval for a modification of first mortgage loan secured by debtor's residence. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., ("Creditor"), whose claim the plan provides for in Class 4, has agreed to a loan modification which will reduce Debtor's mortgage payment to \$2,095.54 a month and the interest rate will change from 4.5% to 3.625%.

The Motion is supported by the Declaration of the Debtor. The Declaration affirms Debtor's desire to modify the loan and provides evidence of Debtor's ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

This loan modification is consistent with the Chapter 13 Plan in this case and Debtor's ability to fund that Plan. There being no objection from the Trustee or other parties in interest, and the motion complying with the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 364(d), the Motion to Approve the Loan Modification 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 to Approve the Loan Modification filed by [name of movant] 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 court
authorizes Roderick Christopher Deal
("Debtor") to amend the terms of the loan with
Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., which is secured by
the real property commonly known as 7508 King
Leopold Court, Vallejo, California, on such
terms as stated in the Modification Agreement
filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion,
Dckt. 96.

5. [11-43840](#)-C-13 EARL/HATTIE JOHNSON MOTION TO DETERMINE FINAL CURE
DPC-1 Peter Macaluso AND MORTGAGE PAYMENT RULE
3002.1
1-20-17 [[100](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 hearing is required.

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a Withdrawal of the Motion to Determine Final Cure and Mortgage Payment Rule 3002.1, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041 **the Motion to Determine Final Cure and Mortgage Payment Rule 3002.1 was dismissed without prejudice, and the matter is removed from the calendar.**

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 January 18, 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. Debtor cannot make the payments under the plan. Debtor has filed an Amended Schedule I indicating income from two sources. Debtor was not previously employed and the Trustee requests that the income source be verified. Debtor has missed multiple plan payments since filing and debtor's ability to make the payments is necessary to confirm the plan.

B. Debtor's father filed two separate declarations indicating his intent to contribute funds to plan payments. Despite this, the debtor was delinquent on plan payments. The Trustee asserts that either the father was not contributing the amount indicated, or the debtor was using the money for something other than plan payments.

C. Debtor is delinquent \$7,050.00 in plan payments. Debtor has made 5 payments toward the plan in the last 12 months.

D. Trustee is worried that the debtor has failed to consider the late fees associated with the missed post-petition mortgage payments.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

7. [16-28546](#)-C-13 LOREN FLYNN
DPC-1 Robert Bowman

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
2-7-17 [[14](#)]

ALSO #22

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 February 7, 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.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

A. The plan is not the debtor's best effort. Debtor listed Child Support payment twice. As a result, the debtor has an additional \$816.92 per month in disposable income.

Debtor's Reply

Debtor replies that it was an inadvertent error listing the domestic support obligation twice in the schedules. Debtor also lists a number of other expenses that were not included previously.

Trustee's Reply

Trustee points out that there is additional disposable income as a result of the inadvertent listing of the double child support payment. The debtor's reply did not propose to make additional payments as a result of

this increase in disposable income. The additional expenses cited by the debtor do not account for the entire \$816.92 per month in additional disposable income.

The court notes that the Debtor has filed a motion to dismiss this chapter 13 case.

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 January 12, 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor cannot make plan payments. Debtor lists property with a claim of \$1,444,458.00. Debtor has not made a payment on the mortgage since 2010. Debtor fails to provide a mortgage payment in the Plan or on the amended Schedule J.
- B. Debtor's plan relies on \$500 each month from relatives, but debtor has not provided any declarations to prove willingness and ability to make such contribution.
- C. Debtor proposes to increase plan payments beginning in month 15 to \$950, however debtor's net disposable income reflects just \$750.00 per month.
- D. Debtor filed an amended Schedule J that changed the rent expense from \$2,000 to \$1,800 for "projected" rent. Debtor is currently living in their residence and not spending the \$1,800 per month expense, and therefore has an additional \$1,800 per month to pay into the plan.

Secured creditor, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. additionally opposes confirmation of the plan on the basis that the plan does not provide for arrearages owed to Wells Fargo. If the debtor does not intend to provide

for the delinquent secured claim in the bankruptcy, Wells Fargo's claim should be placed in Class 4 of the Plan wherein relief from stay will be granted upon confirmation.

Debtor's Reply

Debtor responds to both objections to the Motion to Confirm stating that the code does not require secured claims to be provided for under a chapter 13 plan. Debtor does not respond to the numerous objections from the Trustee. The debtor states that because unsecured creditors are to be paid 100% under the plan, the Best Efforts test does not apply.

Discussion

The court is troubled by the arguments of the debtor. The debtor argues that the debt of Wells Fargo has been bifurcated so as to avoid the limit on secured debts provided for in 11 U.S.C. § 109(e). However, there are several problems to this argument. First, the court does not see a valuation motion on the docket. Thus, the court does not know how a bifurcation has occurred.

However, more importantly, if the debt of Wells Fargo is bifurcated, part of the debt is a secured debt and the remainder is an unsecured debt. The debtor then makes the argument that Class 7 creditors will be paid in full. The plan states that total unsecured claims total \$4,719. Provision 2.15 in the plan states "Does not include Bifurcated Unsecured Portion of Claim 2." No mention is made of Wells Fargo's Claim #4. If the debtor bifurcates a claim, the unsecured portion must be provided for in the plan. If the debtor properly provided for the unsecured portion of Wells Fargo's claim, there would not be 100% dividend to unsecured creditors.

Additionally, although § 1325 does not require provision for a secured creditor, the court has serious doubt that this plan is feasible. The debtor's Schedule J indicates rent payment of \$1,800 per month. The debtor has admitted that she has no intention of using that money to pay the secured creditor. If this plan was confirmed, and the creditor inevitably moved to foreclose on the residence, the debtor would need to provide for moving costs in addition to new rent payments. The court does not have any evidence that the debtor would be able to perform on a plan under such circumstances.

The court has many reasons to deny the Motion to Confirm. The plan is not feasible as proposed. The debtor is currently delinquent under the plan. The debtor has either not bifurcated the claim of Wells Fargo or has bifurcated the claim and has not provided for a 100% disbursement to unsecured creditors. In that case, it is very probable that the plan would fail the best efforts test. The court does not have sufficient evidence to confirm the plan.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Value 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, Debtor's attorney, Ch 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 20, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Value was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). 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.

The Motion to Value secured claim of George and Julie Kidney, "Creditors," is denied.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 4950 No Name Road, Loomis, California. The Debtors seek to value the property at a fair market value of \$450,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtors 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 Debtors assert the following: The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$475,806.00. George and Julie Kidney's second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$36,360.00. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized.

The Trustee correctly points out that nowhere on the record does it show when the debt of George and Julie Kidney was incurred, nor does it list

the last 4 digits of the account number anywhere. The court does not have the evidence required to value the collateral without such evidence.

The Trustee also asserts that the Trustee is not certain the debtor's opinion of value is persuasive. While a debtor's opinion of value is evidence, it is not always conclusive evidence. The court does not have evidence of any other valuation. However, the court cannot grant the motion absent evidence as to when the debtors incurred the George and Julie Kidney debt.

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 to Value is denied.

10. [14-23160](#)-C-13 GUSTAVO/ZENAIDA AZCARATE
HLG-4 Kristy Hernandez

MOTION FOR CONTINUED
ADMINISTRATION OF THE CASE
AND/OR MOTION FOR A WAIVER OF
THE SECTION 1328 CERTIFICATE
REQUIREMENTS
2-1-17 [[49](#)]

Tentative Ruling: The Motion for Continued Administration of the Case and/or Motion for a Waiver of Section 1328 Requirements 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 February 1, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion for Continued Administration of the Case and/or Motion for Waiver of Section 1328 Requirements 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.

<p>The Motion for Continued Administration of the Case and/or Motion for Waiver of Section 1328 Requirements is continued to March 21, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.</p>

Debtor Gustavo Azcarate brings this motion to waive requirements of § 1328 as to Zenaida Banaag Azcarate and to seek permission to continue administration of the case. Zenaida Banaag Azcarate was a co-debtor who deceased on March 28, 2014. Gustavo Azcarate continued to make plan payments in accordance with the confirmed plan. The clerk of court is unable to enter a discharge for Debtor, Zenaida Banaag Azcarate, unless the court grants this motion.

Trustee's Response

Trustee responds that the Debtor has not disclosed if any life insurance proceeds were received or are expected.

Discussion

The only issue revolves around the availability of insurance proceeds. The court will continue this matter to the next chapter 13 hearing date. The debtor should provide the Trustee with information regarding the presence or absence of life insurance proceeds, either already received or expected.

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 Waiver of Section 1328 Requirements 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 is continued to March 21, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

11. [16-27961](#)-C-13 JOHNNY/MELISSA ROBBINS
DPC-1 Peter Cianchetta

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID
P. CUSICK
1-19-17 [[64](#)]

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 20, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

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.

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

1. Creditor disputes the valuation of its collateral in the plan.

The court previously continued this matter to coincide with the valuation motion. The valuation motion has been dropped from the calendar pursuant to parties' stipulation. As a result, the is moot. The objection will be overruled.

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 the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is overruled.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan 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 January 17, 2017. Thirty-five 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 Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. In this instance, opposition to the proposed modifications was filed by Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick.

The Chapter 13 Trustee objects to confirmation of Debtors' Modified Plan for the following reasons:

1. Debtors are proposing a post-petition claim for \$6,257.00. However, according to the Trustee's calculation, the amount should be for six delinquent monthly contract installments which totals \$7,700.85.

2. Debtor incorrectly states in item 1 that \$8,727.00 was the total paid into the plan, however the true amount was \$8,724.00.

The court notes that these slight problems can be corrected in the order confirming. However, as it stands, the modified Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 Motion to Confirm the Modified 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

13. [16-28366](#)-C-13 TIMOTHY SCHAD
DPC-1 Lucas Garcia

OBJECTION TO DISCHARGE BY DAVID
P. CUSICK
1-13-17 [[17](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 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 13, 2017. 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 25, 2017. Dckt. 17.

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 13 bankruptcy case on May 5, 2015. Case No. 15-23704. The case was converted to chapter 7 on December 28, 2015, and the Debtor received a discharge on April 11, 2016.

The instant case was filed under Chapter 13 on December 21, 2016.

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 11, 2016 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. 16-28366), 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. 16-28366, the case shall be closed without the entry of a discharge.

14. [17-20568](#)-C-13 LISA ORTIZ
LBG-1 Lucas Garcia

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.
2-3-17 [[9](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 hearing is required.

The parties having filed a stipulation, Dckt. 25, resolving this dispute, the Motion will be denied as moot and taken off calendar.

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 Value Collateral of Bank of America, N.A., having been presented to the court, the dispute having been resolved pursuant to stipulation of the parties, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is denied as moot, the motion being resolved pursuant to stipulation.

15. [12-25070](#)-C-13 JOSEPH MUNOZ
SDB-6 W. Scott de Bie

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.
2-7-17 [[68](#)]

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 February 7, 2017. 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 Bank of America, 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 536 Countryside Drive, Vacaville, California. The Debtors seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$405,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtors' opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (n re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9 Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$476,474.80. Bank of America, N.A.'s second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$47,426.69. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized.

Trustee's Objection

Trustee filed an objection to the motion on the basis that the Debtor has filed a Motion to Modify where Debtor's mortgage is moving from

Class 3 to Class 4 based on a loan modification. Trustee is uncertain a Motion to Value is appropriate where the terms of the loan modification are unknown and the same creditor holds the first and second deed of trust.

Debtor's Reply

Debtor replies that the Trustee has introduced no authority to support either his contention that the terms of a loan modification must be known prior to a motion to value or that because the same creditor holds the first and second deed of trust, the motion should be denied. Debtor correctly points out that the holder of the second deed of trust has not objected to this motion, and the holder of the first deed of trust may object to the change in its classification by responding to the motion to modify.

Absent additional authority or evidence, the court is inclined to grant 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 Value 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 Bank of America, N.A., secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 536 Countryside Drive, Vacaville, 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 confirm bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$405,000.00 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

16. [16-24172](#)-C-13 DARREN CARTER AND AMY MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
MJD-1 ALEXANDER-CARTER 1-19-17 [[47](#)]
Matthew DeCaminada

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 January 19, 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. The plan may fail the Chapter 7 liquidation analysis and may unfairly discriminate against general unsecured creditors. Debtor has paid her mother, an unsecured creditor, \$7,800.00 and still owes \$40,000.00. Debtors have admitted at the Meeting of Creditors that they have been making monthly payments to their mom. Debtors are proposing a 9.61% dividend to unsecured creditors, which totals approximately \$12,718.00.

B. Debtors filed Amended Schedule J on October 5, 2016 and changed the rent expense from \$1,850 to \$1,200 without explanation. The debtors' address has not changed and debtors have not filed a change of address. Without supporting evidence, the court is unsure how the debtors have reduced rent expenses by \$650 per month.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

17. [16-24173](#)-C-13 RICHARD BROUETTE
EJS-3 Eric Schwab

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
1-17-17 [[50](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 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 17, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required.

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 January 17, 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.

18. [13-24485](#)-C-13 ALLAN/RAQUEL TORNEROS MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
MDL-3 Michael Lee 1-22-17 [[119](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 7, 2017 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 22, 2017. 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 with certain applicable corrections to be made in the order modifying.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The Trustee requests that the existing additional provisions be deleted in the order modifying and replaced with "The debtors' have paid a total of \$172,791.24 through February 3, 2017. Commencing with the February 25, 2017 plan payment, the payment shall be \$4,136.38 for the remaining 15 months of the plan." Furthermore, the Trustee points out that section 2.6 of the plan does not authorize \$3,500 be paid prior to filing and \$500 paid through the plan to the prior attorney. Trustee asks that these amounts be 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 22, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, taking into account the changes requested by the Trustee, 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.

Thru #20

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan 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 January 13, 2017. Thirty-five 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 Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. In this instance, opposition to the proposed modifications was filed by Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick.

The Chapter 13 Trustee objects to confirmation of Debtors' Modified Plan for the following reasons:

1. Debtor included a claim for Wells Fargo Home Mortgage in the amount of \$6,014.78 for post-petition arrears. Debtor states \$1,258.14 of this amount results from paying the Trustee only \$849.32 from December 1, 2013 through December 1, 2014 as opposed to the \$946.10 as they should have.
2. Debtor filed a Schedule J that reflects the ability to pay \$1,885.97. However, debtor is proposing a plan payment of \$2,430.00 which is not supported by Schedule J.

The court continued the hearing to see if the debtors were current under the plan. Absent evidence that the debtors are current, the modified Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 Motion to Confirm the Modified 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

20. [13-34908](#)-C-13 SEAN/SARAH STEWART
AP-1 Matthew J. DeCaminada

CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
1-12-17 [[113](#)]

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. 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 January 12, 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 granted.

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to the real property commonly known as 5935 Larry Way, North Highlands, California. The moving party has provided the Declaration of Rebekah Roper to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by the Debtor.

The Roper Declaration states that the Debtor has not made 8 post-petition payments, with a total of \$8,145.72 in post-petition payments past due. 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 \$122,423.03 (including \$122,423.03 secured by movant's first trust deed), as stated in the Roper Declaration, while the value of the property is determined to be \$166,364.00, as stated in Schedules A and D filed by Debtor.

DEBTORS' OPPOSITION

Debtors allege that the creditor increased mortgage payments on

December 1, 2013 without filing a Notice of Mortgage Payment Change pursuant to FRBP 3002.1(d). Debtors have filed an Amended Plan that will cure the post-filing delinquencies to Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. in the amount of \$6,014.78.

TRUSTEE'S RESPONSE

Trustee responds that the Debtors are delinquent \$7,520.00 under the confirmed plan. The Debtors have filed an Amended Plan and are \$2,480.00 delinquent under the Amended Plan, however a payment is currently pending through electronic transfer.

DISCUSSION

Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. has introduced evidence that the post-petition arrears due are in the amount of \$8,145.72. The Debtors admit that they have not made payments under the Chapter 13 Plan. The Debtors have indicated that an Amended Plan has been filed, yet it appears that the Amended Plan will not cure the post-filing delinquencies as the Debtors claim.

In light of the fact that the Debtors have made substantial payments into the plan, and due to the fact that the equity cushion provides enough protection to the creditor, the court continued this motion until the hearing on the Motion to Modify 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 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 automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., its agents, representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed which is recorded against the property to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale obtain possession of the real property commonly known as 5935 Larry Way, North Highlands, California.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Confirm the Plan 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 January 11, 2017. Thirty-five 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 Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 deny the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. In this instance, opposition to the proposed modifications was filed by Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick.

The Chapter 13 Trustee objects to confirmation of Debtors' Modified Plan for the following reasons:

1. Debtor included a claim for Wells Fargo Home Mortgage in the amount of \$6,014.78 for post-petition arrears. Debtor states \$1,258.14 of this amount results from paying the Trustee only \$849.32 from December 1, 2013 through December 1, 2014 as opposed to the \$946.10 as they should have.
2. Debtor filed a Schedule J that reflects the ability to pay \$1,885.97. However, debtor is proposing a plan payment of \$2,430.00 which is not supported by Schedule J.

The hearing on the Motion to Modify Plan was continued to see if the debtors were current as of the hearing. Currently, the court does not have evidence that the debtors are current on plan payments.

After the hearing held on February 28, 2017, the Debtor filed the

purported original declaration of the Debtor. The Trustee filed a supplemental opposition requesting that the motion be denied because (1) the original handwritten declaration does not match a paragraph from the typed declaration and (2) the typed declaration did not include the information from the handwritten declaration regarding a car accident and purchase of a vehicle.

The court initially worried that the declaration provided to the court did not appear to be actually written by and agreed with by the Debtor. After seeing the Debtor's "original" declaration, the court has serious worries. The declaration did not match up. A declaration is a sworn statement published under penalty of perjury. The court suggests that the Debtor and debtor's counsel take note of that fact.

The modified Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and 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 Motion to Confirm the Modified 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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Dismiss was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(3). 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)(3) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 24, 2017. The court granted a motion to shorten time to hear the motion.

The Motion to Dismiss was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(3). 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.

The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Dismiss and dismiss the case.

The Debtor seeks voluntary dismissal of the Chapter 13 case pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1307(b) as the Debtor has become severely ill and wants to focus on his health.

Section 1307(b) states that on request of the debtor at any time, the court shall dismiss a chapter 13 case that has not been previously converted. This case has not been previously converted. The court will dismiss the 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 Motion to Dismiss the Chapter 13 case filed by the Chapter 13 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 to
Dismiss is granted and the case is dismissed.
