

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein
Chief Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

April 14, 2015 at 2:00 P.M.

1. [15-20203](#)-C-13 JAMES/MONICA IVIE MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF
ADR-1 Justin Kuney CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE
Also #2 3-27-15 [[30](#)]

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 Chapter 13 Trustee and Capital One Auto Finance, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 27, 2015. 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Capital One Auto Finance, "Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is

the owner of the 2010 Ford Escape XLT. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$10,677.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred in June, 2012, more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a balance of approximately \$21,923.00. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$10,677.00. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Capital One Auto Finance secured by a 2010 Ford Escape XLT, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$10,677.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the collateral is \$10,677.00.

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 March 2, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

1. Debtor did not provide Trustee with a tax transcript or copy of his Federal Income Tax return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required, or a written statement that no such document exists. 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A); FRBP 4002(b)(3). This is required seven days before the date first set for the meeting of creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A)(1).
2. Debtor cannot make the payments under the plan and has not filed a motion to value the secured claim of Capital One Auto Finance.
3. The plan will not be complete with 60 months. Section 2.13 of the plan [dckt. 13] provides for priority debts of \$3,002. Pursuant to

the proof of claim filed by the IRS on February 17, 2015, the priority debt totals \$19,130.69.

As the Trustee's concerns highlight, 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 the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay 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 Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 31, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay 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. At the hearing -----.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is denied.

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 2013-35625-A-13J) was filed on December 12, 2013 and dismissed on August 8, 2014, for Debtor's failure to get a plan confirmed. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (2) (A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (C) (i) (II) (aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c) (3) (c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality

of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); see also Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307(and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?

2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-15.

Here, Debtor states that, after his last bankruptcy case was dismissed, his income has increased. Debtor offers neither the reason for the increase in his income nor the amount of the increase. Based on Debtor's motion, the court cannot discern whether Debtor's increased income is sufficient to support a Chapter 13 reorganization. Because Debtor has not demonstrated that the present plan is likely to succeed, Debtor has not sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay.

The motion is denied and the automatic stay is not extended.

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 Extend the Automatic Stay 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 denied and the automatic stay is not extended pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B).

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 March 2, 2015. Thirty-five days' notice is required.

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 provides no explanation for the increase in Debtor's 401K loan balance and monthly payment. Thus, Debtor will not be able to make the plan payment if this continues to increase. Debtor's original Schedule I (dckt. 1) filed February 20, 2013 indicated Debtor had a 401K loan with a balance remaining of \$6,000 and a monthly payroll deduction of \$93.53. Debtor's Supplemental Schedule I (dckt. 53) now reflects a loan balance in excess of \$16,000.00 with a monthly payroll deduction of \$369.57. The Trustee is unable to locate within the docket that the Debtor filed a motion to borrow \$10,000 of additional funds or a court order giving Debtor permission to do so.
2. Debtor's modified plan schedules CarMax Auto Finance regarding a 2004 Nissan 350Z as a Class 2 claim based on value of collateral reduced from \$12,280 to \$12,200. Trustee is unable to locate within

the docket that Debtor has filed a motion to value this vehicle.

As the Trustee's concerns highlight, 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 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 February 11, 2015. 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 Chapter 13 Trustee opposes the motion for the following reasons:

Not Best Efforts

Debtor is above median income. Form 22C shows net income of \$3,916.66. Debtors' amended plan proposes a total of \$2,317 through February 5, 2015, then \$1,187 per month for the remainder of the plan. Debtors amended Schedule J (dckt. 26) lists net income of \$4,621.36, which is \$3,434.36 more than the proposed payment. Debtor is proposing to pay approximately 25% of her net income into the plan per month.

The plan states that unsecured Class 7 creditors shall receive the Federal Interest Rate in effect at the time of filing of .09%. However, Debtor's motion states that the interest rate is pursuant to *In re Braswell*, 2013 Bankr. Lexis 2630, *4; (Bankr, Oregon 2013). In that case, the court used the national prime rate as a base and adjusted it upwards for risk, amounting to 5.75% interest. The national prime rate is currently 3.25%.

Undisclosed Unsecured Debts

The plan does not account for the claims of student loan debt including claims 5-1, 6-1, 10-1, 11-1, and 12-1.

Plan Not Feasible

The plan will not be complete within 60 months. According to the Trustee's calculation, the plan will take 148 months to complete at 100%.

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. April 6, 2015

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, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 23, 2015. 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Chase, "Creditor," is denied without prejudice.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtors' declaration. The Debtors are the owners of the subject real property commonly known as 6537 Cowboy Way, Citrus Heights, California. The Debtors seek to value the property at a fair market value of \$275,000.00 as of the date that the petition was filed. As the owners, 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).

Debtors assert that the first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$300,406.00. Respondent creditor's second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$144,623.39. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized.

DISCUSSION

Debtors seek to value the collateral of the entity they have named in their moving papers, "Chase." Service, however, is not proper. Debtors served the following address by certified mail:

Chase
Attn: Officer
800 Brookside Blvd
Westerville, OH 43081

A search on the FDIC database and the California Secretary of State website do not return a result a "Chase" company or entity. The Court can only assume that the creditor to whom Debtors are referring in their moving papers as the entity that has an interest in the subject real property is "Chase Bank, N.A." The address for service of Chase Bank, N.A. can be found on the FDIC Website at:

Chase Bank USA, N.A.
201 North Walnut Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
New Castle County

Congress created a specific rule to provide for service of pleadings, including this contested matter, on federally insured financial institution, Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7004(h). Based on the lack of proper service here, the motion is denied without prejudice.

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 is denied without prejudice.

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 March 20, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement has been 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

Creditor Wells Fargo ("Creditor") opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the Debtor's Plan fails to provide for Creditor's secured claim in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii), which requires a debtor's Chapter 13 Plan to distribute at least the allowed amount of a creditor's secured claim.

Creditor's claim is evidenced by a promissory note (the "Note") executed by Debtor and dated September 17, 2014, in the original principal sum of \$161,200.00. The Note is secured by a deed of trust encumbering the real property commonly known as 14N Kern Ave, Woodland, California.

Because Debtor has failed to provide for Creditor's secured claim in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii), the Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Therefore, 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 Wells Fargo 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 the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion.

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

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

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on February 11, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. This requirement has been 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

1. Debtor cannot make payments under the plan or comply with the plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325 (a)(6). Debtor's plan relies on the pending Motion to Value the secured claim of Chase. If the motion is not granted, Debtor lacks sufficient monies to pay the claim in full.
2. Section 6 of Debtor's plan indicates that Debtor has filed a request for mortgage loan modification on her residence and that the mortgage arrears will be provided for by the modification. Debtor does not indicate how the modification will provide for the arrears or how the plan is to treat the mortgage if the modification is denied. Debtor proposes a monthly payment of \$3,980 through the plan to Wells Fargo Home Mortgage. The plan does not properly provide for the secured

claim.

3. The additional provisions of the plan are not on a separate paper appended to the plan. Therefore, the additional provisions of the plan are null and void.

Although the court is prepared to grant Debtor's pending motion to value the secured claim of JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. resolving Trustee's first objection, Trustee's second and third objection have not been resolved.

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 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)(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 February 28, 2015. 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. The debtor is delinquent \$1,287.22 under the proposed plan.
2. The order confirming the plan (dckt. 44) reflects attorney fees in the amount of \$4,000, but the proposed, modified plan lists attorney fees in the amount of \$2,800.
3. The plan is not properly signed with the name of the person signing the document typed underneath the signature pursuant to LBR 9004-1(c).
4. There is no current statement of expenses on file.
5. There is no evidence that the Debtors and creditor LS Capital Group have agreed on terms to pay lease arrears in the amount of \$28,911.78 outside of the Chapter 13 plan, and the plan does not provide for payment of the debt.

As the Trustee's objections highlight, 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.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 March 2, 2015. 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 Garret and Ashley Warren ("Debtors") seeks court approval for Debtor to incur post-petition credit. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Creditor"), whose claim the plan provides for, has agreed to a loan modification which will reduce Debtors' mortgage payment to \$1,012.39 a month. The modified principal balance of the note will include all amounts and arrearage that will be past due as of the Modification Effective Date (including unpaid and deferred interest, fees, escrow advances and other costs, but excluding unpaid late charges) less any amounts paid to Creditor but not previously credited to the Debtors' Loan. As of the effective date, the principal balance of the loan that will be due and payable is \$122,449.95 (the "New Principal Balance"). Interest at the rate of 4.500% began to accrue on the New Principal Balance as of June 1, 2014. The maturity date will be June 1, 2044.

The Motion is supported by the Declaration of Garret and Ashley Warren. The Declaration affirms Debtors' desire to obtain the post-petition financing and provides evidence of Debtors' ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a statement of non-opposition.

This post-petition financing 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 Garret and Ashley Warren 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 Garret and Ashley Warren("Debtors") to amend the terms of the loan with Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., which is secured by the real property commonly known as 990 Sierra View Circle #3, Lincoln, CA 95648, California, on such terms as stated in the Modification Agreement filed as Exhibit in support of the Motion, Dckt. 96.

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 February 13, 2015. 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 is \$390 delinquent in plan payments to the Trustee to date. Debtor has paid \$11,550.60 into the plan to date.
2. Debtor has not filed Supplemental Schedules I and J in support of the proposed plan payment of \$320. Debtor's plan payment under the confirmed plan is \$250. Debtor's most recent Schedules I and J were filed July 9, 2014 (dckt. 67) and reflect a monthly net income of \$251.74.

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.

Also #13

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 25, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that Debtor cannot make the payments under the plan or comply with the plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Trustee states that Debtor proposes to avoid the judgment liens of GCFS Inc. and Wells Fargo c/o Cash LLC but has not filed motions to avoid the liens. Further, the Plan does not have sufficient monies to pay the claims in full and therefore should also be denied confirmation.

DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION

Debtor's opposition to the Objection addresses Trustee's concerns as follows:

1. Debtor has obtained an order granting the motion to value the Wells

Fargo second mortgage. The order was entered on March 1, 2015 stemming from a February 24, 2015 hearing. Cash LLC collecting for Wells Fargo does not have a secured claim. Debtor listed this in Schedule D and classified Wells Fargo in the plan as a class 2 creditor. Wells Fargo filed a claim in the first case [#14-28298] indicating that the claim was unsecured. Considering the absence of a security interest, there is no need to file a motion to value collateral with regard to Wells Fargo.

2. Debtor's counsel has anticipated a stipulation from the creditor, which has not yet materialized. Debtor filed a motion to void the abstract on March, 18, 2015 set for hearing on April 14, 2015.

Trustee's Supplemental Objection

The Trustee's objection scheduled for hearing on February 24, 2015, was continued to April 14, 2015 to coincide with Debtor's continued motion to avoid lien. Creditor Cash, LLC has not filed a claim to date, and, after reviewing the claim, the Trustee agrees that the claim of Cash, LLC is unsecured.

DISCUSSION

The court is prepared to grant the Debtor's motion to avoid lien of GCFC. Because granting the motion to avoid lien resolves the only remaining concern of the Chapter 13 Trustee, the Trustee's objection to plan confirmation is overruled.

The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is overruled and the Plan 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 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 the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on January 21, 2015 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.

13. [15-20430](#)-C-13 JOHN LEWIS
TJW-3 Timothy Walsh

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF GCFS,
INC.
3-18-15 [[35](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 18, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of GCFS Inc. for the sum of \$7,654.46. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Solano County on June 4, 2012. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 441 Ebbets Pass Rd. Vallejo, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$181,000 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$293,000 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b)(1) in the amount of \$1,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to

11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of GCFS, Inc., Solano County Superior Court Case No. FCM127847, Document No. 201200065871, recorded on June 4, 2012, with the Solano County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 441 Ebbets Pass Rd. Vallejo, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

14. [13-29532](#)-C-13 MICHAEL CRONE AND
HLG-1 CELESTINA YSAIS
Kristy Hernandez

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
2-17-15 [[50](#)]

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 xxxx, <year>. 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. The debtors are delinquent \$6,040 under the proposed plan. The additional provisions of the proposed modified plan states: "\$2,900 per month for 19 months, \$3,140 per month for 41 months (effective with the March 25, 2015 payment)". (See dckt. 52). The case was filed on July 19, 2013, and 20 payments have come due under the plan; payments totaling \$58,240 have become due under the proposed modified plan. Debtor has paid the Trustee \$52,200 with the last payment of \$2,900 posted on February 26, 2015.
2. Debtors are proposing to reduce dividend to unsecured creditors from 5% to 0%. As of the February disbursement, the Trustee has disbursed a total of \$3,492.83. These

payments have not been authorized under the confirmed plan, but the Trustee is required to make the payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1326(a) (2).

As the Trustee's objections reveal, 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 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 February 17, 2015. 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 delinquent \$6,040 under the proposed plan.
2. Debtors are proposing to reduce the dividend to unsecured creditors from 5% to 0%. As of February disbursement, the Trustee has disbursed a total of \$3,492.83. These payments have not been authorized under the confirmed plan, but the Trustee is required to make the payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1326(a)(2).

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.

Also #17

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Approve Loan Modification 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 (*pro se*), Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, [Official Committee of Creditors Holding General Unsecured Claims/creditors holding the 20 largest unsecured claims], parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 31, 2015. 14 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification 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. At the hearing -----.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification is granted.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification filed by Gary Duerner ("Debtor") seeks court approval for Debtor to incur post-petition credit. Wells Fargo ("Creditor"), whose claim the plan provides for, has agreed to a loan modification which will reduce Debtor's mortgage payment from the current \$2,742.13 a month to \$1,790.87 a month. The modification includes: (1) an interest rate of 2% and payments of \$1790.87 for 5 years, 3% and payments of \$2,023.00 for 1 year, and 3.75% and payments of \$2,205.16 for the remaining 34 years of the modified loan; and (2) forgiveness of all arrearage and late fees if loan kept current for three years on a 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 basis after each of the first three years.

The Motion is supported by the Declaration of Gary Duerner. The Declaration affirms Debtor's desire to obtain the post-petition financing and provides evidence of Debtor's ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

This post-petition financing 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 Gary Duerner 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 Gary Duerner ("Debtor") to amend the terms of the loan with Wells Fargo, which is secured by the real property commonly known as 3527 Buckskin Ct, Rocklin, California, on such terms as stated in the Modification Agreement filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion, Dckt. 55.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Approve Loan Modification 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, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 31, 2015. By the court's calculation, 14 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Approve Forbearance Agreement with HOA at Desert Island 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. At the hearing -----.

The Motion to Approve Forbearance Agreement with HOA at Desert Island is granted.

The Motion to Approve Forbearance Agreement with HOA at Desert Island filed by Gary Duerner ("Debtor") seeks court approval for Debtor to pay arrearage of home owner dues. Desert Island Home Owners Association ("Creditor"), has agreed to a loan modification.

The following terms and conditions are summarized by the court (the full terms of the modification agreement are set forth in the Forbearance Agreement filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion, dckt. 59):

1. Forbearance of all arrearage.
2. New monthly payments of \$ 626.10 for 60 months beginning on July 15,

2015.

3. No interest rate during the payback period.
4. Forgiveness of all accumulated late fees (approximately \$3,200) if payments are made on time during the course of the payment arrangement.

The Motion is supported by the Declaration of Gary Duerner. The Declaration affirms Debtor's ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

This post-petition financing 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 Forbearance Agreement with HOA at Desert Island 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 Forbearance Agreement with HOA at Desert Island filed by Gary Duerner 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 Gary Duerner ("Debtor") to amend the terms of the loan with Desert Island Home Owners Association, which is secured by the real property commonly known as 900 Island Drive #106, Rancho Mirage, California, on such terms as stated in the Modification Agreement filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion, Dckt. 59.

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 March 17, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

1. Debtor is \$1,000 delinquent in plan payments to the Trustee to date and the next scheduled payment of \$1,000 is due on March 17, 2015. Debtor has paid \$0.00 into the plan to date.
2. It appears the plan fails the Chapter 7 liquidation analysis under 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). Debtor's non-exempt equity totals \$25,940, and Debtor proposes to pay the unsecured creditors a zero percent dividend.
3. Debtor did not provide Trustee with a tax transcript or copy of his Federal Income Tax return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required, or a written

statement that no such document exists. 11 U.S.C. § 521(e) (2) (A); FRBP 4002(b) (3). This is required seven days before the date first set for the meeting of creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 521(e) (2) (A) (1).

4. Trustee has requested, and Debtor has failed to provide, the answers to certain questions about Debtor's business (including recent profit and loss, a list of employees, and other questions set out in a Business Case Questionnaire mailed to Debtor) and other documentation (copies of bank statements, business tax returns, licenses, and any insurance policies.)

As the Trustee's objections highlight, 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 the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 February 27, 2015. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d) (2), 9014-1(f) (1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) (ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See *Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. 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 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 September 12, 2013 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

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 10, 2015. 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 Chapter 13 Trustee objects to the Motion on the following grounds:

1. Debtor's plan does not pass the Chapter 7 liquidation analysis under 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

Original Plan/Schedules: Debtor originally filed this case disclosing that he sold his business, Clark Heating & Air-conditioning, to his daughter, an insider. On Schedule B (Dkt. 18), Debtor discloses the balance of \$54,489 owed on a Note for purchase of the business. Debtor exempted the Note on Schedule C under CCP § 703.140(b)(5) in the amount of \$21,934.00, leaving \$32,555 of the Note non-exempt.

On April 30, 2014, Trustee objected to confirmation, citing that the plan failed liquidation because there was \$32,555 non-exempt and the plan was not paying a sufficient amount to unsecured creditors to satisfy liquidation. The objection was eventually sustained.

It appears that Debtor's intent is to depreciate the Note to the "fair market value" of \$32,636, leaving only \$10,759 non-exempt.

Amended Plan/Schedules: In the Motion and Declaration, Debtor indicates that after the 341 Meeting, additional payments were discovered concerning the Note, that reduces the balance on the Note to \$31,679. The Trustee would like the court to be aware that in a review of Debtor's 2012 and 2013 tax returns, Debtor has not reported any income from payment on a note.

Trustee queries the integrity behind the lower Note balance, because it reduces the non-exempt amount down to \$9,745, an amount close to what the Debtor was aiming for in the beginning.

Due to these circumstances, and the fact that Debtor has not provided any evidence accounting for the payments to the court or the Trustee, such as cancelled checks of payments made on the sale of the business, the Trustee requests that Debtor be required to provide a Forensic Accounting of the sales transactions. This is especially considered in this case due to the fact that the purchase of the business is Debtor's daughter, who happens to reside with debtor.

2. It does not appear that the provides all of the Debtor's projected disposable income for the applicable commitment period. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b). Debtor is above median income and proposes a 60 month plan paying \$444 for 10 months and \$677 for 50 months with a guaranteed dividend of 4% to general unsecured claims. Debtor receives tax refunds that are not proposed to be turned over to the Trustee during the life of the plan.

Debtor delayed filing his 2013 return, and when Trustee received a copy of it, it only reported \$29,984 of income, and does not report income derived from payments on the Note for sale of the business.

Debtor received a \$1,297 refund for 2013 and did not report this income to the Trustee. Debtor did not provide Trustee with a copy of his State return; however, the cover sheet on the federal return reports that the state refund was \$132.00.

Debtor's 2012 Return shows that he received a \$647 federal refund that also was not reported to the Trustee.

Trustee's position is that all future tax refunds should be turned over to the Trustee as an additional payment to the plan for payment toward unsecured creditors. The Trustee further requests Debtor explain when the tax refunds for 2012 and 2013 were received and where the funds were spent.

3. Debtor's plan may not reflect his best efforts under 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b). Form B22C shows on line 59 that Debtor's monthly disposable income is \$4,346.75. Debtor is proposing a plan payment of \$444 for 10 months and \$677 for 50 months. The original plan payment was \$444 for 60 months. To support the ability to pay the increase of \$233 per month, Debtor filed Amended Schedules I & J. Debtor's wage income decreased from \$5,171.83 to \$4,483.42. Trustee requested updated payroll stubs, but never received the supporting documentation.
4. Trustee's Objection to Confirmation included an objection to the allowance of Debtor's counsel charging \$6,000 in fees for the case, as

this case did not appear to qualify as a "business case." On July 22, 2014, the court entered a ruling that the case was not considered a "business case" and that maximum fees for representation of the Debtor be \$4,000. According to the First Amended Plan, Debtor paid counsel \$1,000 prior to filing, which leaves a balance of \$3,000 to be paid to counsel through the plan.

DEBTOR'S RESPONSE

Liquidation Analysis: Debtor asserts that the original schedules listed an incorrect amount for the Note. As Amended, Debtor's calculations show non-exempt equity to be \$9,745. Debtor is paying \$38,290 into the plan. Debtor states that, to the extent the value of the note needs to be verified, the Debtor will agree to have a forensic accountant review the note and payments.

Best Efforts: Debtor states that the taxes were delayed in getting filed because of a dispute with his former spouse over the 2012 and 2013 returns. Debtor was attempting to file married jointly, but his former spouse had filed her own returns, leaving Debtor to file his own married filing separately. The delay resulted from attempts to obtain former spouse's signature on the returns.

Debtor states that pay stubs were provided to the Trustee on February 9, 2015 and attached a copy as an exhibit.

Attorneys Fees: Counsel will file an application for fees instead of being paid under the "no look" provisions.

TRUSTEE'S AMENDED OBJECTION

The hearing originally scheduled for February 24, 2015 was continued to April 14, 2015 to allow (1) Debtor to obtain an accounting of the payments made on the note on sale of his business, and to provide for a declaration regarding their delinquent tax returns and how any tax refund was spent; and (2) to allow the Trustee time to review Debtor's paystubs provided in support of the amended budget filed on January 10, 2015 (dckt. 98).

Subsequent to the last hearing, a letter was filed by a person identifying themselves as representing a Ms. Ball who they assert is still married to David Ball, although dissolution is pending in Virginia (dckt. 118). This information appears contrary to Question 16 on Debtor's SOFA.

While Debtor has made progress in addressing the Trustee's initial concerns regarding the plan, the Trustee now raises the following concerns:

1. Trustee is concerned about the liquidation analysis due to the Debtor's transfer and sale of his business to his daughter prior to filing. The promissory note is only signed by the Debtor, and there is no evidence of any cash deposit made into Debtor's bank account even though the note references a "Receipt for Cash Payment." An accounting of payments made to the Debtor or on behalf of the Debtor reduces the balance owed on the note to \$31,679.28, but the Trustee has received nothing supporting these payments such as bank statements or cancelled checks.
2. On February 17, 2015, Debtor filed a request for judicial notice (dckt. 110), which included Debtor's statement of account (a duplicate

of the document filed in dckt. 37) disclosing all payments made on the note since the transfer. After reviewing this filing, the Trustee concluded that: (a) Debtor has not reported any of the payments received on his tax returns; (b) Debtor has not provided evidence of payments such as cancelled checks or bank deposits; (c) the payment breakdown shows that Debtor received multiple payments per month on the note, well exceeding the minimum payment of \$500.

3. The plan fails to propose to pay in all disposable income for the duration of the plan as Debtor has failed to propose to pay in all post-petition tax refunds. For undisclosed reasons, Debtor delayed filing his 2013 return, due to be filed April 15, 2014. To resolve this, Debtor indicates that Debtor will agree to amend the plan so that tax refunds are paid in the plan.
4. The Trustee has reviewed Debtor's updated paystubs and has discerned that Debtor is earning \$3,896 gross per month. Debtor is earning sufficient income to support the plan where the plan payment is \$444 per month with living expenses of \$3,819. It is unclear whether Debtor can afford an increase of \$100—either by decreasing savings, charity, entertainment, and personal care, or by an additional \$100 contribution from the note.
5. Because the plan previously proposed to pay attorney fees of \$6,000, the Trustee agrees that attorney fees shall be paid only by order of the court.
6. The Trustee is not certain of the status of the pending dissolution proceeding.

DISCUSSION

The court shares the Trustee's concerns that Debtor is not adequately disclosing information concerning the note for the sale of the business. The court will order the Debtor to provide the Trustee with proof of payments made on the note and explain why these payments were not reported on Debtor's tax return.

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.

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 March 2, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the Debtor cannot make the payments under the plan because the secured judgment lien of Golden 1 Credit has not been avoided.

The court is prepared to grant the Debtor's motion to avoid lien of Golden 1 Credit. Because granting the motion of avoid lien resolves the only remaining concern of the Chapter 13 Trustee, the Trustee's objection to plan confirmation is overruled.

The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is overruled and the Plan 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 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 the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on January 27, 2015 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.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the September 30, 2014 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 17, 2014. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Golden 1 Credit Union for the sum of \$17,331. The abstract of judgment was recorded with El Dorado County on May 04, 2012. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 3769 Ellies Allie, Placerville, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$210,000 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$222,624 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b)(1) in the amount of \$1 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of Golden 1 Credit Union, El Dorado County Superior Court Case No. PCL20120014, Document No. 2012-0021521, recorded on June 6, 2011, with the Solano County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 3769 Ellies Allie, Placerville, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.
Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 10, 2015. 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). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

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

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 900 Monticello Court, Vacaville, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$560,000 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$668,112. U.S. Bank, N.A.'s second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$139,107. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of U.S. Bank, N.A.'s secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 900 Monticello Court, 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 confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$560,000 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

Also #25

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 March 17, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the plan relies on valuing the collateral of Santander Consumer USA, which has not yet occurred.

The court is prepared to grant Debtor's motion to value the collateral of Santander Consumer USA. As such, the Trustee's concern is resolved, and the court will confirm the Plan.

The Plan does comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is overruled and the Plan 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 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 the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on January 22, 2015 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.

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 Chapter 13 Trustee and Capital One Auto Finance, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 31, 2015. 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Santander Consumer USA, "Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the 2008 Dodge Charger. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$8,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred in June 5, 2012, more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a balance of approximately \$18,937. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$8,000. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Santander Consumer USA secured by a 2008 Dodge Charger, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$8,000.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the collateral is \$8,000.00.

26. [15-20851](#)-C-13 ROBIN SMITH
DPC-1 Gary Fraley

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
3-17-15 [[23](#)]

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 March 17, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the plan relies on motions to value collateral being filed for the Franchise Tax Board and the Internal Revenue Service. To date, these motions have not been filed.

As the Trustee's concerns highlight, 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 the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion.

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

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

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 17, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

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

1. The Plan relies on the motion to void lien of Persolve, set for hearing on March 24, 2015. If the motion is not granted, the Plan does not have sufficient capital to pay the claim in full.
2. Debtors are above median income. The plan proposes to pay \$650 for 60 monthly with 20.99% of the estimated unsecured claims of \$162,752.59 (approximately \$34,161.77) to unsecured creditors. Form 22C shows \$566.65 is the monthly disposable income, but the Debtor claims certain deductions that appear inappropriate:
 - a. Debtors claim \$156.25 in education expenses for dependent children under 18 years of age, but the only dependent minor listed in Schedule J is the 10 month old grandson.

- b. The projected monthly plan payment is listed in the amount of \$800. The plan payment actually proposed is \$650. Thus, line #36 should be listed as \$27.95, not \$34.40.
 - c. Disposable income is listed as \$566.65, rather than \$734.35.
3. The SOFA lists \$4,735 in tax return monies for 2013. The Trustee has received and reviewed the tax returns, but has filed the returns as Exhibits as the Trustee believes that may not be necessary.

The Trustee's concern regarding the motion to void lien of Persolve is moot given that the court granted the motion by minute order on March 25, 2015. (Dckt. 29).

The court shares the Trustee's concern regarding discrepancies on the Debtors' Form 22C. These discrepancies must be resolved before the court confirms the Plan. Therefore, the Plan will not be confirmed at this time.

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 the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Sell Property has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

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

Below is the court's tentative ruling.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, Official Committee of Creditors Holding General Unsecured Claims/creditors holding the 20 largest unsecured claims, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 10, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

The Motion to Sell Property is granted.

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

1213 Blackberry Circle, Folsom, CA 95630

The proposed purchasers of the Property are Sharon O'Donnell and Brian O'Donnell, and the terms of the sale are \$375,000 cash, with all creditors with liens and security interests encumbering the subject property paid in full before or simultaneously with the transfer of title or possession to the buyer. Further, all costs of sale, such as escrow fees, title insurance, and broker's commissions, will be paid in full from the sale proceeds.

The holder of the first deed of trust is Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. and they hold a secured loan for approximately \$251,964.72. When the case was filed, there was an abstract judgment against the property but that lien was avoided.

At the time of the hearing the court announced the proposed sale and requested that all other persons interested in submitting overbids present them in open court. At the hearing the following overbids were presented in open

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 19, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of 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 10300 Gilliam Way, Elk Grove, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$380,000 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$407,722. Bank of America, N.A.'s second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$36,963. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Bank of America, N.A.'s secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 10300 Gilliam Way, Elk Grove, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$380,000 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

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 March 04, 2015. 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 Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC ., Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the 2006 Dodge Magnum. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$5,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The creditor filed an opposition to the Debtor's motion, which contends that the 2006 Dodge Magnum has a retail value of \$12,050.00 based on NADA guidelines.

The Debtor filed a reply to the creditor's opposition. The reply states that the creditor and Debtor have reached an agreement to value the vehicle at \$9,500.

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred in 2008, more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a

balance of approximately \$19,861.84. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$9,500. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC secured by a 2006 Dodge Magnum, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$9,500.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the collateral is \$9,500.00.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 02, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Green Tree Servicing, LLC, "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 11 Mencia Court, Sacramento, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$259,477.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$465,052,000. Green Tree Servicing LLC's second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$44,000. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

ince this is a loan servicing company, it is likely that it is not the creditor. We question whether an order valuing a claim of a servicing company is effective to value the claim. The servicing companies confirm they are not authorized agents for service of process, so the actual creditor has not been served. If Green Tree is not the creditor, the order is ineffective, and at the end of the plan, the real creditor will say, "too bad, you didn't provide for 'our claim' in your 60 month plan, so you

have no right to have the deed of trust reconveyed, pay us or we are going to foreclose."

Green Tree Servicing, LLC has filed Proof of Claim No. 3 with its name as the creditor on the POC form, but there are no documents showing why or how it is the creditor. The court has issued an order requiring Green Tree Servicing, LLC to correctly name the creditor in the POC.

If, at the hearing, Green Tree Servicing, LLC provides evidence that it is the holder of the claim secured by a second deed of trust on the above-referenced real property, the court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Green Tree Servicing LLC's secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 11 Mencia Court, Sacramento, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$259,477.00 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 February 26, 2015. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d) (1), 9014-1(f) (1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) (ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.

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

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on August 2, 2013 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.

Also #34

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 February 19, 2015. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See *Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. 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 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 September 12,
2013 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors
shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the
Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the
Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if
so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the
proposed order to the court.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 26, 2014. 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 Glenn Thomas Purdy ("Debtor") seeks court approval for Debtor to incur post-petition credit. U.S. Bank, N.A. ("Creditor") has agreed to a loan modification which will reduce Debtor's mortgage payment from the current \$2,321.68 a month to \$1,685.21 a month. The modification will defer \$109,371.49 of the principal balance and will treat it as non-interest bearing principal forbearance.

The Motion is supported by the Declaration of Glenn Thomas Purdy. The Declaration affirms Debtor's desire to obtain the post-petition financing and provides evidence of Debtor's ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

This post-petition financing 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 Glenn Thomas Purdy

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 Glenn Thomas Purdy ("Debtor") to amend the terms of the loan with U.S. Bank, N.A., which is secured by the real property commonly known as 4740 Brookside Circle, Fairfield, California, on such terms as stated in the Modification Agreement filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion, Dckt.57.

35. 15-20763-C-13 EUSEBIO RAMIREZ AND ROCIO OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
DPC-1 RUIZ PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
Thomas Gillis 3-11-15 [[24](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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 March 11, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to continue the Objection to April 28, 2015.

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the Plan relies on the debtors' motion to value the collateral of Bank of America set for hearing on March 24, 2015.

In their opposition to the Trustee's objection, Debtors state that their motion to value collateral hearing has been continued to April 28, 2015. Debtor requests that this matter also be continued to April 28, 2015.

The court will continue the matter to April 28, 2015.

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 the Plan is continued to April 28, 2015.

36. [15-20764](#)-C-13 JOHN/OLIVIA D'ANTONIO
DPC-1 Pauldeep Bains

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
3-11-15 [[30](#)]

WITHDRAWN BY M.P.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2014 hearing is required.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 17, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend 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). 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 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 Extend the Automatic Stay is denied.

Debtors seek to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtors' second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtors' first bankruptcy case (No. 2012-29185) was filed on May 11, 2012 and closed without discharge on August 18, 2014, due to Debtors' loss of income and inability to make plan payments. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); *see also* Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307(and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?
2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

Here, Debtors state that, after their last bankruptcy case was closed, their income increased. Debtors offer neither the reason for the increase in income nor the amount of the increase. Based on Debtors' motion and declaration, the court cannot discern whether Debtors' increased income is sufficient to support a Chapter 13 reorganization. Because Debtors have not demonstrated that the present plan is likely to succeed, Debtors have not sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay.

The motion is denied and the automatic stay is not extended.

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay 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 denied and the automatic stay is not extended pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (B).

Thru #43

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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 February 25, 2015. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

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

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation to the extent that the Plan relies on pending motions to avoid liens.

The court is prepared to grant the Debtors' motions to avoid liens. Because granting the motions to avoid lien resolves the only concerns of the Chapter 13 Trustee, the Trustee's objection to plan confirmation is moot, and the court will confirm the Plan.

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 Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed

39. [15-20470](#)-C-13 ALEXANDR/NATALYA TSVEROV
MS-2 Mark Shmorgon

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF CAVALRY
PORTFOLIO SERVICES, LLC
2-25-15 [[25](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 25, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Cavalry Portfolio Services for the sum of \$12,022.40. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Sacramento County on September 14, 2008. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (1) (A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$201,616.50 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$95,631.33 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. Further, there are four additional judgment lien creditors recorded ahead of Cavalry Portfolio Services, LLC in the property with a total debt of \$131,953.60 (including the consensual lien). The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) (1) in the amount of \$100,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (2) (A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b) (1) (B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of Cavalry Portfolio Services, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 06AM002245, Book No. 20060914, Page No. 1719, recorded on September 14, 2008, with the Sacramento County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 25, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of GCFS Inc. for the sum of \$7,133. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Sacramento County on June 5, 2006. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (1) (A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$201,616.50 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$95,631.33 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. Further, there are three additional judgment lien creditors recorded ahead of GCFS Inc. in the property with a total debt of \$124,820.60 (including the consensual lien). The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) (1) in the amount of \$100,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (2) (A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b) (1) (B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of GCFS, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 06AM00456, Book No. 20060605, Page No. 1421 recorded on June 5, 2006, with the Sacramento County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

41. [15-20470](#)-C-13 ALEXANDR/NATALYA TSVEROV
MS-4 Mark Shmorgon

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF
NATIONAL CREDIT ACCEPTANCE,
INC.
2-25-15 [[35](#)]

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 25, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of National Credit Acceptance Inc. for the sum of \$4,189.44. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Sacramento County on March 27, 2006. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$201,616.50 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$95,631.33 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. Further, there are two additional judgment lien creditors recorded ahead of National Credit Acceptance Inc. in the property with a total debt of \$120,631.16 (including the consensual lien). The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b)(1) in the amount of \$100,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of National Credit Acceptance, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 05AM05820, Book No. 20060327, Page No. 0018, recorded on March 27, 2006, with the Sacramento County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 25, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Discover Bank for the sum of \$13,192.65. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Sacramento County on July 28, 2005. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (1) (A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$201,616.50 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$95,631.33 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. Further, there is one additional judgment lien that a creditor recorded ahead of Discover Bank in the property with a total debt of \$107,438.51 (including the consensual lien). The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) (1) in the amount of \$100,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) (2) (A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b) (1) (B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be

prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of Discover Bank, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 04AM09490, Book No. 20060729, Page No. 1942, recorded on July 28, 2005, with the Sacramento County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 25, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien 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 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 Avoid Lien is granted.

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Discover Bank for the sum of \$11,807.18. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Sacramento County on March 27, 2006. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$201,616.50 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$95,631.33 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b)(1) in the amount of \$100,000 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is \$5,984.77 equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing is partially avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

ISSUANCE OF A COURT DRAFTED ORDER

An order (not a minute order) substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

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

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the 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 judgment lien of Discover Bank, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 05AM05820, recorded on March 27, 2006, Book No. 20060914, Page No. 1719, with the Sacramento County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 5752 Lorella Way Sacramento, California, is avoided in the amount of \$5,822.01 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 19, 2015. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) (ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value secured claim of Capital One Auto Finance, "Creditor," is granted.

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the 2011 Volkswagen Jetta Automobile. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$11,800 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred in April 2012, more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a balance of approximately \$14,000. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$11,800. *See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a)*. The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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

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

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings,

evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Capital One Auto Finance secured by a 2011 Volkswagen Jetta Automobile, is \$11,800, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the collateral is \$11,800.

45. [14-30874](#)-C-13 RANDY WILLIAMS
MET-1 Mary Ellen Terranella

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
2-11-15 [[30](#)]

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 February 11, 2015. 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 Chapter 13 Trustee opposes the motion on the basis that:

1. Debtor is \$2,080 delinquent in plan payments to the Trustee to date and the next scheduled payment of \$2,080 is due on April 25, 201. Debtor has paid \$0.00 into the plan to date.
2. Debtor reports having \$2,080 per month in disposable income on his Schedule J, however, his plan proposes to pay only \$520 for the first four months.
3. On Schedule D, Debtor reports telephone, cell phone, internet and cable services total \$260 per month. Debtor also indicates that effective June, 2016, his child support payment will change due to his eldest daughter graduating high school. (Dckt. 30). Due to the change, Debtor proposes to increase his payments from \$2,080 to \$2,925.
4. In the motion to confirm and exhibits, the Sprint account described as

Debtor's telephone bills range from \$302.46 to \$325.91 per month. (Dckt. 33, Ex. C). Debtor's AT&T account, described by Debtor as his internet provider, shows that monthly charges are \$39.00 per month. Debtor's motion indicates that AT&T bills show the internet to be \$78 per month; this appears to be when Debtor fails to make the prior months payment, causing two months of \$39.

5. Debtor failed to disclose interest in a \$2,400 security deposit, \$350 pet deposit, and \$2,300 in last month's rent paid in advance to his landlord. The assets are disclosed in Debtor's rental agreement, provided as Exhibit A in support of the motion to confirm. (Dckt. 33)

As the Trustee's objections highlight, 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.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 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 February 25, 2015. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.

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

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on August 2, 2013 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.

Tentative Ruling: The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay 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 Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 24, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay 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. At the hearing -----.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is granted.

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 11-26797-B-13J) was filed on March 18, 2011 and dismissed on January 27, 2015, for Debtor's failure to make plan payments. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality

of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); see also Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307(and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?

2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

Here, the debtors filed the previous plan to stop a trustee's sale of their home. Mrs. Tamayo became ill with some serious medical issues in 2011-2012. She could no longer operate her business and generate income. In the meantime, the debtors fell behind in their plan payments. They were not able to catch up on their payments, and the trustee moved to dismiss the case. Rather than try and modify the plan and increase the payments to include all the missed mortgage payments, the debtors decided to file a new case with payments that are lower than they would have been if they tried to modify the plan in the last case. Mr. Tamayo has since retired and he is now making more than he was when he was working. Mrs. Tamayo's medical condition has improved.

Debtor has sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay. Debtor asserts that she acquired all the necessary paperwork as of May 7, 2013 and this indicates she will be able to meet the filing requirements for the instant case and move more efficiently towards confirmation of a Chapter 13 plan.

The motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this 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 to Extend the Automatic Stay 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 and the automatic stay is extended pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B) for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

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 February 27, 2015. 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's plan proposes to reduce the commitment period from 60 months to 40 months. Debtor's Form B22C, however, indicates that Debtor is over the median income threshold therefore requiring a plan term of five years. Debtor's motion states that the reason for the reduction in plan term is a result of the adjustable rate mortgage and changes to the ongoing mortgage payment. While Debtor states that he is unable to refinance his residence with Bank of America while he is in a Chapter 13, Debtor has provided no evidence of any attempts to refinance or obtain a loan modification.

(2) Debtor states in item 8 of his declaration that Exhibits A and B were filed to show current income and expense (Schedules I and J), but the Trustee cannot locate the exhibits in the court docket.

(3) Debtor states in his declaration (dckt. 56) that he has no domestic support obligation. However, in a different declaration (dckt. 42), Debtor states that he is required to payt \$1,300 per month in domestic support payments, which began November, 2012.

In reply to the Trustee's opposition, Debtor states that:

(1) Debtor filed supplemental Schedules I and J with his reply.

(2) Debtor is attempting to reduce the length of his Chapter 13 Plan so that he can put himself in a position to deal with the large increase in his ongoing mortgage payments, which will occur in July 2015. Through his modified plan, Debtor is paying creditors the same amount they would receive under his previously confirmed Chapter 13 Plan--just sooner.

(3) Debtor is not longer obligated to make domestic support payments. See Decl. of Shaun Suy. (Dckt. 63).

The court agrees that the Debtor's plan must adhere to a five year payment schedule because Debtor is over the median income threshold. Accordingly, 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 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 March 3, 2014. 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. Trustee is uncertain of the Wyndam/Worldmark Time Share as a business tool. The time share was utilized 19 times over a span of 31 months (June 2012 through December 2014). Of the 19 uses, six constitute use by Debtor or a relative bearing the last name of Lupton.
2. The plan does not provide for the priority claim of the State Board of equalization filed February 26, 2014 (claim #13).
3. Trustee is uncertain of the treatment of Santander Consumer USA, which is not provided for in the plan.

In reply to the Trustee's opposition, Debtor states that:

1. The total cost of the time share is \$486 per month, which

includes a monthly lease payment of \$227 plus \$259 in membership dues and maintenance fees which also billed monthly.

2. One of the six "Lupton" uses of the time share was for a trade show in Las Vegas, a business expense.
3. Debtors feel that time share is a business to tool to differentiate their business from competitors.
4. If the State Board of Equalization claim was not paid prior to filing, Debtors will further modify the plan to include the claim.
5. The Santander claim was inadvertently left out, and Debtors will further modify the plan to include the claim.

The court shares the Trustee's concern over the usefulness of the time share as a business tool. To cure the Trustee's objection, the Debtors must explain the benefit of the time share with more specificity than merely claiming the benefit as 'competitive advantage.' 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 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 September 25, 2014. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.

Wells Fargo Auto Finance ("Creditor") opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that Creditor takes issue with the value assigned to its collateral under the plan.

The Debtors' plan proposes to value the secured claims of Creditor as to two items of collateral: a 2004 Infiniti G35 and a 2007 Chrysler 300C. Creditor's objection is to the proposed values of these secured claims.

The court issued two orders on October 14, 2014, valuing the secured claims of Creditor pursuant to two Motions to Value filed by the Debtors. The court held that the 2004 Infiniti G35 loan is secured in the amount of \$5,625 (Dkt. 70) and that the 2007 Chrysler 300C loan is secured in the amount of \$8,872.

OCTOBER 28, 2014 HEARING

At the hearing on October 28, 2014, counsel for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. appeared and advised the court that his failure to appear at the hearing on the Motion to Value was caused by excusable error and that an evidentiary hearing on both motions may be necessary. The court continued the hearing to permit the parties to meet and confer on the value issue, and for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. to file a motion to vacate the valuation orders, if necessary.

DEBTORS' DECLARATION OF GENTRY LONG

On December 1, 2014, Debtors' son, Gentry Long, submitted a declaration testifying to his use of the Infiniti G35 to drive to and from work. He was recently hired a Rose Billing Services in Los Angeles.

JANUARY 13, 2015 HEARING

At the hearing on January 13, 2015, the court continued the hearing to March 3, 2015. Creditor submitted additional evidence in support of its Objection.

CREDITOR'S DECLARATION OF SCOTT BROWN

Scott Brown is an Auto Inspection Specialist employed by an appraisal company and retained to appraise the subject vehicle.

Mr. Brown's declaration states that he appraised the 2007 Chrysler 300C vehicle on November 21 2014 and determined it to be worth \$11,588 (Ex. G, ECF. 82).

Mr. Brown also conducted an appraisal of the 2004 Infiniti G35 and determined its worth to be \$8,087.00. (Ex. H, ECF 82).

DISCUSSION

The court's decision is to overrule the Objection as the incorrect way to address the issue of valuation. Creditor's Objection to Confirmation is solely that it disagrees with two orders entered valuing its secured claims with regard to the two subject vehicles. The appropriate medium through which Creditor can seek the relief desired is by bringing a motion before the court seeking relief from the orders on the Motions to Value its secured claims. The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that Objection to confirmation the Plan is overruled and the plan is not confirmed.

Tentative Ruling: The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, Creditors, the Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion.

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

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

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on February 26, 2015. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was 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. At the hearing -----
-----.

The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that JPMorgan is the holder of a claim secured only by a security interest in real property commonly known as 2019 Country Creek Ct., Marysville, California, which is Debtor's principal residence, and the Plan understates the pre-petition arrearage owed to JPMorgan in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2).

Due to violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2), the Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

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

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

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. 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 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 February 23, 2015. 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 Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

1. The Plan fails the Chapter 7 liquidation analysis. Debtor's non-exempt equity totals \$7,102 based on a "food truck" (pending objection to exemptions set for 4/28/2015, dckt. 40), and the Debtor is proposing a 7.63% dividend to unsecured creditors.
2. The Debtor is over the median income, but the plan is a 60 month plan.

Based on the Trustee's objections, 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.]

Also #54

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

The Motion to Dismiss 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 - Opposition Filed.

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 January 16, 2015. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Dismiss has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The Debtor filed opposition. 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 Dismiss.

The Chapter 13 Trustee seeks dismissal of Debtor's case based on the following:

1. Debtor is in material default of section 5.03 of the plan because, according to the Trustee's calculations, the plan will complete in 80 months. This term length exceeds the 60 months limit of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d). It appears the Class 1 mortgage arrears claim to be paid through the plan was \$7,884.67 greater than expected.

DEBTOR'S RESPONSE

Debtor states that his Class 1 mortgage arrearage amount reflected in the plan is correct and that the claim filed by his mortgage company does not account for mortgage payments made in his prior Chapter 13 case.

Debtor is attempting to have the mortgage company's claim corrected. If the mortgage company does not correct the mistake, Debtor anticipates filing an Objection to the Claim.

DISCUSSION

The docket shows that on February 11, 2015, the Debtor filed an Objection to the Claim of th mortgage lender. The court is prepared to sustain the Objection. Accordingly, the Trustee's concern is resolved, and dismissal of the case is not warranted.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

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 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion to Dismiss is denied.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2014 hearing is required.

Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on the Creditor, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 11, 2015. Forty-four 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 was 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). 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 Objection to Proof of Claim Number 10-1 of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is sustained.

Marion Spears ("Objector") requests that the court disallow the claim of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Creditor"), Proof of Claim No. 10-1 ("Claim"), Official Registry of Claims in this case. The Claim is asserted to be secured in the amount of \$22,134.67 Objector asserts that the Claim is overstated.

Specifically, Objector contends that Creditor has not accounted for mortgage payments made by debtor through his prior bankruptcy filings paid as Class 1 claims paid through the Chapter 13 Trustee. Further, Creditor did not credit debtor with mortgage payments made between his prior filings. Creditor provided no accounting attached to its claim. Accordingly, debtor's arrearage amount of \$14,250 provided in his Chapter 13 plan is the correct arrearage amount owing on his mortgage when he filed the instant case.

Section 502(a) provides that a claim supported by a Proof of Claim is allowed unless a party in interest objects. Once an objection has been filed, the court may determine the amount of the claim after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). It is settled law in the Ninth Circuit that the party objecting to a proof of claim has the burden of presenting substantial factual basis to overcome the prima facie validity of a proof of claim and the evidence must be of probative force equal to that of the

creditor's proof of claim. *Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991); see also *United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie)*, 349 B.R. 204, 210 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

Here, Creditor has failed to support its claim with documentary evidence. Further, Creditor has failed to respond to Objector's request for an accounting of payments. "Creditors have an obligation to respond to formal or informal requests for information. That request could even come in the form of a claims objection, if it is sufficiently specific about the information required." *In re Heath*, 331 B.R. 424, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005). If the debtor requires documentation to make a good faith inquiry into the existence or amount of any liability and a claimant refuses a legitimate request to produce it, an objection that asserts her good faith challenge and requests disallowance of the claim due to inadequate documentation would be appropriate and could well result in entry of an order disallowing the claim or requiring its amendment. *Id.* at 437. Where, as here, a debtor contests the amount of claim and a creditor fails to respond to the debtor's request for documentary support for a proof of claim, the proper remedy is to reduce the amount of the claim to the amount the debtor swears is correct:

[I]f the debtor thinks, for example, in accordance with her sworn statement in Schedule D in this case, that she owes First North American National Bank only \$1,776.00 on the proof of claim filed by its assignee for \$12,992.72, the proper objection is that the claimant has not established anything in excess of the amount the debtor admits is owed, not a request for complete disallowance of the claim merely because of inadequate documentation.

Id. (citing *In re Shank*, 315 B.R. 799, 815 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2004)).

Based on the evidence before the court, the creditor's claim is reduced to the amount of \$14,250. The Objection to the Proof of Claim is sustained.

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 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Creditor filed in this case by Marion Spears, debtor, having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the objection to Proof of Claim Number 10-1 of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. is sustained and the claim is reduced to the amount of \$14,250.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 14, 2015 hearing is required.

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 final 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 February 12, 2015. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

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

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that Debtor is \$1,400 delinquent in plan payments to the Trustee to date and the next scheduled payment of \$1,400 is due on April 25, 2015. The case was filed on October 9, 2014, and the plan calls for payments to be received by the Trustee not later than the 25th day of each month beginning the month after the order for relief under Chapter 13. The most recent amended plan calls for payments of \$0 through January 2015, then \$1,400 per month commencing February 2015. The Debtor has paid \$1,400 into the plan to date.

In their reply to the Trustee's opposition, Debtors state that they mailed their March plan payment on April 1, 2015. Thus, Debtors will be current on or before the hearing.

Debtors have cured their delinquent plan payment, and the Trustee has withdrawn his objection.

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 February 12, 2015 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.
