

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

April 25, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 9. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE MAY 31, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY MAY 17, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY MAY 23, 2016. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 9 THROUGH 12 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON MAY 2, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

April 25, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

2. 15-23928-A-13 SHAWN/JACQUELINE MOTION TO
EJS-3 CUNNINGHAM MODIFY PLAN
2-23-16 [75]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$300 is less than the \$332 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Second, even if the plan payments had been current, the debtor has not satisfied the burden of proving the plan's feasibility over its duration. As noted by the trustee, the plan's feasibility depends in part on the debtor's re-employment in May 2016. The debtor has produced no evidence as to whether such employment is likely and at what wage.

3. 12-35034-A-13 CHRISTOPHER/TARA BALTZLEY MOTION TO
CJY-2 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
4-8-16 [28]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The debtor is authorized but not required to enter into the proposed modification. To the extent the modification is inconsistent with the confirmed plan, the debtor shall continue to perform the plan as confirmed until it is modified.

4. 16-22143-A-13 KENNETH SHEPPARD MOTION FOR
MBW-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
SAFE CREDIT UNION VS. 4-6-16 [10]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the

court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be dismissed as moot. The case was dismissed on April 15, 2016. As a result the automatic stay has expired as a matter of law. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) & (c)(2). There is no automatic stay to terminate.

5. 16-21345-A-13 MONICA IVIE ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
4-8-16 [19]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of \$79 due on April 4 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

6. 16-20058-A-13 RICHARD ANG MOTION TO
MAC-2 CONFIRM PLAN
3-11-16 [30]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted on condition that an order on MAC-1 is lodged within 7 days of April 25. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

7. 10-30862-A-13 JAY/JOANNE ROBINSON MOTION TO
DBJ-4 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. RABO BANK 3-2-16 [85]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: None. The court determines that there is a material disputed fact, the value of the subject property. Therefore, an evidentiary hearing will be set.

8. 11-42797-A-13 VICTOR OYEYEMI MOTION TO
MAC-4 MODIFY PLAN
3-14-16 [86]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$2,026 is less than the \$2,036 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

9. 15-29899-A-13 JUDITH LADEAUX OBJECTION TO
JPJ-2 EXEMPTIONS
3-15-16 [30]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be overruled.

The debtor has exempted income from an oil and gas lease pursuant to 25 U.S.C. § 410. The trustee argues that because California has opted out of the federal bankruptcy exemption scheme permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 522(d), the debtor is limited to California exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703.130(a). Because section 410 is a federal rather than a California exemption, the trustee argues the exemption must be disallowed. However, section 410 is not an exemption under section 522(d); it is an independent federal exemption under nonbankruptcy law. It is available to this debtor.

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

10. 16-20631-A-13 EMIGDIO SILVA
JPJ-2

OBJECTION TO
EXEMPTIONS
3-28-16 [21]

Final Ruling: This objection to the debtor's exemptions has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the debtor's default is entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

The trustee objects to all of the debtor's Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) exemptions claimed on Schedule C. The trustee argues that because the debtor is married and because the debtor's spouse has not joined in the chapter 13 petition, the debtor must file his spouse's waiver of right to claim exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2). This was not done.

A debtor's exemptions are determined as of the date the bankruptcy petition is filed. Owen v. Owen, 500 U.S. 305, 314 (1991); see also In re Chappell, 373 B.R. 73, 77 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2007) (holding that "critical date for determining exemption rights is the petition date"). Thus, the court applies the facts and law existing on the date the case was commenced to determine the nature and extent of the debtor's exemptions.

11 U.S.C. § 522(b)(1) permits the states to opt out of the federal exemption statutory scheme set forth in section 522(d). In enacting Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.130, the State of California opted out of the federal exemption scheme relegating a debtor to whatever exemptions are provided under state law. Thus, substantive issues regarding the allowance or disallowance of a claimed exemption are governed by state law in California.

California state law gives debtors filing for bankruptcy the right to choose (1) a set of state law exemptions similar but not identical to the Bankruptcy Code exemptions; or (2) California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 703.130, 703.140. In the case of a married debtor, if either spouse files for bankruptcy individually, California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions apply unless, while the bankruptcy case is pending, both spouses waive in writing the right to claim the regular non-bankruptcy state exemptions in any bankruptcy proceeding filed by the other spouse. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2).

Here, the debtor is asserting the exemptions of Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b), which require a spousal waiver. That waiver was not filed with the petition.

11. 12-22750-A-13 PATRICIA SOSA
WW-7

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
3-14-16 [165]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

12. 12-29099-A-13 ROBERT ROGENSKI
PGM-1
VS. THE GOLDEN 1 CREDIT UNION

OBJECTION TO
CLAIM
3-9-16 [45]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of The Golden 1 Credit Union has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

Because the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract, California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach but the statute renews upon each payment made after default. The proof of claim indicates the last payment was on November 28, 2006. Therefore, using this date as the date of breach, when the case was filed on May 10, 2012, more than 4 years had passed. Therefore, when the bankruptcy was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1). The claim will be disallowed except to the extent previously paid by the trustee.