

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Honorable Fredrick E. Clement
Fresno Federal Courthouse
2500 Tulare Street, 5th Floor
Courtroom 11, Department A
Fresno, California

PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

DAY: WEDNESDAY
DATE: MAY 1, 2019
CALENDAR: 9:00 A.M. CHAPTER 7 CASES

Each matter on this calendar will have one of three possible designations: No Ruling, Tentative Ruling, or Final Ruling. These instructions apply to those designations.

No Ruling: All parties will need to appear at the hearing unless otherwise ordered.

Tentative Ruling: If a matter has been designated as a tentative ruling it will be called. The court may continue the hearing on the matter, set a briefing schedule or enter other orders appropriate for efficient and proper resolution of the matter. The original moving or objecting party shall give notice of the continued hearing date and the deadlines. The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions.

Final Ruling: Unless otherwise ordered, there will be no hearing on these matters. The final disposition of the matter is set forth in the ruling and it will appear in the minutes. The final ruling may or may not finally adjudicate the matter. If it is finally adjudicated, the minutes constitute the court's findings and conclusions.

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within 14 days of the final hearing on the matter.

1. [19-10406](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JOEL/MARLENE GARCIA**
[TCS-2](#)

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT
4-12-2019 [[18](#)]

JOEL GARCIA/MV
TIMOTHY SPRINGER

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Compel Abandonment of Property of the Estate
Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(2); no written opposition required
Disposition: Granted
Order: Prepared by moving party

Real Property Description: 547 Cherry Way, Chowchilla, CA

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

Property of the estate may be abandoned under § 554 of the Bankruptcy Code if property of the estate is "burdensome to the estate or of inconsequential value and benefit to the estate." See 11 U.S.C. § 554(a)-(b). Upon request of a party in interest, the court may issue an order that the trustee abandon property of the estate if the statutory standards for abandonment are fulfilled.

The real property described above is either burdensome to the estate or of inconsequential value to the estate. The property has a value of \$244,462 and it is subject to a mortgage held by Wells Fargo Bank in the amount of \$148,495 and an exemption claim in the amount of \$95,967. An order compelling abandonment is warranted.

2. [19-10606](#)-A-7 **IN RE: SHELLY MARTINEZ**
[JHW-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
4-3-2019 [\[14\]](#)

SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC./MV
JERRY LOWE
JENNIFER WANG/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Motion: Stay Relief

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Civil minute order

Subject: 2017 Hyundai Sonata vehicle (voluntary surrendered)

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P.55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

STAY RELIEF

Section 362(d)(2) authorizes stay relief if the debtor lacks equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Chapter 7 is a mechanism for liquidation, not reorganization, and, therefore, property of the estate is never necessary for reorganization. *In re Casgul of Nevada, Inc.*, 22 B.R. 65, 66 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1982). In this case, the aggregate amount due all liens exceeds the value of the collateral and the debtor has no equity in the property. In addition, the debtor has already surrendered the property to the movant. The motion will be granted, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

Santander Consumer U.S.A., Inc.'s motion for relief from the automatic stay has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or

otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the property described in the motion, commonly known as 2017 Hyundai Sonata vehicle, as to all parties in interest. The 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with standing may pursue its rights against the property pursuant to applicable non-bankruptcy law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other relief is awarded. To the extent that the motion includes any request for attorney's fees or other costs for bringing this motion, the request is denied.

3. [19-10313](#)-A-7 **IN RE: DEAN LIMA**
[WFZ-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
4-12-2019 [\[22\]](#)

KINECTA FEDERAL CREDIT
UNION/MV
MARK ZIMMERMAN
MARK BLACKMAN/ATTY. FOR MV.
NON-OPPOSITION

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Stay Relief

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(2); no written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Civil minute order

Subject: 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD Crew Cab SLE vehicle

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, incorporated by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

STAY RELIEF

Section 362(d)(2) authorizes stay relief if the debtor lacks equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Chapter 7 is a mechanism for liquidation, not reorganization, and, therefore, property of the estate is never necessary for reorganization. *In re Casgul of Nevada, Inc.*, 22 B.R. 65, 66 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1982). In this case, the aggregate amount due all liens exceeds the value of the collateral and the debtor has no equity in the property. The movant has produced evidence that the property has a value of \$52,125,

whereas the claim against the property is at least \$52,417. ECF No. 24 at 3. In addition, in the statement of intention and a non-opposition to the motion, the debtor has stated an intent to surrender the property. The motion will be granted, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

Kinecta Federal Credit Union's motion for relief from the automatic stay has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the property described in the motion, commonly known as 2018 GMC Sierra 2500 HD Crew Cab SLE vehicle, as to all parties in interest. The 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with standing may pursue its rights against the property pursuant to applicable non-bankruptcy law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other relief is awarded. To the extent that the motion includes any request for attorney's fees or other costs for bringing this motion, the request is denied.

4. [19-11019](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JOAQUIN CHAVOLLA AND ENEMELI BARBOZA**
CHAVOLLA
[VVF-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
4-15-2019 [\[17\]](#)

MECHANICS BANK/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS
VINCENT FROUNJIAN/ATTY. FOR MV.

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Stay Relief

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(2); no written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Civil minute order

Subject: 2011 Toyota Camry

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

STAY RELIEF

11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(2)(A) requires an individual chapter 7 debtor to file a statement of intention with reference to property that secures a debt. The statement must be filed within 30 days of the filing of the petition (or within 30 days of a conversion order, when applicable) or by the date of the meeting of creditors, whichever is earlier. The debtor must disclose in the statement whether he or she intends to retain or surrender the property, whether the property is claimed as exempt, and whether the debtor intends to redeem such property or reaffirm the debt it secures. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(2)(A); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1019(1)(B).

The petition here was filed on March 17, 2019 and a meeting of creditors is first scheduled for May 10, 2019. Therefore, a statement of intention that refers to the movant's property and debt was due no later than April 16. The debtor filed a statement of intention on the petition date, indicating an intent to reaffirm the debt secured by the property.

11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(2)(B) requires that a chapter 7 individual debtor, within 30 days after the first date set for the meeting of creditors, perform his or her intention with respect to such property. This means that the debtor has until June 9 to enter into a reaffirmation agreement with the movant.

Notwithstanding the debtors' intent to reaffirm the debt secured by the property, they have filed a non-opposition to this motion. ECF No. 25.

Subsection (d)(1) of § 362 of Title 11 provides for relief from stay for "cause."

The debtors' non-opposition to this motion is cause for the granting of relief from stay as to the debtors.

As to the estate, the movant has produced evidence that the property has a value of between \$5,650 and \$8,675, whereas the movant's claim totals approximately \$6,848. As such, there is either no equity in the vehicle for the estate or the equity is non-existent in light of the estate's administrative expenses with respect to the property. This is cause for the granting of relief from stay as to the estate.

Therefore, cause exists to grant relief under § 362(d)(1). The motion will be granted, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

Mechanics Bank's motion for relief from the automatic stay has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the property described in the motion, commonly known as a 2011 Toyota Camry vehicle, as to all parties in interest. The 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with standing may pursue its rights against the property pursuant to applicable non-bankruptcy law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other relief is awarded. To the extent that the motion includes any request for attorney's fees or other costs for bringing this motion, the request is denied.

5. [18-14926](#)-A-7 **IN RE: MICHAEL/CYNTHIA COSENZA**
[NLL-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
3-29-2019 [\[15\]](#)

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION/MV
NEIL SCHWARTZ
NANCY LEE/ATTY. FOR MV.
DISCHARGED 4/10/19

Final Ruling

Motion: Stay Relief

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted in part and denied in part as moot

Order: Civil minute order

Subject: 4112 Chardonnay Dr. Bakersfield, CA

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P.55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true.

TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

AS TO THE DEBTOR

The motion is denied as moot. The stay that protects the debtor terminates at the entry of discharge. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2). In this case, discharge has been entered. As a result, the motion is moot as to the debtor.

AS TO THE ESTATE

Section 362(d)(2) authorizes stay relief if the debtor lacks equity in the property and the property is not necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Chapter 7 is a mechanism for liquidation, not reorganization, and, therefore, property of the estate is never necessary for reorganization. *In re Casgul of Nevada, Inc.*, 22 B.R. 65, 66 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1982). In this case, the aggregate amount due all liens exceeds the value of the collateral and the debtor has no equity in the property. The motion will be granted as to the estate, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.'s motion for relief from the automatic stay has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted in part and denied as moot in part. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the interest of the trustee in the property described in the motion, commonly known as 4112 Chardonnay Dr. Bakersfield, CA. Relief from the automatic stay as to the interest of the debtor in such property is denied as moot given the entry of the discharge in this case. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(C).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with standing may pursue its rights against the property pursuant to applicable non-bankruptcy law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other relief is awarded. To the extent that the motion includes any request for attorney's fees or other costs for bringing this motion, the request is denied.

6. [18-14431](#)-A-7 **IN RE: ARMANDO CONCHAS AND EVELYN**
COTA-CONCHAS
[PFT-2](#)

MOTION TO SELL
3-15-2019 [\[30\]](#)

PETER FEAR/MV
MARK ZIMMERMAN
PETER FEAR/ATTY. FOR MV.

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Sell Property

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Prepared by moving party

Property: 1969 Chevrolet Impala (value of \$3,000) and 50% interest in 2002 Chevrolet Silverado (total value of \$2,777, subject to \$857 exemption)

Buyer: Debtors

Sale Price: \$3,000 for Impala and \$960 for Silverado

Sale Type: Private sale subject to overbid opportunity

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

Section 363(b)(1) of Title 11 authorizes sales of property of the estate "other than in the ordinary course of business." 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1); *see also In re Lionel Corp.*, 722 F.2d 1063, 1071 (2d Cir. 1983) (requiring business justification). The moving party is the Chapter 7 trustee and liquidation of property of the estate is a proper purpose. See 11 U.S.C. § 704(a)(1). As a result, the court will grant the motion. The stay of the order provided by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 6004(h) will be waived.

7. [19-10334](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JOHN MASTRO PLUMBING, INC.**
[PFT-2](#)

MOTION TO SELL
3-15-2019 [[13](#)]

PETER FEAR/MV
DAVID JENKINS
PETER FEAR/ATTY. FOR MV.

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Sell Property

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Prepared by moving party

Property: 2017 GMC Sierra (value of \$35,711, subject to a lien of \$24,092 and the buyer's claim to a 50% ownership interest)

Buyer: John Mastro

Sale Price: \$5,000

Sale Type: Private sale subject to overbid opportunity

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

Section 363(b)(1) of Title 11 authorizes sales of property of the estate "other than in the ordinary course of business." 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1); *see also In re Lionel Corp.*, 722 F.2d 1063, 1071 (2d Cir. 1983) (requiring business justification). The moving party is the Chapter 7 trustee and liquidation of property of the estate is a proper purpose. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 704(a)(1). As a result, the court will grant the motion. The stay of the order provided by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 6004(h) will be waived.

8. [19-10952](#)-A-7 **IN RE: DAVID MUSE**
[APN-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
3-26-2019 [\[16\]](#)

CAB WEST LLC/MV
DAVID JENKINS
AUSTIN NAGEL/ATTY. FOR MV.
ECF ORDER #32 TRANSFERRING FROM B TO A

Final Ruling

Motion: Stay Relief

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Civil minute order

Subject: 2017 Ford F150

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

STAY RELIEF

Subsection (d)(1) of § 362 of Title 11 provides for relief from stay for "cause, including the lack of adequate protection of an interest in property of such party." 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). Adequate protection may consist of a lump sum cash payment or periodic cash payments to the entity entitled to adequate protection "to the extent that the stay . . . results in a decrease in the value of such entity's interest in property." 11 U.S.C. § 361(1). "An undersecured creditor is entitled to adequate protection only for the decline in the [collateral's] value *after* the bankruptcy filing." See Kathleen P. March, Hon. Alan M. Ahart & Janet A. Shapiro, *California Practice Guide: Bankruptcy* ¶ 8:1065.1 (rev. 2012) (citing *United Sav. Ass'n v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs., Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 370-73 (1988)).

The debtor is obligated to make monthly payments to the moving party pursuant to a lease agreement by which the debtor leases the vehicle described above. The debtor has defaulted under such lease agreement with the moving party, and one postpetition payment is past due. The moving party's interest in the vehicle is not being adequately protected due to the debtor's postpetition default.

In addition, the vehicle is already in the movant's possession.

Therefore, cause exists to grant relief under § 362(d)(1). The motion will be granted, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

Cab West, LLC's motion for relief from the automatic stay has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the property described in the motion, commonly known as 2017 Ford F150 vehicle, as to all parties in interest. The 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with standing may pursue its rights against the property pursuant to applicable non-bankruptcy law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other relief is awarded. To the extent that the motion includes any request for attorney's fees or other costs for bringing this motion, the request is denied.

9. [19-10952](#)-A-7 **IN RE: DAVID MUSE**
[RJM-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
3-22-2019 [[10](#)]

FRANCES MURILLO/MV
DAVID JENKINS
RICK MORIN/ATTY. FOR MV.
ECF ORDER #32 TRANSFERRING FROM B TO A

No Ruling

10. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF JUDY FRANK, CLAIM NUMBER 1
3-18-2019 [\[57\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Tentative Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Overruled

Order: Civil minute order

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 1-1 in the amount of \$40,000 filed by Judy Frank. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will overrule the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The court is not convinced that the trustee has overcome the presumptive validity of the subject proof of claim. The basis for the objection is that the debtors scheduled a debt owed by their corporation, and not them personally, to the instant claimant. From this, the trustee asks the court to infer that the subject claim is also owed by the debtors' corporation and not them personally.

However, the scheduled debt referenced in the objection appears to be very different from the debt underlying the subject claim. The referenced scheduled debt is in the amount of \$3,200, whereas the debt underlying this claim is in the amount of \$40,000. As such, the court cannot draw a reasonable inference that the debt underlying the proof of claim is also owed by the debtors' corporation. The proof of claim is unhelpful either. It is not clear from the attachments to the proof of claim that the debtors' corporation owes the subject debt. The proof of claim attaches several pages of what appears to be a handwritten ledger, containing equipment and dollar amounts. But, there is no reference in the ledger to the debtors' corporation. Without more from the trustee, the court cannot sustain the objection. Accordingly, the objection will be overruled.

11. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-10](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF RON BERINGER, CLAIM NUMBER 20
3-18-2019 [[102](#)]

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 20-1 in the amount of \$4,500 filed by Ron Beringer. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches a letter from the claimant seeking collection of the subject debt, which letter is addressed to Stan Kjar as representative of Kjar Equipment & Rental Company.

In other words, the claimant admits that his business was with Kjar Equipment & Rental Company and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

12. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-2](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF ZEE MEDICAL SERVICES, CLAIM NUMBER 3
3-18-2019 [\[62\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 3-1 in the amount of \$211.04 filed by Zee Medical Services. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches an invoice from the claimant, seeking collection of the subject debt, which invoice is addressed to Kjar Rental Company.

In other words, the claimant admits that its business was with Kjar Rental Company and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

13. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-3](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF FERRELLGAS, INC., CLAIM NUMBER 4
3-18-2019 [\[67\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 4-1 in the amount of \$157.90 filed by Ferrellgas, Inc. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches an invoice from the claimant, seeking collection of the subject debt, which invoice is addressed to Kjar Equipment Company.

In other words, the claimant admits that its business was with Kjar Equipment Company and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

14. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-4](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF DA NEIBRU FARMING CO., CLAIM NUMBER 5
3-18-2019 [\[72\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 5-1 in the amount of \$9,330.82 filed by Da Neibru Farming Co. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches a supporting letter from the claimant, unequivocally stating that the debt underlying the claim is owed by Kjar Equipment and Rental Co.

In other words, the claimant admits that its business was with Kjar Equipment and Rental Co. and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

15. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-5](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF SAN JOAQUIN TRACTOR COMPANY, CLAIM
NUMBER 7
3-18-2019 [\[77\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 7-1 in the amount of \$20,952.80 filed by San Joaquin Tractor Company. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also* *Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See* *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, “[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been ‘executed and filed in accordance with these rules.’” *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, “a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor’s liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c).” *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But “a creditor’s lack of adequate response to a debtor’s formal or informal inquiries ‘in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)’s grounds to disallow the claim.’” *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches a billing statement from the claimant, seeking collection of the debt underlying the claim, which statement is addressed to Kjar Equipment & Rental.

In other words, the claimant admits that its business was with Kjar Equipment & Rental and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors’ corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors’ bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

16. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-6](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF PITNEY BOWES INC., CLAIM NUMBER 9
3-18-2019 [\[82\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 9-1 in the amount of \$1,008.37 filed by Pitney Bowes, Inc. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches a billing statement from the claimant, seeking collection of the subject debt, which statement is addressed to Kjar Equipment & Rental.

In other words, the claimant admits that its business was with Kjar Equipment & Rental and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

17. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-7](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF ANTONIO CAMPOS FARMS, INC., CLAIM
NUMBER 10
3-18-2019 [\[87\]](#)

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 10-1 in the amount of \$379,236.61 filed by Antonio Campos Farms, Inc. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); *see also Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. *See Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, “[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been ‘executed and filed in accordance with these rules.’” *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, “a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor’s liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c).” *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But “a creditor’s lack of adequate response to a debtor’s formal or informal inquiries ‘in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)’s grounds to disallow the claim.’” *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim is identical to proof of claim no. 11-1. As such, proof of claim no. 10-1 will be disallowed as duplicative of proof of claim no. 11-1.

Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

18. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-8](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF CASANDRA LINDELL, CLAIM NUMBER 12
3-18-2019 [[92](#)]

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less

than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 12-1 in the amount of \$19,500 filed by Casandra Lindell. The claimant has filed no response to the objection. The court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); see also *Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. See *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim does not contain documentation establishing that the debtors owe the debt underlying the claim. On the contrary, the proof of claim attaches what appears to be a handwritten receipt for equipment signed by Stan Kjar on behalf of Kjar Equipment & Rental Company.

In other words, the claimant admits that her business was with Kjar Equipment & Rental and not the debtors in their individual capacity. This indicates to the court that the debt is not personally owed by the debtors. It is rather owed by the debtors' corporation, a separate and independent legal entity.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted against the debtors' bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

19. [17-11260](#)-A-7 **IN RE: STANLEY/PAMELA KJAR**
[TMT-9](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF STANLEY J. KJAR SR AND PAMELA G. KJAR,
CLAIM NUMBER 19
3-18-2019 [[95](#)]

TRUDI MANFREDO/MV
RILEY WALTER
TRUDI MANFREDO/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Objection: Objection to Claim

Notice: LBR 3007-1(b)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Sustained

Order: Prepared by objecting party

Unopposed objections are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c); LBR 9001-1(d), (n) (contested matters include objections). Written opposition to the sustaining of this objection was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

LEGAL STANDARDS

The trustee objects to the allowance of general unsecured proof of claim no. 19-1 in the amount of \$1,008,952.43 filed by the debtors. The debtor-claimants have filed no response to the objection. The

court will sustain the objection for the reasons discussed in this ruling.

A proof of claim is "deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects." 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3001(f) creates an evidentiary presumption of validity for "[a] proof of claim executed and filed in accordance with [the] rules." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f); see also *Litton Loan Servicing, LP v. Garvida (In re Garvida)*, 347 B.R. 697, 706-07 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006). This presumption is rebuttable. See *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 706. "The proof of claim is more than some evidence; it is, unless rebutted, prima facie evidence. One rebuts evidence with counter-evidence." *Id.* at 707 (citation omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

"A creditor who files a proof of claim that lacks sufficient support under Rule 3001(c) and (f) does so at its own risk. That proof of claim will lack prima facie validity, so any objection that raises a legal or factual ground to disallow the claim will likely prevail absent an adequate response by the creditor." *Campbell v. Verizon Wireless S-CA (In re Campbell)*, 336 B.R. 430, 436 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005).

Furthermore, "[a] claim that is not regular on its face does not qualify as having been 'executed and filed in accordance with these rules.'" *Litton Loan Servicing*, 347 B.R. at 707 n.7 (quoting Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f)). Such a claim lacks prima facie validity.

However, "a claim objection that does not actually contest the debtor's liability or the amount of the debt is not enough to disallow a proof of claim, even if the proof of claim lacks the documentation required by Rule 3001(c)." *Campbell*, 336 B.R. at 434. In other words, objections based solely on noncompliance with Rule 3001(c) are insufficient to disallow a claim absent any factual or legal disagreement as to the liability or amount of the claim. *Id.* at 434-36.

But "a creditor's lack of adequate response to a debtor's formal or informal inquiries 'in itself may raise an evidentiary basis to object to the unsupported aspects of the claim, or even a basis for evidentiary sanctions, thereby coming within [§] 502(b)'s grounds to disallow the claim.'" *Id.* at 436 (quoting *Heath v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co. (In re Heath)*, 331 B.R. 424, 437 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2005)).

DISCUSSION

The subject proof of claim is by the debtors against their bankruptcy estate, based on money they loaned to or guaranteed a loan for a corporation named Kings Equipment Company, Inc. This makes no sense. The debtors cannot be creditors of themselves. This case involves their bankruptcy estate. It does not involve the bankruptcy estate for any corporations, including Kings Equipment Company, Inc.

As such, the claim is improperly asserted in this bankruptcy case, against the bankruptcy estate of Stanley and Pamela Kjar. Accordingly, the objection will be sustained. The proof of claim will be disallowed in its entirety.

20. [12-12563](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JENNIFER WING**
[MAZ-2](#)

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF GCFS, INC.
3-25-2019 [[25](#)]

JENNIFER WING/MV
MARK ZIMMERMAN
\$260.00 REOPEN FEE DUE, RECLOSED 4/9/19

Final Ruling

This motion will be denied as this case is administratively closed. The order closing the case was entered on April 9, 2019, after this motion was filed. ECF No. 31. It appears that the case was closed shortly after it was reopened (on March 25) because the debtor did not pay the reopening case fee. See ECF No. 22. The motion will be denied without prejudice. The court will prepare a civil minute order on this motion.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

The debtor's motion to avoid lien has been presented to the court. Having considered the motion and the administrative status of the case,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is denied without prejudice.

21. [17-14468](#)-A-7 **IN RE: BRUCE GREER**
[RH-10](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR ROBERT HAWKINS, TRUSTEES
ATTORNEY(S)
4-3-2019 [[156](#)]

DAVID JENKINS

Final Ruling

Application: Allowance of Final Compensation and Expense
Reimbursement

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Approved

Order: Civil minute order

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this application was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on the application. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

In this Chapter 7 case, Robert Hawkins, counsel for the trustee, has applied for an allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The applicant requests that the court allow compensation in the amount of \$29,320 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$630.61.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

The court finds that the compensation and expenses sought are reasonable, and the court will approve the application on a final basis.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

Robert Hawkins' application for allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses has been presented to the court. Having

entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the application,

IT IS ORDERED that the application is approved on a final basis. The court allows final compensation in the amount of \$29,320 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$630.61.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the trustee is authorized without further order of this court to pay from the estate the aggregate amount allowed by this order in accordance with the Bankruptcy Code and the distribution priorities of § 726.

22. [17-13776](#)-A-7 **IN RE: JESSICA GREER**
[SFR-4](#)

MOTION FOR ORDER APPROVING STIPULATION
4-3-2019 [[92](#)]

JAMES SALVEN/MV
PETER FEAR
SHARLENE ROBERTS-CAUDLE/ATTY. FOR MV.

Final Ruling

Motion: Approve Compromise of Controversy

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Civil minute order

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

APPROVAL OF COMPROMISE

In determining whether to approve a compromise under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9019, the court determines whether the compromise was negotiated in good faith and whether the party proposing the compromise reasonably believes that the compromise is the best that can be negotiated under the facts. *In re A & C Props.*, 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir. 1982). More than mere good faith negotiation of a compromise is required. The court must also find that the compromise is fair and equitable. *Id.* "Fair and equitable" involves a consideration of four factors: (i) the probability of success in the litigation; (ii) the difficulties to be encountered in collection; (iii) the complexity of the

litigation, and expense, delay and inconvenience necessarily attendant to litigation; and (iv) the paramount interest of creditors and a proper deference to the creditors' expressed wishes, if any. *Id.* The party proposing the compromise bears the burden of persuading the court that the compromise is fair and equitable and should be approved. *Id.*

The movant requests approval of a compromise (titled Stipulation for Settlement and Release). ECF No. 95. The compromise is reflected in the settlement agreement attached to the motion as an exhibit. Based on the motion and supporting papers, the court finds that the compromise presented for the court's approval is fair and equitable considering the relevant *A & C Properties* factors. The compromise or settlement will be approved.

CIVIL MINUTE ORDER

The court shall issue a civil minute order that conforms substantially to the following form:

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are stated in the civil minutes for the hearing.

The trustee's motion to approve a compromise has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the motion,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The court hereby approves the compromise that is reflected in the settlement agreement attached to the motion an exhibit and filed at docket no. 95.

23. [18-14886](#)-A-7 **IN RE: CLEVINGER DRILLING AND WATER WELL SERVICES, INC.**
[LNH-4](#)

MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES
3-29-2019 [[27](#)]

JEFFREY VETTER/MV
D. GARDNER
LISA HOLDER/ATTY. FOR MV.

Tentative Ruling

Motion: Allowance and Payment of Administrative Expenses (compensation of finder/auctioneer, insurance premiums, and taxes)

Notice: LBR 9014-1(f)(1); written opposition required

Disposition: Granted

Order: Prepared by moving party

Description of Expenses:

- (1) compensation of finder/auctioneer for assisting the estate to sell water well drilling rig equipment and accessories;
- (2) up to \$2,079.96 in premiums for insurance coverage on the equipment, pending its sale;
- (3) up to \$2,000 in taxes.

Statutory Basis for Administrative Priority: §§ 330(a), 503(b)(1)(A), 503(b)(1)(B)

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55, incorporated by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written opposition to this motion was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on this motion. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

COMPENSATION OF FINDER/AUCTIONEER

Gould Auction & Appraisal Company, LLC, finder/auctioneer for the trustee, has applied via the trustee for allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The motion requests that the court allow compensation in the amount of \$1,500 plus 10% of any overbid on the sale of water well drilling rig equipment and accessories by the estate, and seeks reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$0.00.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

The court finds that the compensation and expenses sought are reasonable, and the court will approve the application on a final basis.

INSURANCE PREMIUMS AS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The trustee is seeking to pay up to \$2,079.96 in premiums for insurance coverage on well drilling rig equipment and accessories sold by the estate.

"A creditor claiming administrative expense treatment under § 503(b)(1)(A) must show that the claim: [1] arose postpetition; [2] arose from a transaction with the trustee or DIP (as opposed to the preceding [prepetition] entity) or that the claimant gave consideration to the trustee or DIP; and [3] directly and substantially benefited the estate." Kathleen P. March, Hon. Alan M. Ahart & Janet A. Shapiro, *California Practice Guide: Bankruptcy* ¶ 17:507 (rev. 2017) (citing cases).

By incurring the insurance premium expenses, the estate received in exchange a direct and substantial benefit, namely, insurance

coverage for the equipment pending its sale. Thus, the expenses described are actual and necessary costs or expenses of preserving the estate under § 503(b) (1) (A) .

These expenses will be allowed as an administrative expense under § 503(b) (1) (A) and may distributed in accordance with the priorities set forth in § 726(a) (1) and § 507(a) of the Bankruptcy Code.

TAXES AS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The trustee is seeking to pay up to \$2,000 in taxes, including \$800 to the California Franchise Tax Board. The trustee expects the remainder to be income taxes.

"Subject to limited exceptions, a trustee must pay the taxes of the estate on or before the date they come due, 28 U.S.C. § 960(b), even if no request for administrative expenses is filed by the tax authorities, 11 U.S.C. § 503(b) (1) (D), and the trustee must insure that 'notice and a hearing' have been provided before doing so, see *id.* § 503(b) (1) (B). The hearing requirement insures that interested parties . . . have an opportunity to contest the amount of tax paid before the estate's funds are diminished, perhaps irretrievably." *In re Clobeck*, 788 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2015). It is error to approve a trustee's final report without first holding a hearing, see 11 U.S.C. § 102(1), to allow creditors and parties in interest an opportunity to object to the allowance or amount of tax before it is paid. *Id.* 1245 n.1, 1246.

Creditors and parties in interest have had an opportunity to contest the allowance and amount of the estate taxes in this case. No objection has been made. Accordingly, the taxes specified in the motion shall be allowed as an administrative expense under 11 U.S.C. § 503(b) (1) (B) .