

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

May 31, 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 21. 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 JULY 5, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 20, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 27, 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 22 THROUGH 31 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 JUNE 6, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

May 31, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

**Matters to be Called for Argument**

1. 11-46816-A-13 LARRY/PAULA HUNLEY MOTION TO  
PGM-2 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'  
ATTORNEY  
4-27-16 [73]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The applicant substituted into the case for the debtor's original counsel. Original counsel's fee disclosure and the confirmed plan provided that original counsel was paid a \$1,000 and would accept \$2,500 for the remainder of the case pursuant to the court's chapter 13 fee guidelines since subsumed by Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1. Those guidelines provided:

"If counsel has filed an executed copy of the "Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys," but the initial fee is not sufficient to fully compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. . . [C]ounsel should not view the fee permitted by these Guidelines as a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a fee motion. This fee is sufficient to fairly compensate counsel for all preconfirmation services and most post-confirmation services such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. . . ."

This application fails to state how much of the \$3,500 initial fee was actually paid to the original attorney and it fails to argue that the work done by subsequent counsel amounts to substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work." New counsel took to this case over from the original attorney knowing that the latter had agreed to be compensated pursuant to the guidelines. In this circumstance, if the work done should be covered by the initial \$3,500 fee, then it must be allocated between the two. To accomplish this, the applicant/debtor must ask the court to review the compensation paid to the original attorney to determine if that compensation exceeded the reasonable value of his services and/or whether the compensation approved is improvident in light of subsequent developments. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 328, 329.

Otherwise, the court needs to be convinced that even if the work had been done by the original attorney, he would have received additional compensation.

The motion will be denied without prejudice.

2. 16-21717-A-13 SHANE/MICHELLE GALLEGOS OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-11-16 [19]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the

hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist*, or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Second, the debtor has failed to make \$2,238.76 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Third, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fourth, the plan fails to provide at section 2.07 for a dividend to be on account of allowed administrative expenses, including the debtor's attorney's fees. Unless counsel is working for nothing, this means that the plan does not provide for payment in full of priority claims as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2). Also see 11 U.S.C. §§ 503(b), 507(a).

Fifth, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$3,143 is less than the \$2,328.76 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Sixth, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 155 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Seventh, a secured claim that will mature before the last plan payment must be paid in Class 2. Class 1 is reserved for long term secured claims. The claim of Patelco has been misclassified in Class 1.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be

given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

3. 16-20120-A-13 RAQUEL RIOS MOTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONVERT OR TO DISMISS CASE  
5-2-16 [37]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be conditionally denied.

There is cause for dismissal or conversion. The debtor has failed to make \$2,100 as required by the last plan proposed and the debtor failed to promptly seek confirmation of a modified plan after the court denied confirmation of the prior plan.

Nonetheless, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 60 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

4. 15-25326-A-13 GLORIA WULFERT MOTION TO  
FF-2 MODIFY PLAN  
4-15-16 [32]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, because the proposed plan retroactively increases the plan payment but the debtor has failed to pay that increase, the debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$153. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 50 months which exceeds the proposed plan duration of 36 months. Thus, as it is proposed, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

5. 16-21327-A-13 JENNIFER SALAZAR ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
5-9-16 [17]

- 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 \$76 due on May 2 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

6. 16-21931-A-13 NICOLE JACKSON OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-11-16 [21]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Balboa Thrift in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

7. 16-21931-A-13 NICOLE JACKSON OBJECTION TO  
KEH-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
BALBOA THRIFT & LOAN VS. 5-11-16 [17]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling,

rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained to the extent and for the reasons explained in the ruling on the trustee's objection (JPJ-1).

8. 16-20233-A-13 YIMEN MENDEZ COUNTER MOTION TO  
MB-2 DISMISS CASE  
5-12-16 [35]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be conditionally denied.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

9. 12-35034-A-13 CHRISTOPHER/TARA BALTZLEY MOTION TO  
CJY-3 MODIFY PLAN  
4-18-16 [35]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan specifies no duration. Without the duration, the ability of the stream of payments to pay the promised dividends cannot be proven and the debtor cannot prove the plan meets the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

10. 16-21936-A-13 LIDIYA KRAVCHUK OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-12-16 [22]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to

appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$70 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Third, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Fourth, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fifth, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Sixth, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor failed to include a detailed statement of business income and expenses with Schedules I and J and failed to disclose an interest in a business. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Seventh, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) because unsecured creditors would receive more than \$600,000 (or be paid in full) in a chapter 7 liquidation as of the effective date of the plan. This plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors.

11. 16-21437-A-13 JULIE COLLIS-DAVIS  
DEF-2

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
4-6-16 [22]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of First Horizon/First Tennessee Bank in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Second, the debtor has not established that the plan will pay all projected disposable income to unsecured creditors as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because the debtor has erroneously deducted a monthly payment on account of a mortgage that the plan will strip from the debtor's home. Because nothing will be paid on account of the claim, the former mortgage payment may not be deducted from current monthly income of Form 22. See Thissen v. Johnson, 406 B.R. 888, 894 (E.D. Cal. 2009). With this deduction eliminated, the debtor must pay no less than \$12,638.40 to Class 7 unsecured creditors. Because the plan will pay these creditors only \$10,074, it does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b).

12. 16-21437-A-13 JULIE COLLIS-DAVIS  
DEF-2

COUNTER MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-12-16 [33]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be conditionally denied.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

13. 15-21845-A-13 JOSEPH BARNES MOTION TO  
JPJ-2 CONVERT OR TO DISMISS CASE  
5-2-16 [84]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be granted and the case converted to one under chapter 7.

First, the debtor has failed to pay to the trustee approximately \$4,418 as required by the proposed plan. The foregoing has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Second, in breach of section 5.02 of the plan, the debtor failed to cooperate timely with the trustee and produce financial records relating to the debtor's post petition taxes and wages/income. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1), (c)(6).

Because the schedules indicate substantial nonexempt and unencumbered equity in assets, the court concludes that conversions rather than dismissal is in the best interests of creditors.

14. 16-20251-A-13 MYRNA MCDONALD MOTION TO  
PGM-1 CONFIRM PLAN  
4-19-16 [22]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The debtor has failed to make \$1,435 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

15. 16-20556-A-13 JOSEPH/LISA TARANGO MOTION TO  
CJY-2 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION  
5-17-16 [33]

- 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.

16. 16-22058-A-13 JOSE HERNANDEZ  
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
5-11-16 [14]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$3,670 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Third, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist*, or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Fourth, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 94 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Fifth, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Sixth, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor failed to list equipment identified on tax returns on Schedule B and failed to list income on Part I of Form 22, This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

17. 16-22958-A-13 KELLY TIMOTHY  
MMM-1

MOTION TO  
EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY  
5-12-16 [21]

- 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.

This is the second chapter 13 case filed by the debtor. A prior case, Case No. 16-21699, was dismissed on April 5, 2016 because the debtor failed to file all schedules, statements and lists. This case was filed on May 5.

Hence, the debtor's earlier chapter 13 case was dismissed within one year of the most recent petition.

11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A) provides that if a single or joint case is filed by or against a debtor who is an individual in a case under chapter 7, 11, or 13, and if a single or joint case of the debtor was pending within the preceding one-year period but was dismissed, the automatic stay with respect to a debt, property securing such debt, or any lease terminates on the 30<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of the new case.

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows a debtor to file a motion requesting the continuation of the stay. A review of the docket reveals that the debtor has filed this motion to extend the automatic stay before the 30<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of the petition. The motion will be adjudicated before the 30-day period expires.

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one

under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change.”

Here, it appears that the debtor was unrepresented by counsel in the prior case and was unable to timely file her case documents. She now is represented by counsel and all documents are on file. This is a sufficient change in circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

18. 16-21764-A-13 STANLEY BERMAN OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-11-16 [22]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court’s tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$8,465 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, because the debtor is barred from practicing law, it does not appear he has any regular income and hence is not eligible for chapter 13. See 11 U.S.C. § 109(e).

Third, even if the court assumes the debtor actually will have the income listed on Schedule I, after deducting expenses listed on Schedule J, he will have no net income with which to fund any plan. No plan appears feasible.

Fourth, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Fifth, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor has failed to disclose a business in response to questions of the Statement of Financial Affairs and the petition. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Finally, while an amended plan was filed on May 7, the debtor has not filed, served and set for hearing a motion to confirm that plan as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

19. 15-26281-A-13 STEPHEN TRUMAN MOTION TO  
DMS-1 EMPLOY  
5-12-16 [99]

- 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 dismissed without prejudice. A chapter 13 debtor does not need the court's permission to hire an attorney. To the extent this motion seeks such permission, it is unnecessary. However, an attorney must obtain approval of any fees prior to their payment. To the extent this motion seeks approval of compensation or the terms of compensation, the motion must be dismissed because only 19 days' notice was given of the hearing. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(6).

20. 16-21883-A-13 EDWARD/MYLINLINNY STEARNS OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
5-12-16 [21]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected

disposable income. The plan will pay unsecured creditors \$24,801.43 but Form 22 shows that the debtor will have \$46,547.40 over the next five years.

21. 16-23088-A-13 WILLIAM/JERI WILLOUGHBY MOTION TO  
MRL-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 5-13-16 [8]

- 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 seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$270,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Bank of America. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$294,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America's other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation

motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$270,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980).

**THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE**

22. 16-22206-A-13 JACQUELINE/ROBERT COONEY OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
5-11-16 [26]

**Final Ruling:** The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter given that the debtor has filed a response indicating there is no opposition to the objection. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

First, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor failed to list a prior chapter 13 case that was dismissed on the petition. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Ford Motor Credit in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Third, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of the IRS in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Fourth, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay unsecured creditors only \$2,150 even though Form 22 shows that the debtor will have \$46,917 of projected disposable income over the next five years.

Fifth, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) because unsecured creditors would receive \$5,988.38 in a chapter 7 liquidation as of the effective date of the plan. This plan will pay only \$2,150 to unsecured creditors.

23. 16-22518-A-13 STEVEN SIPE MOTION FOR  
LES-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
JAMES AND JUDITH CARTER, TRUSTEES 5-16-16 [19]  
REVOCABLE TRUST AGREEMENT VS.

**Final Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed as moot. The case was dismissed on May 23. As a result, there no longer is an automatic stay to terminate or modify.

24. 15-28433-A-13 JUSTIN WESTCOTT MOTION TO  
RJM-3 CONFIRM PLAN  
4-18-16 [39]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

25. 16-20233-A-13 YIMEN MENDEZ MOTION TO  
MB-2 CONFIRM PLAN  
4-8-16 [28]

**Final Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

The certificate of service for the plan and the motion to confirm it refers to an attached service list. The certificate neither lists the parties served nor attaches a service list. Hence, there is no proof anyone has been served as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b).

26. 16-21447-A-13 DANIEL HERNANDEZ ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
5-13-16 [28]

**Final Ruling:** The order to show cause will be discharged as moot. The case was dismissed on May 18, 2016.

27. 15-21258-A-13 ELIZABETH GOMEZ MOTION TO  
JPJ-4 CONVERT OR TO DISMISS CASE  
5-2-16 [102]

**Final Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed as moot. The case was dismissed on May 23.

28. 16-20461-A-13 ARLENE THIGPEN MOTION TO  
SLH-1 CONFIRM PLAN  
5-2-16 [22]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

29. 16-20477-A-13 ROBIN DIMICELI OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-2 EXEMPTIONS  
4-21-16 [38]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). Therefore, the debtor's default is entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

The debtor's claim of exemptions under both Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703.140(b) and Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 704, et seq., is not permitted by Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 703(a)(1), (a)(3). The debtor must pick one exemption scheme only.

30. 16-20390-A-13 DEBRA FREEMAN MOTION FOR  
AP-2 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
QUICKEN LOANS, INC. VS. 5-3-16 [31]

**Final Ruling:** This motion for relief from the automatic stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor and the trustee 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 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion is granted in part pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) in order to permit the movant to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and to obtain

possession of the subject real property following the sale. All other relief is denied. The subject real property has a value of \$200,000 and is encumbered by a perfected deed of trust or mortgage in favor of the movant. That security interest secures a claim of more than \$388,000. There is no equity and there is no evidence that the subject real property is necessary to an effective reorganization. The debtor's proposed plan was not confirmed and a modified plan has not been proposed.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount of its claim, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day period specified in Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

31. 15-23799-A-13 STEPHANY MURPHY  
SJS-2

MOTION TO  
MODIFY PLAN  
4-22-16 [80]

**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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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 (9<sup>th</sup> 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.