

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

July 17, 2012 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 29. 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 ON AUGUST 13, 2012 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JULY 30, 2012, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 6, 2012. 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 THE ITEMS IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR, ITEMS 30 THROUGH 57. INSTEAD, EACH OF THESE ITEMS HAS 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 JULY 23, 2012, AT 2:00 P.M.

July 17, 2012 at 1:30 p.m.

**Matters to be Called for Argument**

1. 12-29001-A-13 DARREN GIROUX AND OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 JENNIFER WERNESS-GIROUX CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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 debtor failed to utilize the court's mandatory form plan as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(a) (effective on and after May 1, 2012, in all cases regardless when filed).

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 prejudicial 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.

2. 12-29301-A-13 GERSON/MARIBEL GUERRERO OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-28-12 [23]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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.

Because the plan fails to specify how debtor's counsel's fees will be approved, either pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 or by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, and because the plan fails to provide for a dividend toward any fees that are approved, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2).

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 prejudicial 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. 08-34904-A-13 CHAI/KELLY LEE MOTION FOR  
SS-1 ENTRY OF DISCHARGE  
6-14-12 [29]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be denied because it is premature.

The trustee has filed a final report but the time to file objections to it has not expired. His report apparently demonstrates that the debtor has made the payments required by the plan and that the trustee has made the payments to creditors required by the plan. The requirement imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 1328(a) that the debtor receive a discharge only after completion of all payments under the plan has not been satisfied, because creditors must be given 30 days to object to the report. Until that period expires without objection or when any objection has been disposed of, no discharge may be entered. See In re Avery, 272 B.R. 718 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2002); In re Estrada, 322 B.R. 149 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2005).

4. 12-28909-A-13 ROMY OSTER AMENDED OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-18-12 [27]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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 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





7. 12-26719-A-13 ANTHONY/PATRICIA GOEREE MOTION TO  
ET-2 CONFIRM PLAN  
6-1-12 [28]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

Because the plan fails to provide for a dividend toward debtor's counsel's fees, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2). It fails to provide for payment in full of this priority claim.

8. 12-30822-A-13 GERARDO/MARIA RODRIGUEZ MOTION TO  
EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY  
6-13-12 [16]

- 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 was dismissed within one year of the filing of the current case. The case was dismissed because the debtor was unable to maintain the payments required by a confirmed plan.

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



10. 12-27028-A-13 TED/MICHELLE CURRY MOTION TO  
CAH-3 CONFIRM PLAN  
6-7-12 [36]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

Evaluating the objection in the light of the filing of an amended plan, convinces the court the objection is without merit.

First, the plan provides for the maintenance of the ongoing mortgage payment and the complete cure of the pre-petition arrearage. The plan complies with section 1322(b)(2), (5). Second, a review of amended Schedules I and J show that the debtor's income of approximately \$10,000 is sufficient to both fund the plan and to pay for the debtor's maintenance. The plan is feasible as required by section 1325(a)(6).

11. 12-27028-A-13 TED/MICHELLE CURRY OBJECTION TO  
MRG-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION VS. 5-23-12 [31]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The objection will be overruled for the reasons explained in the ruling on the debtor's motion to confirm the amended plan.

12. 11-34835-A-13 JAMES/AMY WHITE MOTION TO  
SJJ-1 MODIFY PLAN  
6-8-12 [26]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The debtor failed to utilize the court's mandatory form plan as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(a) (effective on and after May 1, 2012, in all cases regardless when filed).

Also, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The monthly plan payment of \$2,388 is less than the monthly dividends of \$3,682.11 the trustee is required to pay. The plan's feasibility is further damaged by the fact that the debtor has underestimated the arrears on a home mortgage. Because those arrears must be paid in full, the plan cannot be completed over its stated duration.

Third, because the debtor failed to make all payments required by the confirmed plan, the trustee was unable to maintain payments on the debtor's home mortgage. The modified plan fails to provide for the cure of these missed installments in violation of 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), 1325(a)(5)(B).

13. 08-34236-A-13 LINDA WALLACE MOTION TO  
SDB-3 MODIFY PLAN  
5-24-12 [57]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled on condition that the plan is further modified to provide for a payment of \$572 in July and provided the trustee confirms the receipt of the June installment in the amount of \$570. Payments after July are to be in the amount of \$571.

14. 08-36042-A-13 STEVEN/JENNIFER GREEN MOTION FOR  
PGM-2 ENTRY OF DISCHARGE  
6-15-12 [52]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be denied because it is premature.

The trustee has filed a final report but the time to file objections to it has not expired. His report apparently demonstrates that the debtor has made the payments required by the plan and that the trustee has made the payments to creditors required by the plan. The requirement imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 1328(a) that the debtor receive a discharge only after completion of all payments under the plan has not been satisfied, because creditors must be given 30 days to object to the report. Until that period expires without objection or when any objection has been disposed of, no discharge may be entered. See In re Avery, 272 B.R. 718 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2002); In re Estrada, 322 B.R. 149 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2005).

15. 12-28942-A-13 THOMAS/ELMA SHANE OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-27-12 [38]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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, because the debtor has failed to make all payments required by the plan by failing to pay \$1,810, the court concludes the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).



17. 12-28347-A-13 CHRISTOPHER WRABEL AND OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CSILLA CSISZAR CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [18]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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 plan specifies no plan payment. Without a plan payment, the dividends required by the plan cannot be paid. The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) and with a plan payment it cannot be determined that the plan's duration will be no more than 5 years as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Second, in violation of General Order 05-05 and an order entered in this case on the date of filing, the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition.

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, 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.

18. 12-29048-A-13 JOHN JAMES  
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [23]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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.

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, because the plan fails to specify how debtor's counsel's fees will be approved, either pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 or by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, but nonetheless requires the trustee to pay counsel a monthly dividend on account of such fees, in effect the plan requires payment of fees even though the court has not approved them. This violates sections 329 and 330.

19. 12-30651-A-13 MICHAEL SEVILLA  
RDN-1  
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. VS.

MOTION FOR  
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
6-18-12 [11]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed in part and denied in part.

To the extent the motions asks the court to terminate the automatic stay, the motion will be dismissed as moot - the case was dismissed on July 11 and so the automatic stay has expired as a matter of law. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1), (c)(2). Further, as the motion points out, this case was preceded by an earlier case that was dismissed within 1 year of this case. Therefore, even if the case was still pending, there would be no automatic stay 30 days after the filing of the case. The case was pending beyond the 30-day period. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3).

To the extent relief is requested pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), the court

is not convinced that the filing of two petitions under chapter 13 alone is sufficient evidence of a scheme to hinder, delay and defraud the movant. This is reinforced by the fact that the plan proposed by the debtor in this case made no effort to reorganize the debt formerly secured by the property.

Finally, because the movant no longer holds a claim secured by the subject property, it is not entitled to relief under section 362(d)(4). It foreclosed on its lien and is now the owner of the property. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) provides that:

"On request of a party in interest and after notice and a hearing, the court shall grant relief from the stay provided under subsection (a) of this section, such as by terminating, annulling, modifying, or conditioning such stay . . .

with respect to a stay of an act against real property under subsection (a), by a creditor whose claim is secured by an interest in such real property, if the court finds that the filing of the petition was part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either-

(A) transfer of all or part ownership of, or other interest in, such real property without the consent of the secured creditor or court approval; or

(B) multiple bankruptcy filings affecting such real property."

The motion will be denied as to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) because the movant is not "a creditor whose claim is secured by an interest in such real property." The movant is the owner of the property.

20. 08-20952-A-13 JOSEPH/IRMA LA BRASCA MOTION TO  
PGM-4 MODIFY PLAN  
6-12-12 [110]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

Because the debtor has failed to make \$650 of plan payments, the court concludes that the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

21. 12-28953-A-13 ELIZABETH ROSARIO OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [18]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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.

Because the plan fails to provide for a dividend toward any of the debtor's attorney's fees that are approved, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2).

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 prejudicial 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.

22. 12-29161-A-13 JULIE DAWSON OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
6-15-12 [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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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 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).

23. 12-28867-A-13 LUZVIMINDA HOLLENBECK OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [18]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, the court will set a briefing schedule



25. 09-42074-A-13 MICHAEL MANNLE  
MET-3

MOTION TO  
MODIFY PLAN  
5-31-12 [39]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan as proposed is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the plan payment required by the plan will not result in the payment of required dividends until the 54<sup>th</sup> month. The plan's duration, however, is only 36 months.

26. 12-28979-A-13 MARWAN ABDULRAHIM AND  
JPJ-1 HIYAM ABUTARBOUSH

OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-21-12 [24]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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, because the plan fails to specify how debtor's counsel's fees will be approved, either pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 or by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, and because the plan fails to provide for a dividend toward any fees that are approved, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2).

Second, in violation of General Order 05-05 and an order entered in this case on the date of filing, the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition.

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, 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.

27. 12-25483-A-13 BRIAN ELLIOTT MOTION TO  
PJM-2 CONFIRM PLAN  
6-1-12 [39]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan provides for the home mortgage held by the objecting creditor in Class 4. Class 4 is reserved for, among other claims, claims that are not in default. According to the objection, there is an \$11,298.56 pre-petition arrearage on the objecting creditor's claim. Because the claim is in Class 4 as opposed to Class 1, the plan does not provide for the cure of the arrearage. This violates 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) which prohibits the modification of home mortgages, as well as 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) which requires payment in full of secured claims.

28. 12-25483-A-13 BRIAN ELLIOTT OBJECTION TO  
EAT-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE VS. 7-3-12 [47]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The objection will be sustained for the reasons explained in the ruling on the debtor's motion to confirm a plan, PJM-2. Counsel is reminded that when the debtor files and sets for hearing a motion to confirm a plan, an objection to confirmation should be filed as opposition to the debtor's motion and include the docket control number of the debtor's motion. The objection must not be set for a hearing independent of the debtor's motion.

29. 12-29588-A-13 JOHN/DONNA FIELDS OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-27-12 [17]

- 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 the debtor appears at the hearing and offers opposition to the objection, 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 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 plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The monthly plan payment of \$120 is less than the monthly dividends of \$154 the trustee is required to pay.

Second, the feasibility of the plan also hinges on valuing the collateral of Yolo F.C.U. such that its secured claim may be stripped down to the amount assumed by the plan. However, the debtor failed to file, serve and set for hearing a valuation motion to do so. Without such valuation, the plan cannot be completed with the specified duration.

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 prejudicial 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.

**FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE**

30. 12-27901-A-13 ISIAH LEWIS ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
6-28-12 [32]

**Final Ruling:** The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$87 installment when due on June 25. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

31. 12-27901-A-13 ISIAH LEWIS MOTION TO  
IL-1 CONFIRM PLAN  
5-23-12 [24]

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

The motion does not comply with Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(e) (3) because when it was filed it was not accompanied by a separate proof/certificate of service. Appending a proof of service to one of the supporting documents (assuming such was done) does not satisfy the local rule. The proof/certificate of service must be a separate document so that it will be docketed on the electronic record. This permits anyone examining the docket to determine if service has been accomplished without examining every document filed in support of the matter on calendar. Given the absence of the required proof/certificate of service, the moving party has failed to establish that the motion was served on all necessary parties in interest.

32. 10-24702-A-13 VERNON/JAMIE JIMMERSON MOTION TO  
FF-2 MODIFY PLAN  
5-24-12 [40]

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

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served and the second and third addresses listed above.

33. 12-30602-A-13 MELANIE ACKER MOTION TO  
MCN-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. HSBC 6-5-12 [8]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$216,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Wells Fargo Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$368,890 as of the petition date. Therefore, HSBC's 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 \$216,000. 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).

34. 11-47304-A-13 BERNARD/CYNTHIA CHODERA MOTION TO  
CA-2 CONFIRM PLAN  
5-21-12 [48]

**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 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 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.

35. 12-29425-A-13 LAMONT THOMPSON MOTION TO  
EWV-3 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. 6-15-12 [17]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$326,600 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 \$480,510 as of the petition date. Therefore, JPMorgan Chase Bank's 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 \$326,600. 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).

36. 12-30828-A-13 ALLAN SADAC  
SAC-1  
VS. CITIMORTGAGE

MOTION TO  
VALUE COLLATERAL  
6-15-12 [11]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$108,100 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by America's Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$191,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, CitiMortgage's 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 \$108,100. 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).

37. 12-30828-A-13 ALLAN SADAC MOTION TO  
SAC-2 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. CHASE 6-15-12 [15]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$93,700 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 \$175,000 as of the petition date. Therefore,

Chase's 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 Barte, 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 \$93,700. 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).

38. 11-49832-A-13 ROWENA/VALENTIN EUGENIO MOTION TO  
WSS-3 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION  
6-12-12 [52]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to approve a modification of an existing home loan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the creditors 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 to modify a home mortgage will be granted.

The proposed modification is consistent with confirmed plan which permits direct payment of a home mortgage by the debtor. Further, it will reduce the debtor's monthly payment and enhance the debtor's ability to perform a plan.

39. 12-26434-A-13 RICARDO/MADALYN QUILATAN MOTION TO  
CAH-2 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. JPMORGAN CHASE BANK 6-8-12 [33]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$381,100 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by JPMorgan Chase Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$457,625 as of the petition date. Therefore, JPMorgan Chase Bank'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 \$381,100. 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).

40. 11-45935-A-13 DARIUS/COURTNEY CORBITT MOTION TO  
SLH-2 MODIFY PLAN  
5-22-12 [35]

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

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served and the second and third addresses listed above.

41. 12-23441-A-13 MARCIA DIAZ ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE  
6-28-12 [64]

**Final Ruling:** The order to show cause will be discharged and the case will remain pending.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay an installment in full when due on June 22. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment amount was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

42. 12-24046-A-13 DENISE KUMANCHIK MOTION TO  
SLH-4 CONFIRM PLAN  
5-21-12 [42]

**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 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 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.

43. 10-37354-A-13 JENNIFER/JEREMY HEMBREE MOTION TO  
HDR-4 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$1,874) AND MOTION  
TO MODIFY PLAN  
6-12-12 [64]

**Final Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed without prejudice. A review of the certificate of service reveals that the debtors and all but two creditors were not served with the motion.

44. 12-24954-A-13 TRACY HANCOCK  
EJS-3

MOTION TO  
VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE  
6-12-12 [40]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to vacate the June 12 dismissal order has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the creditors 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 will be granted.

The case was dismissed because the debtor had failed to provide financial information to the trustee. That information had been provided before the hearing on the dismissal motion. Therefore, the dismissal will be vacated.

45. 08-35956-A-13 ERIC/CAROLE SAMUELS  
FF-1

MOTION FOR  
ENTRY OF DISCHARGE  
5-30-12 [60]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to obtain a discharge has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the creditors 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 for entry of a chapter 13 discharge will be granted.

First, the trustee has filed a final report and the time to file objections to it has expired. His report demonstrates that the debtor has made the payments required by the plan and that the trustee has made the payments to creditors required by the plan. The requirement imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 1328(a) that the debtor receive a discharge only after completion of all payments under the plan has been satisfied. See In re Avery, 272 B.R. 718 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2002); In re Estrada, 322 B.R. 149 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2005).

Second, the debtor has filed a certificate in connection with this motion that the debtor is not required by a judicial or administrative order, or by statute, to pay a domestic support obligation. See 11 U.S.C. § 1328(a). No objection has been filed to that certificate and the time to file an objection has expired.

Third, the debtor has filed a certificate evidencing that the debtor has completed a post-petition instructional course concerning personal financial management as described in 11 U.S.C. § 111. This satisfies 11 U.S.C. § 1328(g)(1).

Fourth, by service of this motion, the debtor has given all creditors notice that 11 U.S.C. § 522(q) (1) is not applicable, and that there is no pending proceeding in which the debtor may be found guilty of a felony of the kind described in section 522(q) (1) (A) or liable for a debt of the kind specified in section 522(q) (1) (B). No creditor has objected to this notice. This satisfies the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1328(h).

Finally, the debtor has not received a discharge in a chapter 7, 11, or 12 case during the four years preceding the filing of this case nor has the debtor received a chapter 13 discharge in the two years preceding the filing of this case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1328(f).

Therefore, no earlier than 10 days after the hearing on this motion, the clerk shall enter the debtor's discharge. See 11 U.S.C. § 1328(h).

In the future, motions such as this will be dismissed. Local Bankruptcy Rule 5009-1 became effective May 1, 2012. It prescribes the procedure to obtain entry of a chapter 13 discharge after plan completion. It is no longer necessary to file, serve, and set for a hearing a motion to obtain a discharge in chapter 13 cases.

46. 12-30057-A-13 CARMALITA SAUCEDO MOTION TO  
AH-2 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, NV N.A. 6-18-12 [15]

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

A motion is a contested matter and it must be served like a summons and a complaint. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014 incorporating by reference Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004. Service of the motion did not comply with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(b) (3) and 9014(b). The motion must be served to the attention of an officer, a managing or general agent, or other agent authorized by appointment or law to receive service of process for the respondent creditor. According to the certificate of service, this motion was simply sent to the corporation. Cf. ECMC v. Repp (In re Repp), 307 B.R. 144 (B.A.P. 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) (service in accordance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b) does not satisfy the service requirements of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(b)). Service, then, is deficient.

47. 08-27458-A-13 WAJID/MEHNAZ KHAN MOTION TO  
PGM-3 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION  
6-13-12 [48]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to approve a modification of an existing home loan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1). The failure of the creditors 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 to modify a home mortgage will be granted.

The proposed modification is consistent with confirmed plan which permits

direct payment of a home mortgage by the debtor. Further, it will reduce the debtor's monthly payment and enhance the debtor's ability to perform a plan.

48. 07-23160-A-13 RODOLFO/DORA LISONDRA MOTION FOR  
PGM-2 ENTRY OF DISCHARGE  
6-13-12 [85]

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

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served and the second and third addresses listed above.

49. 08-33862-A-13 PHILIP/SHAUNELL ROBINSON MOTION FOR  
PPR-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
CARMAX AUTO FINANCE VS. 6-18-12 [46]

**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 will be dismissed as moot.

The court confirmed a plan on November 19, 2008. That plan provides for the movant's claim in Class 4. Class 4 secured claims are long-term claims that are not modified by the plan and that were not in default prior to the filing of the petition. They are paid directly by the debtor or by a third party. The plan includes the following provision at section 3.15:

*"Class 4 claims mature after the completion of this plan, are not in default, and are not modified by this plan. These claims shall be paid by Debtor or a third person whether or not the plan is confirmed. Entry of the confirmation order shall constitute an order modifying the automatic stay to allow the holder of a Class 4 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral in the event of a default under the terms of its loan or security documentation provided this case is then pending under chapter 13."*

Because the plan has been confirmed and because the case remains pending under chapter 13, the automatic stay has already been modified to permit the movant to proceed against its collateral.

To the extent there may be a codebtor stay under 11 U.S.C. § 1301, the motion seeks no relief from it.

The movant shall bear its own fees and costs.

50. 11-39068-A-13 PHILIP/KATIA FONTENOT MOTION TO  
CJY-3 MODIFY PLAN  
5-29-12 [35]

**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 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 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.

51. 12-29570-A-13 LOUIS/MARGARITA MENDOZA MOTION TO  
JT-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. 6-18-12 [18]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$346,800 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Wells Fargo Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$719,054 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo Bank'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 \$346,800. 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).

52. 12-27581-A-13 PAMELA JACKS-BLUFORD  
RAC-2

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
5-25-12 [21]

**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 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 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.

53. 12-27282-A-13 TERRANCE/DIANA LIPKINS OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
5-31-12 [16]

**Final Ruling:** The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

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

The plan neither promises to pay class 7 unsecured claims in full nor provides for payment to such claim holders of all the debtor's projected disposable income over the life of the plan as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b).

A chapter 13 debtor's projected disposable income is determined, at least in the first instance, on Form 22. That form calculates the debtor's expected income based on a six-month average of income received pre-petition. From this average, the debtor is permitted to deduct certain expenses as enumerated in 11 U.S.C. § 707(b)(2). See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(3). In this case, the debtor has claimed as two deductions from current monthly income that are not permitted by section 707(b)(2) and, even if permitted, have not been documented. First, the debtor has taken a deduction for \$331 in additional rent above what is permitted by the IRS standards incorporated into section 707(b)(2). The debtor also has taken \$638 in additional transportation expenses above and beyond what is permitted under the standards. Second, the debtor has deducted \$879 more in monthly tax withholdings than is actually being withheld. With these expense deductions eliminated, the debtor's projected monthly disposable income increases by \$1,848, which over the life of the plan is sufficient to pay unsecured claims in full.

If the debtor has not confirmed a plan by August 20, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

54. 12-28182-A-13 EUGENE/LILIA BAUTISTA OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
6-6-12 [18]

**Final Ruling:** The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The objection will be overruled and the motion to dismiss the case will be

denied.

Both the objection and motion are based on the failure of the debtor to file, serve and prosecute a valuation motion concerning the collateral of HSBC. That motion was filed and granted.

55. 12-28182-A-13 EUGENE/LILIA BAUTISTA MOTION TO  
TJW-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. HSBC BANK USA, N.A. 6-12-12 [21]

**Final Ruling:** This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$250,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Select Portfolio Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$468,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, HSBC Bank USA's 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 \$468,000. 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).

56. 12-28182-A-13 EUGENE/LILIA BAUTISTA OBJECTION TO  
TJW-2 CLAIM  
VS. BENEFICIAL FINANCIAL 1, INC. 6-12-12 [28]

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

The notice of hearing informs the claimant that written opposition must be filed and served 14 days prior to the hearing if the claimant wishes to oppose the objection to the proof of claim. Because less than 44 days of notice of the hearing was given, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c) (2) specifies that written opposition is unnecessary. Instead, the claimant may appear at the hearing and orally contest the objection. If necessary, the court may thereafter require the submission of written evidence and briefs. By erroneously informing the claimant that written opposition was required and was a condition to contesting the objection, the objecting party may have deterred the claimant from appearing. Therefore, notice was materially deficient.

57. 12-21995-A-13 OLIVER ADEN MOTION TO  
DS-1 CONFIRM PLAN  
5-21-12 [44]

**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 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 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.