

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

August 12, 2013 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 16. 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 SEPTEMBER 9, 2013 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 26, 2013, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY SEPTEMBER 3, 2013. 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 17 THROUGH 33. 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 AUGUST 19, 2013, AT 2:30 P.M.

August 12, 2013 at 1:30 p.m.

**Matters to be Called for Argument**

1. 12-26804-A-13 BRYAN MACMILLAN MOTION TO  
JPJ-4 DISMISS CASE  
5-30-13 [44]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The motion will be denied. Because the court has reduced the ongoing mortgage installment retroactive to March 2013, the plan is not in material default. There is no cause for dismissal.

2. 13-27119-A-13 GUILLERMO/LETICIA OBJECTION TO  
ASW-1 CARRASCO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. VS. 7-5-13 [18]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The objection will be sustained.

First, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, like the claim of the objecting creditor, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The proposed modified plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrears on the home loan owed to the respondent. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the respondent's secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

Second, to the extent the debtor is not providing for the cure of the arrears because the lender has agreed to accept such treatment, as the objection makes clear, there is no such agreement. The plan then is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

3. 13-28021-A-13 BRUNO/GRACIA AMATO OBJECTION TO  
VVF-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
AMERICAN HONDA FINANCE CORP. VS. 6-19-13 [8]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The objection will be sustained in part.

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

The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

The objection concerning the interest rate payable on the creditor's secured claim, however, will be overruled.

The Supreme Court decided in Till v. SCS Credit Corp., 124 S.Ct. 1951 (2004), that the appropriate interest rate is determined by the "formula approach." This approach requires the court to use the national prime rate in order to reflect the financial market's estimate of the amount a commercial bank should charge a creditworthy commercial borrower to compensate it for the loan's opportunity costs, inflation, and a slight risk of default. The bankruptcy court is required to adjust this rate for a greater risk of default posed by a bankruptcy debtor. This upward adjustment depends on a variety of factors, including the nature of the security, and the plan's feasibility and duration. Cf. Farm Credit Bank v. Fowler (In re Fowler), 903 F.2d 694, 697 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990); In re Camino Real Landscape Main. Contrs., Inc., 818 F.2d 1503 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987).

To set the appropriate rate, the court is required to conduct an "objective inquiry" into the appropriate rate. However, the debtor's bankruptcy statements and schedules may be culled for the evidence to support an interest rate.

As reported by the Federal Reserve at <http://www.federalreserve.gov/releases>, the prime rate is currently 3.25%.

As surveyed by the Supreme Court in Till, courts using the formula approach typically have adjusted the interest rate 1% to 3%. The debtor's proposed rate of 5.25% gives a 2% upward adjustment. Given the nature of the collateral, personal property, its age and current condition, and the proposed length of the plan, the court agrees that this rate satisfies section 1325(a)(B)(ii).

4. 12-40431-A-13 BRON/STAR FARISS MOTION TO  
CA-1 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$3,048.90)  
7-20-13 [22]

Telephone Appearance  
 Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$2,662.50 in fees and \$386.40 in costs. After application of the \$925 retainer and the \$281 paid to counsel for the filing fee, a total of \$1,242.90 in additional compensation is

sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and the Chapter 13 Fee Guidelines, if applicable.

5. 10-41734-A-13 MICHAEL/BRANDI GIRON MOTION TO  
JGD-9 MODIFY PLAN  
6-26-13 [131]
- Telephone Appearance
  - Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan awards the debtor's attorney additional compensation without making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017. This violates sections 329 and 330.

6. 12-28437-A-13 DONALD/MARIA LEEPER MOTION TO  
ET-8 MODIFY PLAN  
6-28-13 [100]
- 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 in the confirmation order to account for all prior payments made by the debtor under the terms of the prior plan, and to provide for plan payments of \$435.11 for 12 months and \$110.21 for 24. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

7. 12-29448-A-13 TODD/CARMELITA HORNE MOTION TO  
JT-2 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION  
7-29-13 [31]
- Telephone Appearance
  - Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

8. 13-27454-A-13 SHANE/SARA NEWSON  
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
7-23-13 [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, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to make \$1,351 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

9. 13-25164-A-13 JOSE LOPEZ  
PGM-1

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
7-3-13 [23]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, to pay the dividends required by the plan and the rate proposed by it will take 75 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay unsecured creditors nothing but Form 22, after eliminating the monthly deduction of \$475.40 for a voluntary retirement contribution, shows that the debtor will have \$28,464.60 over the next five years. The deduction is not allowable. See Parks v. Drummond.

10. 12-38565-A-13 MOHAMED CHAN  
CAH-4

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
6-27-13 [61]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** The objection will be overruled.

In a separate motion, the court valued the collateral of the objecting creditor. It failed to respond to the motion despite due notice. The valuation motion was supported by admissible evidence, the declaration of the debtor which expressed a lay opinion of value. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980). The objecting creditor's collateral has a value of \$48,000. While it attempts to argue the value has changed, it has provided no admissible evidence of such a change.

Therefore, because the plan provides for payment in full of the \$48,000 secured claim, because this is the value of the collateral, the plan satisfies 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (5) (B).

11. 12-40766-A-13 DEBORAH CHRISTENSEN  
CA-2

MOTION TO  
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$3,537.50, EXP.  
\$363.56)  
7-20-13 [26]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$3,537.50 in fees and \$363.56 in costs. After application of the \$2,000 retainer and the \$281 paid to counsel for the filing fee, a total of \$1,620.06 in additional compensation is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and the Chapter 13 Fee Guidelines, if applicable.

12. 13-27668-A-13 VINCENT MUNSON  
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
7-23-13 [20]

- 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, 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.

Second, the debtor effectively failed to appear at the meeting of creditors because he did not appear with his attorney. Without the attorney, the trustee could not proceed. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

There is no need to reach the remaining objections.

13. 12-36686-A-13 JULIA AGUIRRE  
CA-2

MOTION TO  
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$3,803.58)  
7-20-13 [34]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

**Tentative Ruling:** Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and

any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted. The motion seeks approval of \$3,387.50 in fees and \$416.08 in costs. After application of the \$1,500 retainer and the \$281 paid to counsel for the filing fee, a total of \$2,022.58 in additional compensation is sought by this motion. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and the Chapter 13 Fee Guidelines, if applicable.

14. 13-22189-A-13 DAVID/CYNTHIA MCREYNOLDS MOTION TO  
LR-3 VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE  
7-26-13 [64]

- 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 denied.

In this case, a plan has never been confirmed. When the court denied confirmation of the debtor's original plan, it also conditionally denied the trustee's motion to dismiss the case. That is, the court permitted the case to remain pending even though the debtor failed to confirm the original plan but only on the condition that a plan be confirmed no later than July 22. While the debtor filed an amended plan on May 6, 2013, a review of the docket reveals that counsel set a motion to confirm the amended plan for hearing on a calendar not designated by the court for chapter 13 cases. The court clerk advised counsel of the error on May 7 when he mailed a notice to counsel. That notice advised counsel that the motion would not be set for hearing and heard by the court unless an amended notice of hearing was filed and served. Counsel never filed and served an amended notice of hearing. As a result, the motion was not heard, a plan was not confirmed by the court on or before July 22, and the case was dismissed.

Clearly an error was made but this does not entitle the debtor to relief. The error must be excusable and there are no facts suggesting this error was excusable, particularly in light of the fact that counsel was told on May 7

that there was a problem.

15. 13-25490-A-13 GARY/TERRIE COOK  
PLC-4

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
6-21-13 [42]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has failed to make \$2,970 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c) (1) & (c) (4), 1325(a) (6).

Second, 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.

16. 10-28098-A-13 ROBIN ROBINSON  
LR-3

MOTION TO  
RECONSIDER DISMISSAL OF CASE  
7-26-13 [121]

- 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 denied.

In this case, the debtor confirmed a plan but failed to make all payments required by it. This default prompted the trustee to serve a Notice of Default and Application to Dismiss on May 30, 2013. In it, the trustee alleged that as of May 29, 2013, the debtor had failed to make \$2,912 in plan payments.

This procedure for noticing a default and potentially dismissing a chapter 13 case is authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(g) which provides:

(1) *If the debtor fails to make a payment pursuant to a confirmed plan, including a direct payment to a creditor, the trustee may mail to the debtor and the debtor's attorney written notice of the default.*

(2) *If the debtor believes that the default noticed by the trustee does not exist, the debtor shall set a hearing within twenty-eight (28) days of the mailing of the notice of default and give at least fourteen (14) days' notice of the hearing to the trustee pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). At the hearing, if the trustee demonstrates that the debtor has failed to make a payment required by the confirmed plan, and if the debtor fails to rebut the trustee's evidence, the case shall be dismissed at the hearing.*

(3) *Alternatively, the debtor may acknowledge that the plan payment(s) has(have) not been made and, within thirty (30) days of the mailing of the notice of default, either (A) make the delinquent plan payment(s) and all subsequent plan payments that have fallen due, or (B) file a modified plan and a motion to confirm the modified plan. If the debtor's financial condition has materially changed, amended Schedules I and J shall be filed and served with the motion to modify the chapter 13 plan.*

(4) *If the debtor fails to set a hearing on the trustee's notice, or cure the default by payment, or file a proposed modified chapter 13 plan and motion, or perform the modified chapter 13 plan pending its approval, or obtain approval of the modified chapter 13 plan, all within the time constraints set out above, the case shall be dismissed without a hearing on the trustee's application.*

Thus, a debtor receiving a Notice of Default has three alternatives. (1) Cure the default within 30 days of the notice of default. (2) Within 30 days of the notice of default, file a motion to confirm a modified plan and a modified plan in order to cure/suspend the default stated in the notice of default. (3) Contest the notice of default by setting a hearing within 28 days of the notice of default on 14 days of notice to the trustee.

In this case, the debtor admitted the default and proposed a modified plan on June 7, 2013. Because the plan and the motion to confirm it were filed within 30 days of the Notice of Default, the debtor timely responded to the Notice of Default.

However, the motion to confirm was dismissed because it was not served on the IRS in conformity with Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c). That rule, which has been in effect in this court for more than 10 years, requires service on the IRS at three addresses. Counsel for the debtor served the motion at one address.

The motion will be denied for two reasons. First, whatever the explanation, the motion to modify the plan was denied. Second, no good excuse has been offered for the failure to correctly serve the motion on the IRS.

**THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE**

17. 12-26804-A-13 BRYAN MACMILLAN OBJECTION TO  
CFH-1 NOTICE OF MORTGAGE PAYMENT CHANGE  
6-27-13 [46]

**Final Ruling:** This objection to the supplement to the proof of claim of HSBC Bank has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

The creditor is the debtor's home lender. The lender filed a notice of a mortgage payment change on January 11, 2013 giving notice that the debtor's mortgage installment would increase from \$1,008.26 to \$1,266.20 effective February 1, 2013. The change was due to the lender's force-placing insurance on the subject property. However, on February 12 the debtor sent proof of the debtor's own insurance to the lender and the lender agreed the correct installment payment effective in March 2013 would be \$930.52. However, the lender failed to file the required notice of payment change.

This failure had consequences for the plan. The plan requires the trustee to make the debtor's mortgage payment as well as cure the arrears on the mortgage. Therefore, under the plan, when the mortgage installment increased to \$1,266.20, the debtor's plan payment also increased in an amount necessary to cover the increase in the installment plus the trustee's additional compensation. When the lender failed to file a second notice of payment change decreasing the mortgage installment, this had the effect of making the debtor delinquent under the terms of the plan.

Despite numerous attempts by debtor's counsel to get the lender to file a second notice of a payment change, it failed to do so. This prompted the trustee to move to dismiss the case because the debtor was not making the plan payment required by the confirmed plan - an amount calculated based on the erroneous notice of payment change that the lender should have changed by filing a second notice of payment change. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002.1(b).

Therefore, pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002.1(i), the court will sustain the objection to the notice of payment change, determine that the correct mortgage installment is \$930.52 effective March 2013, and award reasonable fees and costs to the debtor. The fees requested, \$2,040, are reasonable.

18. 13-26220-A-13 DALE/STACEY O'NEAL MOTION TO  
PGM-2 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. KITSAP CREDIT UNION 7-22-13 [25]

**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 valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$6,500 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$6,500 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$6,500 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

19. 13-27627-A-13 BRIAN/DIANE LEWIS MOTION TO  
DPR-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 7-10-13 [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 \$159,783 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Chase Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$170,318 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America, N.A.'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 \$159,783. 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).

20. 13-29227-A-13 BRIAN RAND  
CJO-1  
FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSN VS.

MOTION FOR  
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
7-24-13 [10]

**Final Ruling:** The motion will be dismissed because it is moot. The case was dismissed on August 9. Therefore, the automatic stay has expired as a matter of law. See 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) & (c)(2). The motion does not request retroactive or prospective relief.

**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 \$183,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Countrywide Home Loans. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$297,285 as of the petition date. Therefore, GMAC Mortgage, LLC'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 \$183,000. 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).

22. 13-27629-A-13 LORI BISHOP MOTION TO  
TJW-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. 7-11-13 [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 \$405,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Midland Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$480,000 as of the petition date. Therefore, Bank of America, N.A.'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 \$405,000. 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).

23. 13-22834-A-13 SHARON NISHIKAWA  
CA-2

MOTION TO  
CONFIRM PLAN  
7-1-13 [43]

**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.

24. 09-47340-A-13 MICHAEL/ROBYN GRIFFIN  
PGM-7

MOTION TO  
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$1,360)  
7-11-13 [122]

**Final Ruling:** This compensation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(a)(6). The failure of the trustee, the debtor, the United States Trustee, the creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the 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 additional fees represent reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1, if applicable.

25. 13-25754-A-13 NURGUS NAZIR  
JPJ-2

OBJECTION TO  
EXEMPTIONS  
7-1-13 [24]

**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. The debtor is married by the debtor's spouse did not join in this petition. The debtor claimed exemptions pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 703.140(b) but failed to file the waiver by the nonfiling spouse as required by Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. § 703.140(a)(2). However, after the objection was filed, the waiver was filed.

26. 09-46258-A-13 EDGAR/TERESITA OPENIANO MOTION TO  
PGM-3 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'  
ATTORNEY (FEES \$660)  
7-10-13 [52]

**Final Ruling:** This compensation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(a)(6). The failure of the trustee, the debtor, the United States Trustee, the creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the 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 additional fees represent reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1, if applicable.

27. 11-33763-A-13 LANI/CHRIS CATALANO MOTION TO  
SDH-2 MODIFY PLAN  
6-24-13 [37]

**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 motion will be granted on condition the plan is further modified to provide for total plan payments of \$54,709.33 through June 2013.. The plan, as further modified, complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

28. 13-23968-A-13 FREDERICK/MEREDITH HOWE MOTION TO  
MDR-2 CONFIRM PLAN  
6-27-13 [49]

**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.

29. 13-28980-A-13 TAMARA MCFARLAND MOTION TO  
SJJ-1 VALUE COLLATERAL  
VS. GECRB/FINANCING 7-12-13 [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 valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$5,000 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$5,000 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$5,000 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

30. 10-24690-A-13 JAMES/RENEE CARROLL MOTION TO  
FF-4 MODIFY PLAN  
6-27-13 [52]

**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.

31. 13-27891-A-13 ERIK MAIDEN AND LILYBETH OBJECTION TO  
JPJ-1 BAUTISTA CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS CASE  
7-23-13 [31]

**Final Ruling:** The court continues the hearing on the objection and the dismissal motion to September 9, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. so that they may be considered with the debtor's motion to confirm a modified plan.

32. 13-27891-A-13 ERIK MAIDEN AND LILYBETH OBJECTION TO  
MBB-1 BAUTISTA CONFIRMATION OF PLAN  
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON VS. 7-23-13 [34]

**Final Ruling:** The objecting party has voluntarily dismissed the objection.

33. 12-28694-A-13 MIKE DOWNIE AND CHERI MOTION TO  
RAC-2 TILLET-DOWNIE INCUR DEBT  
7-15-13 [33]

**Final Ruling:** This motion to borrow has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b) 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 to incur a purchase money loan to purchase a vehicle will be granted. The motion establishes a need for the vehicle and it does not appear that repayment of the loan will unduly jeopardize the debtor's performance of the plan.