

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

Honorable Fredrick E. Clement  
Sacramento Federal Courthouse  
501 I Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Courtroom 28, Department A  
Sacramento, California

**DAY: MONDAY**  
**DATE: NOVEMBER 2, 2020**  
**CALENDAR: 9:00 A.M. CHAPTER 7 CASES**

**RULINGS**

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

**"No Ruling"** means the likely disposition of the matter will not be disclosed in advance of the hearing. The matter will be called; parties wishing to be heard should rise and be heard.

**"Tentative Ruling"** means the likely disposition, and the reasons therefor, are set forth herein. The matter will be called. Aggrieved parties or parties for whom written opposition was not required should rise and be heard. Parties favored by the tentative ruling need not appear. Non-appearing parties are advised that the court may adopt a ruling other than that set forth herein without further hearing or notice.

**"Final Ruling"** means that the matter will be resolved in the manner, and for the reasons, indicated below. The matter will not be called; parties and/or counsel need not appear and will not be heard on the matter.

**CHANGES TO PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED RULINGS**

On occasion, the court will change its intended ruling on some of the matters to be called and will republish its rulings. The parties and counsel are advised to recheck the posted rulings after 3:00 p.m. on the next business day prior to the hearing. Any such changed ruling will be preceded by the following bold face text: "**[Since posting its original rulings, the court has changed its intended ruling on this matter]**".

**ERRORS IN RULINGS**

Clerical errors of an insignificant nature, e.g. nomenclature ("2017 Honda Accord," rather than "2016 Honda Accord"), amounts, ("\$880," not "\$808"), may be corrected in (1) tentative rulings by appearance at the hearing; or (2) final rulings by appropriate ex parte application. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a) *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024. All other errors, including those occasioned by mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect, must be corrected by noticed motion. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 60(b), *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9023.

1. [20-23111](#)-A-7    **IN RE: COFFEE TEA DISTRIBUTORS, INC.**  
[KJH-2](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR GABRIELSON & COMPANY,  
ACCOUNTANT(S)  
9-29-2020    [[16](#)]

GARY FRALEY/ATTY. FOR DBT.

### **Final Ruling**

**Application:** Allowance of Final Compensation and Expense  
Reimbursement

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

**Disposition:** Approved

**Order:** Civil minute order

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

### **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES**

In this Chapter 7 case, Gabrielson & Company, accountant for the trustee, has applied for an allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The applicant requests that the court allow compensation in the amount of \$4,266.00 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$110.29.

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

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

### **CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

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

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

Gabrielson & Company's application for allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to

appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the application,

IT IS ORDERED that the application is approved on a final basis. The court allows final compensation in the amount of \$4,266.00 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$110.29.

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

2. [20-24534](#)-A-7     **IN RE: NATALIE DAVIDSON**  
[MWR-1](#)

MOTION TO COMPEL ABANDONMENT  
10-4-2020    [[18](#)]

MALCOLM RUTHVEN/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
NON-OPPOSITION

### **Tentative Ruling**

**Motion:** Compel Abandonment of Property of the Estate  
**Notice:** LBR 9014-1(f)(1); trustee's non-opposition filed  
**Disposition:** Granted only as to the business and such business assets described in the motion  
**Order:** Prepared by moving party pursuant to the instructions below

**Business Description:** Debtor's Marriage and Family Therapy Services and the following business assets: leased office space at 744 Empire Street, Fairfield CA 94534, Leased 2020 Subaru Outback, Apple MacBook Air laptop and Apple iPhone, Accounts Receivable of \$425.00

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

Property of the estate may be abandoned under § 554 of the Bankruptcy Code if property of the estate is "burdensome to the estate or of inconsequential value and benefit to the estate." See 11 U.S.C. § 554(a)-(b); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 6007(b). Upon request of a party in interest, the court may issue an order that the trustee abandon property of the estate if the statutory standards for abandonment are fulfilled.

The business described above is either burdensome to the estate or of inconsequential value to the estate. An order compelling abandonment of such business is warranted. The order will compel

abandonment of only the business and its assets that are described in the motion.

3. [19-24641](#)-A-7     **IN RE: S P E DRYWALL, INC**  
[MPD-2](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF ARMANDO DE LA TORRE, CLAIM NUMBER 3  
9-15-2020    [[62](#)]

BRUCE DWIGGINS/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
HOWARD NEVINS/ATTY. FOR MV.

### **Final Ruling**

**Objection:** Objection to Claim

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

**Disposition:** Sustained

**Order:** Prepared by objecting party

### **DEFAULT**

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

### **BURDEN OF PROOF**

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

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

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

#### **ANALYSIS**

The trustee objects to Armando de la Torres’s claim amount. The claim is unclear as to the exact status of the claim- whether it is general unsecured or priority wage claim. Also, nothing is provided to show how the \$2,300.00 claim amount is calculated. Two paystubs are attached to the claim which do not add up to the \$2,300.00 claim amount, Attachment, Claim 3-1.

The trustee objects to the claim, stating it appears to be a duplicate of an amended wage priority proof of claim filed by the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (“Labor Commissioner”) on behalf of approximately 268 wage claimants, including Armando de la Torres. Attachment 2, Claim 12-2. For the foregoing reasons, the court finds the claimant’s proof of claim lacks prima facie validity and will sustain the objection.

4. [19-24641](#)-A-7     **IN RE: S P E DRYWALL, INC**  
[MPD-3](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF MARCO ALVAREZ, CLAIM NUMBER 4  
9-15-2020 [67]

BRUCE DWIGGINS/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
HOWARD NEVINS/ATTY. FOR MV.

#### **Final Ruling**

**Objection:** Objection to Claim

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

**Disposition:** Sustained

**Order:** Prepared by objecting party

#### **DEFAULT**

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

#### **BURDEN OF PROOF**

A proof of claim is “deemed allowed, unless a party in interest . . . objects.” 11 U.S.C. § 502(a). Federal Rule of Bankruptcy

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

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

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

#### **ANALYSIS**

The trustee objects to Marco Alvarez's claim amount. The claim is unclear as to the exact status of the claim- whether it is general unsecured or priority wage claim. Also, nothing is provided to show how the \$2,300.00 claim amount is calculated. One paycheck and one paystub are attached to the claim which do not add up to the \$2,300.00 claim amount, Attachment, Claim 4-1.

The trustee objects to the claim, stating it appears to be a duplicate of an amended wage priority proof of claim filed by the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("Labor Commissioner") on behalf of approximately 268 wage claimants, including Marco Alvarez. Attachment 2, Claim 12-2. For the foregoing reasons, the court finds the claimant's proof of claim lacks prima facie validity and will sustain the objection.

5. [19-24641](#)-A-7    **IN RE: S P E DRYWALL, INC**  
[MPD-4](#)

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF JUAN M. LOPEZ, CLAIM NUMBER 6  
9-15-2020    [[72](#)]

BRUCE DWIGGINS/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
HOWARD NEVINS/ATTY. FOR MV.

### **Final Ruling**

**Objection:** Objection to Claim

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

**Disposition:** Sustained

**Order:** Prepared by objecting party

### **DEFAULT**

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

### **BURDEN OF PROOF**

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

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

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

## ANALYSIS

The trustee objects to Juan M. Lopez's claim amount. The claim is unclear as to the exact status of the claim- whether it is general unsecured or priority wage claim. Also, nothing is provided to show how the \$8,875.00 was calculated, Claim 6-1.

The claim appears to be a duplicate of an amended wage priority proof of claim filed by the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement ("Labor Commissioner") on behalf of approximately 268 wage claimants, including Juan M. Lopez. Attachment 2, Claim 12-2. For the foregoing reasons, the court finds the claimant's proof of claim lacks prima facie validity and will sustain the objection.

6. [18-25447](#)-A-7     **IN RE: JAVIER LOPEZ**  
[MWB-1](#)

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF CAPITAL ONE BANK  
9-28-2020    [[22](#)]

MARK BRIDEN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

DEBTOR DISCHARGED: 01/07/2019;    JOINT DEBTOR DISCHARGED:  
01/07/2019

### Final Ruling

**Motion:** Avoid Lien that Impairs Exemption

**Disposition:** Denied without prejudice

**Order:** Civil minute order

### INSUFFICIENT SERVICE

The court will deny the motion without prejudice on grounds of insufficient service of process on the responding party. A motion to avoid a lien is a contested matter requiring service of the motion in the manner provided by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7004. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4003(d), 9014(b); see also *In re Villar*, 317 B.R. 88, 92 n.6 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2004). Under Rule 7004, service on FDIC-insured institutions must "be made by certified mail addressed to an officer of the institution" unless one of the exceptions applies. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h).

Service of the motion was insufficient. Service of the motion was not made by certified mail to Capital One Bank, and was not addressed to an officer of Capital One Bank. No showing has been made that the exceptions in Rule 7004(h) are applicable. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h)(1)-(3).

### RECYCLED DCN

The docket control number given for this matter violates the court's Local Rules, LBR 9014-1(c), regarding proper use of docket control numbers. The movant used the same docket control number MWB-1 for a previously filed Motion to Reopen Chapter 7 case, ECF 18. When using

a docket control number, a party must use both letters (usually initials of the attorney for the movant) and a number. The numerical portion of the docket control number must be "the number that is one number higher than the number of motions previously filed by said attorney" in that particular case. LBR 9014-1(c)(3). Thus, a party may not use the same docket control number on separate matters filed in the same case.

7. [20-24552](#)-A-7     **IN RE: EUGENIA TORRES**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES  
10-13-2020   [\[15\]](#)

**Final Ruling**

The case having been dismissed, the matter is dropped as moot.

8. [17-20689](#)-A-7     **IN RE: MONUMENT SECURITY, INC.**  
[DNL-27](#)

MOTION FOR ALLOWANCE OF CHAPTER 11 ADMINISTRATIVE WAGE  
CLAIMS AND/OR MOTION TO AUTHORIZE DISTRIBUTION TO CREDITORS,  
MOTION FOR ALLOWANCE AND PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PAYROLL  
TAX CLAIMS  
10-5-2020   [\[805\]](#)

MATTHEW EASON/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
J. CUNNINGHAM/ATTY. FOR MV.

**No Ruling**

9. [17-20689](#)-A-7     **IN RE: MONUMENT SECURITY, INC.**  
[DNL-28](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR BACHECKI, CROM & CO., LLP,  
ACCOUNTANT(S)  
10-5-2020   [\[810\]](#)

MATTHEW EASON/ATTY. FOR DBT.

**Final Ruling**

**Application:** Allowance of Final Compensation and Expense  
Reimbursement

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

**Disposition:** Approved

**Order:** Civil minute order

Unopposed motions are subject to the rules of default. Fed. R. Civ.  
P. 55, *incorporated by* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7055, 9014(c). Written

opposition to this application was required not less than 14 days before the hearing on the application. LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B). None has been filed. The default of the responding party is entered. The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

#### **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES**

In this Chapter 7 case, Bacheki, Crom & Co, LLP, accountant for the trustee, has applied for an allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The applicant requests that the court allow compensation in the amount of \$80,750.80 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$249.20.

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

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

#### **CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

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

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

Bacheki, Crom & Co, LLP's application for allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the application,

IT IS ORDERED that the application is approved on a final basis. The court allows final compensation in the amount of \$80,750.80 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$249.20.

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

10. [17-20689](#)-A-7    **IN RE: MONUMENT SECURITY, INC.**  
[DNL-29](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR J. MICHAEL HOPPER, CHAPTER 7  
TRUSTEE(S)  
10-5-2020    [[816](#)]

MATTHEW EASON/ATTY. FOR DBT.

### **Final Ruling**

**Application:** Allowance of Compensation and Expense Reimbursement

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

**Disposition:** Approved

**Order:** Civil minute order

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

### **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES**

A trustee's compensation is considered in accordance with §§ 326(a) and 330(a). In 2005, "Congress removed Chapter 7 trustees from the list of professionals subject to the Section 330(a)(3) factors. . . . [and] introduced a new provision to Section 330 requiring courts to treat the reasonable compensation awarded to trustees as a 'commission, based on Section 326.'" *Matter of JFK Capital Holdings, L.L.C.*, 880 F.3d 747, 752 (5th Cir. 2018) (quoting 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(7)). "[A] trustee's request for compensation should be presumed reasonable as long as the amount requested does not exceed the statutory maximum calculated pursuant to § 326. [A]bsent extraordinary circumstances, bankruptcy courts should approve chapter 7, 12 and 13 trustee fees without any significant additional review. If the court has found that extraordinary circumstances are present, only then does it become appropriate to conduct a further inquiry to determine whether there exists a rational relationship between the compensation requested and the services rendered." *In re Ruiz*, 541 B.R. 892, 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2015) (second alteration in original) (citations omitted) (internal quotation marks omitted).

In short, § 330(a)(7) "treats the commission as a fixed percentage, using Section 326 not only as a maximum but as a baseline presumption for reasonableness in each case." *Matter of JFK Capital Holdings*, 880 F.3d at 755. This provision "is best understood as a directive to simply apply the formula of § 362 in every case." *Id.* at 753-54. The "reduction or denial of compensation . . . should be a rare event" occurring only when truly exceptional circumstances are present. *Id.* at 756.

In this Chapter 7 case, the trustee has applied for an allowance of compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The court finds (1) that the compensation requested by the trustee is consistent with 11 U.S.C. § 326(a); (2) that no extraordinary circumstances are present in this case, see *In re Salgado-Nava*, 473 B.R. 911 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2012); and (3) that expenses for which reimbursement is sought are actual and necessary.

#### **CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

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

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

The chapter 7 trustee's application for allowance of compensation and reimbursement of expenses has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the application,

IT IS ORDERED that the application is approved on a final basis. The court allows to the trustee compensation in the amount of \$57,000.00 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$0.00.

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

11. [17-20689](#)-A-7 **IN RE: MONUMENT SECURITY, INC.**  
[DNL-30](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR DESMOND, NOLAN, LIVAICH &  
CUNNINGHAM, TRUSTEE'S ATTORNEY(S)  
10-5-2020 [[821](#)]

MATTHEW EASON/ATTY. FOR DBT.  
J. CUNNINGHAM/ATTY. FOR MV.

#### **Final Ruling**

**Application:** Allowance of Final Compensation and Expense  
Reimbursement

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

**Disposition:** Approved

**Order:** Civil minute order

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

The court considers the record, accepting well-pleaded facts as true. *TeleVideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987).

#### **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES**

In this Chapter 7 case, Desmond, Nolan, Livaich & Cunningham, attorney for the trustee, has applied for an allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses. The applicant requests that the court allow compensation in the amount of \$80,560.43 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$14,939.57.

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

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

#### **CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

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

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

Desmond, Nolan, Livaich & Cunningham's application for allowance of final compensation and reimbursement of expenses has been presented to the court. Having entered the default of respondent for failure to appear, timely oppose, or otherwise defend in the matter, and having considered the well-pleaded facts of the application,

IT IS ORDERED that the application is approved on a final basis. The court allows final compensation in the amount of \$80,560.43 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$14,939.57.

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

12. [20-24656](#)-A-7    **IN RE: MONICA MARTINEZ**  
[DVW-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY  
10-19-2020    [[17](#)]

DIANE WEIFENBACH/ATTY. FOR MV.  
U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION VS.

**Tentative Ruling**

**Motion:** Stay Relief

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

**Disposition:** Granted

**Order:** Civil minute order

**Subject:** 803 Windward Dr., Rodeo, CA 94572

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

**STAY RELIEF**

Section 362(d)(1) authorizes stay relief for cause shown. Cause includes the debtor's pre-petition loss of real property by way of foreclosure. In this case, the debtor's interest in the property was extinguished prior to the petition date by a foreclosure sale. The motion will be granted. The movant may take such actions as are authorized by applicable non-bankruptcy law, including prosecution of an unlawful detainer action (except for monetary damages) to obtain possession of the subject property. The motion will be granted, and the 14-day stay of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) will be waived. No other relief will be awarded.

**CIVIL MINUTE ORDER**

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

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

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

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted. The automatic stay is vacated with respect to the property described in the motion, commonly known as 803 Windward Dr., Rodeo, CA 94572, as to all parties in interest. The 14-day stay of the order under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived. Any party with

standing may take such actions as are authorized by applicable non-bankruptcy law, including prosecution of an unlawful detainer action (except for monetary damages) to obtain possession of the subject property.

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

13. [20-23497](#)-A-7    **IN RE: KENNETH PETTIS**  
[MJD-1](#)

MOTION TO CONVERT CASE FROM CHAPTER 7 TO CHAPTER 13  
10-19-2020    [[18](#)]

MATTHEW DECAMINADA/ATTY. FOR DBT.

**No Ruling**