

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

November 13, 2018 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 18. 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 DECEMBER 10, 2018 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY NOVEMBER 26, 2018, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 3, 2018. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 19 THROUGH 28 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 NOVEMBER 19, 2018, AT 2:30 P.M.

November 13, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 18-25708-A-13 REIHANNON PRICE OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-18 [13]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

First, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 72 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 \$30,861 but Form 122C shows that the debtor will have \$149,103 over the next five years.

Third, Counsel for the debtor has opted to receive fees pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 rather than by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017. However, the rights and responsibilities agreement executed and filed indicates that counsel received \$2,000 will receive a further \$2,000 in fees. The plan, on the other hand, requires payment of \$2,000 but states nothing was paid prior to the filing of the case. Therefore, the provision in the proposed plan requiring the trustee to pay the fees contradicts the agreement with the debtor.

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

2. 16-26714-A-13 PAULA HUTCHINSON MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
ROBERT CHAN VS. 10-9-18 [101]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, 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 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1). The movant is the plaintiff is a state court personal injury action against the debtor. The movant seeks relief to proceed with the state court action with the proviso that any judgment/settlement shall be paid from the debtor's insurance coverage, if any, and presented to this court in a proof of claim to the extent the movant wishes to participate in the chapter 13 case. Given the available insurance, there is cause to modify the automatic stay.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

3. 14-26424-A-13 KAROLYN MOTION TO
KWS-2 JOHNSON-LOUDERMILK VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE
9-27-18 [65]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

The case was dismissed on September 5 based on the following ruling:

"The trustee's Notice of Filed Claims was filed and served on February 11, 2015 as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(d). That notice advised the debtor of all claims filed by creditors. Given the claims filed and their amounts, it will take 91 months to pay the dividends promised by the confirmed plan. The confirmed plan specifies that it must be completed within 60 months, the maximum plan duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

The debtor failed to reconcile the plan with the claims, either by filing and serving a motion to modify the plan to provide for all claims within the maximum duration permitted by section 1322(d), or by objecting to claims. This is required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(d)(5) which provides: "If the Notice of Filed Claims includes allowed claims that are not provided for in the chapter 13 plan, or that will prevent the chapter 13 plan from being completed timely, the debtor shall file a motion to modify the chapter 13 plan, along with any valuation and lien avoidance motions not previously filed, in order to reconcile the chapter 13 plan and the filed claims with the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code. These motions shall be filed and served no later than ninety (90) days after service by the trustee of the Notice of Filed Claims and set for hearing by the debtor on the earliest available court date." See In re Kincaid, 316 B.R. 735 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2004).

The time to modify the plan under Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(d)(5) has expired. This material breach of the plan is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6)."

The motion to vacate the dismissal will be denied for two reasons,

First, the motion fails to explain why the debtor did not oppose the trustee's dismissal motion. The debtor did not file written opposition to the motion as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1).

Second, the motion does not explain why the debtor failed to comply timely with Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(d) (5).

4. 14-26424-A-13 KAROLYN MOTION TO
KWS-1 JOHNSON-LOUDERMILK MODIFY PLAN
9-27-18 [59]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

There are inconsistent statements regarding plan payments in the motion and the confirmed plan. The plan provides for \$107,785 payments through September 2018 and a monthly payment of \$2,435 beginning in August 2018. The motion, however, provides for \$105,675 payments through September 2018 and a monthly payment of \$1,800 beginning in October 2014.

5. 17-26025-A-13 PATRICIA SHIELDS MOTION TO
MEV-3 CONFIRM PLAN
9-26-18 [53]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 69 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Second, the debtor failed to utilize the court's mandatory form plan as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(a) (effective on and after December 1, 2017, in all cases regardless when filed).

Third, the debtor has failed to make \$14,750 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).

Fourth, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b) (2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 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 cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the post petition arrears owed to the Class 1 home loan. 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 Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (5) (B).

6. 18-26527-A-13 GEOFF CUMMINS AND LAURA MOTION FOR
DVW-1 BRAMBILA RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
U.S. BANK N.A. VS. 10-30-18 [11]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, 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 in part.

The movant completed a nonjudicial foreclosure sale before the bankruptcy case was filed. Under California law, once a nonjudicial foreclosure sale has occurred, the trustor has no right of redemption. Moeller v. Lien, 25 Cal. App.4th 822, 831 (1994). In this case, therefore, the debtor has no right to ignore the foreclosure. If the foreclosure sale was not in accord with state law, this should be asserted as a defense to an unlawful detainer proceeding in state court. The purchaser's right to possession after a foreclosure sale is based on the fact that the property has been "duly sold" by foreclosure proceedings. Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 1161a. Therefore, it is necessary that the plaintiff prove that each of the statutory procedures has been complied with as a condition for seeking possession of the property. See Miller & Starr, California Real Estate 2d, §§ 18.140 and 18.144 (1989). Alternatively, the debtor should press an independent claim for relief in state court to challenge the foreclosure. The automatic stay is a respite from creditor action while the debtor attempts to reorganize. Here, the debtor has no apparent right to reorganize the movant's debt because of the foreclosure unless that foreclosure was improper. Whether or not it was improper must be decided in state court.

Therefore, the stay will be modified to allow the movant to obtain possession of the subject 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."

Relief under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) will be denied because the movant is not "a creditor whose claim is secured by an interest in such real property," for purposes of 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). The movant now is the owner of the property. According to the motion, the movant purchased the property at the foreclosure sale. The movant does not hold a debt secured by the property. Relief under section 362(d)(4) is available only to creditors who are secured by the property. Ellis v. Yu (In re Ellis), 523 B.R. 673, 678-80 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2014). The movant is not secured by the property. The movant is the owner of the property.

In rem relief will be denied under 11 U.S.C. § 105 as such relief requires an adversary proceeding. Johnson v. TRE Holdings LLC (In re Johnson), 346 B.R. 190, 195 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

7. 18-26529-A-13 BRIAN/HEATHER HENDRICKS MOTION TO
SLH-1 EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
10-23-18 [10]

- 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 most recent petition.

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

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the

presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change."

Here, it appears that the debtor was unable to maintain plan payments in the first case due to serious health condition that interrupted the debtor's ability to work for six weeks. That condition has now ended, the debtor is working and is able to maintain plan payments. This is a sufficient change in circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

8. 18-21033-A-13 DANIEL/CARMEN CARSON MOTION TO
SLE-4 VACATE DISMISSAL OF CASE
10-30-18 [66]

- 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 but the case will be dismissed if a plan is not confirmed on December 17.

The case was dismissed when the debtors failed to confirm a plan by the deadline set by the court. Counsel for the debtors acknowledges that the deadline was not met because attorneys and other personnel left his office. This issue has been rectified and a proposed plan filed together with a motion to confirm it. The court will vacate the dismissal but if the proposed plan is not confirmed at the upcoming December 17 hearing, the case will be dismissed again.

9. 18-25642-A-13 CHENNEL BREED OBJECTION TO
MSK-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
SPECIALIZED LOAN SERVICING L.L.C. VS. 10-22-18 [19]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

12. 18-25669-A-13 JOSE SANDOVAL OBJECTION TO
USA-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE VS. 10-22-18 [36]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

13. 18-25775-A-13 ELIZABETH ANDRADE OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-18 [22]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

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

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Gateway Lending 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

Third, the debtor has not met the burden of proving the plan's feasibility as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The court has terminated the automatic stay to allow the lessor for the debtor's business premises to proceed with its eviction of the debtor's business. The debtor has produced no evidence that the business will continue to operate.

15. 18-25585-A-13 DWAYNE JACKSON OBJECTION TO
TF-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
MP HOLDINGS, L.L.C. VS. 10-26-18 [38]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The objection will be sustained in part.

To the extent the plan proposes to assume the lease of commercial property from the objecting creditor, the provision is inconsistent with court's order requiring the parties to litigate in state court to determine if the lease was terminated before the bankruptcy case was filed.

Even if the lease can be assumed, the debtor has come forward with no evidence that the protracted cure of the rent/monetary default as proposed in the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. § 365(b)(1).

16. 18-26188-A-13 ANTHONY/MIRIAM MOTION TO
MMM-1 DANGERFIELD VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. REAL TIME SOLUTIONS, INC. 10-30-18 [14]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$400,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Select Portfolio. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$450,469 as of the petition date. Therefore,

Real Time Solution'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 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st 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. 9th 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 \$400,000. 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 (5th Cir. 1980).

17. 18-24489-A-13 MATTHEW/ARIANA VICKERS MOTION FOR
EAT-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, L.L.C. VS. 10-16-18 [53]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and to obtain possession of the subject property following sale. The movant is secured by a deed of trust encumbering the debtor's real property. The plan classifies the movant's claim in Class 1 and requires that the post-petition note installments be paid by the trustee to the movant. Because the debtor has failed to make all plan payments, the trustee was unable to make at least two monthly post-petition monthly mortgage payments to the movant as required by the plan. This default is cause to terminate the automatic stay. See Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis), 60 B.R. 432, 434-435 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985).

The loan documentation contains an attorney's fee provision and the movant is an over-secured creditor. The motion demands payment of fees and costs. The court concludes that a similarly situated creditor would have filed this motion. Under these circumstances, the movant is entitled to recover reasonable fees and costs incurred in connection with prosecuting this motion. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(b). See also Kord Enterprises II v. California Commerce Bank (In re Kord Enterprises II), 139 F.3d 684, 689 (9th Cir. 1998).

Therefore, the movant shall file and serve a separate motion seeking an award of fees and costs. The motion for fees and costs must be filed and served no later than 14 days after the conclusion of the hearing on the underlying motion. If not filed and served within this deadline, or if the movant does not intend to seek fees and costs, the court denies all fees and costs. The order granting the underlying motion shall provide that fees and costs are denied. If denied, the movant and its agents are barred in all events and circumstances, in connection with this bankruptcy case or otherwise, from recovering any fees and costs incurred in connection with the prosecution of the motion.

If a motion for fees and costs is filed, it shall be set for hearing pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) or (f)(2). It shall be served on the debtor, the debtor's attorney, the trustee, and the United States Trustee. Any motion shall be supported by a declaration explaining the work performed in connection with the motion, the name of the person performing the services and a brief description of that person's relevant professional background, the amount of time billed for the work, the rate charged, and the costs incurred. If fees or costs are being shared, split, or otherwise paid to any person who is not a member, partner, or regular associate of counsel of record for the movant, the declaration shall identify those person(s) and disclose the terms of the arrangement with them.

Alternatively, if the debtor will stipulate to an award of fees and costs not

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

19. 15-25308-A-13 LARRY PERKINS MOTION FOR
MRG-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
ASPEN PROPERTIES GROUP, L.L.C. VS. 10-12-18 [48]

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 (9th 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 (9th 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 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and to obtain possession of the subject real property following sale. The movant is secured by a deed of trust encumbering the debtor's real property. The debtor has confirmed a plan that does not provide for the payment of the movant's claim. Further, the debtor has not paid the claim under the terms of the contract with the movant since this case was filed. Because the debtor has not paid the movant's claim, and will not pay it in connection with the chapter 13 case, there is cause to terminate the automatic stay.

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

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

20. 18-24442-A-13 RONALD TREJO OBJECTION TO
JPJ-2 CLAIM
VS. CAVALRY SPV I, L.L.C. 9-5-18 [21]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Cavalry SPV I 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 (9th 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 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained and the claim disallowed.

Because the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract, California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach but the statute renews upon each payment made after default. The proof of claim indicates the last payment was on October 20, 2009. Therefore, using this date as the date of breach, when the case was filed on July 16, 2018, more than 4 years had

passed. Therefore, when the bankruptcy was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1).

21. 18-25642-A-13 CHENNEL BREED OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
10-25-18 [24]

Final Ruling: The court concludes that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter.

The objection will be overruled and the motion denied. The objection relates to the alleged failure of the debtor to avoid the judicial lien of American Express Centurion Bank. However, such motion was filed and granted. See JTN-1.

22. 18-25642-A-13 CHENNEL BREED MOTION TO
JTN-1 AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN
VS. AMERICAN EXPRESS CENTURION BANK 10-3-18 [12]

Final Ruling: This motion to avoid a judicial lien 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 (9th 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 (9th 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.

A judgment was entered against debtor in favor of the respondent. The abstract of judgment was recorded in the county where the debtor's home was located. In this bankruptcy the debtor claimed an exemption of \$100,000 and it appears from the record that the debtor is entitled to such exemption.

The motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). The subject real property had an approximate value of \$287,599 as of the petition date. Docket 24. The unavoidable liens totaled approximately \$257,000 on that same date.

The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this judicial lien impairs the debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing will be avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

23. 18-23744-A-13 RYAN/CHRISTINE FINNECY MOTION TO
AB-1 CONFIRM PLAN
9-24-18 [29]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

While a certificate of service accompanies the proposed plan and the motion to confirm it, the certificate refers to an appended service list that in fact is not appended to the certificate. There is no proof that anyone was served with the motion.

24. 15-21845-A-13 JOSEPH BARNES MOTION TO
SS-10 MODIFY PLAN
10-3-18 [214]

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 debtor, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the trustee, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th 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.

25. 18-23858-A-13 ROBERT/JUNE ROSENBERGER OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CLAIM
VS. GOLDEN ONE CREDIT UNION 9-5-18 [16]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Golden One Credit Union 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 (9th 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 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(c)(3)(A) specifies that when a claim is based on a revolving consumer credit agreement, such as a credit card account, the claim holder must file with the proof of claim a statement that includes the name of the entity from whom the creditor purchased the account, the name of the entity to whom the debt was owed at the time of the last transaction, the date of the account holder's last transaction, the date of the last payment, and the date on which the account was charged to profit and loss.

The proof of claim here is for a consumer credit card account. The statement required by Rule 3001(c)(3) is not attached to the proof of claim nor has one been furnished in a response to the objection. The claim will be disallowed.

26. 18-25259-A-13 NIKOLAY MARTYNOV
JPJ-2

OBJECTION TO
EXEMPTIONS
10-11-18 [34]

Final Ruling: This objection to the debtor's exemptions has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the debtor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th 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 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the debtor's default is entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

The trustee objects to all of the debtor's Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b) exemptions claimed on Schedule C. The trustee argues that because the debtor is married and because the debtor's spouse has not joined in the chapter 13 petition, the debtor must file his spouse's waiver of right to claim exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2). This was not done.

A debtor's exemptions are determined as of the date the bankruptcy petition is filed. Owen v. Owen, 500 U.S. 305, 314 (1991); see also In re Chappell, 373 B.R. 73, 77 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2007) (holding that "critical date for determining exemption rights is the petition date"). Thus, the court applies the facts and law existing on the date the case was commenced to determine the nature and extent of the debtor's exemptions.

11 U.S.C. § 522(b)(1) permits the states to opt out of the federal exemption statutory scheme set forth in section 522(d). In enacting Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.130, the State of California opted out of the federal exemption scheme relegating a debtor to whatever exemptions are provided under state law. Thus, substantive issues regarding the allowance or disallowance of a claimed exemption are governed by state law in California.

California state law gives debtors filing for bankruptcy the right to choose (1) a set of state law exemptions similar but not identical to the Bankruptcy Code exemptions; or (2) California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 703.130, 703.140. In the case of a married debtor, if either spouse files for bankruptcy individually, California's regular non-bankruptcy exemptions apply unless, while the bankruptcy case is pending, both spouses waive in writing the right to claim the regular non-bankruptcy state exemptions in any bankruptcy proceeding filed by the other spouse. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(a)(2).

Here, the debtor is asserting the exemptions of Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b), which require a spousal waiver. That waiver was not filed with the petition.

27. 18-25669-A-13 JOSE SANDOVAL
BANK OF THE WEST VS.

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
10-19-18 [30]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed without prejudice.

