

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

November 21, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 4. 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 19, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 5, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY DECEMBER 12, 2016. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 5 THROUGH 18 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON NOVEMBER 28, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

November 21, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 11-46816-A-13 LARRY/PAULA HUNLEY MOTION TO
PGM-2 MODIFY PLAN
9-29-16 [83]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has failed to make \$5,000 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, 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 all of the post-petition arrears owed to Shellpoint on its 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).

2. 15-28416-A-13 PATRICIA HANSEN MOTION TO
LBG-1 INCUR DEBT
11-3-16 [29]

- 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 to incur a loan in order to refinance and consolidate two home loans will be granted. The motion establishes that the new loan will like enhance the ability of the debtor to complete the plan.

3. 16-23841-A-13 RANDY/STEPHANIE STANLEY MOTION TO
SNM-10 SET ASIDE
10-20-16 [104]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

At the instance of the debtor, the court valued the net value of property securing a tax lien held by the FTB at \$9,400. This valuation assumed the subject property had a gross value of \$19,400 and a senior tax lien held by the IRS secured \$10,000, leaving \$9,400 to secure the tax claim of the FTB. As it turns out, the IRS's secured claim is substantially higher. It is \$19,400 and at that amount, the net value in the debtor's assets is \$0. This motion seeks to reduce the secured claim of the FTB from \$9,400 to \$0 consistent with the net value of the subject property.

While were these all of the facts the court would grant the motion. However, the FTB filed a proof of claim acknowledging that its claim was completely unsecured. Whether or not the plan provides for the FTB claim as secured, it cannot be paid on a secured claim because its proof of claim does not demand payment of a secured claim. The plan provides in relevant part:

"2.01. With [exceptions not relevant here] a claim will not be paid pursuant to this plan unless a timely proof of claim is filed by or on behalf of a creditor, including a secured creditor.

. . .

2.04. The proof of claim, not this plan or the schedules, shall determine the amount and classification of a claim unless the court's disposition of a claim objection, valuation motion, or lien avoidance motion affects the amount or classification of the claim."

Hence, the FTB will be paid as an unsecured claim whether or not the motion is granted. Unless the proof of claim is amended to demand a secured claim, this motion is moot.

4. 13-26196-A-13 ELSA NORIEGA AND HIGINIO MOTION TO
AVN-1 NAVARRO VACATE DISMISSAL
10-22-16 [72]

- Telephone Appearance
- Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied.

This case was dismissed on October 7, 2016 as a result of the notice of default filed and served by the trustee on August 30, 2016. This dismissal procedure is authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(g). According to that notice, Through August 2016, the debtor failed to make plan payments totaling \$700. The notice of default also demanded the additional \$400 due on September 29, a total amount of \$1,100.

This notice of default procedure, as authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(g), 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 as well as paying the additional payment that would come due during the 30-day period to cure the 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.

Here, the debtor did nothing and on October 7 the trustee filed a declaration certifying that none of the above options had been exercised and requesting dismissal. That same day the court dismissed the case.

This motion seeks to vacate the dismissal but it fails to demonstrate any cause to do so. The debtor and the debtor's attorney were duly served with the notice of default. The notice of default was accurate - the plan payments were in default.

The debtor asserts that he met with his attorney in early and mid September and decided to modify the plan. However, there is no record that the debtor signed a proposed plan or a declaration in support of a motion to confirm it. It appears that the debtor assumed his attorney was filing a motion to confirm a modified plan. That did not occur. This may justify some action against the attorney but it is not cause to vacate the dismissal. There is no excusable neglect.

FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

5. 16-24204-A-13 STACEY BASE ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
11-1-16 [25]

Final Ruling: The order to show cause will be discharged.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$73 installment when due on October 27. However, after the issuance of the order to show cause, the delinquent installment was paid. No prejudice was caused by the late payment.

6. 16-22206-A-13 JACQUELINE/ROBERT COONEY OBJECTION TO
HDR-3 CLAIM
VS. PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC 10-3-16 [59]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Pacific Gas & Electric 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.

The claim will be allowed as nonpriority unsecured claim in the amount of \$98.68. The remainder of the amount demanded in the proof of claim will be disallowed. The remainder relates to a bill for utility services more than a decade old. This claim, based at best on a written contract, must be pursued within four from the breach of the agreement to provide utility services. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. Given that the claim was due more than a decade ago, the limitations period has expired. Therefore, when the bankruptcy was filed, this portion of the debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1). The remainder relates to utility services at a different address and under a different account.

7. 16-22206-A-13 JACQUELINE/ROBERT COONEY MOTION TO
HDR-4 CONFIRM PLAN
10-4-16 [66]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th 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 (9th 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.

8. 15-21309-A-13 SARA/ANDRE GRAHAM MOTION TO
PBL-1 AVOID JUDICIAL LIEN
VS. GCFS, INC. 10-3-16 [42]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice. A review of the certificate of service indicates that the respondent was not served with the motion.

9. 15-21309-A-13 SARA/ANDRE GRAHAM MOTION TO
PBL-2 MODIFY PLAN
10-3-16 [47]

Final Ruling: The court concludes that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. There is no outstanding objection to the relief requested and the court will not materially alter the relief requested. Accordingly, an actual hearing is unnecessary and this matter is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006).

The motion will be granted provided the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to require a plan payment of \$2,038 beginning September 25, 2016. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

10. 15-21309-A-13 SARA/ANDRE GRAHAM OBJECTION TO
PBL-3 CLAIM
VS. RESURGENT CAPITAL SERVICES 10-3-16 [54]

Final Ruling: The objection has been voluntarily dismissed.

11. 15-21309-A-13 SARA/ANDRE GRAHAM OBJECTION TO
PBL-4 CLAIM
VS. PALISADES COLLECTIONS, L.L.C. 10-3-16 [58]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Palisades Collections, L.L.C., 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.

Because the underlying debt is a contract claim for sale of goods, 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 does not indicate when the claimant receive the last payment. The debtor's declaration indicates the last payment was made in 2006. Assuming the payment was made on the last day of 2006, the date of breach was more than 4 years prior to the filing of the bankruptcy. 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).

12. 16-25935-A-13 DOUGLAS/KIM JACOBS MOTION TO
SS-2 CONFIRM PLAN
10-4-16 [23]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

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

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

13. 16-23841-A-13 RANDY/STEPHANIE STANLEY MOTION TO
SNM-9 CONFIRM PLAN
10-3-16 [90]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c) (3) & (d) (1) and 9014-1(f) (1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) (ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th 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 (9th 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.

14. 13-25164-A-13 JOSE LOPEZ MOTION TO
PGM-6 APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTOR'S
ATTORNEY
10-20-16 [95]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice. According to the certificate of service, the motion was served on the chapter 13 trustee at an incorrect address.

15. 15-20968-A-13 MICHAEL/ARLENE MUNOZ MOTION TO
PBL-2 MODIFY PLAN
10-17-16 [65]

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.

16. 16-24269-A-13 VERONICA WILLIAMS MOTION TO
JMC-1 CONFIRM PLAN
10-6-16 [29]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th 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 (9th 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.

17. 16-24670-A-13 JORGE/LAURA ORELLANA MOTION TO
MET-2 CONFIRM PLAN
10-10-16 [26]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th 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 (9th 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.

18. 16-21385-A-13 WILFREDO/FE ONA MOTION TO
SDB-3 MODIFY PLAN
10-13-16 [59]

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.