

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

November 21, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

---

1.	<a href="#">17-26201</a> -C-13	DAN MCKENZIE	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
	<a href="#">DPC</a> -2	Richard Jare	PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
			10-25-17 [ <a href="#">18</a> ]

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 25, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan is not the debtor's best efforts because: (1) debtor fails to propose to increase his plan payments in 24 months when his 401K loan is paid off; (2) debtor may earn more than reported on Schedule I based upon paystubs provided to the Trustee by the debtor; (3) debtor lists potential future tax refunds, but the Trustee calculates that more tax refunds will actually be available.

B. The plan fails liquidation analysis because although debtor has non exempt equity totaling \$10,685 and debtor is proposing \$14,884 to unsecured creditors, there is potentially additional non-exempt equity in the debtor's real property at 8600 Hume Court, Elk Grove, CA. Additionally, debtor claims \$100,000 exempt on that property, but the Trustee has objected to such exemption.

## Debtor's "Opposition"

Debtor filed three documents that have been flagged as "responses" on the docket. The three documents are exhibits without explanation. The first is a brokers price opinion on the value of the debtor's property at \$375,000. The court is confused as to the value of such evidence. The Trustee had objected to the plan in part because the debtor has non-exempt equity greater than the amount proposed to pay unsecured creditors. The brokers price opinion is about \$50,000 more than the scheduled amount of the property, meaning the debtor would have additional non-exempt equity and the plan would fail liquidation analysis.

The second document is a picture of several rooms.

The third document is what appears to be paychecks from debtor's employer. Trustee had objected to confirmation of the plan in part based on the contention that the debtor had understated income by reporting \$3,066.90 in net income per month. The document was issued on 9/15/17 and lists net pay at \$37,778.94 year to date. That comes out to more than \$4,197.66 in net income per month. It appears to the court that just as the Trustee expected, the debtor under reported income. The court has no explanation from the debtor. Looking at the rest of the paychecks, it does not appear that the debtor makes a consistent amount each pay cycle, and so looking at year to date appears to be a reasonable interpretation absent any explanation from the debtor.

The debtor's "opposition" consisting of three exhibits appear to vindicate the Trustee's fears. The objection will be sustained.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion for Compensation has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 11, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion for Compensation has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted in the amount of \$2,130.00.**

Peter Macaluso, the Attorney for Debtors, ("Applicant") for Charlie and Laura Balangue, ("Clients"), makes an Additional Request for the Allowance of Fees and Expenses in this case.

The period for which the fees are requested is for the period March, 2017, through October, 2017. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$2,505.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00.

**STATUTORY BASIS FOR PROFESSIONAL FEES**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3),

In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to an examiner, trustee under chapter 11, or professional person, the court shall consider the nature, the extent, and the value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors, including—

(A) the time spent on such services;

(B) the rates charged for such services;

(C) whether the services were necessary to the administration of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of, a case under this title;

(D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task addressed;

(E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and

(F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation charged by comparably skilled practitioners in cases other than cases under this title.

Further, the court shall not allow compensation for,

(I) unnecessary duplication of services; or

(ii) services that were not--

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate;

(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A). The court may award interim fees for professionals pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 331, which award is subject to final review and allowance pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330.

### **Benefit to the Estate**

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are "actual," meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must still demonstrate that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided as the court's authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney "free reign [sic] to run up a [professional fees and expenses] without considering the maximum probable [as opposed to possible] recovery." *Id.* at 958. According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

(a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

*Id.* at 959.

In this District the Local Rules provide consumer counsel in Chapter 13 cases with an election for the allowance of fees in connection with the services required in obtaining confirmation of a plan and the services related thereto through the debtor obtaining a discharge. Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 provides, in pertinent part,

“(a) Compensation. Compensation paid to attorneys for the representation of chapter 13 debtors shall be determined according to Subpart (c) of this Local Bankruptcy Rule, unless a party-in-interest objects or the attorney opts out of Subpart (c). The failure of an attorney to file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys, shall signify that the attorney has opted out of Subpart (c). When there is an objection or when an attorney opts out, compensation shall be determined in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, and 2017, and any other applicable authority.”

...

(c) Fixed Fees Approved in Connection with Plan Confirmation. The Court will, as part of the chapter 13 plan confirmation process, approve fees of attorneys representing chapter 13 debtors provided they comply with the requirements to this Subpart.

(1) The maximum fee that may be charged is \$4,000.00 in nonbusiness cases, and \$6,000.00 in business cases.

(2) The attorney for the chapter 13 debtor must file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys.

(3) If the fee under this Subpart is not sufficient to fully and fairly compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. The fee permitted under this Subpart, however, is not a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a motion for additional fees. Generally, this fee will fairly compensate the debtor's attorney for all preconfirmation services and most postconfirmation services, such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. Form EDC 3-095, Application and Declaration RE: Additional Fees and Expenses in Chapter 13 Cases, may be used when seeking additional fees. The necessity for a hearing on the application shall be governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(6)."

The Order Confirming the Chapter 13 Plan expressly provides that Applicant is allowed \$3,500.00 in attorneys fees, the maximum set fee amount under Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 at the time of confirmation. Applicant prepared the order confirming the Plan.

If Applicant believes that there has been substantial and unanticipated legal services which have been provided, then such additional fees may be requested as provided in Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(3). He may file a fee application and the court will consider the fees to be awarded pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330, and 331. In the Ninth Circuit, the customary method for determining the reasonableness of a professional's fees is the "lodestar" calculation. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996), *amended*, 108 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 1997). "The 'lodestar' is calculated by multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate." *Morales*, 96 F.3d at 363 (citation omitted). "This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer's services." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). A compensation award based on the loadstar is a presumptively reasonable fee. *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988).

In rare or exceptional instances, if the court determines that the lodestar figure is unreasonably low or high, it may adjust the figure upward or downward based on certain factors. *Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ.*, 827 F.2d 617, 620 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the court has considerable discretion in determining the reasonableness of professional's fees. *Gates v. Duekmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). It is appropriate for the court to have this discretion "in view of the [court's] superior understanding of the litigation and the desirability of avoiding frequent appellate review of what essentially are factual matters." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437.

## **FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED**

### **Fees and Costs**

Applicant seeks compensation for unanticipated work performed in connection with a motion for relief from stay post confirmation and a motion to dismiss.

Total Hours: 8.35 hours in attorney services in unanticipated work.

**Trustee’s Response**

Trustee responds that part of counsel’s timesheet shows an entry for “anticipated time to file Response to Mtd and and appear for hearing.” The Trustee points out that no appearance was necessary on the Motion to Dismiss because the debtors cured the underlying delinquency. As a result, counsel should not charge for an appearance on the motion to dismiss.

**Discussion**

The court will disallow the portion of the fee that relates to an appearance on the Motion to Dismiss. The court notes that January 6, 2015 counsel prepared and filed a response to a motion to dismiss and it took .25 hours. The entry that states “anticipated time to file Response to Mtd and and appear for hearing” lists 1.5 hours. The response filed on January 6, 2015 stated that debtors would come current as of the date of the hearing. The response filed on October 18, 2017, states that the debtors have come current having paid all creditors. The amount of work going into each response is about equal. Both are approximately the same length, and have similar subject matter. As a result, the court will allow .25 hours or \$75.00 on that entry, and disallow the remaining \$375.00.

As a result, Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$2,130.00
Costs	\$0.00

A review of the application shows that the services provided by Applicant related to the estate enforcing rights and obtaining benefits. The court finds the services were beneficial to the Client and bankruptcy estate and reasonable.

The court shall issue an order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Peter Macaluso (“Applicant”), Attorney for the Chapter 13 Debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, Peter Macaluso is allowed the fees in the amount of \$2,130.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00 as a professional of the Estate.

\*\*\*\*

3. [17-20505](#)-C-13 CARLOS MORA AND TONI  
[SLE](#)-2 DUPONT-MORA  
Steele Lanphier

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN  
9-28-17 [[62](#)]

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 28, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that the debtors may not be able to make payments under the plan because in Class 1 debtors provide that the Trustee shall pay \$1,319 to Wells Fargo Home Mortgage as an ongoing adequate protection payment, however Wells Fargo has filed a Notice of Mortgage Change indicating that the total payment is \$1,348.34. Trustee believes that the plan can be confirmed with the increased mortgage payment if the debtor provides for a correction to the monthly contract payment in the order confirming.

Wells Fargo Bank also opposes confirmation on the same basis.

Currently, the Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 4, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$390.00. Debtor has paid \$390.00 into the plan to date.
- B. Debtor fails to provide for LoanCare Servicing Ctr in the plan and does not intend to make adequate protection payments. Debtor indicates an intention to sell her house, but has not provided a time line in which to do so.
- C. Adding in the mortgage payments to LoanCare, debtor does not have the ability to make payments.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

5. [17-25610](#)-C-13 MEGAN ELLIOTT  
[DPC-1](#) Mikalah Liviakis

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID  
P. CUSICK  
10-4-17 [[27](#)]

Thru #6

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a "Withdrawal of Motion" for the pending Objection to Confirmation of Plan, the "Withdrawal" being consistent with the opposition filed to the Objection, the court interpreting the "Withdrawal of Motion" to be an ex parte motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041 for the court to dismiss without prejudice the Objection to Confirmation of Plan, and good cause appearing, **the court dismisses the Chapter 13 Trustee's Objection to Confirmation of Plan.**

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

An Objection to Confirmation of Plan having been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, the Chapter 13 Trustee having filed an ex parte motion to dismiss the Objection without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, dismissal of the Motion being consistent with the opposition filed, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is dismissed without prejudice.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 4, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

Creditor, Schools Financial Credit Union, opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that the plan does not propose to pay the secured claim in full. The plan relied upon a motion to value that was withdrawn by the debtor.

The court continued this motion from November 7, 2017 to see if the debtor could make such changes to make the plan confirmable. The Trustee's objection to Plan confirmation was withdrawn by the Trustee. However, there is no indication that Schools Financial Credit Union has withdrawn its objection. There has been no additional motion to value filed. As a result, the Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

7. [17-24611](#)-C-13 LISA RICE AND JERRY MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF MIDLAND  
[BB-1](#) LORANGER FUNDING, LLC  
Bonnie Baker 10-18-17 [[30](#)]

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 18, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Avoid Lien is granted.**

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Midland Funding, LLC for the sum of \$2,490.28. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Shasta County on April 11, 2017. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 2701 Alfreda Way, Redding, California.

The Trustee filed a response indicating that the creditor has not filed a proof of claim. Because the debtor is not basing the lien avoidance solely on the failure to file a proof of claim, the motion will be granted.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$175,000 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$116,408.00 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 704.950 in the amount of \$100,000.00 in Schedule C. 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 is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

**ISSUANCE OF A MINUTE ORDER**

An order substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the judgment lien of Midland Funding, LLC, recorded on April 11, 2017, with the Shasta County

Recorder, against the real property commonly known 2701 Alfreda Way, Redding, California, is avoided pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 10, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor's motion does not contain a docket control number.
- B. Monthly dividends stated for administrative fees and Class 2 creditors total \$761.22, whereas the proposed monthly plan payment is \$274.00.
- C. The plan states that the debtor has completed 31 months of payments, however only 30 months have elapsed in the plan.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 10, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors.

The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on October 10, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

10. [14-23014](#)-C-13 SCOTT/LINDA LEA  
[DPC](#)-2 Jon Zitomer

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO NOTICE  
OF MORTGAGE PAYMENT CHANGE  
9-1-17 [[48](#)]

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a Notice of Dismissal of Trustee's Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment Change pursuant to FRCP 41 as incorporated by FRBP 9014 and 7041, the court interpreting the "Withdrawal of Motion" to be an ex parte motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041 for the court to dismiss without prejudice the Motion to Dismiss the Bankruptcy Case, and good cause appearing, **the court dismisses without prejudice the Chapter 13 Trustee's Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment Change.**

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

A Withdrawal having been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment Change is dismissed without prejudice.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 30, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Avoid Lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Avoid Lien is granted.**

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Kelkris Associates, Inc. for the sum of \$82,867.05. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Solano County on April 25, 2011. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 1609 Northwood Dr, Fairfield, California.

The motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A). Pursuant to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$250,000 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$344,673.89 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b)(5) in the amount of \$10 in Schedule C. 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 is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

**ISSUANCE OF A MINUTE ORDER**

An order substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the judgment lien of Kelkris Associates, Inc., Solano County Superior Court Case No. FCS037277, recorded on April 25, 2011, with the Solano County Recorder, against the real property commonly known 1609 Northwood Dr, Fairfield, California, is avoided pursuant to 11

U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 18, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. Debtor cannot make payments under the plan. Debtor's net income is \$749.00 but debtor proposes to pay \$300.00 per month. There are several problems with the debtor's plan as outlined in the objection, including misclassification, failure to list actual dollar amounts on the plan, failure to list exemptions, and failure to list IRS on the schedules or the plan.

B. Trustee is unable to calculate debtor's actual non exempt equity and the debtor has failed to propose a dividend to unsecured creditors so it is impossible to determine the liquidation analysis.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the

proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on September 6, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan relies upon the Motion to Value (see matter #10). The court notes that there is no opposition to the Motion to Value.

B. Debtor's Schedule I lists gross wages as \$5,638.35 per month. However, debtor's actual gross wages averaged over the past 6 months are \$4,846.22 per month. Therefore, debtor does not appear able to make plan payments.

The court continued the objection to give the debtor time to cure delinquency and to provide the Trustee with pay stubs. The court does not have any evidence that either have occurred. The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 1, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----  
-----.

**The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 13-32737) was filed on September 30, 2013 and dismissed on July 19, 2017, for Debtor's failure to make plan payments. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); *see also* Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307( and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?
2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

The Trustee filed a response requesting the court deny the motion as the debtor had not filed schedules so it was impossible to tell if circumstances had changed. Now, the debtor has filed necessary documents. Debtor proposes a much larger amount of payments in the instant case. Additionally, debtor proposes a very small amount of expenses and plans on having her daughter contribute to the plan. Although there is no declaration currently on file indicating an intention to continue contributing throughout the life of the plan by the daughter, the court is convinced that the debtor has sufficient net income to confirm a chapter 13 plan and see it to completion.

Debtor has sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay.

The motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B) for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 22, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.**

The Trustee previously opposed confirmation on the basis that:

A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$2,000.00. Debtor has paid \$49,826.00 into the plan to date.

B. Debtor has not filed Supplemental Schedules I and J since December 5, 2014. Debtor has apparently changed jobs since then and the schedules do not appear to be an accurate representation of his current income and expenses.

The court continued the matter to allow the debtor to file declarations on the updated Schedules I and J. Debtor filed such declarations and the Trustee filed an Amended response indicating that the Trustee no longer opposes the motion to modify. The Plan does comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on September 22, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 7, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The plan is not the debtors' best effort because they fail to propose to pay all disposable income into the plan. Debtors monthly payment appears to be \$1,331.75 not \$1,537.34 as stated on Schedule J.
- B. The plan may not be filed in good faith. Debtors do not indicate why the plan payments will increase by \$9 after the first 5 months. The plan payment should be \$472.62 after taking into account debtors true mortgage payment.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 6, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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.

**The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is denied as moot.**

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. Debtor states that this is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 13-21559) was filed on February 5, 2013 and dismissed on August 15, 2016, for Debtor's failure to make plan payments. However, the proper date for determination of 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A), is the date at which the case is dismissed, rather than the date that the case is closed. As a result, the provisions of the automatic stay do NOT end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

The motion will be denied as moot, as the automatic stay is not automatically lifted after thirty days in this case.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is denied as moot as the automatic stay is not automatically lifted after thirty days in this case.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Incur Debt was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 25, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Incur Debt was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The Motion to Incur Debt is granted.**

The motion seeks permission to purchase a 2013 Hyundai Azera, which the total purchase price is \$19,970.00, with monthly payments of \$387.52 and an interest rate of 11.66%. The down payment will be made by the Debtor's father.

A motion to incur debt is governed by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(c). In *re Gonzales*, No. 08-00719, 2009 WL 1939850, at \*1 (Bankr. N.D. Iowa July 6, 2009). Rule 4001(c) requires that the motion list or summarize all material provisions of the proposed credit agreement, "including interest rate, maturity, events of default, liens, borrowing limits, and borrowing conditions." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(c)(1)(B). Moreover, a copy of the agreement must be provided to the court. *Id.* at 4001(c)(1)(A). The court must know the details of the collateral as well as the financing agreement to adequately review post-confirmation financing agreements. *In re Clemons*, 358 B.R. 714, 716 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. 2007).

The court finds that the proposed credit, based on the unique facts and circumstances of this case, is reasonable. There being no opposition from any party in interest and the terms being reasonable, the motion is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Incur Debt filed by Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted and Cynthia Moseley, Debtor, is authorized to incur debt pursuant to the terms of the agreement, Exhibit C, Dckt. 22.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Professional Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion. - Hearing required

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 20, 2017. Twenty eight days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Objection to Professional Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g)

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes Professional Fees of Steele Lanphier, counsel for the debtor. The Disclosure of Compensation of Attorney reflects that Mr. Lanphier was paid \$2,000 prior to the filing of the statement and that there is \$2,000 due, and states that the fee does not include motions for relief from stay or judicial lien avoidances. Pursuant to the local rules, attorneys are required to include those matters in pre-confirmation settings.

Mr. Lanphier failed to appear at the first meeting of creditors, although the debtor did appear. Lucas Garcia appeared specially for Mr. Lanphier although debtor did not know this would happen, and Mr. Garcia had not looked at any of debtor's bankruptcy documents. Debtor has filed two prior bankruptcies, both of which were not listed on the petition. In one of those cases, Mr. Lanphier was her attorney.

Trustee also states that the plan is not confirmable and that based on the deficiencies in the documents as well as the failure to attend the meeting of creditors, the court should not allow attorneys fees unless a noticed motion is brought.

**Debtor's Response**

The debtor seems to make the following points: (1) it would be redundant to list what motions would be required in 2016(b) statements because the Rights and Responsibilities require the attorney of record to file motions of lien avoidance and motions for relief from stay already; (2) the debtor does not file relief from stay; (3) Mr. Garcia has an established relationship with Lanphier and Associates and he was presumably paid for his appearance at the 341 meeting; (4) the deficiencies on the schedules have been fixed with amendments; (5) the concerns of the Trustee in the objection to confirmation and objection to exemption have been cured.

**Trustee's Reply**

The Trustee points out that if there is conflicting information in the Rights and Responsibilities and the 2016(b) statement, the 2016(b) statement needs to be amended to eliminate such discrepancies. Trustee reiterates that Mr. Garcia was unprepared to make a representation at the Meeting of Creditors, and the debtor was essentially left without representation at such time.

### **Discussion**

The court is convinced, in light of all of the circumstances, that it would be appropriate to require that Mr. Lanphier file fee applications to justify his payment in this case.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Professional Fees filed by Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to Professional Fees is sustained.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 2, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors.

The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on October 2, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 30, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----  
-----.

**The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 17-23040) was filed on May 3, 2017 and dismissed on June 13, 2017, for Debtor's counsel's failure to file the requisite Notice of Motion and Motion to Confirm Chapter 13 plan. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); *see also* Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307( and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?

2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?  
Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

Here, it appears that the debtor has filed a plan, and has served the plan on the Trustee. No Notice of Hearing has yet been filed, but debtor appears to have a plan filed and served on the Trustee. Trustee opposes the motion because the plan relies upon family contribution and the plan is currently unconfirmable. The debtor filed a declaration by debtor's father indicating an ability and intention to help pay for plan payments.

As a result, debtor has sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B) for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

\* \* \* \*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 18, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan is not the debtor's best effort because the debtor admitted at the First Meeting of Creditors that he receives income from the Department of Defense which is not listed on Schedule I. Therefore, his income has been understated.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on September 7, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Creditor, Bank of America, N.A., objects to confirmation on the basis that the plan does not propose to cure the pre-petition arrears in the amount of \$1,869.92. Creditor has filed a proof of claim 6-1 to support this contention.

#### **Debtor's Response**

Debtor responds that there cannot be arrears as debtor has made payment on the loan timely each month and in the full amount. Debtor submitted exhibits showing receipts for payments made to the creditor. Debtor argues that the proof of claim supports debtor's contention that there are no arrears owed to the creditor.

However, the court notes that the proof of claim shows the debtor making payments on the monthly payment, but fees and charges accruing. The debtor has not objected to the proof of claim. The proof of claim has prima facie validity absent objection by the debtor. As a result, the plan does not provide for the creditor's pre-petition arrears and cannot be confirmed.

The court notes that an Objection to Claim has been filed and set for hearing on December 5, 2017.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on August 29, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that

- A. Trustee has been unable to fully assess the feasibility of the plan and has continued the meeting of creditors to September 21, 2017. The court notes that the meeting was concluded as to the debtor at the meeting of creditors held September 21, 2017.
- B. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$376.06. Debtor has paid \$360.00 into the plan to date.
- C. Debtors may have additional income that has not been reported. Debtors' Schedule J lists \$400 as debtor's rental expenses for separate living, however Household 2 on a separate attachment also includes a \$400 rent expense and other expenses for a total of \$650 per month. Debtors additionally have a history of large tax returns but do not propose to pay to the Trustee all tax refunds exceeding a combined total of \$2,000 received during the life of the plan.
- D. Debtors' plan fails liquidation analysis as debtors' non-exempt equity totals \$1,830.00 and debtors are proposing a 0% dividend to unsecured creditors.
- E. Plan does not propose to pay all priority claims as it fails to provide for priority tax claim of Franchise Tax Board in the amount of \$402.09.
- F. Trustee lists a number of inaccuracies in debtors' schedules.

The court continued the matter to November 21, 2017 to allow the debtor to make the changes required. The Trustee filed a supplemental response providing a status of the objection. Debtor has not made the required changes because while the debtor sent some changes to the Trustee, none of the changes were filed with the court, the debtor is delinquent in plan payments due to a Notice of Mortgage Payment Change, and Trustee's Objection to Exemption was granted, but the debtor has not attempted to make the necessary changes in the plan to reflect this. The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

Thru #26

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 16, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The plan contains Additional Provisions that indicate a payment scheme to Class 1 creditor, Ocwen, indicating both payments for the cure of arrears and a regular monthly mortgage payment. The provisions appear to suggest that additional arrears payments will be made, however the plan does not contemplate ongoing arrears payments.
- B. The Additional Provisions incorrectly state amounts paid as October 2017, however these do not include October 31, 2017 disbursements made under the confirmed plan.
- C. Additional Provisions do not establish total amount of post-petition mortgage arrears to be paid.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Value was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 7, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Value was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The Motion to Value secured claim of State of California, Franchise Tax Board, "Creditor," is granted.**

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 4740 Brookside Circle, Fairfield, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$357,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 701; *see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$413,178.00. The Franchise Tax Board's lien on the property has a balance of approximately \$11,896.84. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); *Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated  
in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by  
Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the

pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of State of California Franchise Tax Board secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 4740 Brookside Circle, Fairfield, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$357,000.00 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Incur Debt was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 31, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Motion to Incur Debt was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The Motion to Incur Debt is xxxxx.**

The motion seeks permission to obtain a reverse mortgage on the debtor's residence at 1536 49th Street, Sacramento, California. The reverse mortgage will payoff the existing mortgage of \$186,969.00 and the Chapter 13 Plan balance of \$36,000.00. The value of the property is \$396,000.00.

A motion to incur debt is governed by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(c). In re Gonzales, No. 08-00719, 2009 WL 1939850, at \*1 (Bankr. N.D. Iowa July 6, 2009). Rule 4001(c) requires that the motion list or summarize all material provisions of the proposed credit agreement, "including interest rate, maturity, events of default, liens, borrowing limits, and borrowing conditions." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(c)(1)(B). Moreover, a copy of the agreement must be provided to the court. Id. at 4001(c)(1)(A). The court must know the details of the collateral as well as the financing agreement to adequately review post-confirmation financing agreements. *In re Clemons*, 358 B.R. 714, 716 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. 2007).

### **Trustee's Response**

The Trustee responds that it does not oppose the motion. Although the exhibits do not include the final terms of the reverse mortgage and no estimated closing statement is provided, Trustee recommends approval of the motion so that debtor can proceed and potentially obtain final approval through an ex-parte mechanism.

The court finds that the proposed credit, based on the unique facts and circumstances of this case, is reasonable. There being no opposition from any party in interest and the terms being reasonable, the court is inclined to grant the motion. However, in light of the circumstances, the court may require an additional filing by the debtor when the terms of the reverse mortgage are known.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Incur Debt filed by Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is xxxxxxxxx

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on August 23, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to continue the Motion to Confirm the Plan to December 5, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.**

The Trustee opposed confirmation on the basis that it appears likely that the debtor is required to file a State Tax Return. The debtor has not filed state tax returns for years 2013 through 2015.

**Debtor's Response**

Debtor's mother responds that the Franchise Tax Board will accept returns from the debtor if they are signed by her attorney of record and if a declaration from debtor's mother accompanies the return.

**Trustee's Status Report**

Trustee filed a status report indicating that the debtor filed state tax returns for 2014 and 2015 and the rest of the tax returns will be provided to the Trustee soon. As a result, Trustee requests that the court either confirm the plan or continue to allow for the receipt of the signed tax returns. The court will continue the hearing to December 5, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

The court does not have evidence that such tax returns have been filed. As a result, the Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and

good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is continued to December 5, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 18, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor admitted at the first meeting of creditors that he receives rental income from a property held in Yuba City, however nowhere in the debtor's schedules is this rental income disclosed.
- B. Debtor has not filed the Spousal Waiver for use of the California State Exemptions.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 24, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Approve Loan Modification is granted.**

The Motion to Approve Loan Modification filed by James and Lori Perry ("Debtor") seeks court approval for Debtor to incur post-petition credit. Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc. ("Creditor"), whose claim the plan provides for in Class 4, has agreed to a loan modification which will reduce Debtor's mortgage payment from the current \$2,356.76 a month to \$1,538.44 a month.

The Motion is supported by the debtors' Declaration. The Declaration affirms Debtor's desire to obtain the post-petition financing and provides evidence of Debtor's ability to pay this claim on the modified terms.

This post-petition financing is consistent with the Chapter 13 Plan in this case and Debtor's ability to fund that Plan. There being no objection from the Trustee or other parties in interest, and the motion complying with the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 364(d), the Motion to Approve the Loan Modification is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Approve the Loan Modification filed by debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the court authorizes James and Lori Perry ("Debtor") to amend the terms of the loan with Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc., which is secured by the real property commonly known as 127 Rutherford Drive, Vacaville, California, on such terms as stated in the Modification Agreement filed as Exhibit A in support of the Motion, Dckt. 97.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on October 18, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

The Objection to the Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). The Debtor, 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. At the hearing -----.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan relies upon a Motion to Value. No motion to value has been filed.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the Plan is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on September 29, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$2,610.00.
- B. Debtor's plan does not provide for payment of Specialized Loan Servicing's claim, a Class 2a creditor, indicating that the claim is disputed. Debtors have indicated an intention of objecting to the claim of Specialized, however have not done so to date.
- C. The unsecured claims came in higher (\$118,045.05) than debtors expected (\$43.40) and the plan would exceed 60 months.

**Debtor's Reply**

Debtors filed a reply indicating that they intend to file an amended plan and file an objection to the claim of Specialized Loan Servicing.

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel,

and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling: No appearance at the November 21, 2017 hearing is required.**

-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - No Opposition Filed.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, Committee of Creditors Holding General Unsecured Claims/ or creditors holding the 20 largest unsecured claims, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on October 16, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.**

Gerald L White, the Attorney for Debtors, ("Applicant") for Valoia and Pamela Laolagi ("Clients"), makes a request for interim approval of fees.

The period for which the fees are requested is for the period March, 2017 through October, 2017. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$1,905.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00.

**STATUTORY BASIS FOR PROFESSIONAL FEES**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3),

In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to an examiner, trustee under chapter 11, or professional person, the court shall consider the nature, the extent, and the value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors, including—

- (A) the time spent on such services;
- (B) the rates charged for such services;
- (C) whether the services were necessary to the administration of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of, a case under this title;
- (D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task addressed;

(E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and

(F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation charged by comparably skilled practitioners in cases other than cases under this title.

Further, the court shall not allow compensation for,

(I) unnecessary duplication of services; or

(ii) services that were not--

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate;

(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A). The court may award interim fees for professionals pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 331, which award is subject to final review and allowance pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330.

### **Benefit to the Estate**

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are "actual," meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must still demonstrate that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided as the court's authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney "free reign [sic] to run up a [professional fees and expenses] without considering the maximum probable [as opposed to possible] recovery." *Id.* at 958. According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

(a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

*Id.* at 959.

In this District the Local Rules provide consumer counsel in Chapter 13 cases with an election for the allowance of fees in connection with the services required in obtaining confirmation of a plan and the services related thereto through the debtor obtaining a discharge. Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 provides, in pertinent part,

“(a) Compensation. Compensation paid to attorneys for the representation of chapter 13 debtors shall be determined according to Subpart (c) of this Local Bankruptcy Rule, unless a party-in-interest objects or the attorney opts out of Subpart (c). The failure of an attorney to file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys, shall signify that the attorney has opted out of Subpart (c). When there is an objection or when an attorney opts out, compensation shall be determined in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, and 2017, and any other applicable authority.”

...

(c) Fixed Fees Approved in Connection with Plan Confirmation. The Court will, as part of the chapter 13 plan confirmation process, approve fees of attorneys representing chapter 13 debtors provided they comply with the requirements to this Subpart.

(1) The maximum fee that may be charged is \$4,000.00 in nonbusiness cases, and \$6,000.00 in business cases.

(2) The attorney for the chapter 13 debtor must file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys.

(3) If the fee under this Subpart is not sufficient to fully and fairly compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. The fee permitted under this Subpart, however, is not a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a motion for additional fees. Generally, this fee will fairly compensate the debtor's attorney for all preconfirmation services and most postconfirmation services, such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. Form EDC 3-095, Application and Declaration RE: Additional Fees and Expenses in Chapter 13 Cases, may be used when seeking additional fees. The necessity for a hearing on the application shall be governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(6)."

The Order Confirming the Chapter 13 Plan expressly provides that Applicant is allowed \$3,500.00 in attorneys fees, the maximum set fee amount under Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 at the time of confirmation. Applicant prepared the order confirming the Plan.

If Applicant believes that there has been substantial and unanticipated legal services which have been provided, then such additional fees may be requested as provided in Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(3). He may file a fee application and the court will consider the fees to be awarded pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330, and 331. In the Ninth Circuit, the customary method for determining the reasonableness of a professional's fees is the "lodestar" calculation. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996), *amended*, 108 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 1997). "The 'lodestar' is calculated by multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate." *Morales*, 96 F.3d at 363 (citation omitted). "This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer's services." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). A compensation award based on the lodestar is a presumptively reasonable fee. *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988).

In rare or exceptional instances, if the court determines that the lodestar figure is unreasonably low or high, it may adjust the figure upward or downward based on certain factors. *Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ.*, 827 F.2d 617, 620 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the court has considerable discretion in determining the reasonableness of professional's fees. *Gates v. Duekmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). It is appropriate for the court to have this discretion "in view of the [court's] superior understanding of the litigation and the desirability of avoiding frequent appellate review of what essentially are factual matters." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437.

## **FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED**

### **Fees and Costs**

Applicant seeks compensation for unanticipated work performed in connection with a review of claims, a plan modification, and case management. Applicant provides a task billing analysis and supporting evidence for the services provided at the hourly rate of \$300.00/hour.

Total Hours: 6.35 hours

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation

to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$1,905.00.
Costs	\$0.00

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a statement of nonopposition. Dkt 40.

A review of the application shows that the services provided by Applicant related to the estate enforcing rights and obtaining benefits. The court finds the services were beneficial to the Client and bankruptcy estate and reasonable.

The court shall issue an order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Gerald White (“Applicant”), Attorney for the Chapter 13 Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, Gerald White is allowed the fees in the amount of \$1,905.00 and costs in the amount of \$0.00 as a professional of the Estate.

\*\*\*\*

Thru #35

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 19, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(g).

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Plan will exceed 60 months as the plan does not appear to provide for Solano DCSS which filed a priority claim in the amount of \$20,683.29.
- B. Debtor appears to be delinquent in post petition payments to the State Board of Equalization and it does not appear that debtor can make the payments required.

The court continued the hearing in order to allow the debtor time to make the necessary changes and payments. The court notes that an objection to the claim of Solano County has been filed. No evidence of a cancelled check has been provided to the court. The court does not have evidence that the plan currently complies with §§ 1322 and 1325(a).

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Motion to Confirm the Plan is denied and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on the Creditor, Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on July 28, 2017. 44 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007(a) 30 day notice and L.B.R. 3007-1(b)(1) 14-day opposition filing requirement.) That requirement is met.

The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(b)(1)(A) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

**The Objection to Proof of Claim is xxxxx**

Debtor ("Objector") requests that the court disallow the claim of Solano DCSS ("Creditor"), Proof of Claim No.5-1 ("Claim"), Official Registry of Claims in this case. The Claim is asserted to be unsecured priority claim in the amount of \$20,683.29. Objector asserts that the claim is for spousal support, but the state court has told Mr. Stanley that he should be only paying child support, not spousal support at this time.

**Creditor's Response**

Solano DCSS responds to the motion stating that this underlying issue is being litigated and is set for hearing in Solano County on November 4, 2017. Solano requested that the court continue this hearing until the state court has litigated the issue.

Section 502(a) provides that a claim supported by a Proof of Claim is allowed unless a party in interest objects. Once an objection has been filed, the court may determine the amount of the claim after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). It is settled law in the Ninth Circuit that the party objecting to a proof of claim has the burden of presenting substantial factual basis to overcome the prima facie validity of a proof of claim and the evidence must be of probative force equal to that of the creditor's proof of claim. *Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991); *see also United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie)*, 349 B.R. 204, 210 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

Based on the evidence before the court, the court continued the matter to November 21, 2017 to allow

the state court of Solano to litigate the underlying issue. The court does not have any information regarding the status of the state court issue.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Claim of Solano DCSS, Creditor filed in this case by the debtor, having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the objection to Proof of Claim is xxxxxx

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on the Creditor, Debtor, Debtor's counsel, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on August 14, 2017. 44 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007(a) 30 day notice and L.B.R. 3007-1(b)(1) 14-day opposition filing requirement.)

The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(b)(1)(A) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

**The Objection to Proof of Claim Number 6-1 of Thea Offenbacher-Costa is overruled.**

Chapter 13 Trustee ("Objector") requests that the court disallow the claim of Thea Offenbacher-Costa ("Creditor"), Proof of Claim No. 6-1 ("Claim"), Official Registry of Claims in this case. The Claim is asserted to be unsecured in the amount of \$46,384.50. Objector asserts that the claim was filed after the bar date to file claims. The bar date was June 7, 2017 and the proof of claim was filed June 8, 2017.

Section 502(a) provides that a claim supported by a Proof of Claim is allowed unless a party in interest objects. Once an objection has been filed, the court may determine the amount of the claim after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). It is settled law in the Ninth Circuit that the party objecting to a proof of claim has the burden of presenting substantial factual basis to overcome the prima facie validity of a proof of claim and the evidence must be of probative force equal to that of the creditor's proof of claim. *Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991); *see also United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie)*, 349 B.R. 204, 210 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

Trustee filed a reply indicating that the original objection had errors. The Trustee referred to a response filed by the Creditor, however the court does not see any such response on the docket. The Trustee indicated that the parties agree that the matter should be continued to November 21, 2017.

The creditor filed a declaration stating that it did not receive a copy of debtor's motion to approve a modified plan until June 7, 2017. The creditor attempted to file a proof of claim but was unable to do so until just after midnight, June 8, 2017. The creditor does not suggest that it did not have knowledge of the bankruptcy until

June 7, 2017, only that it did not have knowledge of the plan modification. The original plan filed on January 28, 2017 contemplated a 3% distribution on \$294,335.00 in unsecured claims. The modified plan filed June 6, 2017 contemplated a 15% distribution on \$176,659.00 in unsecured claims. The new plan will pledge approximately 3 times as much to unsecured creditors.

However, Creditor has not directed the court to any relevant authority allowing the court to extend the time to file a proof of claim. The Ninth Circuit has held that equitable tolling cannot be used to extend the filing period of 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). Gardenhire v. Internal Revenue Service (In re Gardenhire), 209 F.3d 1145, 1150 (9th Cir. 2000). Courts do have the ability to extend time to file a proof of claim outside of the 6 exceptions laid out in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3002(c)(1)-(6). However, in a more recent case, the Ninth Circuit held that the time limit in § 727(e)(1) was not jurisdictional and therefore failure to adhere to the strict deadline was not fatal to the trustee's motion. Weil v. Elliot, 859 F.3d 812 (9th Cir. 2017).

Creditor's argument appears to be that once the Creditor saw the modified plan intending to pay unsecured creditors about 3 times as much as the previous plan, the Creditor sought to file a proof of claim to share in the greater contribution. Apparently, the amount to be disbursed to unsecured creditors in the first plan was not enough to induce the Creditor to file a proof of claim. Creditor believes that it is unfair to be served with a modified plan on the day of the claims bar date when the modified plan pledges additional distribution to unsecured creditors.

A recent decision by the United States Supreme Court, Hamer v. Neighborhood Housing Services of Chicago, 2017 WL 5160782 (2017), holds that a court has the authority to use its discretion to enlarge deadlines when the deadline is not "jurisdictional." Deadlines are "jurisdictional" if the time prescription appears in a statute and Congress indicates an intention to treat the time limit as jurisdictional, rather than appearing simply in the rules.

The bankruptcy code in 11 U.S.C. § 329(b)(9) points to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure to determine what the time limit for filing of proofs of claim. FRBP 3002(c) states that "[i]n a . . . chapter 13 individual's debt adjustment case, a proof of claim is timely filed if it is filed not later than 90 days after the first date set for the meeting of creditors called under § 341(a) of the code . . ." Therefore, the deadline for filing proofs of claim is a claims-processing rule, as it arises from the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure rather than from Congress (i.e. the Code).

This court, therefore has the authority to use its discretion to enlarge the deadline, which is an inflexible claims-processing rule. There has been no forfeit as the objection was timely and no waiver.

The court is convinced in this set of facts that the deadline should be expanded to allow for the claim of Thea Offenbacher-Costa. The creditor missed the deadline by a matter of minutes. The creditor did not dally after receiving notice of the modified plan. The bankruptcy code specifically protects creditors from a situation where a notice of insufficient assets is sent out and then assets subsequently become available for distribution to creditors. This situation is similar: the creditor received notice of a very small distribution to creditors and later, after becoming aware of a substantially greater distribution to unsecured creditors, decided to file its proof of claim. Under a literal reading of the law, the court would be precluded from extending the deadline to file proof of claims because the creditor would have been entitled to 2-3% of its claim had it filed its proof of claim upon receipt of the first plan. However, taking into account the totality of the circumstances, the court is convinced that its power of discretion is properly applied to determine that equitable considerations warrant allowance of the claim of Thea Offenbacher-Costa, claim #6-1. Thus, the objection will be overruled.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Claim filed in this case by Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel,

and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the objection to Proof of Claim is overruled.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Extend Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on Shortened Time by order of the Court.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(3) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 16, 2017. The court issued an order to shorten time setting this hearing on a shortened time.

The Motion to Extend Automatic Stay been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy 9014-1(f)(3), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing.

**The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is denied.**

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 17-20032) was filed on January 26, 2017 and dismissed on August 31, 2017, for Debtor's failure to make plan payments. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); *see also* Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307( and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?
2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

*Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

In the previous case, the motion states that the debtor fell behind on payments due to the fact that the debtor did not have income. The motion states that debtor has since been employed and has had a significant increase in income. Debtor's counsel asserts that he was very ill on November 6, 2017 (five days after filing of the case) and thus did not inform coworkers that a motion to extend automatic stay was needed, which is why this was filed so late.

Debtor filed a declaration indicating that she now is “doing business consulting for a fee.” According to the debtor’s schedules in her previous case, she was self employed as well as working part-time at a chiropractic association. The motion to extend states that the debtor lost employment but now has been employed and has a significant increase in income. The court does not read the schedules this way.

In debtor’s earlier case, her schedules showed income of \$5,750, with \$1,350 coming from the part time work and \$4,400 coming from her self employment. Her Schedule J showed \$725 expense per month on self-employment taxes.

In debtor’s current case, her schedules show income of \$4,445 coming from her self employment, and her Schedule J shows \$0 per month for self-employment taxes. This does not appear to be a significant increase in income. In both cases, the plan proposed 0% distribution to unsecured creditors. In debtor’s current case, she does not list any self-employment taxes and no mortgage payment on her Schedule J.

The motion states that Debtor fell behind on payments in the previous case due to a loss of employment. In fact, the debtor never made a single payment on the plan. Additionally, the debtor never confirmed a plan in that case. In the current case, debtor has not included self-employment taxes or mortgage payments in a plan that proposes 0% to unsecured creditors. The court does not find that this plan is confirmable.

The court additionally notes that these are not the only 2 bankruptcies filed by the debtor. On April 6, 2016 debtor filed a chapter 13 case, 16-22178. The court notes that that case was additionally dismissed for failure to make plan payments on August 24, 2016. In that case as well, debtor failed to make a single payment on the plan, and failed to ever confirm a plan. The court cannot look at these circumstances and conclude that the debtor is filing this case in good faith. Debtor has had two previous bankruptcies without confirming a plan or making a single payment of even a single dollar in either bankruptcies. Debtor again does not have a confirmable plan.

Furthermore, no automatic stay has been in effect to protect property of the debtor since February of 2017. The court has no doubt that the debtor has failed to make payments to her secured creditors. The fact that a foreclosure was set for November 2, 2017, and the debtor filed another bankruptcy on November 1, 2017, does not mean that this court is required to extend the automatic stay. It is clear to the court that this filing is a direct result of the foreclosure, and nothing in the debtor’s history suggests that she has any intention of making even a single plan payment.

The court would be surprised if the debtor has made a single mortgage payment since the filing of her first bankruptcy case in April, 2016, as mortgage payments have not been included in any of the debtor’s three bankruptcies’ schedules. The debtor’s schedules shows that she has no equity in the property due to Select Portfolio Servicing, Inc.’s lien. Extension of the automatic stay in this case would be antithetical to the purpose of bankruptcy, which is not to simply protect debtors despite the circumstances.

The debtor has not sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay. The motion to extend automatic stay is denied, and the automatic stay will expire pursuant to the timing laid out in § 362(c).

The motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and

upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is denied.

\*\*\*\*