UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

December 28, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.

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

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 22. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2)[eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE FEBRUARY 1, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JANUARY 19, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JANUARY 25, 2016. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 23 THROUGH 28 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON JANUARY 4, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 15-27901-A-13 LARRY THOMAS — MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
NSV-2 — 11-6-15 [35]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of $2,400 is less than the $2,862 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

2. 15-27901-A-13 LARRY THOMAS — COUNTER MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
NSV-2 — 12-3-15 [55]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be conditionally denied.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

3. 14-26107-A-13 ROBIN LANGLEY — MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
MRG-1 — 12-10-15 [47]
OAKBROOK NOTES TRUST VS.

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be denied.

The movant holds a claim secured by a second priority deed of trust encumbering the debtor's home. The movant filed a proof of claim indicating that the debt had been listed by the debtor under the name PNC Bank.

A review of the confirmed chapter 13 plan reveals that it provides for a secured claim held by PNC Bank and secured by a second priority deed of trust on the debtor's residence. The plan provides that this claim will be paid nothing because, after deducting the amount owed the first priority deed of trust, no equity remained to collateralize the second priority deed of trust. This plan was accompanied by a motion to value the home. That motion was served on PNC Bank but PNC Bank did not oppose the motion. At a hearing on August 18, 2014 that motion was granted.

However, on August 17, 2015 the movant filed a motion to vacate the order valuing its interest in the home at $0. Without opposition, that motion was granted because the debtor failed to serve the valuation motion on the movant who had succeeded to the interest of PNC by the time the valuation motion was filed.

The debtor has not re-served the valuation on the movant.

Nonetheless, and despite the fact that the debtor has not been making contract payments to the movant, there is no cause to terminate the automatic stay because the confirmed plan neither requires contract or plan payments be made to the movant.

In order to establish cause pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) for relief from the automatic stay, it must be shown that the debtor has failed to abide by the terms of the confirmed plan. That is, the debtor must have defaulted under the terms of the plan to the detriment of the movant. See Anaheim Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. Evans, 30 B.R. 530, 531 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1983). No such showing has been made.

4. 15-28408-A-13 BARBARA GIAMMARCO — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
JPJ-1 — 12-7-15 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

While the plan provides that the arrears on a Class 1 claim will be paid, the plan fails to provide a dividend for the arrears. In fact, then, the plan does not provide for the arrears. The plan does not pay this secured claim in full as required by 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5) and 1325(a)(5)(B).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the

prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

5. 15-28416-A-13 PATRICIA HANSEN — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
JPJ-1 — 12-7-15 [14]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

While the plan provides that the arrears on a Class 1 claim will be paid and the payment of administrative expenses, the plan fails to provide dividends for the arrears and the expenses. In fact, then, the plan does not provide for the arrears and the expenses. The plan does not pay the secured claim and administrative expenses in full as required by 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a)(2), (b)(2), (b)(5) and 1325(a)(5)(B).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

6. 15-28219-A-13 JEANIE WITHERS-BERG — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
JPJ-1 — 12-7-15 [26]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to

appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fourth, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "*Documents Required by Trustee*. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist,* or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Fifth, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately $3,002 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Sixth, even if plan payments were current, the court would conclude the plan is not feasible. Schedules I and J show monthly net income of $1,952 but the plan requires a monthly payment of $3,002. The debtor has not proven that her income is likely to increase.

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

A debtor's exemptions are determined as of the date the bankruptcy petition is

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

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

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

Here, the debtor is asserting the exemptions of Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 703.140(b), which require a spousal waiver. That waiver was not filed with the petition. As a result, the debtor has no allowable exemptions. Without exemptions, the debtor's nonexempt assets total more than $1,862. Because the plan does not provide for payment of anything to unsecured creditors, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4).

Eighth, because the debtor failed to commence payments, and because the plan requires the trustee to pay the debtor's ongoing mortgage installments, the installment due in November was not paid. This arrearage must be cured in order to comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5) and 1325(a)(5)(B). The plan does not provide for this cure.

Further, the objection of the Class 1 creditor indicates that the pre-petition arrears on this mortgage are approximately $10,000 more than stated by the debtor in her plan. At the higher amount, either the arrears will not be cured as required by 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5) and 1325(a)(5)(B), or the plan will take more than 60 months to be completed in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

The objection that the debtor has failed to utilize the new official form Schedules will be overruled. Those forms must be filed on and after December 1. The schedules in this case were filed in November.

7. 15-28219-A-13 JEANIE WITHERS-BERG — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
MDE-1
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON VS. — 12-7-15 [22]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a

written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

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

8. 15-28530-A-13 ANTHONY FAULCONER AND NANCI ANDERSON — ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 12-7-15 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will remain pending but the court will modify the terms of its order permitting the debtor to pay the filing fee in installments.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the $79 installment when due on December 2. While the delinquent installment was paid on December 7, the fact remains the court was required to issue an order to show cause to compel the payment. Therefore, as a sanction for the late payment, the court will modify its prior order allowing installment payments to provide that if a future installment is not received by its due date, the case will be dismissed without further notice or hearing.

9. 15-28433-A-13 JUSTIN WESTCOTT
JPJ-1 — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 12-7-15 [17]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor has not disclosed income from a closely held business operated by his spouse.

This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 73 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

10. 15-28640-A-13 CHARLES/MARYLOU HODGE — ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 12-11-15 [42]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of $79 due on December 7 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

11. 15-28541-A-13 BEVERLY HODGE
RDW-1
REDWOOD SERVICING, L.L.C. VS. — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 12-10-15 [27]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The objection will be sustained in part.

According to the objection, the creditor's home mortgage claim has fully matured.

The plan provides for payment in full of this claim over 60 months with interest at the rate of 4.75%. The creditor maintains that the extension of the loan after its maturity is an impermissible modification of its claim and that the interest rate of 4.75% is insufficient.

Generally speaking, home loans cannot be modified. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2). A chapter 13 debtor is limited to curing any default while maintaining the

regular mortgage installment. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(5). However, when the claim has matured prior to the filing of the bankruptcy, there is no bar to modification. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(c)(2).

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

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

The prime rate is currently 3.50 as reported by the Wall Street Journal. As surveyed by the Supreme Court in Till, courts using the formula approach typically have adjusted the interest rate 1% to 3% on personal property loans. The debtor's proposed rate of 4.75% gives a .75% adjustment. The size of this increase, combined with the fact that the movant is secured by real property, not personal property, and given the financial feasibility of the plan (as evidenced by Schedules I and J), satisfies 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(B)(ii). Absent some showing by the objecting creditor that 4.75% is not adequate, the court concludes that it is adequate for purposes of section 1325(a)(5)(ii).

"Moreover, starting from a concededly *low* estimate and adjusting *upward* places the evidentiary burden squarely on the creditors, who are likely to have readier access to any information absent from the debtor's filing. . . ." The creditor here has not satisfied this burden. No evidence, other than the contract rate, is offered to establish that 10% is not adequate for purposes of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(ii). The creditor has come forward with no evidence on this issue.

However, the objection will be sustained in one respect. The creditor's claim totals in excess of $98,700. The plan assumes that it is approximately $87,000. At the higher amount the plan cannot pay the claim in full within 60 months. It is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

12. 15-27442-A-13 PATTI MINH-PHUONG TRAN — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 11-4-15 [32]
JPJ-1

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the

debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fourth, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "*Documents Required by Trustee*. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist,* or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

13.	11-32746-A-13 MET-3	CHRISTOPHER/CAROLINE ALEXANDER	MOTION TO SELL 12-6-15 [46]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion to sell real property will be granted on the condition that the sale proceeds are used to pay all liens of record in full in a manner consistent with the plan. If the proceeds are not sufficient to pay liens of record in full (including liens ostensibly "stripped off"), no sale may be completed without the consent of each lienholder not being paid in full. Also, approval of the sale in no way modifies a confirmed plan. Therefore, if a plan has been confirmed in this case, the debtor shall continue to perform that plan.

14. 15-28048-A-13 JANENE POWELL
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
12-7-15 [20]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

First, because the plan fails to specify how debtor's counsel's fees will be approved, either pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 or by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, but nonetheless requires the trustee to pay counsel a monthly dividend on account of such fees, in effect the plan requires payment of fees even though the court has not approved them. This violates sections 329 and 330.

Second, the plan fails to provide at section 2.07 for a dividend to be on account of allowed administrative expenses, including the debtor's attorney's fees. Unless counsel is working for nothing, this means that the plan does not provide for payment in full of priority claims as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2). Also see 11 U.S.C. §§ 503(b), 507(a).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

15. 15-28558-A-13 ROBERT STANLEY
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
12-7-15 [18]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of

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

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

First, the debtor failed to file an income tax returns for 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014. The returns are delinquent.

Prior to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 becoming effective, the Bankruptcy Code did not require chapter 13 debtors to file delinquent tax returns. If a debtor did not file tax returns, the trustee might object to the plan on the grounds of lack of feasibility or that the plan was not proposed in good faith. See, e.g., Greatwood v. United States (In re Greatwood), 194 B.R. 637 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996), *affirmed*, 120 F.3d. 268 (9th Cir. 1997).

Since BAPCPA became effective, a chapter 13 debtor must file most pre-petition delinquent tax returns. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308. Section 1308(a) requires a chapter 13 debtor who has failed to file tax returns under applicable nonbankruptcy law to file all such returns if they were due for tax periods during the 4-year period ending on the date of the filing of the petition. The delinquent returns must be filed by the date of the meeting of creditors.

In this case, the meeting of creditors has not been concluded in order to give the debtor the opportunity to file the delinquent returns. Nonetheless, because the returns are not yet filed, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) and an uncodified provision of BAPCPA found at section 1228(a) of the Act provide that the court cannot confirm a plan with delinquent returns unfiled.

Second, if requested by the U.S. Trustee or the chapter 13 trustee, a debtor must produce evidence of a social security number or a written statement that such documentation does not exist. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4002(b)(1)(B). In this case, the debtor has breached the foregoing duty by failing to provide evidence of the debtor's social security number. This is cause for dismissal.

Third, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Fourth, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor failed to append to Schedules I and J a detailed statement of business income and expenses. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be

given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

16. 15-29262-A-13 IBRAHEYMA ALHARK — MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
SDH-1 — 12-14-15 [11]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion will be granted.

The debtor filed an earlier chapter 13 case that was dismissed within one year of the most recent petition.

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

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows a debtor to file a motion requesting the continuation of the stay. A review of the docket reveals that the debtor has filed this motion to extend the automatic stay before the 30th day after the filing of the petition. The motion will be adjudicated before the 30-day period expires.

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change."

Here, it appears that the debtor was unable to maintain plan payments in the prior case. In this case, the debtor's household income has increased by approximately $1,700 and monthly net income has increased by more than $1,500. This increase will be devoted to the plan. This is a sufficient change in

circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

17. 15-28564-A-13 DESI/DONNA LOFTON — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
JPJ-1 — 12-7-15 [16]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The objection will be overruled and the motion to dismiss the case will be denied. The debtor has amended the statement of financial affairs as requested by the trustee and the valuation motion has been resolved by stipulation.

18. 15-28377-A-13 RODERICK/LOTTIE STEARNE — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
JPJ-1 — 12-7-15 [22]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay $5,428.82 to unsecured creditors.

While this is consistent with Form 22, as Schedule I makes clear, the debtor's monthly income has increased significantly since the case was filed. Before

the case was filed, the debtor's current monthly income was $8,767.75. However, Hamilton v. Lanning, 130 S.Ct 2464 (2010) permits the trustee to rebut the presumption that the amount of projected disposable income is as stated in Form 22. As reported on Schedules I and J, the debtor's household income is now $10,322.14. Using current income rather than the average for six pre-petition months, and allowing a $215.95 increase for additional income tax, the debtor's monthly projected disposable income is $1,253.47. This will permit payment of $75,208.20 to nonpriority unsecured creditors. Because the plan will these creditors only $5,428.82, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

19. 15-28478-A-13 JPJ-1 — ANGEL PEREZ AND JUANA JIMENEZ — OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 12-7-15 [24]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

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

The objection is premised on the failure of the debtor to value the collateral of Wells Fargo Bank. In fact, such a motion has been filed and granted.

20. 15-28478-A-13 TOG-1 VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. — ANGEL PEREZ AND JUANA JIMENEZ — MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 11-16-15 [17]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of $308,408 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Wells Fargo Bank. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately $367,937 as of the petition date. Therefore, Wells Fargo Bank's other claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured

claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is $0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is $0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair

market value of $308,408. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

The opposition presents no admissible evidence of value. It relies on an unauthenticated broker's price opinion and a zillow.com valuation.

Valuation evidence based on reports from "zillow.com" and other similar Internet based sources is not admissible. It is hearsay. See Fed. R. Evid. 801. While Fed. R. Evid. 803(17) excepts from the hearsay rule market compilations generally used and relied upon by the public, no foundation was laid establishing that the values reported by zillow.com meets this criteria. The court doubts that such a foundation could be laid. As courts have noted, zillow.com is "inherently unreliable." "Zillow is a participatory site almost like Wikipedia. Whereas Wikipedia allows anyone to input or change specific entries, Zillow allows homeowners to do so. A homeowner with no technical skill beyond the ability to surf the web can log in to Zillow and add or subtract data that will change the value of his property." See In re Darosa 442 B.R. 173, 177 (Bankr. D. Mass. 2010). See also In re Phillips, 491 B.R. 255, 260 (Bankr. D. Nev. 2013). For this reason, reports such as Zillow are not compilations made admissible by Fed. R. Evid. 803(17). Id.

Finally, the broker's price opinion has not been authenticated by the broker. No declaration or affidavit from the broker appears in the record.

21. 15-28479-A-13 MYRNA MCDONALD — ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 12-7-15 [20]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of $79 due on December 2 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

22. 15-25595-A-13 DEAN KASSUBE — MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN 9-11-15 [30]
PGM-1

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the plan fails to provide for the priority tax claim of the IRS in the amount fo $188,038.85. As a result, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2).

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) because unsecured creditors would receive $10,100 in a chapter 7 liquidation as of the effective date of the plan. This plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors.

Third, if the debtor provides for payment of the IRS's priority tax claim and its secured claim, it will take 288 months to complete the plan. This exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Finally, the plan provides for the IRS's secured claim in Class 4. Because the claim is for delinquent taxes, it must be paid in Class 2 absent the affirmative consent of the IRS. The Class 4 claim will not be paid during the pendency of the plan even though this claim is not a long term claim and was in default when the case was filed.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

23. 15-25202-A-13 CLENT/LINDA CLARK — MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
DMW-1 — 11-24-15 [58]
WILLIAM WAGLEY VS.

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(d)(2) & (3) requires a separate notice of hearing which specifies the docket control number, the date and time of the hearing, the location of the courthouse, the courtroom in which the hearing will be held, and whether written opposition must be filed. If written opposition must be filed, the notice of hearing also must specify the date it is due, on whom it must be served, and give notice that the failure to file it in a timely manner may result in the motion being resolved without oral argument and the striking of untimely written opposition.

The original notice included none of this information and, while the amended notice corrected some of the deficiencies, it failed to inform the debtor that written opposition had to be filed 14 days prior to the hearing and if it was not filed the motion could be resolved without oral argument.

24. 12-22443-A-13 PHILLIP HASLEY AND MLISSA RIOLO-HASLEY — MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
EJS-2 — 11-9-15 [50]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

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

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

25. 15-26561-A-13 CATHERINE DEFAZIO — MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
MEV-1 — 11-9-15 [35]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

While a separate certificate of service has been filed for this motion, it references an attached service list which in fact is not attached. Hence, there is no proof that the motion and proposed plan have been served on all parties in interest as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b).

26. 15-20584-A-13 CASEY SNELL — OBJECTION TO CLAIM
JPJ-2 — 10-26-15 [29]
VS. ATLAS ACQUISITIONS, L.L.C.

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Atlas Acquisitions, L.L.C., has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the

claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

Because the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract, California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach but the statute renews upon each payment made after default. The proof of claim indicates the last payment was on November 29, 2007. Therefore, using this date as the date of breach, when the case was filed on January 27, 2015, more than 4 years had passed. Therefore, when the bankruptcy was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1).

27. 10-51694-A-13 MERCEDITA/RUEL PALMERA — MOTION TO APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
PGM-4 — 11-27-15 [114]

Final Ruling: This motion to modify a home loan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

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

28. 15-22694-A-13 CINDY FOSTER — MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
PGM-1 — 11-18-15 [32]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§

1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.