1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 5 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 SACRAMENTO DIVISION 7 8 9 10 11 In re Case No. 04-31240-A13G12 MICHAEL and DEBRA ALLEN, Docket Control No. PAM-1 13 Date: April 18, 2005 Debtors. Time: 9:00 a.m. 14 15 On April 18, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. the court considered the 16 motion for relief from the automatic stay of Household Finance Corp. and the stipulation for its resolution as proposed by the parties. The text of the final ruling appended to minutes of the 17 hearing follows. This final ruling constitutes a "reasoned 18 explanation" for the court's decision and is accordingly posted to the court's Internet site, www.caeb.uscourts.gov, in a textsearchable format as required by the E-Government Act of 2002. 19 The original of this final ruling is appended to the minutes of

FINAL RULING

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the April 18 hearing.

There is a confirmed plan in this case. It requires the debtor to make post-petition installment payments on a long-term debt owed to the movant. The movant's collateral is the debtor's residence. The plan provides for the cure of a pre-petition arrearage owed to the movant.

The secured creditor filed a motion for relief from the automatic stay. The motion asserted that the debtor had breached

the obligation to make post-petition installments directly to the movant.

The parties advised the court that they had resolved that motion by stipulation. They have agreed to an adequate protection order. The proposed adequate protection order will not be entered because it conflicts with the three guidelines set out below.

- 1. With one proviso, the court will not approve a stipulated adequate protection order that provides for ex parte relief in the event of a violation of its terms. The court will approve such a stipulation if the breach warranting ex parte termination of the automatic stay consists of the failure to cure an existing post-petition monetary default within 60 days of the entry of the adequate protection order.
- 2. If it will take a debtor more than 60 days to cure a post-petition default, absent good cause, the default must be cured by modifying the plan to provide for the cure through the trustee.
- 3. Once a post-petition default has been cured, the adequate protection order must end. If the default has been cured, there is no need for an adequate protection order. Therefore, the court will not enter orders permitting ex parte relief or authorizing the motion for relief from the automatic stay to be restored to calendar if the debtor defaults on some future obligation. A new motion must be filed.

///

The traditional role of an adequate protection order is to protect a creditor's interest in the debtor's property after the filing of the petition until the confirmation of the plan. Once the plan is confirmed, the plan makes provision for the adequate protection of the claim. There is no need to make provision for payment of a claim outside of the plan once the plan is confirmed. See In re Cason, 190 B.R. 917, 932 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 1995); In re Johnson, 63 B.R. 550 (Bankr. D. Colo. 1986); In re Moore, 13 B.R. 914 (Bankr. D. Or. 1981). The only post-confirmation role for an adequate protection order is to insure that a relatively minor plan default is cured promptly.

A more onerous adequate protection order that operates after confirmation of the plan amounts to a secret plan modification. That is, other creditors, the trustee, and the United States Trustee know nothing about it and they have no opportunity to object to it. They may wish to complain if the adequate protection offered to just one creditor is unduly preferential.

Or, if the adequate protection order hobbles the debtor's ability to complete the plan, other parties in interest may wish to be heard. Since most chapter 13 debtors, including this debtor, are in chapter 13 in an effort to save their homes, any secret provision that unnecessarily hinders this effort is a concern to all creditors. If the stay is terminated pursuant to the stipulation, a debtor is likely to dismiss the case or permit the trustee to dismiss it. As a result all other creditors suffer.

The court will not permit one creditor and the debtor to get together and modify the plan without notice to every other party

interest even though the modification potentially affects all other creditors. The requirement of Rules 2002(b) and 3015(b), (d), (e), and (g) that the trustee, the United States Trustee, and other creditors be served with the plan or a summary of it is seriously compromised, even negated, if the debtor and one creditor can modify the plan in this fashion.

By permitting the debtor to cure post-petition defaults to secured creditors through an adequate protection order, usually all that is accomplished is that one default is traded for a different default. Generally speaking, all of a debtor's disposable income is devoted to the plan. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b). How, then, will the debtor make the plan payment and the ongoing direct payment to the secured creditor as well as the "catch-up" payment required by the adequate protection order? More often than not, the only way to do it, is to stop making the plan payment which then prompts the chapter 13 trustee to request the dismissal of the case.

For these reasons, the court will generally not depart from the three guidelines laid out above absent very good cause. The stipulation offered in this case departed from them without good cause being demonstrated. Specifically, the stipulation continues for the remainder of the case even though the debtor has cured the default and the stipulation permits ex parte relief until the end of the case.

The court will approve the stipulation provided it is modified to provide for its expiration within 6 months and to require 14 days' notice of a hearing on a renewed motion if there is a default during the 6-month period.