

1  
2  
3 NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
4

5  
6 POSTED ON WEBSITE  
7

8  
9 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
FRESNO DIVISION

11 In re ) Case No. 13-13229-B-11  
12 R.K. Best, Inc., )  
13 Debtor. )  
14 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
15 UCB Best Inn, LLC, )  
16 Successor-in-Interest to United )  
Security Bank, )  
17 Secured Creditor. )

18  
19 **MEMORANDUM DECISION REGARDING MOTION FOR  
RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY**

20 This disposition is not appropriate for publication. Although it may be cited for whatever  
21 persuasive value it may have, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 32.1, it has no precedential value, *see*  
9th Cir. B.A.P. R. 8013-1.

22 Marc Forsythe, Esq., of Goe & Forsythe, LLP, appeared on behalf of the secured creditor,  
23 UCB Best Inn, LLC, Successor-in-interest to United Security Bank.

24 Richard Gibson, Esq., of Gibson Law PC, appeared on behalf of the debtor, R.K. Best,  
Inc.

25 This Memorandum Decision follows an evidentiary hearing on a motion for relief  
26 from the automatic stay (the “Motion”) filed by secured creditor UCB Best Inn, LLC,  
27 Successor-in-Interest to United Security Bank (“Best Inn”). The Motion relates to a  
28 pending foreclosure against the Debtor’s only assets, a 61-unit hotel complex and the

1 related furnishings, located in Bakersfield, California (the “Hotel”); it is opposed by the  
2 debtor R.K. Best, Inc. (the “Debtor”). At the time of the evidentiary hearing, this chapter  
3 11 case was only two and one-half month’s old. The timing of the Motion is a significant  
4 factor in the decision process as the Debtor has not yet had an opportunity to confirm a  
5 chapter 11 plan. A ruling in favor of Best Inn will effectively end the bankruptcy case.  
6 However, the Bankruptcy Code and applicable case law do not prohibit a secured creditor  
7 from seeking early relief in appropriate circumstances.<sup>1</sup> The timing of the Motion only  
8 affects, in some cases, the showing which the parties must make to support their  
9 positions. When difficult issues come before the court, the court often has no recourse  
10 but to fall back on the “burden of proof.” The Debtor here had the burden of proof to  
11 show, *inter alia*, that it can “probably” confirm a chapter 11 plan within a reasonable time  
12 and that there is an effective reorganization in process. For the reasons summarized  
13 below, the Debtor has not met that burden and the Motion will be granted.

14 This Memorandum Decision contains the court’s findings of fact and conclusions  
15 of law required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(a), made applicable to this  
16 contested matter by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7052.<sup>2</sup> The court has

---

18 <sup>1</sup> Best Inn’s aggressiveness in this case and the timing of this Motion may be attributable  
19 in part to the fact that the Debtor and its principal, Ramesh Vaghashia, filed a civil action against  
20 Best Inn and its predecessor in the Kern County Superior Court on April 25, 2013, just seven  
21 days before commencement of the bankruptcy (case number S-1500-CV-279215-DRL). Best  
22 Inn removed the civil action to this court on May 23, 2013 (adversary proceeding number 13-  
23 1056). In that civil action, the plaintiffs allege, *inter alia*, that the defendants breached the terms  
24 of a prior settlement agreement and violated the California Business and Professions Code,  
25 causing damage of at least \$1 million. The plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief, and  
26 pray for cancellation of the pending foreclosure. The Debtor states in that pleading that its  
27 financial problems began in 2010 “due to the downturn and recession in the economy.” The  
28 Debtor and Best Inn have already entered into a forbearance agreement in April 2011, to resolve  
a prior default in the underlying mortgage.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all chapter, section and rule references are to the  
Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1330, and to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure,  
Rules 1001-9036, as enacted and promulgated *after* October 17, 2005, the effective date of The  
Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-8, Apr. 20,

1 jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1334, 11 U.S.C. § 362 and General Orders  
2 182 and 330 of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California. This is a  
3 core proceeding as defined in 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(b)(2)(A) & (G).

4 **Background and Findings of Fact.**

5 This bankruptcy was filed on May 2, 2013, one day before the scheduled  
6 foreclosure of liens held by Best Inn.<sup>3</sup> This is a single asset real estate case within the  
7 meaning of § 101(51B), the Debtor’s only scheduled assets and source of income being  
8 the Hotel (valued at \$700,000) and personal property incidental thereto (valued at  
9 \$18,000). The only secured creditors listed on Schedule D are Best Inn (with a scheduled  
10 claim in the amount of \$1.55 million), and the Kern County Treasurer who is in charged  
11 with collecting the Hotel’s real and personal taxes (in the scheduled amount of \$44,000).<sup>4</sup>  
12 Schedule E lists priority tax claims owed to the IRS and the Franchise Tax Board in an  
13 aggregate amount less than \$3,000.<sup>5</sup> The scheduled unsecured claims total approximately  
14 \$238,000, 88% of which appears to arise from “loans” made in 2010 by individuals,  
15 presumably friends and family of the Debtor’s principal.

16 The Debtor’s statement of financial affairs (question #1) reports gross income in  
17 2011 from operation of the business in the amount of \$292,273, declining significantly to  
18

---

19  
20 2005, 119 Stat. 23.

21 <sup>3</sup> Best Inn holds a first priority deed of trust, recorded on April 11, 2006, against the  
22 Hotel property which secures a promissory note in the face amount of \$1.5 million. It also holds  
23 a security interest against the Debtor’s personal property to secure a subsequent loan in the  
24 amount of \$50,000. It appears that Best Inn was in the process of foreclosing both liens when  
25 the petition was filed.

26 <sup>4</sup> Best Inn and the County Treasurer have not yet filed proofs of claim. For purposes of  
27 this Motion, the actual amounts of those claims, as opposed to the scheduled amounts, are  
28 unimportant.

<sup>5</sup> The actual claims filed by the IRS (\$6,083.53) and the FTB (\$1,696.71) total \$7,780.24.  
Based on those claims, the Debtor has not yet filed its 2012 state and federal income tax returns  
and its FICA tax returns for the first two quarters of 2013.

1 \$192,348.04 in 2012. The Debtor reports gross income of \$67,000 year-to-date (January  
2 through April) for 2013. The Debtor's monthly operating report for May 2013 shows a  
3 gross revenue of \$17,069.57. The Debtor also lodged a copy of its June 2013 monthly  
4 operating report as an exhibit to this Motion. It reports gross revenue for that month in  
5 the amount of \$17,718.26. Based on these numbers for the first half of 2013, the court  
6 can infer that the Debtor is on track to realize a gross revenue in 2013 of approximately  
7 \$203,600.

8 The Hotel is owned and operated by Ramesh Kumar Vaghashia ("Ramesh") and  
9 his wife Jagrutiben.<sup>6</sup> Ramesh is 48 years old, he was educated in India and holds a degree  
10 in business administration. He has worked in the hotel business with his uncle Govind  
11 Vaghashia ("Govind") since 1992 and took over the operation of this Hotel, with his  
12 cousin in 1999. Ramesh purchased his cousin's interest in the Hotel in 2011 and has been  
13 solely responsible for its operation since that time. By 2012, the Hotel was delinquent in  
14 its payments to the original lender and Ramesh had to borrow money from Govind, in an  
15 unspecified amount, to bring the loan current.

16 One day before the start of this evidentiary hearing, the Debtor filed a proposed  
17 chapter 11 plan, without a supporting disclosure statement, but it had not yet been placed  
18 on the court's docket and had not been reviewed by the court before the hearing. The  
19 evidentiary hearing commenced with an opening statement from Debtor's counsel,  
20 Richard Gibson, Esq., in which he attempted to explain, somewhat apologetically, the  
21

---

22 <sup>6</sup> The documents in the record offer three different spellings for the last name of the  
23 Debtor's principals. The name listed on the petition and the related documents is Vaghashia. In  
24 opposition to the Motion, Mr. Vaghashia's uncle, Govind, signed and filed a declaration showing  
25 the family name to be Vaghasia. The name stated on the Debtor's List of Equity Holders is also  
26 Vaghasia. Various documents lodged in support of and opposition to the Motion, including the  
27 Debtor's 2011 federal tax return also show the Debtor's principal's name to be Vaghasia.  
28 However, in the Debtor's subsequent First Amended Chapter 11 Plan, uncle Govind's name is  
spelled Vaghashia. In support of a subsequent request filed in this Motion for leave to file late  
documents, the Debtor's principal signed a declaration spelling his name Vaghesia. For  
purposes of this memorandum, the court will use the name as spelled on the petition, Vaghashia.

1 difficult circumstances that led to the Debtor's decline and need for bankruptcy  
2 protection. Mr. Gibson described the Debtor as a "mom and pop" operation not affiliated  
3 with any other hotel organization. The Hotel's operation is managed solely by Ramesh.  
4 The Debtor has one employee, who is paid in cash, and no formal bookkeeping system.  
5 All of the Debtor's books and records were kept by hand in paper form and the Debtor  
6 had no computerized records or journals of its operation. Indeed, the Debtor was unable  
7 to timely file its evidence in preparation for the evidentiary hearing because appropriate  
8 financial records did not exist; all of its "paper" records had to first be compiled in exhibit  
9 form by the Debtor's bookkeeper. (See Debtor's Ex Parte Application to Permit Late  
10 Filing of Documents filed on July 18, 2013.) The Hotel sits in a location where there is  
11 intense competition from various chain hotels, which advertise heavily and frequently  
12 undercut the Debtor's pricing for hotel rooms. At the time of the hearing, the Debtor's  
13 only medium of advertisement was the telephone yellow pages, which began in February  
14 2013.

15 Mr. Gibson also summarized the Debtor's proposed plan to comprise two essential  
16 components: (1) a 30-year amortization of the debt to Best Inn with interest at the annual  
17 rate of 5.5%; and (2) a new "loan" in the amount of \$150,000 from Govind. At that, the  
18 court questioned whether the Debtor had any authority for the proposition that the 30-year  
19 amortization of a commercial loan would be "fair and equitable" within the meaning of  
20 § 1129(b)(2) for purposes of a cram-down contest with Best Inn. Debtor's counsel made  
21 an offer of proof on that issue in the form of testimony from Govind, but no such proof  
22 was forthcoming and the 30-year amortization issue was subsequently abandoned.

23 Midway through the evidentiary hearing, immediately after the direct testimony of  
24 Ramesh and the first break, the Debtor's counsel offered to change the terms of the  
25 proposed plan to: (1) reduce the amortization period from 30 to 15 years; and (2) include  
26 a conditional offer to guarantee performance of the plan by Govind. In subsequent  
27 testimony, Govind also offered to train and assist his nephew in how to market the Hotel  
28 and rebuild the Debtor's business.

1 After the cross-examination of Ramesh, the Debtor called Govind to the witness  
2 stand. Govind testified that he owns and operates seven successful hotels in Southern  
3 California, and that he has a personal net worth of \$20 million, a personal line of credit of  
4 \$5 million, and is conditionally willing to guarantee the Debtor's performance of a  
5 chapter 11 plan. Govind's testimony was supported only by a declaration filed on June  
6 13, 2012, with a copy of a bank statement showing that Govind had \$235,454 in the bank  
7 at that time. Govind's testimony was not supported by any financial statements and  
8 nothing else regarding his personal financial condition was previously provided to this  
9 court or to Best Inn. Govind also testified extensively regarding various marketing  
10 programs and strategies that the Debtor could, but has not yet, employ to increase its  
11 gross revenue. He estimated, without supporting evidence, that proper marketing of the  
12 Hotel could increase the Debtor's revenue by at least 15%.

13 At the conclusion of Govind's testimony, the court broke early for lunch and gave  
14 the parties an opportunity to try to negotiate a settlement based on the newly introduced  
15 offer of financial support from Govind. That effort was unsuccessful for undisclosed  
16 reasons. However, upon resumption of the hearing, the Debtor offered to again amend  
17 the proposed plan, this time to drop all contingencies attached to Govind's offer of  
18 financial support and extend Govind's personal guarantee of the plan based on whatever  
19 property valuation and terms for treatment of Best Inn's claim the court may ultimately  
20 approve. In closing argument, Mr. Gibson acknowledged that it would be difficult for the  
21 Debtor to reorganize based on its current operating conditions. He argued, in essence,  
22 that this case is no longer about the Debtor, it's about Govind's ability to rebuild the  
23 Debtor using his experience and financial resources.

24 One week after the hearing, on July 29, 2013, the Debtor filed its proposed First  
25 Amended Chapter 11 Plan (the "Proposed Plan") again without a supporting disclosure  
26  
27  
28

1 statement.<sup>7</sup> The Proposed Plan is based upon an undefined restructure of the debt to Best  
2 Inn on terms to be “determined by the Bankruptcy Court” which will be “unequivocally  
3 guaranteed” by Govind. The terms of the “guarantee” itself will be stated in “separate  
4 guarantee documents” which were not included with the Proposed Plan. The Proposed  
5 Plan provides for a “new value” contribution of \$150,000 (the source of which will be the  
6 loan from Govind mentioned above), one-half of which will be distributed to unsecured  
7 creditors, and the Debtor’s principals will retain their equity interests.

8 **Issues Presented.**

9 Best Inn requests relief from the automatic stay pursuant to § 362(d)(1) & (d)(2).  
10 Best Inn contends that cause exists to terminate the stay pursuant to § 362(d)(1) based,  
11 *inter alia*, on the uncontested fact that: (1) the Debtor had failed to make at least six  
12 prepetition payments on Best Inn’s secured obligation; and (2) the Debtor had failed to  
13 pay more than \$93,000 in prepetition property taxes (which Best Inn recently paid to  
14 protect the collateral, and added to its loan balance). There was no testimony or evidence  
15 introduced at the hearing to refute these issues and the court accepts the well-pled facts in  
16 the moving papers and the supporting declaration of Timothy Ault in support of a finding  
17 that these facts are true. Accordingly, there is no dispute that some cause exists to grant  
18 the Motion. As part of an early cash collateral order, the Debtor has been making \$4,000  
19 monthly payments to Best Inn, which arguably covers the accruing interest in the secured  
20 portion (\$700,000) of Best Inn’s loan, and there was no evidence to suggest that the Hotel  
21 property itself is distressed or declining in value. The court therefore declines to find that  
22 Best Inn’s interest in the Hotel is not, for now, adequately protected.

23 Best Inn contends that relief from stay is also appropriate under § 362(d)(2)  
24 because (1) the Debtor has no equity in the Hotel, and (2) the Hotel is not necessary to an  
25 effective reorganization. Here, based on the Debtor’s own schedules, the “lack of equity”

---

26  
27 <sup>7</sup> The Proposed Plan is also incomplete with regard to the treatment of certain claims,  
28 such as the Class 1 priority claims, and does not appear to be the actual document which the  
Debtor hopes to confirm.

1 issue is undisputed, so this part of the Motion boils down to the “effective reorganization”  
2 question. Despite the fact that the Motion was filed by Best Inn, the Debtor bears the  
3 burden of proof on this issue. § 362(g).

4 **Analysis and Conclusions of Law.**

5 **Timing of the Motion and the Burden of Proof.** Before proceeding, it is  
6 necessary to identify the rules that define what the Debtor is required to show and what  
7 the court must determine. When faced with a motion for relief from stay under  
8 § 362(d)(2), the debtor has the burden to show “a reasonable possibility of a successful  
9 reorganization within a reasonable time.” *United Sav. Assn v. Timbers of Inwood Forest*  
10 *Assoc., Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 376 (1988). Applying this rule to subsequent cases, the Ninth  
11 Circuit Bankruptcy Appellate Panel has adopted the four-part test first stated in *In re*  
12 *Holly’s, Inc.*, 140 B.R. 643, 700 (Bankr. W.D. Mich. 1992) in which the burden of proof  
13 is described as a “moving target which is more difficult to attain as the Chapter 11 case  
14 progresses.” *See, In re Sun Valley Newspapers, Inc.*, 171 B.R. 71, 75 (9th Cir. BAP  
15 1994). The *Holly’s*, court separated the inquiry into four stages based on the timing of the  
16 creditor’s motion for relief: “The four broad categories can be stated as follows: (1) is it  
17 *plausible* that a successful reorganization will occur within a reasonable time?; (2) is it  
18 *probable* that a successful reorganization will occur within a reasonable time?; (3) is it  
19 *assured* that a successful reorganization will soon occur?; or (4) is it *impossible* that a  
20 successful reorganization will occur within a reasonable time?” *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at 700  
21 (emphasis original); *see also, Sun Valley Newspapers, Inc.*, 171 B.R. at 75.

22 *Holly’s*, teaches us that the *Timbers* standard imposes an increasing burden of  
23 proof on the debtor regarding the viability of reorganization as a means of balancing a  
24 debtor’s need to reorganize against the delay, and consequent harm, imposed on creditors  
25 by the automatic stay. Initially the balance favors the debtor. But the burden of proof  
26 rapidly shifts in favor of secured creditors, requiring a heightened showing by the debtor  
27 of its ability to reorganize. Immediately after the case is filed, a debtor opposing stay  
28 relief may offer a “less strenuous” showing of “a reasonable possibility of successful

1 reorganization within a reasonable time.” During this stage, the debtor may sustain its  
2 burden of proof by offering evidence that a successful reorganization within a reasonable  
3 time is “plausible.” The standard is initially low, requiring only evidence that is  
4 “superficially worthy of belief” that the debtor is capable of producing a plan. The terms  
5 of the plan can be obscure and vague, as long as it is plausible that a successful  
6 reorganization may occur. The bankruptcy court must balance the reasonableness of the  
7 delay borne by the secured creditors against the debtor’s ability to formulate a  
8 confirmable plan. During this early phase of the case, if the debtor presents any evidence  
9 that a confirmable plan is plausible, the balance favors the debtor and the creditors are  
10 expected to wait while the debtor attempts to craft its plan. *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at 701.

11 As expiration of the exclusivity period draws near, a greater showing is required;  
12 the debtor must show that a successful plan of reorganization is “probable.” “Probable”  
13 requires an evidentiary showing that it is more likely than not that the debtor is capable of  
14 producing a plan that is confirmable. Though not required to produce a plan or satisfy  
15 confirmation standards, it must produce sufficient evidence “that the tools necessary to  
16 formulate a plan are available.” During this phase of the case, “the balance between the  
17 reasonableness of the delay borne by the secured creditors and the debtor’s ability to  
18 formulate a plan is approximately equal.” If the court can’t be persuaded that a successful  
19 reorganization is probable, no further delay is warranted and the court should grant stay  
20 relief. *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at 701-02.

21 After exclusivity ends, the debtor faces the “most stringent and convincing  
22 showing” as to the viability of reorganization. The debtor must offer evidence that a  
23 successful reorganization within a reasonable time is “assured.” “Assured” means that  
24 evidence offered in opposition to the motion for stay relief demonstrates that it is “certain  
25 or unquestionable that *a plan* to be considered at confirmation *will soon be produced.*”  
26 (emphasis original). Even at this late stage the debtor is not required to produce a plan to  
27 defend a motion for stay relief. But the debtor must produce “concrete evidence” that a  
28 plan capable of confirmation is forthcoming. After the expiration of the exclusivity

1 period, the “balance between the reasonableness of the delay borne by a secured creditor  
2 and the debtor’s ability to formulate a plan favors the creditor.” If the debtor fails in its  
3 showing, the creditor should be put to no further delay and the stay should be lifted.

4 *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at 702.

5 Finally, notwithstanding the amount of time that a case has been pending, whether  
6 long or short, the court must grant relief if successful reorganization is “impossible.”

7 “Impossible” means there is a “lack of any realistic prospect of effective reorganization.”

8 *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at 702-03.

9 This case falls within the second temporal phase described in *Holly’s*, the  
10 “probable” stage. The exclusivity period under § 1121(b) has not yet expired, but neither  
11 was this Motion brought immediately after the case was filed.<sup>8</sup> Balancing the  
12 reasonableness of further delay to be borne by Best Inn against the Debtor’s ability to  
13 formulate a confirmable plan, the court must take into consideration that the need for  
14 bankruptcy relief wasn’t forced upon the Debtor as a result of sudden or unexpected  
15 circumstances. The Debtor’s financial difficulties began in 2010. The secured claim that  
16 Best Inn seeks to enforce has already been in default and the Debtor has already entered  
17 into at least one forbearance agreement to restructure the debt. (*See* footnote 1, *supra*.)  
18 The Debtor has had at least three years to address its financial problems and to develop a  
19 marketing and financial strategy to improve its business and save its assets. The fact that  
20 the Debtor has not seriously addressed these issues prior to the evidentiary hearing is a  
21 significant factor in the court’s deliberation. The Debtor has had the protection of the  
22 automatic stay for more than two months to come forward with a feasible plan and show  
23 that it can “probably” reorganize. The court must therefore examine the evidence to  
24 determine whether it is “more likely than not” that the Debtor can produce a confirmable

---

25  
26 <sup>8</sup> The Debtor is not a “small business” within the meaning of § 101(51D). Therefore, the  
27 exclusivity period expires 120 days after the commencement of the case, August 30, 2013.  
28 § 1121(b). The evidentiary hearing was held July 22, 2013, 81 days after commencement of the  
case.

1 plan and that “the tools necessary to formulate a plan are available.” *Holly’s*, 140 B.R. at  
2 702. It is against the backdrop that the court will consider the Motion.

3 **The Probability of a Successful Reorganization.** Addressing the “probable  
4 reorganization” issue, Debtor’s counsel first called the Debtor’s principal Ramesh  
5 Vaghashia to testify with regard to the Debtor’s financial records and future projections.  
6 Much of Mr. Vaghashia’s testimony was confusing, ambiguous, and inconsistent with the  
7 documents offered into evidence. Best Inn points to the precipitous decline in gross  
8 revenue (approximately \$100,000, more than one-third of the gross for 2011) reported on  
9 the Debtor’s statement of financial affairs for 2011 and 2012 as evidence of the fact that  
10 the Debtor is in serious financial difficulty. The Debtor’s June monthly operating report  
11 showed a positive cash flow, for the first two months of operation, of less than \$4,000.  
12 However, it gave no details to show what expenses had, or had not, been paid. The June  
13 report showed a negative cash balance in the bank and numerous postpetition charges to  
14 the Debtor’s account for bad checks.

15 Ramesh’s testimony regarding pre and postpetition gross and net revenues was not  
16 supported by the Debtor’s own profit and loss statement and monthly operating reports.  
17 For example, Ramesh acknowledged that the “lodging sales” figures (\$278,662.83)  
18 reflected in the 2012 profit and loss statements (Debtor’s exhibit B - the “2012 P&L  
19 Statement”) was grossly overstated because it included cash advances (money charged to  
20 the Hotel customer’s credit cards and given back to the customers after the deduction of a  
21 substantial fee) totaling approximately \$121,700. If this is true, then the Debtor’s actual  
22 gross income for 2012 would be closer to \$157,000, not the figure of \$192,384 reported  
23 in the statement of financial affairs. After adjustment for these “cash advances,” the 2012  
24 P&L Statement reports a net *operating loss* (adjusted to delete the depreciation expense)  
25 of more than \$90,000. The 2012 P&L Statement does little to show that reorganization of  
26 the Debtor is probable.

27 On cross-examination, Ramesh was questioned about Best Inn’s exhibit 15, the  
28

1 Debtor's 2012 tenant occupancy tax ("TOT") return which reports "total rents received  
2 from all rental units" totaling approximately \$125,000, far below both the "Income from  
3 operation of business" reported on the statement of financial affairs (\$192,348), and the  
4 "lodging sales" reported on the Debtor's own 2012 P&L Statement (\$156,962 after  
5 adjustment for the "customer charge backs"). In response, Ramesh explained that the  
6 TOT returns were wrong, and that his former business associate had intentionally  
7 understated the "total rents" to the County tax collector.<sup>9</sup>

8 Finally, with regard to projected future performance, Ramesh testified that the  
9 Hotel's business is seasonal, the best season begins in March and improves through the  
10 summer months. Ramesh projected that the Hotel's gross revenue should be  
11 approximately \$30,000 per month for the months of June, July, and August. This  
12 testimony stands in stark contrast to the Debtor's monthly operating reports which show  
13 actual gross income for the months of May and June 2012, to be \$17,069.57 and  
14 \$17,718,86, respectively.

15 In summary, Ramesh's testimony regarding the Debtor's past performance and his  
16 "optimistic" projections for future performance were simply unbelievable. Ramesh did  
17 not have a firm grip on the Debtor's operations and a clear understanding of its financial  
18 conditions. When questioned, Ramesh seemed unfamiliar with the financial data and was  
19 woefully unable to explain the numerous discrepancies. When asked about the real  
20 property taxes (an issue near and dear to Best Inn), Ramesh didn't know how much the  
21 taxes were and could not explain why the monthly report did not show that money was  
22 being reserved to pay the property taxes. Ramesh's testimony, and the documents he  
23

---

24 <sup>9</sup> Ramesh testified that during this time, an unknown number of rooms were rented for cash and  
25 the tenants were not charged the TOT. Based on Ramesh's testimony, the Debtor has a duty to file  
26 amended TOT returns to correctly report the total rents received for every year in which the false TOT  
27 returns were filed. There was no evidence, that the Debtor intends to file corrected TOT returns, or that  
28 the Debtor can possibly account for the "total rents" in those prior years based on its informal  
bookkeeping system. The County, however, would presumably be entitled to assert a priority claim for  
taxes, penalties and interest relating to the fraudulent TOT returns. The Debtor has not acknowledged or  
provided for this potential claim in either its Proposed Plan or its proposed budget.

1 offered into evidence, do not show that a successful reorganization is probable, or that  
2 any reorganization is even in process. Further, the court is not persuaded that the tools  
3 are presently in place to formulate and perform a successful plan of reorganization.

4 **The Debtor's Proposed Plan.** Before concluding, the court will address the  
5 Proposed Plan which the Debtor filed a week after the evidentiary hearing. The Debtor  
6 was not required to file a plan in response to a motion for relief from stay, but if a plan is  
7 so filed, the bankruptcy court is not required to hold a hearing to determine if the plan  
8 offered is confirmable before it can rule on the Motion. The court is only required to  
9 "determine if a successful reorganization is possible within a reasonable period of time.  
10 *In re Sun Valley Newspaper, Inc.*, 171 B.R. at 74 (rejecting the notion that a debtor could  
11 file an amended chapter 11 plan prior to every relief from stay hearing, "and thus be able  
12 to continue the hearings *ad infinitum*") (emphasis original).

13 As mentioned above, the Proposed Plan is premised on the suggestion that Govind  
14 will "unequivocally guarantee" performance of a plan confirmed on whatever terms the  
15 court may determine to be "fair and equitable." Govind also offered to train Ramesh and  
16 help him develop a better marketing plan for the Hotel. However, Govind is not  
17 proposing to purchase the Hotel and personally assume the Hotel's liabilities. Neither is  
18 he offering to take over and actually direct the Hotel's business operations which will  
19 apparently remain with Ramesh. The haunting question that remains unanswered after all  
20 of the testimony is: Why was the Debtor unable, or unwilling, to adjust to the changing  
21 market conditions in 2011 and 2012, when it was so apparent that the Debtor was headed  
22 for a financial disaster? Assuming for now that Govind could make some positive  
23 changes in the Hotel's operations, there was no evidence, empirical or otherwise, to show  
24 that the Hotel's declining business operations can be drastically reversed, within a  
25 reasonable period of time, to make the Proposed Plan feasible. Govind's nebulous offer  
26 of educational, logistical, and financial support is, at best, speculation and the court  
27 cannot find that the Debtor has an "effective reorganization in prospect" based solely on a  
28

1 new scheme conceived and tendered for the first time in the middle of the evidentiary  
2 hearing. It is reversible error for a bankruptcy court to confirm a chapter 11 plan that is  
3 based on “visionary schemes which promise creditors and equity security holders more  
4 . . . than the debtor can possibly attain after confirmation.” *Pizza of Hawaii, Inc. v.*  
5 *Shakey’s Inc. (In re Pizza of Hawaii, Inc.)*, 761 F.2d 1374, 1382 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985) quoting 5  
6 *Collier on Bankruptcy* ¶ 1129.02[11] at 1129-34 (15<sup>th</sup> ed. 1984).

7 **Application of Rule 4001(a)(3).**

8  
9 Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) provides that an order granting a  
10 motion for relief from an automatic stay is stayed until the expiration of 14 days after the  
11 order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Best Inn did not specifically request  
12 that the court waive this rule, however, the court must consider its application here in  
13 light of the circumstances. Rule 4001(a)(3), which was added by the 1999 amendments  
14 to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, recognizes that motions granting relief  
15 from the automatic stay can have enormous consequences for the parties involved and can  
16 often dictate the success or failure of the entire bankruptcy case. Rule 4001(a)(3) enables  
17 the debtor, or other party who opposes relief from stay, to seek a stay pending appeal of  
18 an adverse ruling. 9 *Collier on Bankruptcy*, (15th Ed. Revised), ¶ 4001.04A, pg. 4001-  
19 18. “[W]ithout a stay pending appeal, appeals from such orders can often become moot if  
20 the party granted relief proceeds with a sale or some other action that cannot be easily  
21 undone.” *Id.* at pg. 4001-19. For that reason, the court is reluctant to make any ruling  
22 which prematurely terminates the Debtor’s appellate remedies.

23 Best Inn published a notice of sale under Cal.Civ.Code § 2924(f)(b) for  
24 enforcement of its liens before commencement of this bankruptcy. That sale date has  
25 been postponed to some future date pending a ruling on this motion. In theory, Best Inn  
26 will be in a position to conduct a trustee’s sale soon after this ruling is entered. The  
27 timing and delay inherent in the State’s statutory foreclosure scheme will not give the  
28 protection here that is intended by Rule 4001(a)(3). In addition, the court is not yet

1 persuaded that there isn't room for some deal to be worked out between Govind and Best  
2 Inn once the parties have had an opportunity to absorb the impact of this ruling.

3 **Conclusion.**

4 Based on the foregoing, the court is not persuaded that this Debtor can probably  
5 reorganize and confirm a chapter 11 plan based on the strength of its own resources. The  
6 Debtor now acknowledges that reorganization of the Hotel will require the massive  
7 personal and financial intervention of a third party, Govind Vaghashia. However, the  
8 Debtor currently does not have a viable chapter 11 plan, the only plan on file at the time  
9 of the evidentiary hearing having been materially amended twice during the course of the  
10 evidentiary hearing, and the subsequent Proposed Plan being incomplete and unsupported  
11 by evidence of its "probable" feasibility. Mr. Vaghashia's ability to both underwrite a  
12 successful chapter 11 plan and rebuild this Debtor into a profitable operation within a  
13 reasonable time is, at this point, purely speculative. Clearly, cause exists to terminate the  
14 automatic stay and the Debtor has not sustained its burden to establish that an effective  
15 reorganization is probable within a reasonable period of time. Accordingly, the Motion  
16 will be granted. The automatic stay will be terminated as it applies to Best Inn's right to  
17 exercise its remedies against the Hotel under applicable nonbankruptcy law. The  
18 fourteen-day stay of the court's order pursuant to Fed.R.Bankr.P. 4001(a)(3) will **not** be  
19 waived. Best Inn shall submit a proposed order consistent herewith.

20  
21 Dated: August 6, 2013

22 /s/ W. Richard Lee

23 W. Richard Lee

24 United States Bankruptcy Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28