

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
Eastern District of California**

**Honorable Ronald H. Sargis  
Chief Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California**

**January 6, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.**

---

**FINAL RULINGS**

- |    |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1. | <a href="#"><u>20-25508-E-7</u></a><br><a href="#"><u>EMM-1</u></a><br><br>CAM VENTURE I REO, LLC VS. | MIRIAM MALONE AND<br>LEONARDO VASQUEZ<br>Pro Se | MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM<br>AUTOMATIC STAY<br>12-21-20 <a href="#"><u>[14]</u></a> |
|----|---|---|--|

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the January 6, 2021 hearing is required.  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—No Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor (*pro se*), Chapter 7 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 21, 2020. By the court's calculation, 15 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Debtor, creditors, the Chapter 7 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion.

This bankruptcy case having been dismissed, the court has determined that oral argument will not be of assistance in ruling on the present Motion.

**The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is denied without prejudice as moot**, the automatic stay having been terminated by dismissal of this bankruptcy case.

CAM Venture I REO, LLC ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to the real property commonly known as 185 Oceanview Drive, Vista, California ("Property"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Brad Klein to introduce evidence as a basis for Movant's contention that Miriam Malone and Leonardo Vasquez ("Debtor") do not have an ownership interest in or a right to maintain possession of the Property. Movant presents evidence that it is the owner of the

Property. Movant asserts it purchased the Property at a pre-petition Trustee's Sale on May 12, 2020. Based on the evidence presented, Debtor would be at best a tenant at sufferance. Movant commenced an unlawful detainer action in California Superior Court, County of San Diego. Complaint, Exhibit 3, Dckt. 18.

Movant has provided a properly authenticated copy of the recorded Trustee's Deed Upon Sale to substantiate its claim of ownership. Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Property for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Property is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

The instant case was dismissed on December 29, 2020, for failure to timely file documents. Dckt. 23.

The applicable Bankruptcy Code provision for the matter before the court is 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) and (2). That section provides:

In relevant part, 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) provides:

(c) Except as provided in subsections (d), (e), (f), and (h) of this section—

(1) the stay of an act against property of the estate under subsection (a) of this section continues until such **property is no longer property of the estate**;

(2) the stay of any other act under subsection (a) of this section continues until the earliest of—

(A) the time the case is closed;

(B) *the time the case is dismissed*; or

(C) if the case is a case under chapter 7 of this title concerning an individual or a case under chapter 9, 11, 12, or 13 of this title, the time a discharge is granted or denied;

11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (emphasis added).

When a case is dismissed, 11 U.S.C. § 349 discusses the effect of dismissal. In relevant part, 11 U.S.C. § 349 states:

(b) Unless the court, for cause, orders otherwise, a dismissal of a case other than under section 742 of this title—

(1) reinstates—

(A) any proceeding or custodianship superseded under section 543 of this title;

(B) any transfer avoided under section 522, 544, 545, 547, 548, 549, or 724(a) of this title, or preserved under section 510(c)(2), 522(i)(2), or 551 of this title; and

(C) any lien voided under section 506(d) of this title;

(2) vacates any order, judgment, or transfer ordered, under section 522(i)(1), 542, 550, or 553 of this title; and

***(3) reverts the property of the estate in the entity in which such property was vested immediately before the commencement of the case under this title.***

11 U.S.C. § 549(c) (emphasis added).

Therefore, as of December 29, 2020, the automatic stay as it applies to the Property, and as it applies to Debtor, was terminated by operation of law. At that time, the Property ceased being property of the bankruptcy estate and was abandoned, by operation of law, to Debtor.

The court shall issue an order confirming that the automatic stay was terminated and vacated as to Debtor and the Property on December 29, 2020.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by CAM Venture I REO, LLC (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is denied without prejudice as moot, this bankruptcy case having been dismissed on December 29, 2020 (prior to the hearing on this Motion). The court, by this Order, confirms that the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) were terminated as to Miriam Malone and Leonardo Vasquez (“Debtor”) pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(B) and the real property commonly known as 185 Oceanview Drive, Vista, California, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(1) and § 349(b)(3) as of the December 29, 2020 dismissal of this bankruptcy case.

TD AUTO FINANCE LLC VS.

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the January 6, 2020 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 7 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on November 20, 2020. By the court's calculation, 47 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party's failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. *See Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record, there are no disputed material factual issues, and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.**

TD Auto Finance LLC ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2016 Mazda CX-5, VIN ending in 3806 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Richard Woessner to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Lyn Wilson ("Debtor").

Movant argues Debtor has not made 3.88 post-petition payments, with a total of \$1,822.56 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 34.

The Chapter 7 Trustee, Susan K. Smith ("Trustee"), does not oppose the relief requested. Trustee's December 5, 2020 Docket Entry Statement.

## DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$15,558.23 (Declaration, Dckt. 34), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$17,800.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor.

## 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because “cause” is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff’d sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by TD Auto Finance LLC (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2016 Mazda CX-5, VIN ending in 3806 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

No other or additional relief is granted.