

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Ronald H. Sargis

Bankruptcy Judge

Modesto, California

January 16, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

1. [24-90700-E-7](#)
[SPS-1](#)

ELIJAH DAVIS AND
MONSERATH VOLKOV
Pro Se

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
12-18-24 [[22](#)]

WILMINGTON TRUST NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION VS.

Item 1 thru 2

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

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor (*pro se*) and all creditors and parties in interest on December 18, 2024. By the court's calculation, 29 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). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Wilmington Trust, National Association, not in its individual capacity but solely as Delaware Trustee of SMRF Trust VIII-A ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Elijah Davis and Monserath Volkov's ("Debtor") real property commonly known as 337 & 337 ½ Rose Ave., Venice, CA 90291 ("Property"). Movant has provided the Declaration of Melissa Braun to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property. Decl., Docket 25.

January 16, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

- Page 1 of 23 -

Movant argues Debtor is the latest recipient of partial interests in real property belonging to Brittany Dawn Debeikes (“Borrower”). Movant alleges Borrower was facing foreclosure, so she gifts a partial interest in her property to someone who immediately files bankruptcy, Debtor here, and uses that other person’s automatic stay to delay, hinder, and defraud the foreclosing lender. Movant seeks relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4).

Movant provides evidence that Borrower incurred multiple loans in the amount of approximately \$1,500,000 each secured against various parcels of real property. Decl., Docket 25. All loans were in default with foreclosure sales scheduled, and those sales were frustrated by Borrower transferring an interest to a person who then filed bankruptcy.

The loan incurred against the real Property in this case was in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 and incurred on December 30, 2019. *Id.* at ¶ 6. As the loan went into default, the sale was scheduled for October 1, 2024, and then continued to November 5, 2024. Just before the sale, Movant received a notice that the Property had been conveyed in part to Debtor and that Debtor had filed bankruptcy just prior to the foreclosure sale being conducted. *Id.* at ¶ 9. Movant states in its Memorandum of Points and Authorities that the deed and notary on the deed were a forgery, the notary not existing. Mem. 4:24-27, Docket 27.

Movant provides the following table of Borrower’s various parcels of properties and related bankruptcies:

Address	E.D. Cal. Bankruptcies
333 & 333 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
355 & 355 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
359 & 359 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
341 & 341 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-24801 24-90700 (instant bankruptcy)
337 & 337 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-24801 24-90700 (instant bankruptcy)
1414 Main St, Venice, CA	24-25062

Id. at 2:16-28.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4)

Prospective Relief from Future Stays

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) allows the court to grant relief from the stay when the court finds that the petition was filed as a part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either (i) transfer of all or part ownership or interest in the property without consent of the secured creditors or court approval or (ii) multiple bankruptcy cases affecting particular property. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07 (Alan n. Resnick & Henry H. Sommer eds. 16th ed.).

Certain patterns and conduct that have been characterized as bad faith include recent transfers of assets, a debtor's inability to reorganize, and unnecessary delays by serial filings. *Id.*

Relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) may be granted if the court finds that two elements have been met. The filing of the present case must be part of a scheme, and it must contain improper transfers or multiple cases affecting the same property.

Here, it is apparent in the record that this bankruptcy is part of a scheme to hinder and delay Movant. The transfer to Debtor was made just prior to filing, and the transfer follows an obvious trend that Borrower has been engaging in to delay foreclosures.

With respect to the elements, the court concludes that the filing of the current Chapter 7 case in the Eastern District of California was part of a scheme by Debtor to hinder and delay Movant from conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale by filing multiple bankruptcy cases.

The fact that a debtor commences a bankruptcy case to stop a foreclosure sale is neither shocking nor *per se* bad faith. The automatic stay was created to stabilize the financial crisis and allow all parties, debtor and creditors, to take stock of the situation. The filing of the current Chapter 7 case cannot have been for any bona fide, good faith reason in light of the improper and possibly fraudulent property transfers.

The court finds that proper grounds exist for issuing an order pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Movant has provided sufficient evidence concerning bankruptcy cases being filed to prevent actions against the Property. Movant has provided the court with evidence that Debtor has engaged in a scheme to hinder, defraud, and delay creditors through the multiple filing of bankruptcy cases.

In granting the 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) relief, the court notes that such is not the end of the game for Debtor. While granting relief through this case, if Debtor has a good faith, bona fide reason to commence another case while that order is in effect for the Property, the judge in the subsequent case can impose the stay in that case. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4). That would ensure that Debtor, to the extent that some bona fide reason existed, would effectively assert such rights rather than filing several bankruptcy cases that are then dismissed.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3)

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, to halt the fraudulent transfer scheme, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. Mot. 2:23-26, Docket 22.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Wilmington Trust, National Association, not in its individual capacity but solely as Delaware Trustee of SMRF Trust VIII-A (“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 granted, and the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed that is recorded against the real property commonly known as 337 & 337 ½ Rose Ave., Venice, CA 90291 (“Property”) to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale to obtain possession of the Property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above relief is also granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), which further provides:

“If recorded in compliance with applicable State laws governing notices of interests or liens in real property, an order entered under paragraph (4) shall be binding in any other case under this title purporting to affect such real property filed not later than 2 years after the date of the entry of such order by the court, except that a debtor in a subsequent case under this title may move for relief from such order based upon changed circumstances or for good cause shown, after notice and a hearing. Any Federal, State, or local governmental unit that accepts notices of interests or liens in real property shall accept any certified copy of an order described in this subsection for indexing and recording.”

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

2. [24-90700](#)-E-7
[SPS-2](#)

ELIJAH DAVIS AND
MONSERATH VOLKOV

Pro Se

WILMINGTON TRUST NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION VS.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY

12-18-24 [\[31\]](#)

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

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor (*pro se*) and all creditors and parties in interest on December 18, 2024. By the court's calculation, 29 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). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Wilmington Trust, National Association, not in its individual capacity but solely as Delaware Trustee of SMRF Trust VIII-A ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Elijah Davis and Monserath Volkov's ("Debtor") real property commonly known as 341 Rose Ave., Venice, CA 90291 ("Property"). Movant has provided the Declaration of Melissa Braun to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property. Decl., Docket 33.

Movant argues Debtor is the latest recipient of partial interests in real property belonging to Brittany Dawn Debeikes ("Borrower"). Movant alleges Borrower was facing foreclosure, so she gifts a partial interest in her property to someone who immediately files bankruptcy, Debtor here, and uses that other person's automatic stay to delay, hinder, and defraud the foreclosing lender. Movant seeks relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4).

Movant provides evidence that Borrower incurred multiple loans in the amount of approximately \$1,500,000 each secured against various parcels of real property. Decl., Docket 33. All loans were in

default with foreclosure sales scheduled, and those sales were frustrated by Borrower transferring an interest to a person who then filed bankruptcy.

The loan incurred against the real Property in this case was in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 and incurred on December 30, 2019. *Id.* at ¶ 7. As the loan went into default, the sale was scheduled for October 1, 2024, and then continued to November 5, 2024. Just before the sale, Movant received a notice that the Property had been conveyed in part to Debtor and that Debtor had filed bankruptcy just prior to the foreclosure sale being conducted. *Id.* at ¶ 8. Movant states in its Memorandum of Points and Authorities that the deed and notary on the deed were a forgery, the notary not existing. Mem. 4:24-27, Docket 35.

Movant provides the following table of Borrower's various parcels of properties and related bankruptcies:

Address	E.D. Cal. Bankruptcies
333 & 333 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
355 & 355 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
359 & 359 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-90601 24-13319
341 & 341 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-24801 24-90700 (instant bankruptcy)
337 & 337 1/2 Rose Ave, Venice, CA	24-24801 24-90700 (instant bankruptcy)
1414 Main St, Venice, CA	24-25062

Id. at 2:16-28.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4)

Prospective Relief from Future Stays

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) allows the court to grant relief from the stay when the court finds that the petition was filed as a part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either (i) transfer of all or part ownership or interest in the property without consent of the secured creditors or court approval or (ii) multiple bankruptcy cases affecting particular property. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07 (Alan n. Resnick & Henry H. Sommer eds. 16th ed.).

Certain patterns and conduct that have been characterized as bad faith include recent transfers of assets, a debtor's inability to reorganize, and unnecessary delays by serial filings. *Id.*

Relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) may be granted if the court finds that two elements have been met. The filing of the present case must be part of a scheme, and it must contain improper transfers or multiple cases affecting the same property.

Here, it is apparent in the record that this bankruptcy is part of a scheme to hinder and delay Movant. The transfer to Debtor was made just prior to filing, and the transfer follows an obvious trend that Borrower has been engaging in to delay foreclosures.

With respect to the elements, the court concludes that the filing of the current Chapter 7 case in the Eastern District of California was part of a scheme by Debtor to hinder and delay Movant from conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale by filing multiple bankruptcy cases.

The fact that a debtor commences a bankruptcy case to stop a foreclosure sale is neither shocking nor *per se* bad faith. The automatic stay was created to stabilize the financial crisis and allow all parties, debtor and creditors, to take stock of the situation. The filing of the current Chapter 7 case cannot have been for any bona fide, good faith reason in light of the improper and possibly fraudulent property transfers.

The court finds that proper grounds exist for issuing an order pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Movant has provided sufficient evidence concerning bankruptcy cases being filed to prevent actions against the Property. Movant has provided the court with evidence that Debtor has engaged in a scheme to hinder, defraud, and delay creditors through the multiple filing of bankruptcy cases.

In granting the 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) relief, the court notes that such is not the end of the game for Debtor. While granting relief through this case, if Debtor has a good faith, bona fide reason to commence another case while that order is in effect for the Property, the judge in the subsequent case can impose the stay in that case. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4). That would ensure that Debtor, to the extent that some bona fide reason existed, would effectively assert such rights rather than filing several bankruptcy cases that are then dismissed.

**Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3)
Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement**

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, to halt the fraudulent transfer scheme, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. Mot. 2:23-26, Docket 31.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Wilmington Trust, National Association, not in its individual capacity but solely as Delaware Trustee of SMRF Trust VIII-A (“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 granted, and the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed that is recorded against the real property commonly known as 341 Rose Ave., Venice, CA 90291 (“Property”) to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale to obtain possession of the Property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above relief is also granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), which further provides:

“If recorded in compliance with applicable State laws governing notices of interests or liens in real property, an order entered under paragraph (4) shall be binding in any other case under this title purporting to affect such real property filed not later than 2 years after the date of the entry of such order by the court, except that a debtor in a subsequent case under this title may move for relief from such order based upon changed circumstances or for good cause shown, after notice and a hearing. Any Federal, State, or local governmental unit that accepts notices of interests or liens in real property shall accept any certified copy of an order described in this subsection for indexing and recording.”

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

COREY & FAYE FENIG 2008
REVOCABLE TRUST VS.

DEBTORS DISMISSED: 12/05/24

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

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

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—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, parties in interest, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 10, 2024. By the court's calculation, 37 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. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offer 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. At the hearing, -----

-----.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted, the automatic stay having been terminated by dismissal of this bankruptcy case.

Corey & Faye Fenig 2008 Revocable Trust as to an undivided 57,000.00/112,000.00 interest; and Pokras Family Trust as to an undivided 55,000.00/112,000.00 interest, its successors and/or assignees ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Raul Moors and Laura Kirk's ("Debtor") real property commonly known as 13603 Chadron Ave. Hawthorne, CA 90250 ("Property"). Movant has provided the Declaration of Tony Pokras to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property. Decl., Docket 24.

Movant seeks relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Debtor is not the borrower on the note that is secured by the Property. The borrower is Cassandra A. Burke ("Borrower"). As the basis for 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) relief, Movant provides evidence that Borrower transferred an interest in the Property

to Debtor in this case just prior to Debtor filing and to delay a scheduled foreclosure sale. Decl. ¶ 9, Docket 24.

However, the instant case was dismissed on November 6, 2024, for a failure to timely file documents. Dckt. 30. Movant requests the court retain jurisdiction to enter the order for relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Docket 32.

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) *revests 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 5, 2024, the automatic stay as it applies to the Property, and as it applies to Debtor, was terminated by operation of law. The court shall issue an order confirming that the automatic stay was terminated and vacated as to Debtor and the Property on December 5, 2024.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4)

Prospective Relief from Future Stays

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) allows the court to grant relief from the stay when the court finds that the petition was filed as a part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either (i) transfer of all or part ownership or interest in the property without consent of the secured creditors or court approval or (ii) multiple bankruptcy cases affecting particular property. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07 (Alan n. Resnick & Henry H. Sommer eds. 16th ed.).

Certain patterns and conduct that have been characterized as bad faith include recent transfers of assets, a debtor's inability to reorganize, and unnecessary delays by serial filings. *Id.*

Relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) may be granted if the court finds that two elements have been met. The filing of the present case must be part of a scheme, and it must contain improper transfers or multiple cases affecting the same property. With respect to the elements, the court concludes that the filing of the current Chapter 7 case in the Eastern District of California was part of a scheme by Debtor to hinder and delay Movant from conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale by filing multiple bankruptcy cases.

The fact that a debtor commences a bankruptcy case to stop a foreclosure sale is neither shocking nor *per se* bad faith. The automatic stay was created to stabilize the financial crisis and allow all parties, debtor and creditors, to take stock of the situation.

However, in this case, Borrower transferred an interest in the Property to Debtor, the very day this bankruptcy case was filed on November 6, 2024. Decl. ¶ 9, Docket 24. The transfer was unauthorized. The transfer and bankruptcy occurred just prior to the scheduled foreclosure sale of November 19, 2024. The court concludes that the unauthorized transfer amounts to a scheme Debtor has perpetrated to delay Movant's recovery.

The court finds that proper grounds exist for issuing an order pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Movant has provided sufficient evidence concerning bankruptcy cases being filed to prevent actions against the Property. Movant has provided the court with evidence that Debtor has engaged in a scheme to hinder, defraud, and delay creditors through the multiple filing of bankruptcy cases.

In granting the 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) relief, the court notes that such is not the end of the game for Debtor. While granting relief through this case, if Debtor has a good faith, bona fide reason to

commence another case while that order is in effect for the Property, the judge in the subsequent case can impose the stay in that case. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4). That would ensure that Debtor, to the extent that some bona fide reason existed, would effectively assert such rights rather than filing several bankruptcy cases that are then dismissed.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3)
Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, due to the unauthorized transfer of Property to delay foreclosure, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. Mot. 2:3-12, Docket 22.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

Attorneys' Fees Requested
Request for Attorneys' Fees

In the Motion, almost as if an afterthought, Movant requests that it be allowed attorneys' fees. The Motion does not allege any contractual or statutory grounds for such fees (other than to state Movant seeks the fees "pursuant to the Note and Deed of Trust securing Movant's claim or pursuant to 11 U.S.C. Section 506(b)"). No dollar amount is requested for such fees. No evidence is provided of Movant having incurred any attorneys' fees or having any obligation to pay attorneys' fees. Based on the pleadings, the court would either: (1) have to award attorneys' fees based on grounds made out of whole cloth, or (2) research all of the documents and California statutes and draft for Movant grounds for attorneys' fees, and then make up a number for the amount of such fees out of whole cloth. The court is not inclined to do either.

Furthermore, a claim for attorney's fees and related nontaxable expenses must be made by motion unless the substantive law requires those fees to be proved at trial as an element of damages. FED. R. CIV. P. 54(d)(2)(A); FED. R. BANKR. P. 7054, 9014.

No other or additional relief is granted.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Corey & Faye Fenig 2008 Revocable Trust as to an undivided 57,000.00/112,000.00 interest; and Pokras Family Trust as to an undivided 55,000.00/112,000.00 interest, its successors and/or assignees ("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 granted, and the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents,

representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed that is recorded against the real property commonly known as 13603 Chadron Ave. Hawthorne, CA 90250 (“Property”) to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale to obtain possession of the Property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above relief is also granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), which further provides:

“If recorded in compliance with applicable State laws governing notices of interests or liens in real property, an order entered under paragraph (4) shall be binding in any other case under this title purporting to affect such real property filed not later than 2 years after the date of the entry of such order by the court, except that a debtor in a subsequent case under this title may move for relief from such order based upon changed circumstances or for good cause shown, after notice and a hearing. Any Federal, State, or local governmental unit that accepts notices of interests or liens in real property shall accept any certified copy of an order described in this subsection for indexing and recording.”

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

CATHAY BANK VS.

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

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

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—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, other parties in interest, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 30, 2024. By the court's calculation, 17 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. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offer 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. At the hearing, -----

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Cathay Bank ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Aaron Harvey and Monica Still's ("Debtor") real property commonly known as 1657 Sugarloaf Drive, San Mateo, California 94403 ("Property"). Movant has provided the Declaration of David Scheiber to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property. Decl., Docket 25.

Movant argues the current bankruptcy case is the fourth to affect the Property in the past four months. Mot. 1:14-23, Docket 23. There was a foreclosure sale scheduled for December 18, 2024, delayed by the most recent filing. The borrowers on the note are Chu Fung Lin and Kuan Hung Lin ("Borrower"). Movant asserts that Chu Fung Lin transferred by Grant Deed all of her interest in the Property, held in her capacity as the Trustee of the Kuan Hung Lin and Chu Fung Lin Revocable Trust dated November 18, 2022, to herself, individually, and the Debtors, as joint tenants. *Id.*

In addition to this present case, Movant provides evidence of the following cases that have been filed that affect the Property:

- A. Case No. 24-30599-DM-13 (Northern District of California)
 - 1. Filed: August 13, 2024
 - 2. Chapter 13
 - 3. Dismissal Date: September 17, 2024
- B. Case No. 24-30789-HLB (Northern District of California)
 - 1. Filed: October 23, 2024
 - 2. Chapter 13
 - 3. Dismissal Date: November 7, 2024
 - 4. Reason for Dismissal: Failure to timely file documents
- C. Case No. 24-90722
 - 1. Filed: November 26, 2024
 - 2. Chapter 7
 - 3. Dismissal Date: December 16, 2024
 - 4. Reason for Dismissal: Failure to timely file documents

Decl. ¶¶ 9-12, Docket 25. Movant provides additional evidence that there have been two unauthorized transfers of the Property. *Id.* at ¶ 12, 14. Finally, Movant provides evidence that Movant is owed \$341,541.40 pursuant to the terms of the note securing the Property, \$581,813.40 pursuant to a subsequent HELOC loan, and a total of \$93,932.37 in arrearage. *Id.* at ¶ 15.

DISCUSSION

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 Property, to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, at the nonjudicial foreclosure sale to obtain possession of the Property.

[11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4)

Prospective Relief from Future Stays

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) allows the court to grant relief from the stay when the court finds that the petition was filed as a part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either (i) transfer of all or part ownership or interest in the property without consent of the secured creditors or court approval or (ii) multiple bankruptcy cases affecting particular property. 3 COLLIER ON BANKRUPTCY ¶ 362.07 (Alan n. Resnick & Henry H. Sommer eds. 16th ed.).

Certain patterns and conduct that have been characterized as bad faith include recent transfers of assets, a debtor's inability to reorganize, and unnecessary delays by serial filings. *Id.*

Relief pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) may be granted if the court finds that two elements have been met. The filing of the present case must be part of a scheme, and it must contain improper transfers or multiple cases affecting the same property. With respect to the elements, the court concludes that the filing of the current Chapter 7 case in the Eastern District of California was part of a scheme by Debtor to hinder and delay Movant from conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale by filing multiple bankruptcy cases.

The fact that a debtor commences a bankruptcy case to stop a foreclosure sale is neither shocking nor *per se* bad faith. The automatic stay was created to stabilize the financial crisis and allow all parties, debtor and creditors, to take stock of the situation. The filing of the current Chapter 7 case cannot have been for any bona fide, good faith reason in light of both unauthorized transfers occurring and multiple bankruptcy cases being filed that affect the Property.

The court finds that proper grounds exist for issuing an order pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Movant has provided sufficient evidence concerning bankruptcy cases being filed to prevent actions against the Property. Movant has provided the court with evidence that Debtor has engaged in a scheme to hinder, defraud, and delay creditors through the multiple filing of bankruptcy cases.

In granting the 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4) relief, the court notes that such is not the end of the game for Debtor. While granting relief through this case, if Debtor has a good faith, bona fide reason to commence another case while that order is in effect for the Property, the judge in the subsequent case can impose the stay in that case. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4). That would ensure that Debtor, to the extent that some bona fide reason existed, would effectively assert such rights rather than filing several bankruptcy cases that are then dismissed.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3)

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, for no particular reason, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. Although Movant has not pleaded facts with particularity justifying waiving the fourteen day stay, the court waives the fourteen day stay to prevent further delay in light of the scheme affecting Movant's recovery of the Property.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Cathay Bank (“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 granted, and the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed that is recorded against the real property commonly known as 1657 Sugarloaf Drive, San Mateo, California 94403 (“Property”) to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale to obtain possession of the Property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above relief is also granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), which further provides:

“If recorded in compliance with applicable State laws governing notices of interests or liens in real property, an order entered under paragraph (4) shall be binding in any other case under this title purporting to affect such real property filed not later than 2 years after the date of the entry of such order by the court, except that a debtor in a subsequent case under this title may move for relief from such order based upon changed circumstances or for good cause shown, after notice and a hearing. Any Federal, State, or local governmental unit that accepts notices of interests or liens in real property shall accept any certified copy of an order described in this subsection for indexing and recording.”

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

FINAL RULINGS

5. [24-90571-E-7](#)
[JCW-1](#)

MEGAN GOODEILL
Michael Benavides

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
12-6-24 [\[12\]](#)

CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the January 16, 2025 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,, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 6, 2024. By the court's calculation, 41 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.

Capital One Auto Finance, a division of Capital One, N.A. ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2014 Honda CR-V EX Sport Utility 4D, VIN ending in 0577 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Yvette Hutchison to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Megan Elizabeth Goodeill ("Debtor"). Decl., Docket 15.

Movant argues Debtor has not made two post-petition payments, with a total of \$691.96 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration ¶ 4, Docket 15. Movant also provides evidence that there are 3.5 pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$1,233.84. *Id.*

Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report Provided

Movant has also provided a copy of the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report for the Vehicle. Ex. C, Docket 16. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

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 \$10,722.23 (Declaration ¶ 5, Docket 15), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$9,129, as stated on the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report. Ex. C, Docket 16.

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.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988).

Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle 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 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.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, for no particular reason, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States

Supreme Court. With no grounds for such relief specified, the court will not grant additional relief merely stated in the prayer.

Movant has not pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is not granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Capital One Auto Finance, a division of Capital One, N.A. (“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 Motion is granted, and 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 2014 Honda CR-V EX Sport Utility 4D, VIN ending in 0577 (“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.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is not waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

**CREDIT ACCEPTANCE
CORPORATION VS.**

Final Ruling: No appearance at the January 16, 2025 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, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 11, 2024. By the court’s calculation, 36 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.

Credit Acceptance Corporation (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2016 Honda Pilot, VIN ending in 7258 (“Vehicle”). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Danielle Washington to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Natalie Rose Rojas and Angel Rojas (“Debtor”). Decl., Docket 12.

Movant argues Debtor has not made one post-petition payments, with a total of \$720.61 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration ¶ 7, Docket 12. Movant also provides evidence that there are three pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$2,882.44. *Id.*

The Chapter 7 Trustee filed a Nonopposition on December 17, 2024.

J.D. Power Valuation Report Provided

Movant has also provided a copy of the J.D. Power Valuation Report for the Vehicle. Ex. D, Docket 14. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

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 \$25,585.46 (Declaration ¶ 6, Docket 2), while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$15,125, as stated on the J.D. Power Valuation Report. Ex. D, Docket 14.

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.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988).

Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle 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 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.

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant

requests, as Movant is in possession of the vehicle and its value is depreciating, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. Mot. 3:16-17, Docket 10.

Movant has pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Credit Acceptance Corporation (“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 Motion is granted, and 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 Honda Pilot, VIN ending in 7258 (“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.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.