



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

March 4, 2025 at 1:30 p.m.

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable Christopher M. Klein shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person**, at Sacramento Courtroom #35, (2) via **ZoomGov Video**, (3) via **ZoomGov Telephone**, and (4) via **CourtCall**.

You may choose any of these options unless otherwise ordered or stated below.

All parties who wish to appear at a hearing remotely must sign up by 4:00 p.m. **one business day** prior to the hearing. Information regarding how to sign up can be found on the **Remote Appearances** page of our website at <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/Calendar/RemoteAppearances>. Each party who has signed up will receive a Zoom link or phone number, meeting I.D., and password via e-mail.

If the deadline to sign up has passed, parties who wish to appear remotely must contact the Courtroom Deputy for the Department holding the hearing.

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest may connect to the video or audio feed free of charge and should select which method they will use to appear when signing up.
- Members of the public and the press appearing by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the zoom telephone number. Video appearances are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may appear in person in most instances.

To appear remotely for law and motion or status conference proceedings, you must comply with the following guidelines and procedures:

1. Review the [Pre-Hearing Dispositions](#) prior to appearing at the hearing.
2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the [CourtCall Appearance Information](#).

If you are appearing by ZoomGov phone or video, please join at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the calendar and wait with your microphone muted until the matter is called.

Unauthorized Recording is Prohibited: Any recording of a court proceeding held by video or teleconference, including "screen shots" or other audio or visual copying of a hearing is prohibited. Violation may result in sanctions, including removal of court-issued medical credentials, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the court. For more information on photographing, recording, or broadcasting Judicial Proceedings, please refer to Local Rule 173(a) of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein

Bankruptcy Judge

Sacramento, California

March 4, 2025 at 1:30 p.m.

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. 24-25806 -C-13 CHARLES ROGERS AND EMY
LGT -1 CASTANEDA
Julius Cherry | OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY TRUSTEE LILIAN G. TSANG
2-11-25 [13] |
|---|---|

Tentative Ruling:

The Objection has been set on Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) notice which requires 14 days' notice. The Proof of Service shows that 21 days' notice was provided. Dkt. 15.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan is sustained.

The Chapter 13 Trustee, Lilian Tsang ("Trustee"), opposes confirmation of the Chapter 13 plan on the basis that:

1. Debtors' schedules list business expenses higher than the profit and loss statements that were submitted to the Trustee; and
2. Debtors' plan relies on speculative income that may not allow debtors to make all plan payments.

DISCUSSION

The debtors have provided profit and loss statements that are inconsistent with the amounts listed in their schedules.

Notwithstanding whether the plan relies on speculative income as Trustee argues, the debtors have not carried their burden to show the plan is adequately funded. That is reason to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

That is reason to deny confirmation. Therefore, the Objection is sustained.

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.

March 4, 2025 at 1:30 p.m.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, Lilian Tsang, 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 Objection is sustained.

2. [24-25685](#)-C-13 SUSANA ORTIZ
[KMM](#)-1 Steven Alpert

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
1-31-25 [[17](#)]

TOYOTA MOTOR CREDIT
CORPORATION VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the March 4, 2025 hearing is required.

The Motion has been set on Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) procedure which requires 28 days' notice. The Proof of Service shows that 32 days' notice was provided. Dkt. 22.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Toyota Motor Credit Corporation ("Movant") filed this Motion seeking relief from the automatic stay as to the debtor's 2020 Toyota Camry (the "Property").

Movant argues cause for relief from stay exists pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) because the debtor is delinquent \$806.23 in postpetition payments. Declaration, Dkt. 21.

DISCUSSION

A review of the plan shows the Confirmed Chapter 13 Plan provides for Movant's claim as a Class 3. Plan, Dkt. 3; Order, see Dkt. 33. The Confirmed Plan states the following with respect the automatic stay and Class 3 claims:

(a) Upon confirmation of the plan, the automatic stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) and the co-debtor stay of 11 U.S.C. § 1301(a) are (1) terminated to allow the holder of a Class 3 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral; (2) modified to allow the holder of a Class 4 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral and any nondebtor in the event of a default under applicable law or contract; and (3) modified to allow the nondebtor party to an unexpired lease that is in default and rejected in section 4 of this plan to obtain possession of leased property, to dispose of it under applicable law, and to exercise its rights against any nondebtor.

Id.

Based on the plain language of the Plan, the automatic stay was already modified to allow Movant to enforce its rights with respect to the collateral. Therefore, the relief requested by the Motion is moot.

The court recognizes that creditors may need an order specifying the

continuing effect and modification of an automatic stay when state recording and filing law come into play, as well as for title insurance purposes.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal has recognized the basic "discretion is the better part of valor" principle when it comes to the automatic stay. Seeking a separate order clearly specifying the scope of the relief granted in the Plan is not inappropriate.

The court grants the Motion, granting relief that under the terms of the confirmed Chapter 13 Plan, see Dkt. 33, in this bankruptcy case, "all bankruptcy stays are modified to allow [Movant , and its agents and successors, as] the holder of a Class 3 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral."

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 Toyota Motor Credit 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 that the relief is granted pursuant to the Motion, the court confirming that "all bankruptcy stays are modified to allow [Movant , and its agents and successors, as] the holder of a Class 3 secured claim to exercise its rights against its collateral and any nondebtor in the event of a default under applicable law or contract." Confirmed Chapter 13 Plan, Dkt. 3; Order Confirming, see Dkt. 33.

No Tentative Ruling:

The Motion has been set on Local Rule 9014-1(f)(3) notice which requires an Order Shortening Time of Notice. The Order Shortening Time was entered on February 26, 2025. Dkt. 22.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is xxxxxx.

Latoya Poland ("Debtor") seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy petition pending in the past year. Debtor's prior bankruptcy case was dismissed on January 23, 2025, after Debtor failed to set a hearing on her plan and provide required documents to the Trustee. Order, Bankr. E.D. Cal. No. 24-25063, Dkt. 33. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing of the petition.

Here, Debtor states that the instant case was filed in good faith and explains that the previous case was dismissed because she did not receive notice of the hearing on dismissal and uploaded the documents before the Meeting of Creditors.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). As this court has noted in other cases, Congress expressly provides in 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A) that the automatic stay **terminates as to Debtor**, and nothing more. In 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4), Congress expressly provides that the automatic stay **never goes into effect in the bankruptcy case** when the conditions of that section are met. Congress clearly knows the difference between a debtor, the bankruptcy estate (for which there are separate express provisions under 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) to protect property of the bankruptcy estate) and the bankruptcy case. While terminated as to Debtor, the plain language of 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) is limited to the automatic stay as to only Debtor. The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if one or more of Debtor's cases was pending within the year preceding filing of the instant case. *Id.* § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(I). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* § 362(c)(3)(C).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); see also Laura B. Bartell, *Staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-10 (2008). An important indicator of good faith is a realistic prospect of success in the second case, contrary to the failure of the first case. See, e.g., *In re Jackola*,

No. 11-01278, 2011 Bankr. LEXIS 2443, at *6 (Bankr. D. Haw. June 22, 2011) (citing *In re Elliott-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 815-16 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006)). Courts consider many factors—including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307(c) and 1325(a)—but the two basic issues to determine good faith under § 362(c) (3) are:

- A. Why was the previous plan filed?
- B. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

In re Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-15.

At the hearing xxxxxxxxxx

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 to Extend the Automatic Stay filed by Latoya Poland 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 xxxxxxxxxx