

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

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
1200 I Street, Suite 200
Modesto, California

PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS COVER SHEET

DAY: TUESDAY

DATE: March 9, 2021

CALENDAR: 1:00 P.M. CHAPTER 13

Each matter on this calendar will have one of three possible designations: No Ruling, Tentative Ruling, or Final Ruling. These instructions apply to those designations.

No Ruling: All parties will need to appear at the hearing unless otherwise ordered.

Tentative Ruling: If a matter has been designated as a tentative ruling it will be called. The court may continue the hearing on the matter, set a briefing schedule, or enter other orders appropriate for efficient and proper resolution of the matter. The original moving or objecting party shall give notice of the continued hearing date and the deadlines. The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions.

Final Ruling: Unless otherwise ordered, there will be no hearing on these matters and no appearance is necessary. The final disposition of the matter is set forth in the ruling and it will appear in the minutes. The final ruling may or may not finally adjudicate the matter. If it is finally adjudicated, the minutes constitute the court's findings and conclusions.

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within seven (7) days of the final hearing on the matter.

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
Bankruptcy Judge
Modesto, California

March 9, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

-
1. [19-90305](#)-B-13 DANI IBRAHIM AND ATOURINA MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
[BSH](#)-4 NISANO 1-27-21 [[84](#)]
Brian S. Haddix

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to permit the requested modification and confirm the modified plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. Counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

The court will issue an order.

March 9, 2021 at 1:00 p.m.

2. [19-91007](#)-B-13 AMY LOPEZ
[RDG-1](#) Bradley J. Swingle

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, CLAIM
NUMBER 14
2-3-21 [[52](#)]

Final Ruling

The objection has been set for hearing on at least 30 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(2). The court has determined that this matter may be decided on the papers. See General Order No. 618 at p.3, ¶ 3 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020) (ordering courthouse closure "until further notice" due to the COVID-19 pandemic and further ordering that all civil matters are to be decided on the papers unless the presiding judge determines a hearing is necessary). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f).

The court's decision is to sustain the objection to Claim No. 14 of U.S. Department of Education and disallow the claim in its entirety.

The Chapter 13 Trustee requests that the court disallow the claim of U.S. Department of Education ("Creditor"), Claim No. 14. The claim is asserted to be in the amount of \$21,793.78. The Trustee asserts that the claim has not been timely filed. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c). The deadline for filing proofs of claim in this case for a government unit was May 6, 2020. The Creditor's claim was filed December 29, 2020.

Section 501(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that any creditor may file a proof of claim. "A proof of claim is a written statement setting forth a creditor's claim." Rule 3001(a). If the claim meets the requirements of § 501, the bankruptcy court must then determine whether the claim should be allowed. Section 502(a) provides that a claim is deemed allowed unless a party in interest objects. If such an objection is made, the court shall allow such claim "except to the extent that the proof of claim is not timely filed." See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9).

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3002(c) governs the time for filing proofs of claim in a Chapter 13 case. Rule 9006(b)(3) prohibits the enlargement of time to file a proof of claim under Rule 3002(c) except as provided in one of the six circumstances included in Rule 3002(c). *Zidell, Inc. v. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska Lines, Inc.)*, 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-1433 (9th Cir. 1990) ("We . . . hold that the bankruptcy court cannot enlarge the time for filing a proof of claim unless one of the six situations listed in Rule 3002(c) exists."). No showing has been made that any of those circumstances apply.

The court also notes that the excusable neglect standard does not apply to permit the court to extend the time to file a proof of claim under Rule 3002(c). As the Ninth Circuit stated in *Coastal Alaska*:

Rule 9006(b) plainly allows an extension of the 90-day time limit established by Rule 3002(c) only under the conditions permitted by Rule 3002(c). Rule 3002(c) identifies six circumstances where a late filing is allowed, and excusable neglect is not among them. Thus, the 90-day deadline for filing claims under Rule 3002(c) cannot be extended for excusable neglect.

Id. at 1432. In fact, the time for filing claims under Rule 3002(c) cannot be extended for any equitable reason at all. As stated in *Spokane Law Enforcement Credit Union v. Barker (In re Barker)*, 839 F.3d 1189, 1197 (9th Cir. 2016): "[T]he Ninth Circuit has repeatedly held that the deadline to file a proof of claim in a Chapter 13 proceeding is 'rigid' and the bankruptcy court lacks equitable power to extend this deadline after the fact."

In sum, Creditor filed an untimely proof of claim and has not demonstrated any reason that would permit the court to allow its late-filed proof of claim.

Based on the evidence before the court, the Creditor's claim is disallowed in its entirety as untimely. The objection to the proof of claim is sustained.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

3. [20-90719](#)-B-13 ISAIAS CASTELLANOS
[GB-1](#) Gregory J. Smith

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-5-21 [[61](#)]

VIDA CAPITAL GROUP LLC VS.

CASE CONVERTED: 3/01/21

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Responses were filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee and Debtor.

The court has determined this matter may be decided on the papers. See General Order No. 618 at p.3, ¶ 3 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020) (ordering courthouse closure "until further notice" due to the COVID-19 pandemic and further ordering that all civil matters are to be decided on the papers unless the presiding judge determines a hearing is necessary). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f).

The court's decision is to deny the motion without prejudice.

This case was converted to one under chapter 7. Therefore, the motion for relief from automatic stay filed by Vida Capital Group LLC shall be served on the Chapter 7 Trustee. The motion is denied without prejudice.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

4. [21-90026](#)-B-13 JIMMY/SHIRLEY SANDERS
[MET](#)-1 Brian S. Haddix

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-9-21 [[13](#)]

BANK OF THE WEST VS.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion for relief from automatic stay.

Bank of the West ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2017 Keystone Bullet Trailer (the "Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Aimee Nanon to introduce into evidence the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by the Debtor.

The Nanon Declaration states that there is one pre-petition payments in default totaling \$250.36. Additionally, there is one post-petition payments in default totaling \$250.36.

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this motion, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$20,152.02, as stated in the Nanon Declaration, while the value of the Vehicle is determined to be \$13,000.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor.

The Vehicle is listed in Class 3 of the plan as a secured claim to be surrendered by the Debtors.

Discussion

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. *In re Harlan*, 783 F.2d 839 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1986); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay since the Debtors and the estate have not made post-petition payments. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985).

Additionally, once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. *United Savings Ass'n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Associates. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375-76 (1988); 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either the Debtors or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Moreover, the Debtors intend to surrender the Vehicle since it is listed in Class 3 of the plan. The court determines that the Vehicle is not necessary for any effective reorganization in this Chapter 13 case.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow creditor, 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.

There also being no objections from any party, the 14-day stay of enforcement under Rule 4001(a)(3) is waived.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined this matter may be decided on the papers. See General Order No. 618 at p.3, ¶ 3 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020) (ordering courthouse closure "until further notice" due to the COVID-19 pandemic and further ordering that all civil matters are to be decided on the papers unless the presiding judge determines a hearing is necessary). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f).

The court's decision is to not confirm the first amended plan.

The Chapter 13 Trustee objects to confirmation of the plan on grounds that the Debtor is delinquent \$4,268.00 with an additional payment of \$5,000.00 due February 25, 2021, that the priority claim of the Internal Revenue Service is higher than that provided for in the Debtor's plan, and that plan payments do not work out mathematically because they are insufficient to cover the total payments to secured creditors plus the Trustee's fees and expenses.

The Debtor filed a response stating that she has made a payment of \$9,268.00 via TFS and that the delinquency was due to her erroneously sending a personal check. Debtor also states that the proof of claim filed by the IRS provided an estimate of the 2019 taxes, that she has since filed her 2019 tax return, and that the amount owing is \$4,887.00 rather than the IRS estimate of \$10,606.17. Problematic is that the Debtor provides no evidence that her monthly plan payments are mathematically sufficient. Debtor merely makes a general statement that the proposed plan works and that it can be outlined in the order confirming. However, no clarification is made in the response or in the form of a declaration.

Without any evidence that the Debtor's plan payments work out mathematically, the amended plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1323, and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

6. [20-90262](#)-B-13 KATHY HARDISTY
[CLH](#)-6 Charles L. Hastings

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
2-1-21 [[207](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to confirm the amended plan.

11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits a debtor to amend a plan any time before confirmation. The Debtor has provided evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The amended plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. Counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

The court will issue an order.

7. [20-90768](#)-B-13 JUAN/HEIDI RUIZ
[RDG](#)-2 Simian S. Hundal

OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIM OF
EXEMPTIONS
1-27-21 [[31](#)]

Final Ruling

The objection has been set for hearing on at least 28-days the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4003(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed. The court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing.

The court's decision is to overrule the objection.

The Trustee objects to the Debtors' exemption of household goods, furnishings, electronics, and jewelry on Schedule C without indicating a dollar amount. Instead the Debtors' exemptions provide for "100% of fair market value, up to any applicable statutory limit." Without the exact value of the claimed exemptions, it is impossible to know whether the exemptions claimed fall within the dollar limitations specified under the code.

Debtors filed a response stating that they have filed an amended Schedule C on February 9, 2021. A review of the court's docket shows this to be the case and that another amended Schedule C was filed on February 16, 2021.

The Trustee's objection is overruled and the claimed exemptions are allowed.

The objection is ORDERED OVERRULED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

8. [19-90092](#)-B-13 CHRISTOPHER/CARLA MOTION TO INCUR DEBT
[MSN](#)-2 REYNOLDS 1-25-21 [[31](#)]
Thru #9 Mark S. Nelson

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to incur debt.

The motion seeks permission to purchase a 2017 Nissan Altima ("Vehicle"), the total purchase price of which is \$24,017.60, with monthly payments of \$333.60. The Vehicle is intended to replace a 2008 GMC Acadia that was used by Joint Debtor Carla Reynolds ("Joint Debtor") as her primary transportation but the loan of which was in her sister's name. The GMC Acadia was surrendered to the finance company due to problems, the cost of repairs which would be greater than the car's worth.

The monthly payment for the Vehicle is less than that of the surrendered GMC Acadia, which was \$425.00. The loan term for the Vehicle will be 65 months at an interest rate of 13.39%. Schedules I and J were filed on January 25, 2021, showing that the Debtors have sufficient income to cover their expenses.

Discussion

A motion to incur debt is governed by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(c). *In re Gonzales*, No. 08-00719, 2009 WL 1939850, at *1 (Bankr. N.D. Iowa July 6, 2009). Rule 4001(c) requires that the motion list or summarize all material provisions of the proposed credit agreement, "including interest rate, maturity, events of default, liens, borrowing limits, and borrowing conditions." Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(c)(1)(B). Moreover, a copy of the agreement must be provided to the court. *Id.* at 4001(c)(1)(A). The court must know the details of the collateral as well as the financing agreement to adequately review post-confirmation financing agreements. *In re Clemons*, 358 B.R. 714, 716 (Bankr. W.D. Ky. 2007).

The court finds that the proposed credit, based on the unique facts and circumstances of this case, is reasonable. There being no opposition from any party in interest and the terms being reasonable, the motion is granted.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

9. [19-90092](#)-B-13 CHRISTOPHER/CARLA MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
[MSN](#)-3 REYNOLDS 1-25-21 [[36](#)]
Mark S. Nelson

Final Ruling

The motion been set for hearing on the 35-days' notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 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). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined this matter may be decided on the papers. See General Order No. 618 at p.3, ¶ 3 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020) (ordering courthouse closure "until further notice" due to the COVID-19 pandemic and further ordering that all civil matters are to be decided on the papers unless the presiding judge determines a hearing is necessary). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f).

The court's decision is to permit the requested modification and confirm the modified plan.

Feasibility depends on the granting of a motion to incur debt, MSN-2. That matter is heard at Item #8 and was granted.

The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes. Counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

The court will issue an order.