

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

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
Robert T. Matsui U.S. Courthouse
501 I Street, Sixth Floor
Sacramento, California

PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS COVER SHEET

DAY: TUESDAY

DATE: MARCH 17, 2026

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.

3. [25-27411](#)-B-13 MICHAEL/DENISE PERKINS MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR
RJ-1 Richard L. Jare RICHARD JARE, DEBTORS
ATTORNEY(S)
3-3-26 [[26](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on less than 28-days notice. Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition.

The court has 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). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to **conditionally grant the motion and continue the matter to March 24, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.**

Debtors' counsel Richard Jare ("Counsel") seeks relief from the court's order confirming plan that states Debtors' attorney will seek approval of fees by filing and serving an application in compliance with U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016 and 2017. Dkt. 24. Counsel states that he and Debtors had intended the bankruptcy case to proceed under the no look flat fee because Debtors did not want to risk the uncertainties of hourly billing. Counsel states that he inadvertently failed to check mark Section 3.05 of the plan filed December 31, 2025, to opt for compensation under the no look fee of Local Bankr. R. 2016-1(c).

To support his motion, Counsel states that the Rights and Responsibilities form, dkt. 5, indicates Debtors' and Counsel's desire to proceed with the no look fee at less than 33% of what is allowed for nonbusiness cases.

Discussion

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1), applicable by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9024, permits the court to relieve a party from a final judgment or order for "mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9024. Relief for excusable neglect is governed by the *Pioneer-Briones* factors, i.e., (1) the danger of prejudice to any non-moving party; (2) the length of delay and the potential impact of that delay on judicial proceeding; (3) the reason for the delay, including whether the delay was within the reasonable control of the movant; and (4) whether the debtor's conduct was in good faith. *Pioneer Inv. Servs. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P'ship*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993); *Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*, 116 F.3d 379, 381 (9th Cir. 1997).

The danger of prejudice to creditors is nonexistent. Vacating the election for fees under Local Bankr. R. 2016-1(b) and allowing Counsel to elect for fees under Local Bankr. R. 2016-1(c) would not delay judicial proceedings. Counsel acted swiftly by filing this motion a day after the court entered its order confirming plan. Counsel's failure to check mark the appropriate box was due to the mistaken belief that it was check marked. Lastly, there is no indication of any bad faith by Debtors or Counsel particularly given that they intended to proceed with the no look fee as indicated in the filed Rights and Responsibilities.

Given the aforementioned, the motion to vacate election of attorney fees under Local Bankr. R. 2016-1(b) in order to elect fees under Local Bankr. R. 2016-1(c) is conditionally granted.

Conditional Nature of this Ruling

Because the motion has been filed, set, and served under Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2), any party in interest shall have until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 20, 2026, to file and serve an opposition or other response to the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 3007-1(b)(2). Any opposition or response shall be served on the Chapter 13

Trustee and creditor by facsimile or email.

If no opposition or response is timely filed and served, the motion will be deemed granted for the reasons stated hereinabove, this ruling will no longer be conditional and will become the court's final decision, and the continued hearing on March 24, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. will be vacated.

If an opposition or response is timely filed and served, the court will hear the motion on March 24, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

The motion is ORDERED CONDITIONALLY GRANTED and CONTINUED to March 24, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. for reasons stated in the minutes.

4. [25-26823](#)-B-13 PATRICIA BROWN MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
[MJD](#)-2 Matthew J. DeCaminada 2-7-26 [[29](#)]

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. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

5. [25-25325](#)-B-13 JUAN ALVAREZ
BM-2 Christie S. Lee
Thru #6

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR
LORIS L. BAKKEN, CHAPTER 7
TRUSTEE(S)
2-11-26 [[94](#)]

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 compensation.

Loris L. Bakken ("Applicant"), former Chapter 7 Trustee, makes a first and final request for the allowance of \$1,740.00 in fees and no reimbursement of expenses. The period for which the fees are requested is for September 29, 2025, through January 7, 2026.

Debtor Juan Alvarez ("Debtor") had filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 7 on September 29, 2025. Applicant was appointed interim Chapter 7 Trustee. The meeting of creditors was held on November 5, 2025, continued from time to time, and concluded on January 7, 2026. No other trustee was nominated, and Applicant became the permanent Chapter 7 Trustee. Thereafter, Debtor filed a motion to voluntarily convert this case to a case under Chapter 13, which was not opposed. The case was converted by order entered on January 7, 2026.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

Here, Applicant's services in the relevant period included case administration, employment of professionals, analysis of and objections to Debtor's claimed exceptions, and review of Debtor's motion to convert case. The court finds that the compensation sought is reasonable, actual, and necessary, and the court will approve the motion.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$1,740.00
Costs and Expenses	\$ 0.00

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

The court will issue an order.

6. [25-25325](#)-B-13 JUAN ALVAREZ
[BM-3](#) Christie S. Lee

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION BY THE
LAW OFFICE OF BINDER MALTER
HARRIS & ROME-BANKS LLP FOR
RENO FERNANDEZ, TRUSTEES
ATTORNEY(S)
2-11-26 [[99](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. Local Bankr. R. 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 is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion for compensation.

Reno Fernandez of Binder Malter Harris & Rome-Banks LLP ("Applicant"), general bankruptcy counsel for Loris L. Bakken, Chapter 7 Trustee, applies for entry of an order approving and allowing, on a final basis, compensation in the amount of \$3,315.00 and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of \$28.24. The period for which the fees are requested is for November 21, 2025, through January 7, 2026.

Debtor Juan Alvarez ("Debtor") had filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 7 on September 29, 2025. Applicant was appointed interim Chapter 7 Trustee. The meeting of creditors was held on November 5, 2025, continued from time to time, and concluded on January 7, 2026. No other trustee was nominated, and Applicant became the permanent Chapter 7 Trustee. Thereafter, Debtor filed a motion to voluntarily convert this case to a case under Chapter 13, which was not opposed. The case was converted by order entered on January 7, 2026.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

Here, Applicant's services in the relevant period included application for employment of professionals, providing analysis and preparing objections to Debtor's claimed exemptions, review of Debtor's motion to convert case, and preparation of fee applications for Applicant and the Chapter 7 Trustee.

Applicant's hourly rate of \$425.00 is not reasonable in this Chapter 13 case. See *In re Lupekha*, 2024 WL 1146610 (Bankr. E.D. Cal., March 14, 2024). The court typically would reduce Applicant's hourly rate to \$375.00. *Id.* However, doing so here is unnecessary given Applicant's voluntary reduction by non-billable time.

Applicant bills 9.6 hours at \$425.00 per hour. That totals \$4,080.00. Applicant has voluntarily reduced that amount by \$765.00 in non-billable time which results in the \$3,315.00 requested. Reducing Applicant's hourly rate to a reasonable rate of \$375.00 would result in compensation of \$3,600.00. Applicant's current request is less than the amount that otherwise would be allowed based on an hourly-rate reduction.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$3,315.00
Costs and Expenses	\$ 28.24

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

The court will issue an order.

7. [24-90748](#)-B-13 MASAAKI ORIKURA
[BSH-1](#) Brian S. Haddix

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR
BRIAN S. HADDIX, DEBTORS
ATTORNEY(S)
2-16-26 [[27](#)]

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 compensation.

Brian Haddix ("Applicant"), the attorney to Chapter 13 Debtor, makes a request for the allowance of \$12,760.00 in fees and \$45 in expenses. After application of the \$2,125.00 retainer, a total of \$10,680 as final compensation is sought by this motion. Debtor and Counsel opted out of the no look fee under Local Bankr. R. 2016-1. The period for which the fees are requested is for December 3, 2024, through February 16, 2026. The order of the court approving employment of Applicant was entered on January 26, 2025.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

Here, Applicant's services in the relevant period included pre-petition communications with Debtor regarding foreclosure, preparation of schedules, Chapter 13 plan strategy, preparation and attendance at meeting of creditors, review of and preparation of objections to proof of claims, creditor communications, plan confirmation, and compliance.

Applicant's hourly rate of \$400.00 is not reasonable in this Chapter 13 case. See *In re Lupekha*, 2024 WL 1146610 (Bankr. E.D. Cal., March 14, 2024). A reasonable hourly rate is \$375.00. *Id.*

Whereas the 31.90 hours of time Applicant bills equals the \$12,760.00 requested, 31.90 hours at \$375.00 is \$11,962.50. Less the \$2,125.00 retainer already paid, Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay Applicant, compensation of \$9,837.50 in fees and \$45.00 in expenses.

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

The court will issue an order.

8. [24-24058](#)-B-13 MICHAEL WADLINGTON AND MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
[RAS](#)-1 KATHLEEN BARBER AUTOMATIC STAY
Julius J. Cherry 2-13-26 [[22](#)]
SELECT PORTFOLIO SERVICING
INC. 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 deny as unnecessary the motion for relief from automatic stay.

Select Portfolio Servicing Inc. ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to real property commonly known as 9375 Tilton Lane, Orangevale, California (the "Property"). Movant has provided the Declaration of Roselia Chavez to introduce into evidence the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property.

The Chavez Declaration states that the note and mortgage have been in default since November 1, 2025, and that there are three post-petition payments in default, each in the amount of \$1,939.19 less suspense of \$1,446.36, totaling \$4,371.21.

Non-opposition was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee stating that the plan confirmed on November 15, 2024, places Movant in Class 4 to be paid directly by Debtors outside of the plan and that the motion may not have been necessary. The court agrees.

Section 3.11 of the confirmed plan is captioned "Bankruptcy stays." In relevant part, § 3.11(a) states as follows: "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 . . . 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[.]" In other words, the automatic stay was modified for the purposes relief is now requested when the plan was confirmed. No further relief is necessary or appropriate. See *Khabushani v. Anderson (In re Khabushani)*, 2021 WL 2562113 at *2 (9th Cir. BAP June 22, 2021) (abuse of discretion for court to terminate an already terminated automatic stay).

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

The court will issue an order.

9. [25-23765](#)-B-13 RATTANA POK
[PGM-2](#) Peter G. Macaluso

MOTION TO COMPROMISE
CONTROVERSY/APPROVE SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT WITH REAL TIME
RESOLUTIONS, INC. ET AL.
2-11-26 [[47](#)]

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 continue the matter to March 24, 2026, to provide Debtor additional time to supplement the record with analysis that the *In re A & C Props.* and *In re Woodson* factors have been established.

Debtor requests that the court approve a confidential settlement agreement and release between Debtor and Real Time Resolutions, Inc. ("Creditor"). The terms of the agreement are fully disclosed in the executed copy of the Agreement, dkt. 49, exh. A, which states in part that Debtor is to dismiss the state court action and convert or dismiss the chapter 13 bankruptcy, Creditor shall cease all foreclosure efforts, and Debtor agrees to pay Creditor \$125,000.00 with interest at 0% (the initial payment of \$5,220.00 was due on February 1, 2026, and has been paid by Debtor and, beginning March 1, 2026, through January 1, 2028, Debtor shall pay \$5,000.00 per month).

Debtor and Creditor have resolved these claims and disputes, subject to approval by the court.

Discussion

Approval of a compromise is within the discretion of the court. *U.S. v. Alaska Nat'l Bank of the North (In re Walsh Construction)*, 669 F.2d 1325, 1328 (9th Cir. 1982). When a motion to approve compromise is presented to the court, the court must make its independent determination that the settlement is appropriate. *Protective Committee for Independent Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414, 424-425 (1968). In evaluating the acceptability of a compromise, the court evaluates four factors:

1. The probability of success in the litigation;
2. Any difficulties expected in collection;
3. The complexity of the litigation involved and the expense, inconvenience and delay necessarily attending it; and
4. The paramount interest of the creditors and a proper deference to their reasonable views.

In re A & C Props., 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir. 1986); *In re Woodson*, 839 F.2d 610, 620 (9th Cir. 1988).

Debtor has not analyzed the four factors or whether they have been established. Rather than deny the motion, the court shall give Debtor until 5:00 p.m. March 20, 2025, to file a supplemental declaration analyzing the *In re A & C Props.* and *In re Woodson* factors and whether they have been met. The hearing on this matter is continued to 1:00 p.m. on March 24, 2026.

The court will issue an order.

10. [25-26785](#)-B-13 BERTHA CRISP
[NAR](#)-2 Natali A. Ron

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
1-28-26 [[28](#)]

CONTINUED TO 4/07/26 AT 1:00 P.M. TO BE HEARD AFTER THE CONTINUED MEETING OF CREDITORS SET FOR 3/26/26.

Final Ruling

No appearance at the March 17, 2026, hearing is required. The court will issue an appropriate order.

The motion is ORDERED CONTINUED to April 7, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. for reasons stated in the minutes.

11. [25-27398](#)-B-13 ANTHONY MENOR
[SKI-1](#) Natali A. Ron
And #14
AMERICREDIT FINANCIAL
SERVICES, INC. VS.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
2-17-26 [[12](#)]

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.

Americredit Financial Services, Inc. dba GM Financial ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2023 Chevrolet Corvette (the "Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Phillip Ford Sr. to introduce into evidence the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by the Debtor.

The Ford Declaration states that Debtor signed a retail installment sale contract only as a personal guarantor and executed a personal guarantee in connection with the purchase of the Vehicle. The vehicle is not listed in Debtor's schedules or chapter 13 plan, but Debtor lists Movant in Schedule F as a business debt collection. Therefore, Movant has filed its motion out of an abundance of caution to seek relief from the automatic stay as to any perceived interest Debtor may have in the Vehicle.

The Ford Declaration states that there is a partial pre-petition payment in default totaling \$2,139.52. Additionally, there are two post-petition payments in default totaling \$4,279.68.

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this motion, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$107,720.13 as stated in the Ford Declaration. Movant requests that the court grant relief from the automatic stay since the Vehicle is not property of the estate and because Debtor is not on title to the Vehicle.

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 Debtor 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 Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). And no opposition or showing having been made by the Debtor or the Trustee, the court determines that the Vehicle is not necessary for any effective reorganization in this Chapter 13 case.

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.

12. [25-26642](#)-B-13 NORA NIETO
[LGT](#)-1 David A. Boone

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
1-20-26 [[12](#)]

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a notice of withdrawal of its objection, the objection is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041. The matter is removed from the calendar.

Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 23 and the continued hearing on August 19, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. are vacated. The objection to confirmation is dismissed without prejudice.

The objection is ORDERED DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the plan is CONFIRMED for reasons stated in the minutes. An appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 plan shall be prepared consistent with the current practice of the Chapter 13 Trustee assigned to the case and the proposed order shall be submitted to the court.

The court will issue an order.

13. [25-26648](#)-B-13 RAMON RAMIREZ
[LGT](#)-1 Jessica A. Dorn

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
1-15-26 [[17](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from March 10, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, March 13, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 30, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on March 17, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

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

The court will issue an order.

14. [25-27398](#)-B-13 ANTHONY MENOR
[LGT-1](#) Natali A. Ron
See Also #11

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
2-18-26 [[21](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from March 10, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, March 13, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 35, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on March 17, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

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

The court will issue an order.