

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

April 7, 2020 at 2:00 p.m.

1.	<u>20-20734</u> -C-13 <u>DPC-1</u>	CHRISTINE CONRAD Jeffrey Ogilvie	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK 3-16-20 <u>[12]</u>
-----------	---	--	--

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 Objection. 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) Objection—Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor’s Attorney on March 16, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 22 days’ notice was provided. 14 days’ notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 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 offers opposition to the Objection, 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 Objection. At the hearing -----

-----.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan is sustained.
--

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. The plan proposes valuing the secured claim of Citibank, N.A. But, no motion has been filed to initiate that process.

B. Debtor did not attend the March 12, 2020, Meeting of Creditors.

DISCUSSION

Debtor's Plan proposes valuing the secured claim of Citibank, N.A. However, no motion has been filed seeking that relief. Without the court valuing the claim, the Plan is not feasible. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Additionally, Debtor did not appear at the Meeting of Creditors held pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 341. Appearance is mandatory. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 343. Attempting to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by Trustee and any creditors who appear represents a failure to cooperate. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). That is cause to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The Objection is sustained, and the Plan is not confirmed.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), 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 to Confirmation of the Plan is sustained, and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

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 Objection. 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) Objection—Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor’s Attorney on March 16, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 22 days’ notice was provided. 14 days’ notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 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 offers opposition to the Objection, 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 Objection. At the hearing -----
-----.

<p>The Objection to Confirmation of Plan is sustained.</p>

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor admitted at the Meeting of Creditors that she never reviewed the filing documents, and that she did not think the bankruptcy would work.
- B. Debtor has not provided all tax returns and pay advices required.

DISCUSSION

The current proposed plan has not been demonstrated to be feasible. Debtor admitted at the Meeting of Creditors she never reviewed the filing documents, and that she did not think the bankruptcy would work. If the Debtor’s financial information has not been provided accurately, the plan is not feasible and cannot be confirmed. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Debtor has not provided Trustee with employer payment advices for the sixty-day period preceding the filing of the petition as required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv); FED. R. BANKR. P. 4002(b)(2)(A). Debtor has failed to provide all necessary pay stubs. That is cause to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

Debtor did not provide either a tax transcript or a federal income tax return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A)(i); FED. R. BANKR. P. 4002(b)(3). Debtor has failed to provide the tax transcript. That is cause to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The Objection is sustained, and the Plan is not confirmed.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), 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 to Confirmation of the Plan is sustained, and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

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 Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 28, 2020. By the court's calculation, 39 days' notice was provided. 35 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(5) & 3015(h) (requiring twenty-one days' notice); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(2) (requiring fourteen days' notice for written opposition).

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. LOCAL BANKR. R. 9014-1(g).

<p>The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is denied.</p>
--

The debtor, Honey Lore Balico Dumayag ("Debtor") seeks confirmation of the Modified Plan to cure a delinquency caused by a one-month strike at Debtor's work. Declaration, Dckt. 37. The Modified Plan provides for payments of \$116.41 for 10 months and \$150.50 for 50 months. Modified Plan, Dckt. 38. 11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation.

CHAPTER 13 TRUSTEE'S OPPOSITION

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), filed an Opposition on March 24, 2020. Dckt. 46. Trustee opposes confirmation on the following grounds:

1. Debtor's Supplemental Schedule I includes a \$1,200 monthly contribution from her boyfriend, which Debtor has not supported with evidence.
2. Debtor's Supplemental Schedule I now includes \$386.17 in mandatory

retirement contributions and \$426.73 in voluntary retirement contributions (lines 5b and 5c), where these items were previously budgeted at \$0.00 and \$401.48 respectively.

3. Supplemental Schedule J now budgets \$1,175.00 for rent/mortgage payments where Debtor previously budgeted \$0.00 for this expense. Debtor has not changed her address.

DISCUSSION

The current proposed plan has not been demonstrated to be feasible. The Debtor has introduced a very large monthly contribution from her boyfriend, without providing any evidence of his ability of desire to make this contribution. That is reason to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Debtor also now claims several dramatic changes in expenses. One which goes from having no rent expense to having a significant rent expense. These are unexplained.

Additionally, the Debtor has included a voluntary contribution to retirement. The plan provides only an 11% dividend to unsecured claims, and therefore the plan does not meet the requirements of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(1).

The Modified Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329 and is not confirmed.

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 Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Honey Lore Balico Dumayag (“Debtor”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is denied, and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

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 Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 21, 2020. By the court's calculation, 46 days' notice was provided. 35 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(9); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(1).

The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). 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). Opposition having been filed, the court will address the merits of the motion at the hearing. If it appears at the hearing that disputed material factual issues remain to be resolved, a later evidentiary hearing will be set. LOCAL BANKR. R. 9014-1(g).

<p>The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is denied.</p>

The debtor, Kirk Byron Lossius and Michelle Monique Lossius ("Debtor"), seek confirmation of the Amended Plan. The Amended Plan provides for payments of \$5,400.00 per month for 12 months, and \$5,700.00 per month for 48 months. Amended Plan, Dckt. 23. 11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits a debtor to amend a plan any time before confirmation.

CHAPTER 13 TRUSTEE'S OPPOSITION

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), filed an Opposition on March 18, 2020. Dckt. 31. Trustee opposes confirmation because Debtor is \$4,782.60 delinquent in plan payments.

DISCUSSION

Debtor is \$4,782.60 delinquent in plan payments. Delinquency indicates that the Plan is not feasible and is reason to deny confirmation. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

The Amended Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1323, and 1325(a) and is not confirmed.

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 Confirm the Amended Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Kirk Byron Lossius and Michelle Monique Lossius (“Debtor”) 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 to Confirm the Amended Plan is denied, and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020 hearing is required.

Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim—No Opposition Filed.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on Creditor, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 21, 2020. By the court's calculation, 46 days' notice was provided. 44 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 3007(a) (requiring thirty days' notice); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3007-1(b)(1) (requiring fourteen days' notice for written opposition).

The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(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 Objection to Proof of Claim Number 1 of LVNV Funding LLC is sustained, and the claim is disallowed in its entirety.

The debtors, Kirk Byron Lossius and Michelle Monique Lossius ("Objector") requests that the court disallow the claim of LVNV Funding LLC ("Creditor"), Proof of Claim No. 1 ("Claim"), Official Registry of Claims in this case. The Claim is asserted to be unsecured in the amount of \$7,890.67.

Objector asserts that the Statute of Limitations on the collection of contract claims in California is four years from the date the balance was due under the contract or four years from the date the last payment was made under the contract. Objector states that according to the Proof of Claim, the last charge-off date and last transaction date were September 30, 2008, and November 17, 2008, respectively.

DISCUSSION

Section 502(a) provides that a claim supported by a Proof of Claim is allowed unless a party in interest objects. Once an objection has been filed, the court may determine the amount of the claim

after a noticed hearing. 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). It is settled law in the Ninth Circuit that the party objecting to a proof of claim has the burden of presenting substantial factual basis to overcome the prima facie validity of a proof of claim, and the evidence must be of probative force equal to that of the creditor's proof of claim. *Wright v. Holm (In re Holm)*, 931 F.2d 620, 623 (9th Cir. 1991); *see also United Student Funds, Inc. v. Wylie (In re Wylie)*, 349 B.R. 204, 210 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2006).

California Code of Civil Procedure § 337 states in relevant part:

(b). An action to recover (1) upon a book account whether consisting of one or more entries; (2) upon an account stated based upon an account in writing, but the acknowledgment of the account stated need not be in writing; (3) a balance due upon a mutual, open and current account, the items of which are in writing; provided, however, that where an account stated is based upon an account of one item, the time shall begin to run from the date of said item, and where an account stated is based upon an account of more than one item, the time shall begin to run from the date of the last item.

...

(d) When the period in which an action must be commenced under this section has run, a person shall not bring suit or initiate an arbitration or other legal proceeding to collect the debt. The period in which an action may be commenced under this section shall only be extended pursuant to Section 360.

A review of Proof of Claim No. 1 lists the charge off date as September 30, 2008. The court takes judicial notice that a creditor does not “charge off” an account if payments are being made or further credit is being extended. (This basic fundamental point of credit transactions is commonly known by both creditors and consumers alike.)

No payment or other transaction occurred after November 17, 2008. Thus, the four-year statute of limitations expired in November of 2012. Therefore, Creditor was required by California law to “not bring suit or initiate an arbitration or other legal proceeding to collect the debt.”

Based on the evidence before the court, the creditor's claim is disallowed in its entirety due to the statute of limitations expiring prior to the filing of the case. The Objection to the Proof of Claim 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.

The Objection to Claim of LVNV Funding LLC (“Creditor”) filed in this case by the debtors, Kirk Byron Lossius and Michelle Monique Lossius (“Objector”) 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 to Proof of Claim Number 1 of LVNV Funding LLC is sustained, and the claim is disallowed in its entirety.

Attorney's fees and costs, if any, shall be requested as provided by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54 and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 7054 and 9014.

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 Objection. 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) Objection—Hearing Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 9, 2020. By the court's calculation, 29 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 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 offers opposition to the Objection, 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 Objection. At the hearing -----

-----.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan is sustained.

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor has not provided all tax returns and pay advices required by 11 U.S.C. § 521.
- B. Debtor lists a deduction for repayment of retirement loans, which Debtor admitted at the Meeting of Creditors will cease 3 years into the plan.

DISCUSSION

Debtor did not provide either a tax transcript or a federal income tax return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A)(i); FED. R. BANKR. P. 4002(b)(3). Debtor has failed to provide the tax transcript. That is

cause to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

Debtor has not provided Trustee with employer payment advices for the sixty-day period preceding the filing of the petition as required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv); FED. R. BANKR. P. 4002(b)(2)(A). Debtor has failed to provide all necessary pay stubs. That is cause to deny confirmation. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(1).

The Plan proposes to pay a 51 percent dividend to unsecured claims, and Debtor admitted he will have more disposable income to contribute once he finishes paying off a retirement loan in 3 years. Thus, the court may not approve the Plan. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b)(1)

The Plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The Objection is sustained, and the Plan is not confirmed.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), 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 to Confirmation of the Plan is sustained, and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

FINAL RULINGS

7. [20-20287](#)-C-13 **LORI ANDERSON** **OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIM OF**
[DPC-1](#) **Pro Se** **EXEMPTIONS**
3-4-20 [\[27\]](#)

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor (*pro se*) on March 4, 2020. By the court's calculation, 34 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Claimed Exemptions 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 Objection to Claimed Exemptions is sustained, and the exemptions are disallowed in their entirety.

David Cusick ("the Chapter 13 Trustee") objects to Saythamma Sayamnath's ("Debtor") use of the California exemptions (1) without the filing of the spousal waiver required by California Code of Civil Procedure § 703.140, (2) where both sections 703 and 704 are used, and (3) where debtor claimed her jewelry exempt under the exemption for furnishing, clothes, and goods.

As to the spousal waiver requirement, California Code of Civil Procedure § 703.140(a)(2), provides:

If the petition is filed individually, and not jointly, for a spouse, the exemptions provided by this chapter other than the provisions of subdivision (b) are applicable, except that, if **both** of the spouses effectively waive in writing the right to claim, during the period the case commenced by filing the petition is pending, the exemptions provided by the applicable exemption provisions of this chapter, other than subdivision (b), in any case commenced by filing a petition for

either of them under Title 11 of the United States Code, then they may elect to instead utilize the applicable exemptions set forth in subdivision (b).

(emphasis added). The court's review of the docket reveals that the spousal waiver has not been filed.

Additionally, California Code of Civil Procedure § 703.140(a)(1) states:

(1) If spouses are joined in the petition, they jointly may elect to utilize the applicable exemption provisions of this chapter other than the provisions of subdivision (b), or to utilize the applicable exemptions set forth in subdivision (b), **but not both.**

Here, Debtor attempted to utilize both exemptions.

The Trustee's Objection is sustained, and all of Debtor's claimed exemptions are disallowed.

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 Objection to Claimed Exemptions filed by David Cusick ("the Chapter 13 Trustee") having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that Objection is sustained, and all of Debtor's claimed exemptions are disallowed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

The Motion to Confirm is dismissed without prejudice.

The debtors Medy Ford Beauchane and Jamie Suzanne Beauchane having filed a “Notice of Withdrawal of Motion”, which the court construes to be an Ex Parte Motion to Dismiss the pending Motion on March 31, 2020, Dckt. 50; no prejudice to the responding party appearing by the dismissal of the Motion; the Chapter 13 Trustee having the right to request dismissal of the motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041; and the dismissal being consistent with the opposition filed by The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”); the Ex Parte Motion is granted, the debtors’ Motion is dismissed without prejudice, and the court removes this Motion from the calendar.

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 Confirm filed by debtors Medy Ford Beauchane and Jamie Suzanne Beauchane having been presented to the court, debtors having requested that the Motion itself be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, Dckt. 50, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion to Confirm is dismissed without prejudice.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 26, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 41 days’ notice was provided. 35 days’ notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(5) & 3015(h) (requiring twenty-one days’ notice); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(2) (requiring fourteen days’ notice for written opposition).

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 respondent 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 to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.
--

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The debtor, Larry Kenneth January and LaShonda Deene January (“Debtor”), have filed evidence in support of confirmation. The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), filed a Non-Opposition on March 24, 2020. Dckt. 57. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329 and is confirmed.

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 Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Larry Kenneth January and LaShonda Deene January (“Debtor”) 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 Debtor's Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed on February 26, 2020, is confirmed. Debtor's Counsel shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Objection—Hearing Not Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 18, 2020. By the court's calculation, 20 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion.

Upon review of the record, a hearing is not necessary.

<p>The hearing on the Objection is continued to April 28, 2020 at 2:00 p.m.</p>
--

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. The proposed plan provides payment on a second deed of trust as to 3702 Longhorn Creek, San Antonio, Texas, which is not a claim listed on Schedule D.
- B. The Debtor lists 4802 Neer, San Antonio, Texas on Schedule A but does not list any debt on Schedule D. However, Schedule J shows a monthly expense to Mr. Cooper and for two monthly HOA fees.

DEBTOR'S REPLY

Debtor filed a Reply on March 18, 2020. The Reply states that an Amended Schedule D has been filed listing the second deed of trust held by Real Time Resolutions.

The Reply also states that scheduled expenses are for the 3702 Longhorn Creek property, as the other property was paid for by Debtor's disabled brother and sister, and sold in February 2020. However, Debtor also notes Amended Schedules I and J have been filed to reflect accidentally omitted rental income and expenses.

DISCUSSION

Before this Objection To Confirmation was filed, the Debtor has filed a Motion To Confirm set for April 28, 2020, hearing. Wells Fargo Bank, National Association, as Trustee, filed an Opposition to that Motion on March 26, 2020. Dckt. 37.

The court shall continue the hearing on this Objection to be heard alongside Debtor's Motion, so that all parties in interest can weigh in on plan confirmation.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), 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 hearing on the Objection is continued to April 28, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 17, 2020. By the court's calculation, 50 days' notice was provided. 35 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(9); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(1).

The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). 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 respondent 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.

<p>The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.</p>
--

11 U.S.C. § 1323 permits a debtor to amend a plan any time before confirmation. The debtor, Greg William Karamatic ("Debtor") has provided evidence in support of confirmation. The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), filed a Response indicating non-opposition on March 18, 2020. Dckt. 36. The Amended Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

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 Confirm the Amended Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Greg William Karamatic ("Debtor") 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 Debtor's Amended

Chapter 13 Plan filed on February 17, 2020, is confirmed. Debtor's Counsel shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 3, 2020. By the court's calculation, 35 days' notice was provided. 35 days' notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(5) & 3015(h) (requiring twenty-one days' notice); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(2) (requiring fourteen days' notice for written opposition).

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 respondent 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.

<p>The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.</p>

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The debtors, Sean Patrick Roenspie and Amy Elaine Roenspie ("Debtor"), have filed evidence in support of confirmation. The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), filed a Response indicating non-opposition on March 24, 2020. Dckt. 68. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329 and is confirmed.

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 Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Sean Patrick Roenspie and Amy Elaine Roenspie ("Debtor") 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 Debtor's Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed on March 3, 2020, is confirmed. Debtor's Counsel shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Creditor, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 27, 2020. By the court's calculation, 40 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien 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.

<p>The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien is granted.</p>

This Motion requests an order avoiding the judicial lien of Unifund CCR Partners ("Creditor") against property of the debtor, Violet Hayes ("Debtor") commonly known as 26753 Capay St, Esparto, California ("Property").

A judgment was entered against Debtor in favor of Creditor in the amount of \$1,043.12. Exhibit B, Dckt. 23. An abstract of judgment was recorded with Yolo County on September 7, 2006, that encumbers the Property. *Id.*

Pursuant to Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$260,000.00 as of the petition date. Dckt. 1. The unavoidable and senior liens that total \$156,293.18 as of the commencement of this case are stated on Debtor's Schedule D. *Id.* Debtor has claimed an exemption pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 703.140(b)(5) in the amount of \$103,706.82 on Schedule C. *Id.*

After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of the judicial lien impairs Debtor's exemption

of the real property, and its fixing is avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

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 Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by Violet Hayes (“Debtor”) 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 judgment lien of Unifund CCR Partners, California Superior Court for Yolo County Case No. CV-G-06-519, recorded on September 7, 2006, Document No. 2005-0035198-00, with the Yolo County Recorder, against the real property commonly known as 26753 Capay St, Esparto, California, is avoided in its entirety pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), subject to the provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 349 if this bankruptcy case is dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Objection—Hearing Not Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 11, 2020. By the court's calculation, 27 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion.

Upon review of the record, a hearing is not necessary.

The hearing on the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is continued to May 5, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., dba WELLS FARGO AUTO ("Creditor") holding a secured claim opposes confirmation of the Plan based on a dispute over the valuation of Creditor's secured claim.

The Debtor filed a Response noting that a Motion To Value has been set for hearing Mat 5, 2020. Dckt. 23.

Because the plan's feasibility hangs on the outcome of that Motion, the court will continue the hearing on the Objection to be heard alongside Debtor's Motion to Value.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., dba WELLS FARGO AUTO ("Creditor") holding a secured claim 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 hearing on the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is continued to May 5, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Objection—Hearing Not Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor’s Attorney on March 16, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 22 days’ notice was provided. 14 days’ notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. ‘

Upon review of the record, a hearing is not necessary.

The hearing on the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is continued to May 5, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), filed this Objection on the basis that the plan proposes valuing the secured claim of Wells Fargo, and no motion has been filed for that purpose.

The Debtor filed a Response noting that a Motion To Value has been set for hearing Mat 5, 2020. Dckt. 23.

Because the plan’s feasibility hangs on the outcome of that Motion, the court will continue the hearing on the Objection to be heard alongside Debtor’s Motion to Value.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), 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 hearing on the Objection to Confirmation of Plan is continued to May 5, 2020, at 2:00 p.m.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

The case having previously been dismissed, the Objection is overruled as moot.

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 Objection To Debtor's Claim of Exemptions having been presented to the court, the case having been previously dismissed, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is overruled as moot, the case having been dismissed.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 28, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 39 days’ notice was provided. 35 days’ notice is required. FED. R. BANKR. P. 2002(a)(5) & 3015(h) (requiring twenty-one days’ notice); LOCAL BANKR. R. 3015-1(d)(2) (requiring fourteen days’ notice for written opposition).

The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). 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 respondent 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.

<p>The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.</p>

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. The debtors, Michael Lee Lucero and Maria Guadalupe Martinez (“Debtor”), have filed evidence in support of confirmation. The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), filed a Non-Opposition on March 24, 2020. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329 and is confirmed.

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 Confirm the Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed by the debtor, Michael Lee Lucero and Maria Guadalupe Martinez (“Debtor”) 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 Debtor's Modified Chapter 13 Plan filed on February 28, 2020, is confirmed. Debtor's Counsel shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

18. [20-20268](#)-C-13
[DPC-1](#)

ROBERT ACKERMAN
Lucas Garcia

OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIM OF
EXEMPTIONS
3-3-20 [\[22\]](#)

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”), having filed a Notice of Dismissal, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, **the Objection was dismissed without prejudice, and the matter is removed from the calendar.**

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion—Hearing Not Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, Creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on February 18, 2020. By the court's calculation, 21 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value Collateral and Secured Claim was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Debtor, creditors, the Chapter 13 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. Upon review of the record, and the default of the non-responding parties at the initial hearing, there are no disputed material factual issues at this continued hearing and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

The Motion to Value Collateral and Secured Claim of One Main Financial Group, LLC ("Creditor") is granted.

The Motion filed by Tresa Lynn McBride ("Debtor") to value the secured claim of One Main Financial Group, LLC ("Creditor") is accompanied by Debtor's declaration. Debtor is the owner of a 2010 Toyota Yaris ("Vehicle"). Debtor seeks to value the Vehicle at a replacement value of \$4,898.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See* FED. R. EVID. 701; *see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

MARCH 16, 2020 HEARING

At the March 16, 2020, no party appeared to oppose the Motion. However, the court noted that the pleadings did not specify whether the requirements of the hanging paragraph of 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) were met. The court continued the hearing to allow Debtor to supplement the record.

DISCUSSION

The lien on the Vehicle's title secures a non-purchase-money loan, to secure a debt owed to Creditor with a balance of approximately \$17,070.49. Declaration, Dckt. 25; Proof of Claim, No. 1. Therefore, Creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. Creditor's

secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$4,898.00, the value of the collateral. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

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 Value Collateral and Secured Claim filed by Tresa Lynn McBride (“Debtor”) 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 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted, and the claim of One Main Financial Group, LLC (“Creditor”) secured by an asset described as 2010 Toyota Yaris (“Vehicle”) is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$4,898.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Vehicle is \$4,898.00 and is encumbered by a lien securing a claim that exceeds the value of the asset.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Objection—Hearing Not Required.

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 16, 2020. By the court's calculation, 22 days' notice was provided. 14 days' notice is required.

The Objection to Confirmation of Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2) and the procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4). Debtor, Creditors, the Chapter 13 Trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion.

Upon review of the Motion and supporting pleadings, and the files in this case, the court has determined that oral argument will not be of assistance in ruling on the Motion. The defaults of the non-responding parties in interest are entered.

<p>The Objection to Confirmation of Plan is overruled.</p>

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. The plan proposes valuing the secured claim of One Main Financial, but no order has been issued valuing that claim to date.
- B. Debtor did not include Debtor's name on the "/s/" on the plan, which violates Local Bankruptcy Rule 9004-1.
- C. Debtor lists net income from Social Security and Retirement totaling \$2,728.00 monthly. However, documentation submitted to the Trustee shows that income is only \$2,565.13.

DEBTOR'S REPLY

Debtor filed a Reply on March 30, 2020. Dckt. 28. Debtor asserts the Motion To Value (Dckt. 14) is set for hearing, and that a plan meeting the requirement that debtor's name has be typed under the "/s/" has been filed.

Debtor further concedes the income was lower than anticipated, but argues that Debtor has reduced cable and other personal expense so that her net disposable income remains \$230.30. Declaration, Dckt. 28; Exhibit, Dckt. 30.

DISCUSSION

A review of the docket shows the court has granted the Debtor's Motion To Value. With the correction made to the plan signature line and the new budget shown in Debtor's Exhibit (Dckt. 30), the plan appears to be feasible, and all grounds for Objection resolved.

The Plan does comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The Objection is overruled.

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 Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee"), 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 overruled, and Tresa Lynn McBride's ("Debtor") Chapter 13 Plan filed on January 15, 2020, is confirmed. Counsel for 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.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the April 7, 2020, hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, Creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 4, 2020. By the court's calculation, 34 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value Collateral and Secured Claim 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 to Value Collateral and Secured Claim of U.S. Bank, N.A., as trustee ("Creditor") is granted, and the secured claim is determined to have a value of \$0.00.

The debtor Marilyn Jane Munoz filed this Motion To Value seeking to value the secured claim of U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee, successor in interest to Bank of America, National Association, as Trustee, successor by merger to LaSalle Bank National Association, as Trustee for Bear Stearns Mortgage Funding Trust 2006-SL6, Mortgage Backed-Certificates, Series 2006-SL6, its assignees and/or successors by and through its servicing agent JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., at \$0.00.

Thereafter, the parties filed a Stipulation agreeing that Creditor's claim is wholly unsecured. Dckt. 25. This stipulates that the secured claim is valued at \$0.00.

Pursuant to the Stipulation of the Parties, Creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); *Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220

(9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

Creditor's allowed claim shall be provided for as a general unsecured claim in this case.

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 Value Collateral and Secured Claim filed by Marilyn Munoz ("Debtor") having been presented to the court, the Parties having filed a Stipulation to Value the Secured Claim at \$0.00, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted, and the claim of U.S. Bank National Association, as Trustee, successor in interest to Bank of America, National Association, as Trustee, successor by merger to LaSalle Bank National Association, as Trustee for Bear Stearns Mortgage Funding Trust 2006-SL6, Mortgage Backed-Certificates, Series 2006-SL6, its assignees and/or successors by and through its servicing agent JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("Creditor") secured by a Second Deed of Trust on the property commonly known as 8669 Redbanks Rd., Redding, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan.

The Stipulation of the Parties contains additional terms, conditions, and provisions akin to those which are terms of a bankruptcy plan or the subject of proceedings other than a motion to value a secured claim pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Though the additional terms of the Stipulation are not incorporated into an order issued pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a), the court is cognizant that such representations have been made between the respective parties and that each party has relied thereon.