

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

May 16, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 24. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE JUNE 20, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 6, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 13, 2016. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 25 THROUGH 28 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON MAY 23, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

May 16, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 15-20907-A-13 CATHERINE/MARK FALLON AMENDED MOTION TO
MOH-4 MODIFY PLAN
4-4-16 [60]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objection sustained.

First, the proposed plan fails to account for all prior payments made by the debtor under the terms of the confirmed plan. Without these already made payments, the payment stream promised in the modified plan will not pay the promised dividends. Also, if the modified plan is confirmed as it is written, creditors receiving dividends from the prior plan payments that are no longer required by the modified plan could be compelled to refund them because the modified plan does not provide for them.

Second, the original confirmed plan and the proposed modified plan include conflicting provisions for the payment of Ocwen's secured claim. The former provides for the claim in Class 4 and the latter provides for it in Class 1. While it is possible to split a secured claim between these classes, the modified plan must make clear the period of time the claim will be paid in Class 1 and in Class 4. The modified plan does not do this.

Third, the treatment of the IRS's secured claim in Class 2A cannot be confirmed. The dividend stream does not pay the claim in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B), and the failure to pay interest on the claim means that the plan will not pay the claim in full as of its effective date.

Fourth, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Schedules I and J show that the debtor will have monthly net income of approximately \$335; the plan requires a monthly payment of \$1,362.

2. 16-21315-A-13 CHRISTINE MCKAY OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [19]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$4,480 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

3. 16-21320-A-13 JUAN/CATHERINE MARTINEZ OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-27-16 [23]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$770 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the debtor has failed to list all bank accounts and 2016 income in the statements and schedules. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$1,850 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6). Third, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Fourth, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Fifth, Ocwen's secured claim is misclassified in Class 1. That class is reserved for long term claims not modified by the plan. Such claims receive their ongoing contract installment payment and any arrears are cured. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) and (b)(5). Ocwen will not be paid its ongoing contract

claim but will receive a different amount. Hence, the claim belongs in Class 2. And, because the claim is being modified, the entire claim, including unmatured principal, must be paid in full through the plan. The only debt that can be permitted to remain long term debt is debt that is not modified by the chapter 13 plan. As long as the plan is only curing an arrearage, the long term debt may continue beyond the length of the plan and be classified in Class 1. See 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(3) & (5). Whenever a long term debt is modified prospectively in a chapter 13 case, such as by changing its interest rate or future installments, the entire claim must be paid during the chapter 13 case as a Class 2 claim. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(d) and 1325(a)(5). See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004).

Of course, if Ocwen's claim is secured by the debtor's home, the plan's failure to provide for a cure of the arrears and the maintenance of payments means that it will modify the claim in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2).

5.	16-21931-A-13 NICOLE JACKSON MMM-1 VS. BALBOA THRIFT AND LOAN	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 5-2-16 [13]
	<input type="checkbox"/> Telephone Appearance <input type="checkbox"/> Trustee Agrees with Ruling	

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the 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 motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$4,923 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$4,923 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$4,923 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

6. 16-21532-A-13 MARY MURPHY
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [29]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The plan will take more than 200 months to be completed because it provides for payment in full of unsecured claims. The debtor has not taken account of the now unsecured claim of JPMorgan Chase in the amount of more than \$69,000. The plan will not be completed within the 5-year maximum duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

The argument that JPMorgan Chase's claim, which has been stripped from its collateral pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) as interpreted by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997), is not an allowed claim because it was discharged in a prior chapter 7, fails to deal with In re Gounder, 266 B.R. 879 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2001), affirmed, (E.D. Cal. 2001). That case concludes that a discharged secured claim that is stripped from its collateral in a subsequent case becomes an unsecured claim the prior discharge notwithstanding.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

7. 16-21333-A-13 DEBORAH REIFER
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-27-16 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor has failed to include with Schedules I and J a detailed statement of income and expenses associated with the rental of property. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See

Fourth, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payments of \$4,000, 5,000, and \$6,000 are less than the \$7,000 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month. This problem becomes even more acute when the debtor's understatement of the arrears owed to The Bank of New York Mellon is taken into account. This raises that secured claim by more than \$18,000.

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

The objection will be sustained to the extent and for the reasons explained in the ruling on the trustee's objection (JPJ-1).

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$315,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Nationstar Mortgage. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$335,839 as of the petition date. Therefore, First Tennessee Bank's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is

completely under-collateralized. No portion of this claim will be allowed as a secured claim. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a).

Any assertion that the respondent's claim cannot be modified because it is secured only by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence is disposed of by In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). See also In re Bartee, 212 F.3d 277 (5th Cir. 2000); In re Tanner, 217 F.3d 1357 (11th Cir. 2000); McDonald v. Master Fin., Inc. (In re McDonald), 205 F.3d 606, 611-13 (3rd Cir. 2000); and Domestic Bank v. Mann (In re Mann), 249 B.R. 831, 840 (B.A.P. 1st Cir. 2000).

Because the claim is completely under-secured, no interest need be paid on the claim except to the extent otherwise required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4). If the secured claim is \$0, because the value of the respondent's collateral is \$0, no interest need be paid pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(ii).

Any argument that the plan, by valuing the respondent's security and providing the above treatment, violates In re Hobdy, 130 B.R. 318 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1991), will be overruled. The plan is not an objection to the respondent's proof of claim pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 and 11 U.S.C. § 502. The plan makes provision for the treatment of the claim and all other claims, and a separate valuation motion has been filed and served as permitted by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The plan was served by the trustee on all creditors, and the motion to value collateral was served by the debtor with a notice that the collateral for the respondent's claim would be valued. That motion is supported by a declaration of the debtor as to the value of the real property. There is nothing about the process for considering the valuation motion which amounts to a denial of due process.

To the extent the respondent objects to valuation of its collateral in a contested matter rather than an adversary proceeding, the objection is overruled. Valuations pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 are contested matters and do not require the filing of an adversary proceeding. Further, even if considered in the nature of a claim objection, an adversary proceeding is not required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007. It is only when such a motion or objection is joined with a request to determine the extent, validity or priority of a security interest, or a request to avoid a lien that an adversary proceeding is required. Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2). The court is not determining the validity of a claim or avoiding a lien or security interest. The respondent's deed of trust will remain of record until the plan is completed. This is required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I). Once the plan is completed, if the respondent will not reconvey its deed of trust, the court will entertain an adversary proceeding. See also 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(I).

In the meantime, the court is merely valuing the respondent's collateral. Rule 3012 specifies that this is done by motion. Rule 3012 motions can be filed and heard any time during the case. It is particularly appropriate that such motions be heard in connection with the confirmation of a plan. The value of collateral will set the upper bounds of the amount of the secured claim. 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). Knowing the amount and character of claims is vital to assessing the feasibility of a plan, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6), and determining whether the treatment accorded to secured claims complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5).

According to the debtor's evidence, an appraisal by John Ashworth, the residence has a fair market value of \$315,000. While the creditor has objected

to the motion, its evidence is inadmissible. Attached to the opposition is what purports to be an appraisal by David Winn. However, Mr. Winn has not authenticated his appraisal with a declaration or affidavit. See Fed. R. Evid. 901. Without authentication, the offered appraisal is hearsay. Therefore, the debtor's evidence is the only evidence before the court.

10. 16-20037-A-13 JACK/STACEY MARTINEZ MOTION TO
WSS-2 CONFIRM PLAN
4-1-16 [48]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be denied and the objections will be sustained in part.

First, counsel for the debtor has opted to receive fees pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 rather than by making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017. However, counsel has not complied with Rule 2016-1 by filing the rights and responsibilities agreement. The abbreviated procedure for approval of the fees permitted by Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 is not applicable. Therefore, the provision in the proposed plan requiring the trustee to pay the fees without counsel first making a motion in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330 and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, 2017, permits payment of fees without the required court approval. This violates sections 329 and 330.

Second, the plan fails to provide at section 2.07 for a dividend to be on account of allowed administrative expenses, including the debtor's attorney's fees. Unless counsel is working for nothing, this means that the plan does not provide for payment in full of priority claims as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(a)(2). Also see 11 U.S.C. §§ 503(b), 507(a).

11. 16-21345-A-13 MONICA IVIE MOTION TO
ADR-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. CAPITAL ONE AUTO FINANCE 4-29-16 [33]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the 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 motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$7,650 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence,

the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$7,650 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$7,650 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

12. 16-21545-A-13 ALANIE NONAN
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-27-16 [19]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$200 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take 173 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

13. 16-21447-A-13 DANIEL HERNANDEZ
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [21]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the case will be dismissed.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to

appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$100 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Third, the debtor is not eligible for chapter 13 relief. 11 U.S.C. § 109(h) prohibits an individual from being a debtor under any chapter unless that individual received a credit counseling briefing from an approved non-profit budget and credit counseling agency during the 180-day period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. In this case, the debtor has not filed a certificate evidencing that briefing was completed during the 180-day period prior to the filing of the petition. Hence, the debtor was not eligible for bankruptcy relief when this petition was filed.

Fourth, in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv) and Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-1(c) the debtor has failed to provide the trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition. The withholding of this financial information from the trustee is a breach of the duties imposed upon the debtor by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4) and the attempt to confirm a plan while withholding this relevant financial information is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Fifth, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Sixth, the plan filed by the debtor is not a good faith attempt to file a plan as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1321. The proposed plan has no duration nor dividends. Without these terms, the debtor cannot meet the burden of proving the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) and pays the minimum dividends required by 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(3), (b)(5), 1325(a)(4) and (a)(5)(B). This plan has not been proposed in good faith as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

14. 16-21447-A-13 DANIEL HERNANDEZ
EAT-1
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. VS. OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-28-16 [25]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained to the extent and for the reasons explained in the ruling on the trustee's objection (JPJ-1).

15. 16-21453-A-13 EDWIN/LOLITA ESPINO
JPJ-1 OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-27-16 [14]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained.

The plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$1,499 to be made in months 5 through 24 of the plan, is less than the \$1,721 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

16. 16-21764-A-13 STANLEY BERMAN
ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
4-26-16 [17]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will remain pending but the court will modify the terms of its order permitting the debtor to pay the filing fee in installments.

The court granted the debtor permission to pay the filing fee in installments. The debtor failed to pay the \$79 installment when due on April 21. While the delinquent installment was paid on May 5, the fact remains the court was required to issue an order to show cause to compel the payment. Therefore, as a sanction for the late payment, the court will modify its prior order allowing installment payments to provide that if a future installment is not received by its due date, the case will be dismissed without further notice or hearing.

17. 16-21471-A-13 TYLER/KIMBERLY WELCH
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [13]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

The plan provides that the arrearage owed on a home loan will be paid "pro rata." It fails to state pro rata with what claims and, even if this was clear, because the dividend is not a equal monthly installment, it does not satisfy 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B)(iii)(I).

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

18. 16-21378-A-13 LYDIA MONTEJANO
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [16]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$145 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, if requested by the U.S. Trustee or the chapter 13 trustee, a debtor must produce evidence of a social security number or a written statement that such documentation does not exist. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4002(b)(1)(B). In this case, the debtor has breached the foregoing duty by failing to provide evidence of the debtor's social security number. This is cause for dismissal.

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

19. 16-22683-A-13 LONDON THOMAS MOTION TO
DBL-1 EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
5-2-16 [9]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the 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 motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be denied.

While two prior cases were filed by someone using the debtor's name and identifying information, the debtor attests he did not file these cases, did not sign the petitions or the related case documents, and he did not authorize anyone to file or sign them for him.

The debtor asks the court to impose the automatic stay. While this request is made pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3), that section is not applicable for two reasons.

First, section 362(c)(3) is applicable when the debtor has filed one case that was dismissed in the year prior to the most recent case. There are two prior petitions that were dismissed. Hence, section 362(c)(3) is not applicable; 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(4) arguably is applicable.

Second, whether section 362(c)(3) or (c)(4) is applicable, they are applicable only if the debtor filed the petitions or if his creditors filed them as involuntary cases. The motion states that the debtor did not file the two prior cases and it is clear from a review of those dockets that they are not involuntary cases. Hence, because the debtor has not filed any prior cases, neither section 362(c)(3) nor section 362(c)(4) comes into play.

20. 16-21385-A-13 WILFREDO/FE ONA
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [33]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Capital One Bank in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

21. 16-21385-A-13 WILFREDO/FE ONA
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A. VS.

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-7-16 [19]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be overruled.

The plan provides for the objecting creditor's claim in Class 1. This means that the plan will cure the pre-petition arrearage while maintaining the monthly contract installment. The plan explicitly provides that the claim is not modified in any way. This treatment satisfies the requirements of 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(2), (b)(5), and 1325(a)(5)(B). The fact that the plan may erroneously understate the amount of the arrears by approximately \$2,000 is not important because the arrears demanded by the creditor, not the amount stated in the plan, will be paid unless the debtor or the trustee successfully objects to a proof of claim filed by the creditor.

22. 16-21694-A-13 ALICE PEREZ
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [32]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained and the motion to dismiss the case will be conditionally denied.

First, the debtor has failed to commence making plan payments and has not paid approximately \$350 to the trustee as required by the proposed plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. This is cause to deny confirmation of the plan and for dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor has failed to list an interest in a retirement account on Schedule B. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

Third, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Travis Credit Union in order to strip down or strip off its secured claim from its collateral. No such motion has been filed, served, and granted. Absent a successful motion the debtor cannot establish that the plan will pay secured claims in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B) or that the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(j) provides: "If a proposed plan will reduce or eliminate a secured claim based on the value of its collateral or the avoidability of a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f), the debtor must file, serve, and set for hearing a valuation motion and/or a lien avoidance motion. The hearing must be concluded before or in conjunction with the confirmation of the plan. If a motion is not filed, or it is unsuccessful, the Court may deny confirmation of the plan."

Fourth, the debtor's attorney's fee disclosure conflicts with the Rights and Responsibilities agreement. The former provides of a total fee of \$2,000 and the latter for a fee of \$4,000. Given the discrepancy, counsel shall apply for fees and not utilize the abbreviated fee procedure authorized by Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1.

23. 16-21694-A-13 ALICE PEREZ
RDW-1
HERITAGE COMMUNITY CREDIT UNION VS.

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
4-28-16 [36]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be overruled.

First, the assertion that the case and the plan have been filed in bad faith will be overruled. This objection is based on the assertion that the debtor converted the creditor's collateral before the case was filed. Assuming this

is true (and the debtor denies it), it is not a basis for denying confirmation. It may be a basis for challenging the dischargeability of the debtor pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1328 but it is not by itself enough to conclude the case or the plan have been proposed in bad faith.

Second, if the claim is nondischargeable, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(10) does not require that the plan pay interest on the objecting creditor's claim. This section permits, but does not require, a debtor to provide for interest on a nondischargeable claim.

This is frequently an issue on nondischargeable tax and student loan claims. Post-petition interest on a nondischargeable student loan is also nondischargeable. See Great Lakes Higher Educ. Corp. v. Pardee (In re Pardee), 218 B.R. 916, 925 (B.A.P. 9th Cir.1998), *affirmed*, 193 F.3d 1083 (9th Cir. 1999). This is consistent with Bruning v. United States, 376 U.S. 358 (1964). In Bruning, the Supreme Court determined that post-petition interest on a nondischargeable tax debt was itself nondischargeable under the former Bankruptcy Act. See also Ward v. Board of Equalization of Cal. (In re Artisan Woodworkers), 204 F.3d 888 (9th Cir. 2000).

Under the Bankruptcy Code, unsecured creditors are not entitled to include unmatured, or post-petition, interest as part of their claims in the bankruptcy proceeding and cannot collect such interest from the bankruptcy estate. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(2). Hence, while a chapter 13 debtor could confirm a plan and pay the principal owed on a student loan principal with any unpaid interest that had accrued prior to the filing of the petition, section 502(b)(2) prevented the debtor from paying the post-petition interest accumulating on the loan during the pendency of the chapter 13. That post-petition interest nonetheless accumulated and survived the discharge. Accord, Roa-Moreno v. HHS (In re Roa-Moreno), 208 B.R. 488, 491-92 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1997).

Section 1322(b)(10) was added to the Bankruptcy Code by BAPCPA to avoid this problem. If the debtor pays all unsecured claims in full, the debtor may provide for payment of the nondischargeable post-petition interest accumulating on just the nondischargeable debt.

Hence, this objection is without merit for two reasons. First, section 1322(b)(10) gives the debtor some latitude to pay interest on nondischargeable claims but it does not require the debtor to do so. Second, the debtor cannot pay interest on such claims unless the debtor pays unsecured claims in full. Here, the debtor is not paying them in full and 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) does not require the debtor to do so.

24. 16-21399-A-13 RITA SCHROEDER
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-27-16 [32]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because this hearing on an objection to the confirmation of the proposed chapter 13 plan and a motion to dismiss the case was set pursuant to the procedure required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4), the debtor was not required to file a written response. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the objection. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no

opposition. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The objection will be sustained and the case will be conditionally dismissed.

First, the debtor failed to appear at the meeting of creditors. Appearance is mandatory. See 11 U.S.C. § 343. To attempt to confirm a plan while failing to appear and be questioned by the trustee and any creditors who appear, the debtor is also failing to cooperate with the trustee. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3). Under these circumstances, attempting to confirm a plan is the epitome of bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3). The failure to appear also is cause for the dismissal of the case. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(6).

Second, to pay the dividends required by the plan at the rate proposed by it will take more than 600 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Third, the debtor is not eligible for chapter 13 relief. 11 U.S.C. § 109(h) prohibits an individual from being a debtor under any chapter unless that individual received a credit counseling briefing from an approved non-profit budget and credit counseling agency during the 180-day period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. In this case, the debtor has not filed a certificate evidencing that briefing was completed during the 180-day period prior to the filing of the petition. Hence, the debtor was not eligible for bankruptcy relief when this petition was filed.

Fourth, Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(b)(6) provides: "Documents Required by Trustee. The debtor shall provide to the trustee, not later than the fourteen (14) days after the filing of the petition, Form EDC 3-088, *Domestic Support Obligation Checklist*, or other written notice of the name and address of each person to whom the debtor owes a domestic support obligation together with the name and address of the relevant state child support enforcement agency (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 464 & 466), Form EDC 3-086, *Class 1 Checklist*, for each Class 1 claim, and Form EDC 3-087, *Authorization to Release Information to Trustee Regarding Secured Claims Being Paid By The Trustee*." Because the plan includes a class 1 claim, the debtor was required to provide the trustee with a Class 1 checklist. The debtor failed to do so.

Fifth, 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(B) & (C) requires the court to dismiss a petition if an individual chapter 7 or 13 debtor fails to provide to the case trustee a copy of the debtor's federal income tax return for the most recent tax year ending before the filing of the petition. This return must be produced seven days prior to the date first set for the meeting of creditors. The failure to provide the return to the trustee justifies dismissal and denial of confirmation. In addition to the requirement of section 521(e)(2) that the petition be dismissed, an uncodified provision of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 found at section 1228(a) of BAPCPA provides that in chapter 11 and 13 cases the court shall not confirm a plan of an individual debtor unless requested tax documents have been turned over. This has not been done.

Sixth, the plan filed by the debtor is not a good faith attempt to file a plan as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1321. The proposed plan has no duration nor dividends for Class 7 or the amount of the monthly installment due on the Class 1 claim of Caliber. Without these terms, the debtor cannot meet the burden of proving the plan is feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) and pays the minimum dividends required by 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(b)(3), (b)(5), 1325(a)(4) and

(a) (5) (B) . This plan has not been proposed in good faith as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a) (3) .

Because the plan proposed by the debtor is not confirmable, the debtor will be given a further opportunity to confirm a plan. But, if the debtor is unable to confirm a plan within a reasonable period of time, the court concludes that the prejudice to creditors will be substantial and that there will then be cause for dismissal. If the debtor has not confirmed a plan within 75 days, the case will be dismissed on the trustee's ex parte application.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

25. 11-39600-A-13 MICHAEL/REBECCA KLEIN MOTION TO
CJY-4 MODIFY PLAN
4-6-16 [58]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

26. 12-25204-A-13 CHARANJIT SINGH MOTION TO
CJY-2 MODIFY PLAN
4-5-16 [37]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814 [if the case is pending in the Sacramento Division]; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because, while the U.S. Attorney was served, he was served at the IRS was served at 2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401, Fresno, CA 93721-1318. This is the correct address only if the case is pending in the Modesto or Fresno Divisions. This case is pending in the Sacramento Division.

27. 15-29111-A-13 ERWIN/MARY ANN SANTOS MOTION TO
PGM-2 CONFIRM PLAN
4-4-16 [45]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(c)(3) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b),

1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

28.	16-21320-A-13 JUAN/CATHERINE MARTINEZ PPR-1 GOLDEN 1 CREDIT UNION VS.	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN 4-7-16 [19]
-----	---	---

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(c)(4) provides:

Objecting to Plan Confirmation. Creditors, as well as the trustee, may object to the confirmation of the chapter 13 plan. An objection and a notice of hearing must be filed and served upon the debtor, the debtor's attorney, and the trustee within seven (7) days after the first date set for the meeting of creditors held pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 341(a). The objection shall be set for hearing on the confirmation hearing date and time designated in the Notice of Chapter 13 Bankruptcy Case, Meeting of Creditors & Deadlines. The objection shall comply with LBR 9014-1(a)-(e), (f)(2), and (g)-(l), including the requirement for a Docket Control Number on all documents relating to the objection. The notice of hearing shall inform the debtor, the debtor's attorney, and the trustee that no written response to the objection is necessary. Absent a timely objection and a properly noticed hearing on it, the Court may confirm the chapter 13 plan without a hearing.

Here, the Notice instructed parties in interest to set a hearing on any objection on May 16. While this objection was set on the correct day, the notice informed the debtor that the hearing had been set pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). As indicated in Rule 3015-1(c)(4), it should have informed the debtor that the hearing was set pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). By referring to the wrong rule, the notice required a written response to the objection even though the rules of this court require no written response.