

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT Eastern District of California Honorable René Lastreto II Department B - Courtroom #13 Fresno, California

Hearing Date: Wednesday, May 21, 2025

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable René Lastreto II, shall be simultaneously: (1) In Person at, Courtroom #13 (Fresno hearings only), (2) via ZoomGov Video, (3) via ZoomGov Telephone, and (4) via CourtCall. You may choose any of these options unless otherwise ordered or stated below.

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

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

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest and/or their attorneys may connect to the video or audio feed free of charge and should select which method they will use to appear when signing up.
- Members of the public and the press who wish to attend by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the Zoom telephone number. Video participation or observing are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may attend in person unless otherwise ordered.

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

- 1. Review the $\frac{\text{Pre-Hearing Dispositions}}{\text{Dispositions}}$ prior to appearing at the hearing.
- 2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the <u>CourtCall Appearance Information</u>. If you are appearing by ZoomGov phone or video, please join at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the calendar and wait with your microphone muted until the matter is called.

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

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

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

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

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

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within 14 days of the final hearing on the matter.

Post-Publication Changes: The court endeavors to publish its rulings as soon as possible. However, calendar preparation is ongoing, and these rulings may be revised or updated at any time prior to 4:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled hearings. Please check at that time for any possible updates.

9:30 AM

1. $\frac{25-10009}{LGT-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: KATHERINE SCONIERS STANPHILL

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 2-24-2025 [20]

LILIAN TSANG/MV DISMISSED 4/30/25

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

An order dismissing this case was entered on April 30, 2025. (Doc. #45). The objection will be OVERRULED AS MOOT.

2. $\frac{25-10009}{LGT-2}$ -B-13 IN RE: KATHERINE SCONIERS STANPHILL

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 4-7-2025 [32]

LILIAN TSANG/MV DISMISSED 4/30/25

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

An order dismissing this case was entered on April 30, 2025. (Doc. #45). The objection will be OVERRULED AS MOOT.

3. $\frac{24-13717}{\text{SLL}-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: SHENA SIELERT

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF STATE OF CALIFORNIA EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT DEPT.

4-21-2025 [22]

SHENA SIELERT/MV STEPHEN LABIAK/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in

conformance with the ruling below.

Shena Sielert ("Debtor") moves for an order avoiding a judicial lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) in favor of the California Employment Development Dept. ("Creditor") in the sum of \$6,717.72 and encumbering residential real property located at 55650 Quail Hollow Court, North Fork California, 93643 ("Property"). Doc. #22.

Debtor complied with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(b)(6) by serving Creditor, a state corporation or other governmental organization subject to suit, through both the Creditor's legal office and its Director, Nancy Farias, on April 21, 2025. Doc. #26. While Rule 7004(b)(6) requires only service through First Class Mail, Debtor opted to use Certified Mail.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the creditors, the chapter 7 trustee, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amounts of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

No party in interest timely filed written opposition. This motion will be GRANTED.

To avoid a lien under 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1), the movant must establish four elements: (1) there must be an exemption to which the debtor would be entitled under § 522(b); (2) the property must be listed on the debtor's schedules as exempt; (3) the lien must impair the exemption; and (4) the lien must be either a judicial lien or a non-possessory, non-purchase money security interest in personal property listed in § 522(f)(1)(B). § 522(f)(1); Goswami v. MTC Distrib. (In re Goswami), 304 B.R. 386, 390-91 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2003) (quoting In re Mohring, 142 B.R. 389, 392 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1992), aff'd, 24 F.3d 247 (9th Cir. 1994)).

Here, a judgment was entered against Debtor in favor of Creditor in the amount of \$6,717.72 on October 27, 2022. Doc. \$23 (Exhib. C). The abstract of judgment was issued that same day, and it was recorded in Madera County on October 28, 2022. *Id.* That lien attached to Debtor's interest in Property. *Id.*; Doc. \$24.

There is an inconsistency in the moving papers. Debtor declares that the current amount owed on account of this lien is \$6,717.72, and this figure comports with the abstract of judgment. Docs. ##24-25. However, the Debtor's Schedule D lists the amount of the claim as \$4,716.19. Doc. #1 (Schedule D). The court will apply the larger figure in this ruling.

As of the petition date, Property had an approximate value of \$440,588.00. Doc. #1 (Sched. A/B). Debtor claimed a \$363,588.00 exemption in Property pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. ("CCP") \$ 704.730. Doc. #1 (Sched. C).

Property is encumbered by a first deed of trust in favor Deutch [sic] Bank National Trust Co. in the amount of \$77,000.00. Doc. #1 (Sched. D). It appears from Schedule D that Property is also encumbered by a judicial lien in the amount of \$3,348.87 owing to Capital One Bank (USA) N.A. ("Capital One"). Id. The Capital One lien is not reference in the moving papers, and the court has no information on when it was obtained, when it was recorded, or whether Debtor will seek to avoid the Capital One lien in the future. No such avoidance motion has been filed regarding the Capital One lien thus far. However, for the reasons outlined below, the court does not require information about the Capital One lien to rule as there is insufficient equity in the Property to pay either lien.

Property's encumbrances can be illustrated as follows:

Creditor	Amount	Recorded	Status
1. Deutch Bank	\$77,000.00	10/30/09	Unavoidable
2. Capital One	\$3,348.87	Unknown	Unknown
3. Creditor	\$\$6,717.72	10/28/22	Avoidable

When a debtor seeks to avoid multiple liens under § 522(f)(1) and there is equity to which liens can attach, the liens must be avoided in the reverse order of their priority. Bank of Am. Nat'l Tr. & Sav. Ass'n v. Hanger (In re Hanger), 217 B.R. 592, 595 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997), aff'd, 196 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1999). Liens already avoided are excluded from the exemption impairment calculation. Ibid.; § 522(f)(2)(B).

"Under the full avoidance approach, as used in Brantz, the only way a lien would be avoided 'in full' was if the debtor's gross equity were equal to or less than the amount of the exemption." Bank of Am. Nat'l Tr. & Sav. Ass'n v. Hanger (In re Hanger), 217 B.R. 592, 596 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997), aff'd, 196 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 1999), citing In re Brantz, 106 B.R. 62, 68 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1989) ("Avoidance of all judicial liens results unless (3) [the result of deducting the debtor's allowable exemptions and the sum of all liens not avoided from the value of the property] is a positive figure."), citing In re Magosin, 75 B.R. 545, 547 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1987) (judicial lien was avoidable in its entirety where equity is less than exemption).

Strict application of the § 522(f)(2) formula with respect to Creditor's lien is illustrated as follows:

Amount of judgment lien		6 , 717.72
Total amount of unavoidable liens (incl. liens not	_	
yet avoided)		77,000.00
Debtor's claimed exemption in Property	+	363,588.00
Sum		\$447,305.72
Debtor's claimed value of interest absent liens		440,588.00
Extent lien impairs exemption		\$6,717.72

All Points Capital Corp. v. Meyer (In re Meyer), 373 B.R. 84, 91 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2007); accord. Hanger 217 B.R. at 596, Higgins v. Household Fin. Corp. (In re Higgins), 201 B.R. 965, 967 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1996); cf. Brantz, 106 B.R. at 68, Magosin, 75 B.R. at 549-50, In re Piersol, 244 B.R. 309, 311 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2000). Since there is no equity for liens to attach and this case does not involve fractional interests or co-owned property with non-debtor third parties, the § 522(f)(2) formula can be re-illustrated using the Brantz formula with the same result:

Fair market value of Property		\$440,588.00
Total amount of unavoidable liens (incl. liens not yet avoided)	_	\$77 , 000.00
Homestead exemption	_	363,588.00
Remaining equity for judicial liens		\$0.00
Creditor's judicial lien		\$6,717.72
Extent Debtor's exemption impaired		(\$6,717.72)

After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there is insufficient equity to support any judicial liens. Therefore, the fixing of Creditor's judicial lien impairs Debtor's exemption in the Property and its fixing will be avoided.

Debtor has established the four elements necessary to avoid a lien under § 522(f)(1). Accordingly, this motion will be GRANTED. The proposed order shall state that Creditor's lien is avoided from the subject Property only and include a copy of the abstract of judgment as an exhibit.

4. $\frac{24-11025}{PBB-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: LAMAR/AT VERDUZCO

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 4-15-2025 [30]

AT VERDUZCO/MV PETER BUNTING/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order in

conformance with the ruling below.

Lamar and At Verduzco ("Debtors") move for an order confirming the First Modified Chapter 13 Plan dated April 15, 2025. Docs. #30, #32. Debtor's current plan was confirmed on August 19, 2024. Doc. #23.

No party has timely objected.

This motion was set for hearing on 35 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3015-1(d)(1). The failure of any party in interest, including but not limited to creditors, the U.S. Trustee, and the case Trustee, to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amounts of damages). Televideo Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987).

The motion requests that the confirmed plan be modified as follows:

1. Plan payments will be \$1,510.00 per month for months 1-11. Payments will be \$600.00 per month for the remaining life of the plan.

- 2. Class 2(A) Creditor Hyundai Capital America shall be paid an aggregate of \$13,362.46 for months 1-11 and then \$400.00 per month for the remaining life of the plan.
- 3. The dividend to unsecured creditors will be reduced from 100% down to 0%.
- 4. The plan is otherwise unchanged.

Compare Doc. #3 and Doc. #32.

Debtors aver that this modification is necessary because of a significant reduction of income because co-debtor At Verduzco was laid off from his job. Doc. #35. This is confirmed by Debtors' Amended Schedule I & J, which reflects a monthly net income of \$600.00, down from \$2,294.74 which was their monthly net income as calculated in their Amended Schedule I & J dated August 16, 2024. Compare Doc. #21 and Doc. #36.

No party in interest has objected, and the defaults of all non-responding parties in interest are entered. This motion is GRANTED. The order shall include the docket control number of the motion, shall reference the plan by the date it was filed, and shall be approved as to form by Trustee.

5. $\frac{25-10925}{\text{JCW}-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: JORGE GONZALEZ AND NANCY RAMIREZ

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY PNC BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION 5-5-2025 [19]

PNC BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION/MV JERRY LOWE/ATTY. FOR DBT. JENNIFER WONG/ATTY. FOR MV.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

PNC Bank ("Creditor") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Jorge Gonzalez and Nancy Ramirez (collectively "Debtors") on March 26, 2025. Doc. #19. On May 19, 2025, Debtors filed their *First Modified Chapter 13 Plan*. Accordingly, this Objection to the prior plan will be OVERRULED as moot.

6. $\frac{25-10925}{LGT-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: JORGE GONZALEZ AND NANCY RAMIREZ

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 5-5-2025 [15]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
JERRY LOWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Jorge Gonzalez and Nancy Ramirez (collectively "Debtors") on March 26, 2025. Doc. #19. On May 19, 2025, Debtors filed their *First Modified Chapter 13 Plan*. Accordingly, this Objection to the prior plan will be OVERRULED as moot.

7. $\underbrace{25-10926}_{\text{BONILLA}}$ -B-13 IN RE: JUAN CARLOS MIRANDA AND CARRIE LGT-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 5-1-2025 [19]

LILIAN TSANG/MV MARK ZIMMERMAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Juan Carlos Miranda and Carrie Bonilla (collectively "Debtors") on March 26, 2025, on the following basis:

1. The Debtors failed to appear at the 341 Meeting of Creditors conducted on April 29, 2025. The continued meeting is set for June 10, 2025. Trustee may supplement this Objection.

Doc. #19.

This objection will be CONTINUED to June 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the objection to confirmation is withdrawn, the Debtors shall file and serve a written response to the Objection not later than 14 days before the hearing. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the Debtors' position. Any reply shall be served no later than 7 days before the hearing.

If the Debtors elect to withdraw the plan and file a modified plan in lieu of filing a response, then a confirmable, modified plan shall be filed, served, and set for hearing not later than 7 days before the hearing. If the Debtors do not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection will be sustained on the grounds stated in the objection without further hearing.

8. <u>25-10879</u>-B-13 **IN RE: JUAN SALDANA AND**LGT-1 **PATRICIA GARCIA AGUILERA**

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 5-1-2025 [14]

LILIAN TSANG/MV JEFFREY ROWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Withdrawn.

No order is required.

On May 12, 2025, the Trustee withdrew this Objection to Confirmation. Doc. #17. Accordingly, this Objection is WITHDRAWN.

9. $\frac{25-10887}{LGT-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: ERIC/REBECCA GRIMM

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 5-1-2025 [13]

LILIAN TSANG/MV JERRY LOWE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Chapter 13 trustee Lilian G. Tsang ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the *Chapter 13 Plan* filed by Eric and Rebecca Grimm (collectively "Debtors") on March 22, 2025, on the following basis:

- 1. Debtors have not filed a motion to value the collateral of either Nuvision Federal Credit Union or Sunnova Energy International, both of which are listed as a Class 2 claim and for which the plan proposes to pay the value of the collateral.
- 2. Debtors' 341 Meeting of Creditors has not been concluded. Trustee received Debtors' financial documents on April 25, 2025, and was unable to review them prior to the April 28, 2025, hearing date. The 341 meeting has been continued to May 27, 2025. The Trustee may supplement this Objection.

Doc. #13. On May 12, 2025, Debtors filed a *Motion to Value Collateral* of Sunova Energy International which is set for hearing on June 11, 2025 (Doc. #16), but no such motion has been filed as to Nuvision Federal Credit Union, and Objection #2 has not been addressed at all.

This objection will be CONTINUED to June 25, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or the objection to confirmation is withdrawn, the Debtors shall file and serve a written response to the Objection not later than 14 days before the hearing. The response shall specifically address each issue raised in the objection to confirmation, state whether the issue is disputed or undisputed, and include admissible evidence to support the Debtors' position. Any reply shall be served no later than 7 days before the hearing.

If the Debtors elect to withdraw the plan and file a modified plan in lieu of filing a response, then a confirmable, modified plan shall be filed, served, and set for hearing not later than **7 days before the hearing**. If the Debtors do not timely file a modified plan or a

written response, this objection will be sustained on the grounds stated in the objection without further hearing.

10. $\underline{25-10389}_{-B-13}$ IN RE: DONALD/STEPHANIE SALKIN LGT-2

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 4-22-2025 [21]

LILIAN TSANG/MV JOEL WINTER/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's

findings and conclusions. The court will issue an

order.

The chapter 13 trustee asks the court to dismiss this case under 11 U.S.C. \S 1307(c)(1) for unreasonable delay by Donald and Stephanie Salkin ("Debtors") that is prejudicial to creditors and 11 U.S.C. \S 1307(c)(4) Debtors' failure to commence making plan payments. Doc. #21. Debtors did not oppose.

Unless the trustee's motion is withdrawn before the hearing, the motion will be GRANTED without oral argument for cause shown.

This motion was set for hearing on 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the creditors, the debtor, the U.S. Trustee, or any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by LBR 9014-1(f)(1)(B) may be deemed a waiver of any opposition 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 moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the above-mentioned parties in interest are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. Upon default, factual allegations will be taken as true (except those relating to amount of damages). Televideo Systems, Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires that a plaintiff make a prima facie showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

Here, Debtors have failed to:

- appear and testify at the initial 341 Meeting of Creditors on March 18, 2025, and the continued 341 Meeting of Creditors on April 15, 2025. [11 U.S.C § 341] and/or F.R.B.P 4002;
- 2. file and set for hearing a motion to value 2018 Subaru Outback held by Capital One Auto Finance pursuant to Local Rule 3015-1(j); and
- 3. commence making plan payments. As of April 22, 2025, payments are delinquent in the amount of \$1,950.00. While this motion is pending, the April 25, 2025, of \$1,950.00 will come due.

Under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c), the court may convert or dismiss a case, whichever is in the best interests of creditors and the estate, for cause. "A debtor's unjustified failure to expeditiously accomplish any task required either to propose or to confirm a chapter 13 plan may constitute cause for dismissal under § 1307(c)(1)." Ellsworth v. Lifescape Med. Assocs., P.C. (In re Ellsworth), 455 B.R. 904, 915 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2011). There is "cause" for dismissal under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1) for unreasonable delay.

In addition, the trustee has reviewed the schedules and determined that this case has a liquidation value of \$2,441.51 after trustee compensation if the case were converted to chapter 7. Doc. #23. This amount is comprised of the value of Debtors' 2014 Acura RDX, household goods and electronics, and tax refunds. Id. The liquidation value of this case is de minimis. Therefore, dismissal, rather than conversion, serves the interests of creditors and the estate.

Accordingly, the motion will be GRANTED, and the case dismissed.

11. $\underline{25-10192}$ -B-13 IN RE: WENDY ROBINSON LGT-1

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE LILIAN G. TSANG 3-7-2025 [15]

RABIN POURNAZARIAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On April 28, 2025, the Debtor in this case filed her *First Amended Chapter 13 Plan.* Doc. #36. Accordingly, the Trustee's Objection to the original Plan dated January 24, 2025, is OVERRULED as moot.

12. $\frac{24-13097}{LGT-1}$ -B-13 IN RE: ROBERT HERMAN

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG 4-8-2025 [38]

LILIAN TSANG/MV MARK ZIMMERMAN/ATTY. FOR DBT.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On April 22, 2025, the Debtor in this case filed his *First Amended Chapter 13 Plan.* Doc. #51. Accordingly, the Trustee's Objection to the original Plan dated March 6, 2025, is OVERRULED as moot.

11:00 AM

1. $\frac{23-10457}{23-1024}$ -B-11 IN RE: MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

CONTINUED PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT, JURY DEMAND 5-11-2023 [1]

RUBIO V. MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL EILEEN GOLDSMITH/ATTY. FOR PL.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 9, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On May 14, 2025, the parties submitted a Joint Status Report stating, inter alia, that on May 6, 2025, they had successfully completed mediation and reached an agreement resolving this matter "in principle." Parties ask for 45 days to finalize or provide further status update. Accordingly, this matter will be CONTINUED to July 9, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

2. $\frac{23-10457}{23-1024}$ -B-11 IN RE: MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT 5-11-2023 [1]

RUBIO V. MADERA COMMUNITY HOSPITAL EILEEN GOLDSMITH/ATTY. FOR PL.

FINAL RULING: There will be no hearing on this matter.

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 9, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

On May 14, 2025, the parties submitted a Joint Status Report stating, inter alia, that on May 6, 2025, they had successfully completed mediation and reached an agreement resolving this matter "in principle." Parties ask for 45 days to finalize or provide further status update. Accordingly, this matter will be CONTINUED to July 9, 2025, at 11:00 a.m.