

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

May 26, 2015 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 20. 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 ON JUNE 22, 2015 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 8, 2015, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JUNE 15, 2015. 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 21 THROUGH 40 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 JUNE 1, 2015, AT 2:30 P.M.

May 26, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 11-36003-A-13 ANDREW/JULIE SCHWEITZER MOTION TO
EGS-1 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
4-24-15 [82]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The motion seeks permission to modify a home mortgage. However, there is no proof with the motion, as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(i)(3)(C), that the debtor has the current financial ability to maintain plan payments and afford to repay the modified home loan.

2. 15-22621-A-13 ROSHAWN INGRAM OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
5-5-15 [15]

- ☐ 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 make \$351 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, 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.

Third, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, the petition fails to disclose a prior bankruptcy filed in 2011. 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).

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. 15-21845-A-13 JOSEPH BARNES MOTION TO
SS-3 CONFIRM PLAN
4-6-15 [31]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Aaron's 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."

However, the court overrules the objections concerning or implicating the secured claim of Harley Davidson. According to its proof of claim, the contract debt is amortized over a seven year period through January 2021. While it appears the obligation secured by the motorcycle was accelerated before the bankruptcy case was filed because the debtor had failed to make monthly payments, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(3) permits a chapter 13 debtor to cure "any default." And, because the note requires payments beyond the 5 year plan duration, 11 U.S.C. § U.S.C. § 1322(b)(5) permits the debtor to maintain contract installment payments and to cure the pre-petition default. This is done in Class 1. In effect, the acceleration of the loan may be undone, the pre-petition default cured through the plan and a cure payment made to the creditor with the ongoing installment payment.

According to Schedules I and J, the debtor has enough income to fund the ongoing installment and the plan payment. The plan is feasible.

- ☐ 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 admitted at the meeting of creditors that the debtor failed to file an income tax returns for the prior 4 years. The returns are delinquent.

Prior to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 becoming effective, the Bankruptcy Code did not require chapter 13 debtors to file delinquent tax returns. If a debtor did not file tax returns, the trustee might object to the plan on the grounds of lack of feasibility or that the plan was not proposed in good faith. See, e.g., Greatwood v. United States (In re Greatwood), 194 B.R. 637 (9th Cir. B.A.P. 1996), *affirmed*, 120 F.3d. 268 (9th Cir. 1997).

Since BAPCPA became effective, a chapter 13 debtor must file most pre-petition delinquent tax returns. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308. Section 1308(a) requires a chapter 13 debtor who has failed to file tax returns under applicable nonbankruptcy law to file all such returns if they were due for tax periods during the 4-year period ending on the date of the filing of the petition. The delinquent returns must be filed by the date of the meeting of creditors.

In this case, the meeting of creditors was held and concluded. While it is possible for the deadline to file the delinquent returns to be extended, to receive an extension the trustee hold the meeting of creditors open. See 11 U.S.C. § 1308(b). The trustee did not hold the meeting open. Hence, the deadline for filing the delinquent returns has expired and it is impossible for the debtor to comply with section 1308.

There are two consequences to a failure to comply with section 1308. The failure is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(e). Also, 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(9) and an uncodified provision of BAPCPA found at section 1228(a) of the Act provide that the court cannot confirm a plan if delinquent returns have not been filed with the taxing agency and filed with the court. This has not been done and so the court cannot confirm any plan proposed by the debtor.

Second, 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.

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, 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, the plan classifies one secured claim held by Ocwen Loan Services in two classes, Class 1 and Class 4. These classes are mutually exclusive.

Sixth, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrearages owed to the Class 1 secured claims of Ocwen and Carrington. The plan provides only for the ongoing payments. By failing to provide for cures, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying these home loans. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claims will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

Seventh, to pay the dividends required by the plan and 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).

Eighth, the plan is not feasible as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6) because the monthly plan payment of \$1,500 is less than the \$4,195 in dividends and expenses the plan requires the trustee to pay each month.

Ninth, even if \$1,500 fully funded the plan, the plan would not be feasible. Schedules I and J show that the debtor will have no monthly net income with which to fund the plan.

5. 15-21946-A-13 OSIRIS HENDERSON OBJECTION TO
BHT-2 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
HSBC BANK USA, N.A. VS. 4-17-15 [32]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Given the dismissal of the case on the trustee's motion, the objection will be dismissed as moot.

6. 15-21946-A-13 OSIRIS HENDERSON OBJECTION TO
BHT-3 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO. VS. 4-23-15 [38]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Given the dismissal of the case on the trustee's motion, the objection will be dismissed as moot.

7. 15-22356-A-13 KIM SCHMIDT OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
5-5-15 [15]

- ☐ 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 fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The schedules do not disclose a \$10,000 pension due to the debtor. 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).

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting motions to value the collateral of The Golden One Credit Union and RC Willey Home Furnishings in order to strip down or strip off their secured claims from their collateral. No such motions have been filed, served, and granted. Absent successful motions 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.

8. 15-21258-A-13 ELIZABETH GOMEZ MOTION TO
MC-1 CONFIRM PLAN
4-8-15 [32]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

Even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrearages owed to the Class 4 secured claim of Wells Fargo. The plan provides only for the ongoing payment. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

9. 15-22663-A-13 MELINDA LACUSKY OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
5-5-15 [15]

- ☐ 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 plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Bank of America 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."

Second, the debtor has not carried the burden of proving the feasibility of the plan as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6). The ability of the debtor depends on the willingness of a third party to contribute \$600 to the debtor. There is no proof that this person has the ability or the inclination to make this payment.

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.

10. 15-23064-A-13 LAURA HARDEN-COLON MOTION FOR
VVF-1 RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
AMERICAN HONDA FINANCE CORP. VS. 5-6-15 [15]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, 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 granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit the movant to repossess and to obtain possession of its personal property security, and to dispose of it in accordance with applicable nonbankruptcy law. The movant is secured by a vehicle. The debtor has proposed a plan that does not provide for the payment of the movant's claim. Further, the debtor has not paid the claim under the terms of the contract with the movant. Because the debtor has not paid the movant's claim, and will not pay it in connection with the chapter 13 case, there is cause to terminate the automatic stay.

Because the movant has not established that the value of its collateral exceeds the amount of its claim, the court awards no fees and costs. 11 U.S.C. § 506(b).

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be waived.

11. 15-22365-A-13 OMOTAYO FASUYI
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
5-5-15 [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 make \$375 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(4) because unsecured creditors would receive \$8,425 in a chapter 7 liquidation as of the effective date of the plan. This plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors.

Third, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. Specifically, Schedule I does not include the ages of the debtor's dependents or the debtor's occupation. 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).

12. 15-21667-A-13 KENNETH BEALL

ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE
5-6-15 [24]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The case will be dismissed.

The debtor was given permission to pay the filing fee in installments pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1006(b). The installment in the amount of \$77 due on May 1 was not paid. This is cause for dismissal. See 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(2).

13. 15-20379-A-13 ALBERTO/KATHARINE OBREGON
PGM-4

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
4-14-15 [65]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, 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 \$400; the plan requires a monthly payment of \$510.

Second, the plan's feasibility depends on the debtor successfully prosecuting a motion to value the collateral of Sierra Central 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."

Third, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the arrearages owed to the Class 4 secured claim of America's Servicing Company. The plan provides only for the ongoing payment. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

14. 15-20681-A-13 VALERIE SMITH
JME-1

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
4-3-15 [25]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, the debtor has failed to make \$409.02 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay unsecured creditors approximately \$12,180.18 but Form 22 shows that the debtor will have \$12,900 of projected disposable income over the next five years. The problem become even more significant if one uses the debtor's monthly gross income as reported on Schedule I, \$7,659.86, and substitutes it for the debtor's average current monthly income of \$7,068.14 as reported on Form 22. Given that Schedule I admits the higher income and does not indicate at line 13 that the debtor anticipates a decrease in income within the next year, this change in income is substantial that is known and virtually certain at this point in time. In this circumstance, Hamilton v. Lanning, 130 S.Ct 2464 (2010) permits the trustee to rebut the presumption that the amount of projected disposable income is as stated in Form 22. The debtor has come forward with no evidence that the

change is not substantial or likely to continue. Unsupported comments by counsel are not evidence, particularly in the face of the sworn statement by the debtor. See line 1, Schedule I.

15. 15-20484-A-13 CHRISTOPHER WEBB MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
4-8-15 [48]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be on the condition that the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to account for all prior payments of \$12,607.22 made by the debtor under the terms of the prior plan, and to provide for a plan payment of \$4,202.11 beginning May 25, 2015. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

The objection relating to the fact that the debtor has included mortgage payments on Schedule J and also provide for those same payments in the plan will be overruled. If a plan provides for the payment of a mortgage through the plan, that mortgage expense should not be included on Schedule J as a monthly expense to be paid by the debtor. Placing the expense both on Schedule J and in the plan in effect deducts the expense twice from the debtor's monthly income. In this instance, however, even with the expense deducted twice, the debtor's monthly net income is sufficient to fund the plan (which also requires payment in full of unsecured claims). The mistake is of no consequence.

16. 15-20884-A-13 JACQUIE ROBINSON OBJECTION TO
JPJ-3 EXEMPTIONS
4-20-15 [32]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The objection will be sustained.

The amended exemptions, to the extent based upon Cal. Civ. Pro. §§ 704.100(b), 704.101(c), 704.020(a)(1), 704.080(a)(2)(b)(2), 704.730(a)(1), are disallowed. These sections either do not exist or, if they exist, are not exemptions. This is without prejudice to claiming further exemptions.

17. 14-20086-A-13 DANETTE PALLADINO MOTION TO
RJ-6 MODIFY PLAN
4-20-15 [53]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

The debtor has failed to make \$225 of payments required by the plan. This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

18. 14-30390-A-13 BERNARD MOSE AND FARRAH MOTION TO
PGM-1 LAVULO-MOSE CONFIRM PLAN
4-9-15 [29]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: If the amended schedules and statements are not filed by June 1, the motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained. The debtor conceded at the meeting of creditors that income was not included in those statements and schedules. The debtor agreed to amend them but has not done so.

The motion will be denied and the objection will be sustained.

The debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor has not included all pre-petition income on 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).

19. 14-30390-A-13 BERNARD MOSE AND FARRAH COUNTER MOTION TO
PGM-1 LAVULO-MOSE DISMISS CASE
5-11-15 [35]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be conditionally denied.

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.

20. 13-36092-A-13 WOODROW POYNTER MOTION TO
GW-5 QUASH
5-11-15 [96]

- ☐ 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 granted. There are no pending contested matters or adversary proceeding in which the court has authorized discovery to take place. Nor has the court authorized any examinations under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2004 and nothing in the confirmed plan requires the debtor to submit to this inquiry by the creditor. The pendency of a bankruptcy is not a roving commission to delve into a debtor's financial affairs.

21. 12-39409-A-13 RICHEY HARRISON OBJECTION TO
JPJ-4 CLAIM
VS. NELSON MOORE 4-8-15 [125]

The objection will be sustained. The last date to file a timely proof of claim was March 6, 2013. The proof of claim was filed on February 2, 2015. Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(9) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3002(c), the claim is disallowed because it is untimely. See In re Osborne, 76 F.3d 306 (9th Cir. 1996); In re Edelman, 237 B.R. 146, 153 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1999); Ledlin v. United States (In re Tomlan), 907 F.2d 114 (9th Cir. 1989); Zidell, Inc. V. Forsch (In re Coastal Alaska), 920 F.2d 1428, 1432-33 (9th Cir. 1990).

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument. Given that the debtor has filed a modified plan and set a hearing on a motion to confirm it, the court deems the debtor to have admitted the merits of this objection and motion.

First, 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.

Second, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b) because it neither pays unsecured creditors in full nor pays them all of the debtor's projected disposable income. The plan will pay nothing to unsecured creditors. While this is consistent with Form 22, the debtor has not accurately completed Form 22. The debtor has taken an impermissible deduction from current monthly income for a \$493.81 voluntary pension contribution. This is disposable

income; the debtor may not make those contributions and deduct them from the debtor's current monthly income. Accord Parks v. Drummond (In re Parks), 475 B.R. 703 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2012). As a result, the debtor has monthly projected disposable income of \$379. If paid to unsecured creditors, they would share a total of \$22,744 over the life of the plan. Therefore, the plan does not comply with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(b).

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.

23. 14-27217-A-13 MICHAEL POWELL AND MOTION TO
LBG-5 DEBORAH SENNECA CONFIRM PLAN
3-13-15 [79]

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.

24. 14-30526-A-13 BALVIR SINGH AND NIRMAL MOTION TO
DN-8 KAUR CONFIRM PLAN
4-10-15 [63]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be granted and the objection will be overruled provided the plan is modified in the confirmation order to clarify that counsel will be paid no additional fees, by the estate or the debtor, and that the \$1000 previously paid was pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c), and that the plan being confirmed is the plan filed April 10, 2015. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

25. 15-21526-A-13 DEE LINDERER MOTION TO
BLG-1 CONFIRM PLAN
4-7-15 [20]

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; 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 the IRS was not served at the first address.

Also, Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(b) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the various state agencies shall be to particular addresses that can be found on the Roster of Public Agencies maintained by the clerk of court.

The Roster provides that service of motions and notices on the California Franchise Tax Board shall be mailed to Bankruptcy Section MS A-340, PO Box 2952, Sacramento, CA 95812-2952

Service in this case is deficient because the motion was not served by mail at this address.

26.	10-36328-A-13 DONNIE HALEY SDB-1	MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN 4-16-15 [45]
-----	--	--

Final Ruling: The court deems the reply to the objection to be a voluntary dismissal of the motion to confirm the modified plan. The motion will be dismissed accordingly.

27.	15-21528-A-13 KEVIN KRONE CAH-1 VS. DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST CO.	MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL 4-23-15 [29]
-----	---	---

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$226,828 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Ocwen Loan Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$256,099 as of the petition date. Therefore, Deutsche Bank National Trust Co.'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).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$226,828. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

28. 14-27232-A-13 SPENCER/VANESSA
SAC-7 GRIMENSTEIN

MOTION TO
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'
ATTORNEY
4-22-15 [114]

Final Ruling: This compensation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(a)(6). The failure of the trustee, the debtor, the United States Trustee, the 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 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.

The motion seeks approval of \$10,375 in fees incurred in connection with this case for work done on behalf of the debtor. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the plan and Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 to the extent applicable.

29. 15-21845-A-13 JOSEPH BARNES
JPJ-1

OBJECTION TO
EXEMPTIONS
5-12-15 [55]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument. Given that the debtor has filed a modified plan and set a hearing on a motion to confirm it, the court deems the debtor to have admitted the merits of this objection and motion.

The objection will be dismissed as moot. While the objection is well taken, the debtor filed amended exemptions on May 14, 2015 that address the objection. To the extent the trustee believes the amended exemption remains objectionable, he may file a further objection.

30. 14-32051-A-13 SIL/YUN KIM

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
3-31-15 [25]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

First, The motion does not comply with Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(e)(3) because when it was filed it was not accompanied by a separate proof/certificate of service. Appending a proof of service to one of the supporting documents (assuming such was done) does not satisfy the local rule. The proof/certificate of service must be a separate document so that it will be docketed on the electronic record. This permits anyone examining the docket to determine if service has been accomplished without examining every document filed in support of the matter on calendar. Given the absence of the required proof/certificate of service, the moving party has failed to establish that the motion was served on all necessary parties in interest.

Second, a motion placed on the calendar by the moving party for hearing must be

given a unique docket control number as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(c). The purpose of the docket control number is to insure that all documents filed in support and in opposition to a motion are linked on the docket. This linkage insures that the court as well as any party reviewing the docket will be aware of everything filed in connection with the motion.

This motion was filed without a docket control number. Therefore, it is possible that documents have been filed in support or in opposition to the motion that have not been brought to the attention of the court. The court will not permit the movant to profit from possible confusion caused by this breach of the court's local rules.

31. 15-22353-A-13 LEONOR AMADO MOTION TO
CLH-2 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. CCO MORTGAGE 4-27-15 [19]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice. The certificate of service indicates the motion was served on May 27, 2015, which is the day of the hearing. The amount of notice is less than required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1).

32. 14-27356-A-13 JOHN BALDWIN OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CLAIM
VS. DISCOVER BANK/DB SERVICING CORP. 4-2-15 [20]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Discover Bank/DB Servicing Corp. has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

According to the documentation attached to the proof of claim, the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract. California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach. According to the claim, the last payment was received on June 27, 2010, which is more than four years prior to the filing of this case. Hence, when the case was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1).

33. 14-28062-A-13 JESUS ARROYO AND JENNIFER OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 ANTROBUS CLAIM
VS. LVNV FUNDING, L.L.C. 4-2-15 [35]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of LVNV Funding, L.L.C., has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

According to the documentation attached to the proof of claim, the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract. California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach. According to the claim, the last payment was received on June 15, 2002, which is more than four years prior to the filing of this case. Hence, when the case was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1).

34. 14-27966-A-13 NICHOLE/MELVIN RED OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CLAIM
VS. DISCOVER BANK/DB SERVICING CORP. 4-2-15 [30]

Final Ruling: This objection to the proof of claim of Discover Bank/DB Servicing Corp. has been set for hearing on at least 44 days' notice to the claimant as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(c)(1)(ii). The failure of the claimant to file written opposition at least 14 calendar days prior to the hearing is considered as consent to the sustaining of the objection. 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 objecting party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the claimant's default is entered and the objection will be resolved without oral argument.

The objection will be sustained.

According to the documentation attached to the proof of claim, the underlying debt is a contract claim, most likely based on a written contract. California law provides a four year statute of limitations to file actions for breach of written contracts. See Cal. Civ. Pro. Code § 337. This statute begins to run from the date of the contract's breach. According to the claim, the last payment was received on October 5, 2008, which is more than four years prior to the filing of this case. Hence, when the case was filed, this debt was time barred under applicable nonbankruptcy law and must be disallowed. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(b)(1).

35. 15-21279-A-13 RAY/ARLINDA TEEGARDEN OBJECTION TO
JPJ-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CASE
4-8-15 [21]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. The debtor failed to file written opposition by the deadline set by the court in its briefing schedule. This is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

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

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 \$2,680 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, to pay the dividends required by the plan and the rate proposed by it will take 425 months which exceeds the maximum 5-year duration permitted by 11 U.S.C. § 1322(d).

Fourth, the debtor has failed to give the trustee financial records for a closely held business. This is a breach of the duties imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(3) & (a)(4). 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).

It is unnecessary to address the remaining issues. The foregoing is ample reason to deny confirmation and to dismiss the case.

36. 14-31880-A-13 LYNDA WILLIAMS
PGM-2
VS. HSBC BANK USA, N.A./BANK
OF AMERICA, N.A.

MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL
4-28-15 [61]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor 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 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 trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

The debtor seeks to value the debtor's residence at a fair market value of \$381,000 as of the date the petition was filed. It is encumbered by a first deed of trust held by Specialized Loan Servicing. The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$607,156 as of the petition date. Therefore, HSBC Bank USA, N.A./Bank of America, N.A.'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).

To the extent the creditor objects to the debtor's opinion of value, that objection is also overruled, particularly in light of its failure to file any contrary evidence of value. According to the debtor, the residence has a fair market value of \$381,000. Evidence in the form of the debtor's declaration supports the valuation motion. The debtor may testify regarding the value of property owned by the debtor. Fed. R. Evid. 701; So. Central Livestock Dealers, Inc., v. Security State Bank, 614 F.2d 1056, 1061 (5th Cir. 1980).

37. 12-36683-A-13 ANTHONY/ANA CARUSO
CA-2

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
4-10-15 [50]

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be granted on the condition that the plan is further modified in the confirmation order to account for the prior payments of \$5,642 made by the debtor through April 25, 2015 under the terms of the confirmed plan, and to provide for a plan payment of \$166 beginning May 25, 201. As further modified, the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

38. 11-20388-B-13 KELIKUPA/CASSY MATU
CAH-6

MOTION TO
APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
4-16-15 [113]

Final Ruling: This motion to modify a home loan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b) 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 sustaining of the objection. 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 debtor is authorized but not required to enter into the proposed modification. To the extent the modification is inconsistent with the confirmed plan, the debtor shall continue to perform the plan as confirmed until it is modified.

39. 14-24691-A-13 MICHAEL LAMB AND MARGARET
PGM-2 LEDOUX-LAMB

MOTION TO
APPROVE COMPENSATION OF DEBTORS'
ATTORNEY
4-28-15 [93]

Final Ruling: This compensation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(a)(6). The failure of the trustee, the debtor, the United States Trustee, the 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 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.

The motion seeks approval of \$3,300 in additional fees incurred principally in connection with an adversary proceeding. The foregoing represents reasonable compensation for actual, necessary, and beneficial services rendered to the debtor. Any retainer may be drawn upon and the balance of the approved compensation is to be paid through the plan in a manner consistent with the

plan and Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1, if applicable.

40.	09-45297-B-13 NORMA LOYA SNM-10 VS. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.	MOTION TO AVOID LIEN 4-17-15 [58]
-----	--	---

Final Ruling: The court finds that a hearing will not be helpful to its consideration and resolution of this matter. Accordingly, it is removed from calendar for resolution without oral argument.

The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

This motion is not a motion to avoid a lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1)(A) or (B). Rather, it seeks the cancellation or avoidance of a deed of trust because the court previously determined that the real property securing that deed of trust, the debtor's home, had no value to the respondent. Therefore, because the plan has been completed, the debtor seeks to remove deed of trust from the chain of title to the debtor's home. See In re Zimmer, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002) and In re Lam, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997).

This relief must be requested in an adversary proceeding. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7001(2).