



UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California
Honorable Jennifer E. Niemann
Hearing Date: Thursday, May 28, 2026
Department A - Courtroom #11
Fresno, California

Unless otherwise ordered, all matters before the Honorable Jennifer E. Niemann shall be simultaneously: (1) **In Person** at Courtroom #11, (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 who wish to appear at a hearing remotely must sign up by 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 <https://www.caeb.uscourts.gov/Calendar/CourtAppearances>. Each party 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 who wish to appear remotely must contact the Courtroom Deputy for the Department holding the hearing.

Please also note the following:

- Parties in interest 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 appearing by ZoomGov may only listen in to the hearing using the zoom telephone number. Video appearances are not permitted.
- Members of the public and the press may not listen in to trials or evidentiary hearings, though they may appear in person in most instances.

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

1. Review the [Pre-Hearing Dispositions](#) prior to appearing at the hearing.
2. Parties appearing via CourtCall are encouraged to review the [CourtCall Appearance Information](#).

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 no hearing on these matters. 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.

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 POSSIBLE UPDATES.

9:30 AM

1. [26-11211](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SCOTT NULL**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE LILIAN G. TSANG
5-11-2026 [\[12\]](#)

STEVEN ALPERT/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Scott Elliot Null ("Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 along with a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on March 20, 2024. Doc. #1, 3. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan because (1) Debtor has not filed tax returns for 2023, 2024, or 2025, (2) Debtor needs to provide pay advices for Debtor's non-filing spouse for the 60 days prior to filing this case, (3) Debtor has failed to file a spousal waiver to allow Debtor to utilize current exemptions, and (4) the meeting with creditors has not yet concluded. Doc. #12. Debtor's 341 meeting of creditors has been continued to June 18, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. See court docket entry on May 5, 2026.

This objection is continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Trustee's objection to confirmation is withdrawn, Debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than June 18, 2026. 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 Debtor's position. Trustee shall file and serve a reply, if any, by June 25, 2026.

If Debtor elects to withdraw this 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 June 25, 2026. If Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection to confirmation will be sustained on the grounds stated in Trustee's objection without a further hearing.

2. [26-11113](#)-A-13 **IN RE: JESUS/MARIZZA DE LA CRUZ**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE LILIAN G. TSANG
5-11-2026 [\[12\]](#)

STEVEN ALPERT/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Dropped from calendar.

NO ORDER REQUIRED.

Trustee withdrew the objection to confirmation on May 22, 2026. Doc. #16.

3. [26-11522](#)-A-13 **IN RE: THEONNA HILL**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES
5-8-2026 [\[13\]](#)
\$78.00 INSTALLMENT PAID 5/12/26

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

DISPOSITION: The order to show cause will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The record shows that the installment fees now due have been paid.

The order permitting the payment of filing fees in installments will be modified to provide that if future installments are not received by the due date, the case will be dismissed without further notice or hearing.

4. [25-13930](#)-A-13 **IN RE: MINERVA MARTINEZ**
[LGT-1](#)

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
1-2-2026 [\[12\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

5. [25-13930](#)-A-13 **IN RE: MINERVA MARTINEZ**
[LGT-2](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
2-5-2026 [\[18\]](#)

LILIAN TSANG/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF ONEMAIN FINANCIAL GROUP, LLC
4-27-2026 [56]

MINERVA MARTINEZ/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/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.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of creditors, 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 Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

Minerva Martinez ("Debtor"), the debtor in this chapter 13 case, moves pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 4003(d) and 9014 to avoid the judicial lien of OneMain Financial Group, LLC ("Creditor") on the residential real property commonly referred to as 2716 Loch Fern Court, Bakersfield, California ("Property"). Doc. #56; Schedule C, Doc. #1; Schedule D, Doc. #1.

In order 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). 11 U.S.C. § 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)).

Debtor filed the bankruptcy petition on November 22, 2025. Doc. #1. A judgment was entered against Debtor in the amount of \$8,121.69 in favor of Creditor on March 25, 2024. Ex. 4, Doc. #59. The abstract of judgment was recorded pre-petition in Kern County on October 16, 2024, as document number 224127942. Ex. 4, Doc. #59. The lien attached to Debtor's interest in the Property located in Kern County. Doc. #56. The Property also is encumbered by a lien in favor of Planet Home Lending, LLC in the amount \$218,753.49. Schedule D, Doc. #1. Debtor claimed an exemption of \$395,000.00 in the Property under California Code of Civil Procedure § 704.730. Schedule C, Doc. #1. Debtor asserts a market value for the Property as of the petition date at \$335,600.00. Schedule A/B, Doc. #1.

Applying the statutory formula:

Amount of Creditor's judicial lien		\$8,121.69
Total amount of all other liens on the Property (excluding junior judicial liens)	+	\$218,753.49
Amount of Debtor's claim of exemption in the Property	+	\$395,000.00
		\$621,875.18
Value of Debtor's interest in the Property absent liens	-	\$335,600.00
Amount Creditor's lien impairs Debtor's exemption		\$286,275.18

After application of the arithmetical formula required by § 522(f)(2)(A), the court finds there is insufficient equity to support Creditor's judicial lien. Therefore, the fixing of this 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 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(1). Accordingly, this motion is GRANTED. The proposed order shall state that Creditor's judicial lien is avoided on the subject Property only and include a copy of the abstract of judgment as an exhibit.

7. [26-11333](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SAMINEH AMIRSHAHI**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY TRUSTEE LILIAN G. TSANG
5-11-2026 [\[39\]](#)

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Samineh Amirshahi ("Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 on March 27, 2026 along with a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on April 9, 2026. Doc. ##1, 12. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan because: (1) Debtor has failed to provide any of the following required documents, including but not limited to (a) proof of identification, (b) proof of social security number, (c) pay advices for the 60 days prior to filing, and (d) 2025 tax returns; (2) an amended chapter 13 plan needs to be filed that provides monthly plan payments, plan terms and checks the box at section 1.02; (3) a credit counseling certificate needs to be filed; and (4) the meeting of creditors has not yet concluded. Doc. #39. Debtor's 341 meeting of creditors has been continued to June 4, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. See court docket entry on May 5, 2026.

This objection is continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Trustee's objection to confirmation is withdrawn, Debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than June 18, 2026. 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 Debtor's position. Trustee shall file and serve a reply, if any, by June 25, 2026.

If Debtor elects to withdraw this 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 June 25, 2026. If Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection to confirmation will be

sustained on the grounds stated in Trustee's objection without a further hearing.

8. [26-11333](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SAMINEH AMIRSHAHI**
[MB-03](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
4-29-2026 [\[30\]](#)

MARK MALKASIAN/MV
HAGOP BEDOYAN/ATTY. FOR MV.

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.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of 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 Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movants have done here.

As an informative matter, the movant incorrectly completed Section 6 of the court's mandatory Certificate of Service form. In Section 6, the declarant marked that service was effectuated by Rule 5 and Rules 7005, 9036 Service. Doc. #37. However, Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure ("Rule") 4001(a)(1) and 9014(b) require service of a motion for relief from stay to be made pursuant to Rule 7004 on the debtor, which was done here. In Section 6, the declarant should have checked the appropriate boxes under both Section 6A and Section 6B.

The movants, Jim Malkasian and Mark Malkasian (together, "Movants"), seek relief from the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), or in the alternative pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1), with respect to residential real property located at 15618 Porterville Highway, McFarland, California 93250 ("Property") belonging to debtor Samineh Amirshahi ("Debtor"). Doc. #30.

JUDICIAL NOTICE

As an initial matter, Movants ask this court to take judicial notice of certain public records and filings submitted by Movants as a request for judicial notice to support Movants' position and assertions in the motion for relief from the automatic stay. Doc. #35. Here, Movants request the following documents to which the motion specifically refers and are not in dispute:

- (1) Grant Deed recorded on March 28, 2024, in the Kern County Recorder's Office, as Document No. 224034228 (Ex. A, Doc. #35);
- (2) Voluntary Petition for Valdor LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("Valdor"), filed on June 24, 2024, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 24-11751 (Ex. B, Doc. #35);
- (3) Dismissal of Valdor's first case, Case No. 24-11751 (Ex. C, Doc. #35);
- (4) Voluntary Petition for Valdor filed on July 30, 2024, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 24-12162 (Ex. D, Doc. #35);
- (5) Dismissal of Valdor's second case, Case No. 24-12162 (Ex. E, Doc. #35);
- (6) Voluntary Petition for Debtor filed on February 17, 2026, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 26-10618 (Ex. F, Doc. #35);
- (7) Dismissal of Debtor's first case, Case No. 26-10618 (Ex. G, Doc. #35);
- (8) Voluntary Petition for Debtor filed on March 27, 2026, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 26-11333 (Ex. H, Doc. #35);
- (9) Debtor's proposed Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 9, 2026, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 26-11333 (Ex. I, Doc. #35); and
- (10) Order regarding incomplete filing and notice of intent to dismiss case if documents are not timely filed, filed on March 31, 2026, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of California, Case No. 26-11333 (Ex. J, Doc. #35).

Doc. #35. This court also may take judicial notice of and consider the records in this bankruptcy case, filings in other court proceedings, and public records. Fed. R. Evid. 201; Bank of Am., N.A. v. CD-04, Inc. (In re Owner Mgmt. Serv., LLC), 530 B.R. 711, 717 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2015).

RELEVANT FACTS

On December 20, 2021, Movants lent \$625,000.00 to Valdor. Doc. #30; Decl. of Mark Malkasian, Doc. #32; Decl. of Jim Malkasian, Doc. #33; Ex. 1, Doc. #34. Movants' debt is secured by a deed of trust on the Property. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; J. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #33; Ex. 2, Doc. #34. Valor made the first two payments on the loan but has since defaulted on that loan and has not cured the default. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; J. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #33.

Valdor filed a chapter 11 bankruptcy case on June 25, 2024. RJN Ex. B, Doc. #35. That bankruptcy case was dismissed on July 31, 2024. RJN Ex. C, Doc. #35. Valdor filed a second bankruptcy case on July 30, 2024. RJN Ex. D, Doc. #35. That bankruptcy case was dismissed on September 30, 2024. RJN Ex. E, Doc. #35.

Months prior to Valdor filing its first chapter 11 bankruptcy, Valdor transferred the Property to Debtor by grant deed on March 28, 2024. RJN Ex. A, Doc. #35. Movants did not consent to this transfer of the Property. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; J. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #33. Movants believe that there is a clear pattern made by Valdor, insiders of Valdor, and/or associates of insiders of Valdor, including Debtor, to keep Movants from being able to foreclose on the Property. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; J. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #33.

Movants recorded a notice of default and election to sell under the deed of trust on July 9, 2025, which was after Valor's second bankruptcy was dismissed. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; Ex. 3, Doc. #34. Based on the coversheet filed with the motion, a notice of sale was published in October 2025. Doc. #36.

Debtor filed her first bankruptcy case without an attorney on February 17, 2026, which was dismissed on March 9, 2026 for failure to timely file documents. RJN Ex. G, Doc. #35. Debtor filed the instant chapter 13 bankruptcy case also without an attorney on March 27, 2026. Doc. #1. Movants believe Debtor's multiple bankruptcies are evidence of a scheme to delay, hinder and defraud creditors. M. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #32; J. Malkasian Decl., Doc. #33. Movants also believe that Debtor's case was filed in bad faith because Debtor's proposed plan contains only nonstandard provisions, fails to list a proposed plan payment, and does not list Movants' secured claim in the plan. Id. Further, chapter 13 plans are limited to no more than 60 months but Debtor's plan is currently a 72-month plan and Debtor's schedules do not support plan feasibility. Id.

ANALYSIS UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 362(d) (4)

Section 362(d) (4) of the Bankruptcy Code allows the court to grant relief from the stay with respect to real property

if the court finds that the filing of the [bankruptcy] petition was part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors that involved either [] a transfer of all or part ownership of, or other interest in such real property without the consent of the secured creditor or court approval; or [] multiple bankruptcy filings affecting such real property.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d) (4). To obtain relief under § 362(d) (4), the court must affirmatively find: (1) the debtor's bankruptcy filing is part of a scheme; (2) the object of the scheme is to delay, hinder, or defraud creditors; and (3) the scheme involves either (i) the transfer of some interest in real property without the secured creditor's consent or court approval or (ii) multiple bankruptcy filings affecting the property. First Yorkshire Holdings, Inc. v. Pacifica L 22 (In re First Yorkshire Holdings, Inc.), 470 B.R. 864, 870-71 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2011).

"A scheme is an intentional construct. It does not happen by misadventure or negligence." In re Duncan & Forbes Dev., Inc., 368 B.R. 27, 32 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2007). Because direct evidence of a scheme is uncommon, "the court must infer the existence and contents of a scheme from circumstantial evidence. The party claiming such a scheme must present evidence sufficient for the trier of fact to infer the existence and content of the scheme." Id.; see Jimenez v. ARCPE 1, LLP (In re Jimenez), 613 B.R. 537, 545 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2020).

The court finds that Movants have made the requisite showing for relief under § 362(d) (4). Specifically, the court finds that the transfer of the Property from Valor to Debtor prior to Debtor filing her first bankruptcy case without the consent of Movants was part of a scheme and the objective of that scheme was to delay and hinder Movants' ability to foreclose on the Property.

Further, this is the second voluntary chapter 13 petition filed by Debtor in the last four months, and the prior case was filed as a "bare bones" petition and dismissed prior to confirmation. The current case also was filed as a "bare bones" petition with incomplete schedules, no credit counseling certificate, and an incomplete chapter 13 plan filed. Tr. Obj., Doc. #39 and docket generally. The chapter 13 trustee has filed a motion to dismiss Debtor's second bankruptcy case on the grounds that Debtor has not (a) appeared at the initial

§ 341 meeting of creditors, (b) provided required documents to the trustee, (c) filed a complete plan, (d) filed accurate schedules and/or statements, and (e) has failed to provide a credit counseling certificate. Doc. #42. A review of this bankruptcy case indicates that Debtor is not diligently prosecuting this bankruptcy case.

Based on the evidence before the court, the court finds the filing of Debtor's first and second bankruptcy cases were part of a scheme to delay, hinder, or defraud Movants that involved both a transfer of ownership of the Property without the consent of Movants as well as multiple bankruptcy cases affecting the Property. Debtor also is not diligently prosecuting this bankruptcy case.

Accordingly, in rem relief is warranted under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). Because the court grants relief from stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4), the court does not need to rule on Movants' request for alternative relief under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1).

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the motion is granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(4). The order shall be binding in any other case under Title 11 of the United States Code purporting to affect the Property for two years after the date of the entry of the order. No other relief is awarded.

The order shall also provide that the bankruptcy proceeding has been finalized for purposes of California Civil Code § 2923.5.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(4) will be ordered waived in light of the actions of Debtor to hinder and delay the rights of Movants.

9. [26-11333](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SAMINEH AMIRSHAHI**
[MB-4](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY JIM MALKASIAN AND MARK MALKASIAN
5-11-2026 [46]

MARK MALKASIAN/MV
HAGOP BEDOYAN/ATTY. FOR MV.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Samineh Amirshahi ("Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 on March 27, 2026 along with a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on April 9, 2026. Doc. ##1, 12. Creditors Jim Malkasian and Mark Malkasian (together, "Creditors") object to confirmation of the Plan because: (1) the Plan proposes to pay creditors for 72 months; (2) Debtor's schedules are incorrect and do not support Debtor's proposed plan payments; (3) Debtor's plan has not been proposed in good faith and appears to be part of a scheme to hinder, defraud, and delay Creditor from foreclosing under their deed of trust on the property located at 15618 Porterville Highway, McFarland, California 93250 ("Property"); and (4) Debtor has not filed any required paperwork, which presumably includes tax returns. Doc. #46.

This objection is continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Creditor's objection to confirmation is withdrawn, Debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than June 18, 2026. 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 Debtor's position. Creditor shall file and serve a reply, if any, by June 25, 2026.

If Debtor elects to withdraw this 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 June 25, 2026. If Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection to confirmation will be sustained on the grounds stated in Creditor's objection without a further hearing.

10. [25-14243](#)-A-13 **IN RE: PABLO CHAVEZ**
[CAE-1](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING DISGORGEMENT OF FEES RE: VOLUNTARY PETITION
4-23-2026 [[86](#)]

JOSHUA STERNBERG/ATTY. FOR DBT.
DISMISSED 04/02/26

NO RULING.

11. [25-12747](#)-A-13 **IN RE: BRIAN/AUBREY SLOVER**
[SLL-2](#)

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR STEPHEN LABIAK, DEBTORS ATTORNEY(S)
4-27-2026 [[42](#)]

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.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of 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 Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

Law Offices of Stephen Labiak ("Movant"), counsel for Brian Kenneth Slover and Aubrey Nichole Slover (together, "Debtors"), the debtors in this chapter 13 case, requests allowance of final compensation for services in the amount of \$12,760.00 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of \$347.64 for services rendered from April 1, 2025 through April 9, 2026. Doc. #42. Debtors' confirmed plan provides, in addition to \$1,500.00 paid prior to filing the case, for \$15,500.00 in attorney's fees. Doc. ##27, 36. No prior fee application has been filed.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered" and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses" to a debtor's attorney in a chapter 13 case. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1), (4)(B). The court may allow reasonable compensation to the chapter 13 debtor's attorney for representing interests of the debtor in connection with the bankruptcy case. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4). In determining the amount of reasonable compensation, the court shall consider the nature, extent, and value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3).

Here, Movant demonstrates services rendered relating to: (1) prepetition consultation with Debtors and fact gathering, including independently verifying information; (2) preparing voluntary petition, schedules and related forms and amendments thereto; (3) preparing for and attending 341 meeting of creditors; (4) preparing and prosecuting Debtors' original and first modified plans; (5) claim administration and claim objections; (6) preparing the fee application; and (7) general case administration. Ex. A, Doc. #45. The court finds that the compensation and reimbursement sought are reasonable, actual, and necessary, and the court will approve the motion.

This motion is GRANTED. The court allows on a final basis the compensation requested by this motion in the amount of \$12,760.00 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of \$347.64 to be paid in a manner consistent with the terms of the confirmed plan.

12. [25-14347](#)-A-13 **IN RE: RYAN/AMANDA CRAIN**
[BMO-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
5-5-2026 [[56](#)]

TUCOEMAS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION/MV
STEPHEN LABIAK/ATTY. FOR DBT.
BRANDON ORMONDE/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Granted in part and denied in part.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The Moving Party shall submit a proposed order after hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 9014-1(f)(2) and will proceed as scheduled. Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults and grant the motion. If opposition is presented at the hearing, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2). The court will issue an order if a further hearing is necessary.

The movant, Tucoemas Federal Credit Union ("Movant"), seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) to permit Movant to exercise its rights in accordance with applicable non-bankruptcy law regarding collateral financed pursuant to a sales contract ("Contract") entered into by Ryan and Amanda Crain (together, "Debtors") and financed by Movant. Doc. #56. Pursuant to the Contract, Debtors purchased a 2021 Stealth Trailer 241 ("Collateral"). Id.

Debtors filed this chapter 13 case on December 31, 2025. Doc. #1. Pre-petition, on June 29, 2021, Movant and Debtors entered into the Contract. Ex. A, Doc. #59. As of November 2025, Debtors breached the terms of the Contract by failing to make monthly payments. Doc. #56; Decl. of Liliana Gonzalez, Doc. #58. The total balance due and owed on the loan is \$40,974.28 and Movant asserts the value of the Collateral is \$18,980.00. Id.; Ex. C, Doc. #59.

Movant has not repossessed the Collateral and request relief from the automatic stay to pursue repossessing the Collateral because Debtors are delinquent in their monthly payments. Gonzalez Decl., Doc. #58.

ANALYSIS UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1)

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) allows the court to grant relief from the stay for cause, including the lack of adequate protection. "Because there is no clear definition of what constitutes 'cause,' discretionary relief from the stay must be determined on a case by case basis." In re Mac Donald, 755 F.2d 715, 717 (9th Cir. 1985).

After review of the included evidence, the court finds that "cause" exists to lift the stay because Debtors are in default under the Contract with respect to the Collateral and has failed to make any payments under the Contract since October 30, 2025. Gonzalez Decl., Doc. #58. Debtors owe at least \$2,273.55 in delinquent pre-petition and post-petition payments. Id. According to Debtors' confirmed chapter 13 plan, Movant's secured claim will be satisfied by the surrender of the Collateral. Plan § 3.09, Doc. #41; Order, Doc. #63.

ANALYSIS UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) allows the court to grant relief from the stay if the debtor does not have any equity in such property and such property is not necessary to an effective reorganization.

It is unclear from Movant's papers whether Movant seeks relief from stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). The caption of the first page of the motion references 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2); however, the remainder of the moving papers does not address 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). Doc. #56.

The evidence filed in support of the motion does not address whether Debtors have any equity in the Property, and Movant has the burden with respect to that issue. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(1). Because Movant has not met its burden with respect to establishing Debtors' lack of equity in the Property, relief from stay based on 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) is denied.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, pending opposition being raised at the hearing, the motion will be granted pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to permit Movant to exercise to its rights pursuant to applicable law, proceed with repossession of the Collateral, and to use the proceeds from its disposition to satisfy its claim. The motion will be denied as to 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). No other relief is awarded.

The 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be ordered waived because Debtors have failed to make both pre- and post-petition payments to Movant and Debtors' confirmed plan provides for the surrender of the Collateral to Movant.

13. [25-12265](#)-A-13 **IN RE: MANUEL/RISSY MONTOYA**
[AOE-1](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
4-22-2026 [[101](#)]

RISSY MONTOYA/MV
ANTHONY EGBASE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Overruled as moot.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

This motion to confirm plan is OVERRULED AS MOOT. The debtors filed a third amended plan on May 2, 2026 (AOE-3, Doc. #122), with a motion to confirm the modified plan set for hearing on June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. Doc. ##119-124. Although, a certificate of service was not filed with the motion to confirm.

14. [25-14167](#)-A-13 **IN RE: GILBERT COTA**
[RSW-1](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
4-20-2026 [[29](#)]

GILBERT COTA/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/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.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 35 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice ("LBR") 3015-1(d)(1). The failure of creditors, 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 Sys., Inc. v. Heidenthal, 826 F.2d 915, 917 (9th Cir. 1987). Constitutional due process requires a moving party make a *prima facie* showing that they are entitled to the relief sought, which the movant has done here.

This motion is GRANTED. The confirmation order shall include the docket control number of the motion, and it shall reference the plan by the date it was filed.

15. [26-11276](#)-A-13 **IN RE: ROBERT HEARD**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
5-6-2026 [[13](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
NEIL SCHWARTZ/ATTY. FOR DBT.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 2, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Robert Lawrence Heard ("Debtor") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 along with a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on March 24, 2026. Doc. #1, 3. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan because: (1) the Plan does not provide for the value of two checking accounts listed in Schedule A/B; (2) the Plan incorrectly provides for attorney's fees that exceed the allowed amount of \$158.33 per month; (3) Debtor incorrectly claimed exemptions in Schedule C; (4) Debtor's income is not listed on Form 122C; and (5) Trustee requests miscellaneous items which include (a) a copy of Debtor's non-filing spouse's 2025 federal income taxes, (b) a declaration indicating Debtor is not required to file tax returns, (c) the filing of an amended disclosure of compensation for Debtor's attorney, (d) verification of income from family support in the amount of \$758.33, (e) documentation related to Debtor's interest in property located at 9803 Heather Meadows Drive in Bakersfield, California, (f) verification of monthly expenses of \$700 for charitable or religious donations, (g) documents related to monthly contract installments to LoanCare, LLC, and Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC, (h) amended Statement of Financial Affairs that lists all income immediately preceding the filing of the petition, including social security and pension income; and (i) amendments to Schedule H related to how long Debtor has lived in a community property state. Doc. #13.

This objection is continued to July 2, 2026. Unless this case is voluntarily converted to chapter 7, dismissed, or Trustee's objection to confirmation is withdrawn, Debtor shall file and serve a written response no later than June 18, 2026. 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 Debtor's position. Trustee shall file and serve a reply, if any, by June 25, 2026.

If Debtor elects to withdraw this 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 June 25, 2026. If Debtor does not timely file a modified plan or a written response, this objection to confirmation will be sustained on the grounds stated in Trustee's objection without a further hearing.

16. [25-13477](#)-A-13 **IN RE: DAVID/NORMAJEAN FERLAND**
[DAB-1](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF SUNRUN
2-5-2026 [[26](#)]

NORMAJEAN FERLAND/MV
DAVID BOONE/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

17. [25-13477](#)-A-13 **IN RE: DAVID/NORMAJEAN FERLAND**
[DAB-3](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
2-5-2026 [[34](#)]

NORMAJEAN FERLAND/MV
DAVID BOONE/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

18. [26-11482](#)-A-13 **IN RE: NATHAN SCHULTZ**

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE TO PAY FEES
5-6-2026 [[35](#)]

ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
\$153.00 FINAL INSTALLMENT PAID 5/13/26

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

DISPOSITION: The order to show cause will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The record shows that the installment fees now due have been paid.

19. [26-11482](#)-A-13 **IN RE: NATHAN SCHULTZ**
[BRL-1](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY, MOTION/APPLICATION FOR RELIEF FROM
CO-DEBTOR STAY, MOTION/APPLICATION FOR ADEQUATE PROTECTION
5-7-2026 [[42](#)]

ROBERT ANGELERI/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
BENJAMIN LEVINSON/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Denied as to 11 U.S.C. § 1301(c) (3) and continued to
July 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. as to all other relief.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings
and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the
hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the
hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice 9014-1(f) (2) and will proceed
as scheduled. Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends
to enter the respondents' defaults and deny the motion in part and continue the
motion in part. The court will issue an order as to the further hearing.

The movants, Iris Angeleri and Robert Adrian Angeleri III (together,
"Movants"), seek relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d) (1),
(d) (2) and (d) (4) with respect to real property located at 1315 Robinson
Street, Bakersfield, California ("Property") owned by Nathan Schultz
("Debtor"). Doc. #42. Movants also seek relief from the co-debtor stay under
11 U.S.C. § 1301(c) (3). Id.

RELEVANT FACTS

Movants are the current holders of a promissory note and current beneficiaries
of a first priority deed of trust on the Property. Decl. of Corey Cullen,
Doc. #47. Debtor's business, Schultz Investments 21, Inc., a California
Corporation ("Schultz Corp."), is the borrower on the note held by Movants. Id.
At the time the loan was made by Movants to Schultz Corp. in March 2022,
Schultz Corp. owned the Property. Id.

Movants' note became delinquent by the failure of Schultz Corp. to pay the note
at maturity on April 1, 2025. Cullen Decl., Doc. #47. As a result, Movants
started foreclosure proceedings by recording a Notice of Default on June 25,
2025. Id. A trustee's sale was set for March 18, 2026. Id.

On February 8, 2026, Schultz Corp. transferred the Property by grant deed to
Nathan Schultz individually ("Debtor"), which was recorded on March 18, 2026.
Doc. #42; Decl. of Corey Cullen, Doc. #47. Debtor filed his first bankruptcy
case on March 16, 2026 ("First Case"), Case No. 26-11087. Cullen Decl.,
Doc. #47.

Because the loan matured pre-petition, Debtor's plan does not properly provide
for Movants' claim. Cullen Decl., Doc. #47. Further, Movants state cause exists
to terminate the stay because Debtor failed to disclose any tenant for a lease
of this Property in Schedule G. Id.

ANALYSIS UNDER 11 U.S.C. § 1301(c) (3)

Section 1301 of the Bankruptcy Code provides for a codebtor stay that prohibits a creditor from acting to collect any part of a consumer debt from an individual that is liable on the debt with the bankruptcy debtor. 11 U.S.C. § 1301(a). The term 'consumer debt' means debt incurred by an individual primarily for a personal, family, or household purpose. 11 U.S.C. § 101(8).

Here, there is no analysis or evidence to support Movants' request for relief regarding a codebtor stay. However, even if there was an analysis, it appears from the moving papers that there is no co-debtor stay in place because the initial funds were borrowed by Debtor's company, Schultz Corp, and not Debtor. Therefore, this section is inapplicable by its terms because § 1301(a), which provides for a co-debtor stay, only applies to consumer debts. Here, the debt is not a consumer debt of Debtor and was incurred by a corporation.

REMAINING RELIEF REQUESTED

On May 1, 2026, Movants filed a proof of claim for Movants' secured claim in the amount of \$161,097.67. Claim 8. On May 22, 2026, the chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") filed an objection to confirmation because, among other things, Debtor's proposed plan misclassifies Movants as a Class 1 creditor. Doc. #60. The attachments to Movants' filed proof of claim show that Movants' loan matured on April 1, 2025. Claim 8. Because Class 1 is for claims that "mature after completion of this plan" and Movants' claim already matured prior to the filing of the case, Movants' claim should be provided for in Class 2 of the plan. If Debtor can confirm a plan that would pay Movants' claim during the life of the plan, such a confirmed plan could preclude this court from granting Movants' motion for relief from stay.

For the reasons stated above, this matter will be continued to July 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. to allow Debtor time to file an amended plan and notice a motion to confirm that plan to be heard in conjunction with this motion.

Because Movants set this motion for relief from stay for hearing pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f) (2), Movants have waived the time constraints of 11 U.S.C. § 362(e). See LBR 4001-1(a) (1).

20. [26-11482](#)-A-13 **IN RE: NATHAN SCHULTZ**
[BRL-2](#)

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY, MOTION FOR ADEQUATE PROTECTION
5-12-2026 [\[50\]](#)

GLENN ZAHLER/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
BENJAMIN LEVINSON/ATTY. FOR MV.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continued to July 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice 9014-1(f) (2) and will proceed

as scheduled. Unless opposition is presented at the hearing, the court intends to enter the respondents' defaults and deny the motion in part and continue the motion in part. The court will issue an order as to the further hearing.

The movant, Glenn Zahler ("Movant"), seeks relief from the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) and (d)(2) with respect to real property located at 444 Border Court, Frazier Park, California ("Property") owned by Nathan Schultz ("Debtor"). Doc. #50.

Movant is the current holder of a promissory note and current beneficiary of a first priority deed of trust on the Property. Doc. #50; Decl. of Glenn Zahler, Doc. #52. Debtor is the borrower of the loan being serviced by Movant. Id. The note matured on February 1, 2025. Id. Movant's loan became delinquent by the failure of Debtor to make a full payment due May 1, 2024, and all payments thereafter. Id. As a result, Movant started foreclosure proceedings by recording a Notice of Default on October 21, 2025. Id. A trustee's sale was set for March 18, 2026. Id. Because the loan matured pre-petition, Debtor's plan does not properly provide for Movant's claim. Id. Further, Movant states cause exists to terminate the stay because Debtor failed to disclose any tenant for a lease of this Property in Schedule G. Id.

On May 6, 2026, Movant filed a proof of claim for Movant's secured claim in the amount of \$184,742.50. Claim 11. On May 22, 2026, the chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") filed an objection to confirmation because, among other things, Debtor's proposed plan misclassifies Movant as a Class 1 creditor. Doc. #60. The attachments to Movant's filed proof of claim show that Movant's loan matured on February 1, 2025. Claim 11. Because Class 1 is for claims that "mature after completion of this plan" and Movant's claim already matured prior to the filing of the case, Movant's claim should be provided for in Class 2 of the plan. If Debtor can confirm a plan that would pay Movant's claim during the life of the plan, such a confirmed plan could preclude this court from granting Movant's motion for relief from stay.

For the reasons stated above, this matter will be continued to July 9, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. to allow Debtor time to file an amended plan and notice a motion to confirm that plan to be heard in conjunction with this motion.

Because Movant set this motion for relief from stay for hearing pursuant to LBR 9014-1(f)(2), Movant has waived the time constraints of 11 U.S.C. § 362(e). See LBR 4001-1(a)(1).

21. [26-11482](#)-A-13 **IN RE: NATHAN SCHULTZ**
[RSW-1](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
4-9-2026 [\[12\]](#)

NATHAN SCHULTZ/MV
ROBERT WILLIAMS/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Granted.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

This motion was filed and served on at least 14 days' notice prior to the hearing date pursuant to Local Rule of Practice 9014-1(f) (2). At the initial hearing held on April 23, 2026, the hearing on the motion to extend automatic stay was continued to May 28, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. and the automatic stay was extended through June 1, 2026. Order, Doc. #28. The court ordered the objecting secured creditors to file and serve written opposition not later than May 7, 2026 and any reply to be filed and served not later than May 14, 2026. Order, Doc. #28. On May 22, 2026, the court granted the debtor's an ex parte application to extend time to file his reply by May 20, 2026. Doc. #59.

Creditors Iris Angeleri and Robert Adrian Angeleri II (together, "Angeleris") filed and served timely opposition on May 7, 2026. Doc. #39. Creditor Glen Zahler ("Zahler" and together with Angeleris, "Creditors") also filed and served timely opposition on May 7, 2026. Doc. #36. The debtor filed and served a timely reply on May 20, 2026. Doc. #58. Based on Creditors' oppositions and the debtor's reply, the court is inclined to grant the motion.

Debtor Nathan Thomas Schultz ("Debtor") moves the court for an order extending the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (B). Doc. #12.

Debtor had a chapter 13 case pending within the preceding one-year period that was dismissed, Case No. 26-11087 (Bankr. E.D. Cal.) ("Prior Case"). The Prior Case was filed on March 16, 2026 by Debtor in pro se and dismissed on March 27, 2026 for Debtor's failure to file documents timely. Decl. of Nathan Schultz, Doc. #14. Under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (A), if a debtor had a bankruptcy case pending within the preceding one-year period that was dismissed, then the automatic stay with respect to any action taken with respect to a debt or property securing such debt or with respect to any lease shall terminate with respect to the debtor on the 30th day after the filing of the current case. Debtor filed this case on April 1, 2026. Petition, Doc. #1. Based on the prior continuance, the automatic stay will terminate in the present case on June 1, 2026.

Section 362(c) (3) (B) allows the court to extend the stay "to any or all creditors (subject to such conditions or limitations as the court may then impose) after notice and a hearing completed before the expiration of the 30-day period only if the party in interest demonstrates that the filing of the later case is in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed[.]" 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (B).

Section 362(c) (3) (C) (i) creates a presumption that the case was not filed in good faith if (1) the debtor filed more than one prior case in the preceding year; (2) the debtor failed to file or amend the petition or other documents without substantial excuse, provide adequate protection as ordered by the court, or perform the terms of a confirmed plan; or (3) the debtor has not had a substantial change in his or her financial or personal affairs since the dismissal, or there is no other reason to believe that the current case will result in a discharge or fully performed plan. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (C) (i).

The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) (3) (C). Under the clear and convincing standard, the evidence presented by the movant must "place in the ultimate factfinder an abiding conviction that the truth of its factual contentions are 'highly probable.'" Factual contentions are highly probable if the evidence offered in support of them instantly tilt[s] the evidentiary scales in the affirmative when weighed against the evidence offered in opposition." Emmert v. Taggart (In re Taggart), 548 B.R. 275, 288 n.11 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2016) (citations omitted) (vacated and remanded on other grounds by Taggart v. Lorenzen, 139 S. Ct. 1795 (2019)).

In this case, the presumption of bad faith arises because Debtor's Prior Case was dismissed for failure to timely file documents. See Case No. 26-11087, Doc. #11.

In support of this motion to extend the automatic stay, Debtor declares that the Prior Case was filed to stop the foreclosure of his real property. Doc. #12; Schultz Decl., Doc. #14. Debtor states his Prior Case was dismissed because he filed the Prior Case without the assistance of an attorney. Id. Debtor is now represented by an experienced chapter 13 attorney and Debtor now understands all the requirements needed to confirm a chapter 13 plan. Id. Debtor asserts he will file everything on time to show that he has the ability to make plan payments since he is employed and also has rental income. Id.

Angeleris opposes the motion asserting that shortly before Debtor filed the Prior Case, Debtor transferred real property located at 1315 Robinson Street, Bakersfield, California in which Angeleris holds a security interest from the non-debtor entity to whom Angeleris lent money and which held title to the real property until transferred to Debtor. Opp., Doc. #21. Angeleris also assert that Angeleris' loan matured on April 1, 2025, and Debtor must pay \$154,727.56, the full amount of the matured loan, along with interest during the 60 months of the plan. Id. In addition, Angeleris note that Debtor failed to schedule five additional liens against the Property. Decl. of Corey Cullen, Doc. #39; Ex. A-E, Request for Judicial Notice, Doc. #22. In support of Angeleris' factual assertions, Angeleris have provided evidence in the form of exhibits that include a copy of an interest only period fixed rate note provided by Debtor's company, Schultz Investments 21, Inc., to Angeleris as well as a deed of trust securing the note and a declaration supporting the evidence provided. Cullen Decl., Doc. #39; Exs. A & B, Doc. #40.

Zahler is the current holder on a promissory note of Debtor secured by a first deed of trust in Debtor's real property located at 444 Border Court, Frazier Park, California, on which Debtor became delinquent. Opp., Doc. #24. Zahler commenced foreclosure proceedings that were halted by the filing of the Prior Case. Id. Zahler also asserts that Zahler's loan matured on February 1, 2025, and Debtor must pay \$186,140.00, the full amount of the matured loan, along with interest during the 60 months of the plan. Id. In addition, Zahler notes that Debtor failed to schedule three additional liens against the Property. Decl. of Glenn Zahler, Doc. #36; Ex. A-C, Request for Judicial Notice, Doc. #25. In support of Zahler's factual assertions, Zahler has provided evidence in the form of an interest only period fixed rate note provided by Debtor to Zahler, a deed of trust securing the note and a declaration supporting the evidence provided. Zahler Decl., Doc. #36; Exs. A & B, Doc. #37.

In support of this motion to extend the automatic stay and in response to Creditors' opposition, Debtor declares that while he had financial difficulties and fell behind on his mortgage payments, which caused foreclosure proceedings to be initiated, Debtor's financial situation has improved because Debtor now has a job that pays over \$16,000.00 a month, and Debtor expects to receive a pay increase with a promotion. Decl. of Debtor, Doc. #58. Debtor agrees that Creditors' claims are mistakenly placed in Class 1, and Debtor will file a modified plan to correct this error. Id. With respect to the undisclosed transfer and liens, Debtor did not disclose the pre-petition transfer raised by Angeleris because Debtor believed that he was only required to disclose transfers by Debtor and not to Debtor. Id. Debtor listed blanket liens for the California Tax Board and California Employment Department because Debtor plans to provide for these liens in his chapter 13 plan and pay these debts in full over the life of the plan. Id. Debtor did not list his rental income in his Schedule G because his tenant pays month-to-month. Id. Finally, while the properties at issue are not Debtor's residence, Debtor would like to keep the

properties as part of his investments because Debtor has invested a lot of money into these properties. Id.

The court finds that Debtor's explanation as to whether the current case will result in a fully performed plan rebuts the presumption of bad faith that arose from the failure to file all necessary documents in the Prior Case and that Debtor's petition commencing this case was filed in good faith.

Accordingly, the court will extend the automatic stay beyond June 1, 2026 for all purposes only as to those parties named in Debtor's motion (Doc. #12), unless terminated by further order of the court.

22. [26-11484](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SUZANNE JOSEFOWSKI**
[PGM-1](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
4-8-2026 [[13](#)]

SUZANNE JOSEFOWSKI/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

23. [26-11484](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SUZANNE JOSEFOWSKI**
[PGM-1](#)

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
4-30-2026 [[34](#)]

CENTRAL PACIFIC BANK/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
ANDREW LEE/ATTY. FOR MV.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

24. [26-11484](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SUZANNE JOSEFOWSKI**
[RAS-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY U.S. BANK TRUST NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
4-23-2026 [[24](#)]

U.S. BANK TRUST NATIONAL ASSOCIATION/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
SHANA STARK/ATTY. FOR MV.

NO RULING.

25. [25-26886](#)-A-13 **IN RE: BRENDOLYNN CHAMPLAIE**
[GO-2](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO CONVERT CASE FROM CHAPTER 13 TO CHAPTER 7 AND/OR
MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
4-9-2026 [[84](#)]

RCVI GROUP INC./MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
GIOVANNI ORANTES/ATTY. FOR MV.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

26. [25-26886](#)-A-13 **IN RE: BRENDOLYNN CHAMPLAIE**
[PGM-2](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
4-22-2026 [[91](#)]

BRENDOLYNN CHAMPLAIE/MV
PETER MACALUSO/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

27. [25-25890](#)-A-13 **IN RE: DONALD CLEVELAND**
[SW-5](#)

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
4-21-2026 [[96](#)]

DONALD CLEVELAND/MV
JAMES SHEPHERD/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

28. [25-13795](#)-A-13 **IN RE: CHRISTOPHER MORRIS**
[TCS-2](#)

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF AMERICAN HONDA FINANCE CORPORATION,
CLAIM NUMBER 4
1-12-2026 [[30](#)]

CHRISTOPHER MORRIS/MV
TIMOTHY SPRINGER/ATTY. FOR DBT.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings
and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the
hearing.

This matter has been resolved by stipulation of the parties filed on April 23,
2026. Doc. #63. However, an order approving the stipulation has not been signed
by the court. This matter will be continued to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. to
allow the parties additional time to submit an order approving the stipulation
to the court that the chapter 13 trustee has approved as to form.

29. [25-13795](#)-A-13 **IN RE: CHRISTOPHER MORRIS**
[TCS-3](#)

CONTINUED EVIDENTIARY HEARING RE: MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF AMERICAN
HONDA FINANCE CORPORATION
1-12-2026 [[35](#)]

CHRISTOPHER MORRIS/MV
TIMOTHY SPRINGER/ATTY. FOR DBT.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings
and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the
hearing.

This matter has been resolved by stipulation of the parties filed on April 23,
2026. Doc. #63. However, an order approving the stipulation has not been signed
by the court. This matter will be continued to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. to
allow the parties additional time to submit an order approving the stipulation
to the court that the chapter 13 trustee has approved as to form.

30. [26-11099](#)-A-13 **IN RE: RAMON/CELINA JARA**
[LGT-1](#)

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN G. TSANG
5-5-2026 [[14](#)]

LILIAN TSANG/MV
T. O'TOOLE/ATTY. FOR DBT.

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Continued to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings
and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the
hearing.

Ramon Manuel Jara and Celina Jara (together, "Debtors") filed a voluntary petition under chapter 13 along with a chapter 13 plan ("Plan") on March 16, 2026. Doc. #1, 3. The chapter 13 trustee ("Trustee") objects to confirmation of the Plan because: (1) an amended Schedule I with business income and expense attachments needs to be filed to determine plan feasibility; (2) Debtors have failed to provide any of the required documents including, but not limited to: (a) business case questionnaire, (b) business bank statements for the 6 months prior to filing, and (c) profit & loss statements for the 6 months prior to filing; (3) either amended schedules or a declaration needs to be filed explaining how the funds from Debtors' 2025 tax returns were expended; (4) an amended Statement of Financial Affairs needs to be filed; (5) an amended disclosure of compensation of attorney needs to be filed; and (6) the meeting of creditors has not yet concluded. Debtors' 341 meeting of creditors has been continued to June 4, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. See court docket entry on May 5, 2026.

On May 21, 2026, Debtors responded to Trustee's objection to confirmation stating that Debtors have: (1) filed an amended Schedule I; (2) filed an amended disclosure of compensation; and (3) provided the documents requested by Trustee to Trustee prior to Debtors' continued 341 meeting of creditors. Doc. #17-19, 21.

Based on Debtors' response to Trustee's objection, the court is inclined to continue the hearing on this objection to June 11, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. to be heard after Debtors' continued § 341 meeting of creditors.

31. [25-24493](#)-A-13 **IN RE: MARILYN BARZELAY**
[DPC-3](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
4-17-2026 [[35](#)]

DAVID CUSICK/MV
MARK SHMORGON/ATTY. FOR DBT.

NO RULING.

11:00 AM

1. [25-10233](#)-A-7 **IN RE: GERARDO CLAVEL CARTAGENA**
[25-1018](#) [CAE-1](#)

STATUS CONFERENCE RE: AMENDED COMPLAINT
4-9-2026 [[27](#)]

LOPEZ, SR. V. CLAVEL CARTAGENA ET AL
STUART BROWN/ATTY. FOR PL.
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

NO RULING.

2. [21-10853](#)-A-12 **IN RE: MIKE WEBER**
[26-1001](#) [CAE-1](#)

CONTINUED STATUS CONFERENCE RE: COMPLAINT
2-3-2026 [[1](#)]

WEBER V. ADVANCE AMERICA, CASH ADVANCE CENTERS OF CA, LLC
PETER SAUER/ATTY. FOR PL.

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

DISPOSITION: Continued June 25, 2026 at 11:00 a.m.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

Pursuant to the status report filed by the plaintiff on May 25, 2026
(Doc. #15), the status conference is continued to June 25, 2026 at 11:00 a.m.

3. [21-10679](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SYLVIA NICOLE**
[23-1029](#) [SN-4](#)

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR DISCOVERY
4-10-2026 [[239](#)]

NICOLE V. AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Denied.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings
and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the
hearing.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice prior to the
hearing date as required by Local Rule of Practice 9014-1(f)(1). The defendant
timely filed written opposition on May 8, 2026. Doc. #270.

Sylvia Nicole ("Plaintiff") moves the court to continue the discovery deadlines in this adversary proceeding pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 16(b), made applicable to this adversary proceeding by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7016, to provide Plaintiff additional time for discovery. Mot., Doc. #239. American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah ("Defendant") opposes the motion and contends that Plaintiff has not shown good cause for such an extension as required by Rule 16(b)(4). Doc. #270.

The scheduling order in this adversary proceeding ("Scheduling Order") was entered on March 31, 2025, and established the close of discovery on September 25, 2025, and the close of expert discovery on January 30, 2026. Scheduling Order, Doc. #162. The Scheduling Order further stated that all motions seeking to modify the Scheduling Order "will be considered upon a showing of good cause and, if the request for modification is occasioned by the need for additional time to complete discovery, due diligence." Scheduling Order, p.7, Doc. #162. Plaintiff filed this motion on April 10, 2026. Doc. #239.

Rule 16(b) requires the judge to issue a scheduling order that, once issued, "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." Rule 16(b)(4). "Rule 16(b)'s 'good cause' standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment. The [bankruptcy] court may modify the pretrial schedule 'if it cannot reasonably be met despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.'" Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992) (citations omitted). When the failure to take discovery was based on a choice, a mere change in tactic does not constitute good cause. See Classical Silk, Inc. v. Dolan Grp., Inc., No. CV 14-09224-AB, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 190580, at *9-10 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2016).

Here, Plaintiff asserts that due to multiple lawsuits, adversary proceedings, and appeal cases on which Plaintiff has been working for the past year, Plaintiff has not been able to take depositions of key witnesses for this case. Doc. #239. Due to these circumstances, Plaintiff is not ready for trial and requests additional time for discovery but does not assert the amount of additional time Plaintiff is requesting. Id.

In opposition, Defendant asserts that Plaintiff fails to establish good cause to grant this motion. Doc. #270. Plaintiff's sole reason for requesting additional time for discovery is due to Plaintiff's involvement in other legal matters over the past year that were voluntary, and that reason does not constitute excusable neglect or good cause to extend discovery deadlines. Id. Plaintiff is the instigator of this adversary proceeding and was responsible for managing the timelines she now seeks to ignore. Id. Further, Plaintiff's lack of diligence does not outweigh the prejudice against Defendant if the motion is granted. Id.

Rule 16(b) and this court's Scheduling Order require Plaintiff to show her diligence with respect to discovery before this court will extend the ordered discovery deadlines. The court finds that Plaintiff's choice not to conduct discovery in this adversary proceeding before the discovery deadline closed due to Plaintiff permitting other lawsuits in which she is involved to take priority over her timely prosecution of this adversary proceeding does not support this court finding that Plaintiff has been diligent in conducting discovery in this adversary proceeding. The court finds Plaintiff has failed to show good cause for extending the discovery deadline under Rule 16(b) and the legal authority interpreting that rule.

Accordingly, this motion is DENIED.

4. [21-10679](#)-A-13 **IN RE: SYLVIA NICOLE**
[23-1029](#) [SN-5](#)

MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT JUDGMENT
4-10-2026 [\[238\]](#)

NICOLE V. AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
RESPONSIVE PLEADING

TENTATIVE RULING: This matter will proceed as scheduled.

DISPOSITION: Denied.

ORDER: The minutes of the hearing will be the court's findings and conclusions. The court will issue an order after the hearing.

This motion was set for hearing on at least 28 days' notice as required by Local Rule of Practice 9014-1(f)(1). The defendant timely filed written opposition on May 8, 2026. Doc. #267. The plaintiff timely replied to the opposition on May 21, 2026 ("Reply"). Doc. #293. This matter will proceed as scheduled.

Sylvia Nicole ("Plaintiff") moves to set aside default judgment against Plaintiff as a result from the motion filed by American Automobile Association of Northern California, Nevada & Utah ("Defendant") to deem facts admitted ("Deemed Admissions Motion") entered on November 26, 2025. Doc. #238; Order, Doc. #198. The court notes that the instant motion does not ask for the correct relief because (1) a default judgment was not entered that Plaintiff can seek to have set aside, and (2) Defendant's Deemed Admitted Motion was denied as unnecessary. Doc. ##195, 238. To the extent Plaintiff is asking to withdraw Plaintiff's admissions that are deemed admitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 36(b), incorporated into this adversary proceeding by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure ("Bankruptcy Rule") 7036, and accept Plaintiff's late responses to Defendant's request for admissions, that request is denied.

RELEVANT FACTS

On September 17, 2025, Defendant moved pursuant to Rule 36(a)(6) for an order deeming facts admitted in its Request for Admissions, Set Number One ("Admissions Request") served on Plaintiff on the grounds that Plaintiff's response was untimely, unverified, and non-substantive. Doc. #185.

Defendant served the Admissions Request on Plaintiff on May 29, 2025. Decl. of Danielle C. Weller, Doc. #187; Ex. A, Doc. #187. According to Defendant, pursuant to Rule 36(a)(3), made applicable to this adversary proceeding by Bankruptcy Rule 7036, Plaintiff's response to the Admissions Request was to be served no later than July 3, 2025. Weller Decl., Doc. #187. On July 18, 2025, Plaintiff responded to the Admissions Request by merely stating "Deny" with respect to each admission. Doc. #175. Ex. B, Doc. #187. Plaintiff signed her response but did not sign the response under oath or penalty of perjury. Id. Plaintiff is a chapter 13 debtor and is representing herself in this adversary proceeding.

The court entered an order determining that because Plaintiff did not respond to discovery by the deadline required by Rule 36(a)(3), the facts in the Admissions Request were deemed admitted. Doc. #195. Further, because the facts in the Admission Request were automatically deemed admitted, the response of

"Deny" to each request for admission is sufficient, and Plaintiff was not required to sign her response under oath or penalty of perjury, so the Deemed Admitted Motion was denied as unnecessary. Id.

APPLICABLE LAW

A matter is admitted unless within 30 days after being served with a request for admission, the party to whom the request is directed serves on the requesting party a written answer or objection. Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3). A party who fails to respond within 30 days and later tries to withdraw its deemed admissions "must make a strong showing[.]" 999 v. C.I.T. Corp., 776 F.2d 866, 869 (9th Cir. 1985). To determine whether a party may be permitted to withdraw or amend an admission, the court must determine whether the party satisfies two prongs: "First, the withdrawal will aid in presenting the merits of the case. Second, no substantial prejudice to the party who requested the admission will result from allowing the admission to be withdrawn or amended." Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(b); Conlon v. U.S., 474 F.3d 616, 625 (9th Cir. 2007).

ANALYSIS

Here, Plaintiff asserts that Plaintiff was unaware of the Deemed Admitted Motion due to her address change which is why she did not file an opposition or appear at the hearing. Doc. #238. Further, Plaintiff states that the Deemed Admitted Motion should never have been granted because Plaintiff did file a response to Defendant's Admissions Request on July 18, 2025. Doc. #238; Ex. 1, Doc. #238. In opposition, Defendant states that the mailing issue is irrelevant because the Admissions Request alone is self-executing when there is a failure to timely respond to the Admissions Request, which is applicable here. Doc. #267. The court agrees that the Admissions Request was self-executing and whether the Deemed Admissions Motion was properly served on Plaintiff is irrelevant because that motion was denied as unnecessary. Further, the court notes that the Deemed Admissions Motion was filed on September 17, 2025 and heard on November 25, 2026, yet Plaintiff did not file a notice of address change to reflect her new address in Arizona until January 6, 2026. Doc. #200. Plaintiff also did not file this motion until April 10, 2026, and only after Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. Doc. ##219, 238.

Plaintiff has not presented any evidence to support the court granting this motion pursuant to Rule 36(b). Specifically, Plaintiff has failed to present any evidence that shows Plaintiff will be unable to present her case on the merits or that Defendant, as the adverse party, would not be substantially prejudiced by the withdrawal or amendment of the deemed admissions, which is what the court is required to determine in order to grant Plaintiff's motion.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to allow Plaintiff's late responses to the Admissions Request is DENIED.

5. [19-15081](#)-A-13 **IN RE: CHRISTOPHER/KERRI TYSON**
[25-1023](#) [CAE-2](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
4-29-2026 [[48](#)]

TYSON ET AL V. AMERICAN EDUCATION SERVICES ET AL

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

DISPOSITION: The order to show cause will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The record shows that the missing corporate disclosure statement was filed on May 4, 2026. Doc. #53. Therefore, this order to show cause is VACATED.

6. [19-15081](#)-A-13 **IN RE: CHRISTOPHER/KERRI TYSON**
[25-1023](#) [CAE-3](#)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
4-29-2026 [[49](#)]

TYSON ET AL V. AMERICAN EDUCATION SERVICES ET AL

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

DISPOSITION: The order to show cause will be vacated.

ORDER: The court will issue an order.

The record shows that the missing corporate disclosure statement was filed on May 4, 2026. Doc. #52. Therefore, this order to show cause is VACATED.

1. [26-10638](#)-A-11 **IN RE: FRIEDENBACH FAMILY FARMS LLC**
[FW-3](#)

CONTINUED MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO BORROW AND TO USE 2026
ALMOND CROP AS COLLATERAL FOR SUCH BORROWING SENIOR TO ALL
EXISTING LIENS
5-21-2026 [[138](#)]

FRIEDENBACH FAMILY FARMS
LLC/MV
PETER SAUER/ATTY. FOR DBT.

NO RULING.

2. [26-10638](#)-A-11 **IN RE: FRIEDENBACH FAMILY FARMS LLC**
[FW-2](#)

CONTINUED MOTION TO USE CASH COLLATERAL
2-18-2026 [[5](#)]

FRIEDENBACH FAMILY FARMS
LLC/MV
PETER SAUER/ATTY. FOR DBT.

NO RULING.