

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher M. Klein  
Bankruptcy Judge  
Sacramento, California

June 6, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

---

1.	<a href="#">17-21602</a> -C-13	EUGENIA STULEANEC	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
	DPC-1	Peter Macaluso	PLAN BY DAVID P. CUSICK
			4-26-17 [ <a href="#">21</a> ]

Thru #2

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on April 26, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

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

**The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan relies on the Motion to Value (see matter #2).

B. Debtor lists income from maintenance service in 2015 on the Statement of Financial Affairs, #5, however the debtor did not list this business on the Statement of Financial Affairs, #27.

#### **DEBTOR'S RESPONSE**

Debtor responds that an amended Statement of Financial Affairs addressing the Trustee's concerns has been filed.

The court notes that there is no opposition to the Motion to Value. Additionally, the court notes that the Statement of Financial Affairs has been appropriately amended and filed. As a result, the objection will be overruled.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on March 13, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

2. [17-21602](#)-C-13 EUGENIA STULEANEC  
PGM-1 Peter Macaluso

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF  
HERITAGE COMMUNITY CREDIT UNION  
4-21-17 [[15](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 21, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 *Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<b>The Motion to Value secured claim of Heritage Community Credit Union, "Creditor," is granted.</b>
--

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of a 2007 Mercedes GL450. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$7,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan incurred in April 2010, more than 910 days prior to the filing of the petition, with a balance of approximately \$9,234.87. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$7,000.00. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The court notes that the Creditor has filed a proof of claim indicating that the value is \$8,944.73. The creditor however has not responded to the Motion to Value.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Heritage Community Credit Union, secured by a purchase-money loan secured against the Debtors' 2007 Mercedes GL450, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$7,000.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan.

\*\*\*\*

3. [15-24006](#)-C-13 MICHELE BLAIR  
MET-3 Mary Ellen Terranella

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR  
MARY ELLEN TERRANELLA, DEBTOR'S  
ATTORNEY  
5-1-17 [[99](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling: No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.**  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, Committee of Creditors Holding General Unsecured Claims/ or creditors holding the 20 largest unsecured claims, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 1, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 *Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.**

Mary Ellen Terranella, the Attorney for Debtor, ("Applicant") for Michele Blair, ("Client"), makes an Additional Request for the Allowance of Fees and Expenses in this case.

The period for which the fees are requested is for the period May 20, 2016 through March 7, 2017. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$2,500.00.

#### **STATUTORY BASIS FOR PROFESSIONAL FEES**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3),

In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to an examiner, trustee under chapter 11, or professional person, the court shall consider the nature, the extent, and the value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors, including-

- (A) the time spent on such services;
- (B) the rates charged for such services;
- (C) whether the services were necessary to the

administration of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of, a case under this title;

(D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task addressed;

(E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and

(F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation charged by comparably skilled practitioners in cases other than cases under this title.

Further, the court shall not allow compensation for,

(I) unnecessary duplication of services; or

(ii) services that were not--

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate;

(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A). The court may award interim fees for professionals pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 331, which award is subject to final review and allowance pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330.

### **Benefit to the Estate**

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are "actual," meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must still demonstrate that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided as the court's authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney "free reign [sic] to run up a [professional fees and expenses] without considering the maximum probable [as opposed to possible] recovery." *Id.* at 958. According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

(a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

*Id.* at 959.

In this District the Local Rules provide consumer counsel in Chapter 13 cases with an election for the allowance of fees in connection with the services required in obtaining confirmation of a plan and the services related thereto through the debtor obtaining a discharge. Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 provides, in pertinent part,

"(a) Compensation. Compensation paid to attorneys for the representation of chapter 13 debtors shall be determined according to Subpart (c) of this Local Bankruptcy Rule, unless a party-in-interest objects or the attorney opts out of Subpart (c). The failure of an attorney to file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys, shall signify that the attorney has opted out of Subpart (c). When there is an objection or when an attorney opts out, compensation shall be determined in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, and 2017, and any other applicable authority."

...

(c) Fixed Fees Approved in Connection with Plan Confirmation. The Court will, as part of the chapter 13 plan confirmation process, approve fees of attorneys representing chapter 13 debtors provided they comply with the requirements to this Subpart.

(1) The maximum fee that may be charged is \$4,000.00 in nonbusiness cases, and \$6,000.00 in business cases.

(2) The attorney for the chapter 13 debtor must file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys.

(3) If the fee under this Subpart is not sufficient to fully and fairly compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. The fee permitted under this Subpart, however, is not a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a motion for additional fees. Generally, this fee will fairly compensate the debtor's attorney for all preconfirmation services and most postconfirmation services, such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. Form EDC 3-095, Application and Declaration RE: Additional Fees and Expenses in Chapter 13 Cases, may be used when seeking additional fees. The necessity for a hearing on the application shall be governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a) (6)."

The Order Confirming the Chapter 13 Plan expressly provides that Applicant is allowed \$3,500.00 in attorneys fees, the maximum set fee amount under Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 at the time of confirmation. Applicant prepared the order confirming the Plan.

If Applicant believes that there has been substantial and unanticipated legal services which have been provided, then such additional fees may be requested as provided in Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(3). He may file a fee

application and the court will consider the fees to be awarded pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330, and 331. In the Ninth Circuit, the customary method for determining the reasonableness of a professional's fees is the "lodestar" calculation. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996), *amended*, 108 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 1997). "The 'lodestar' is calculated by multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate." *Morales*, 96 F.3d at 363 (citation omitted). "This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer's services." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). A compensation award based on the loadstar is a presumptively reasonable fee. *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988).

In rare or exceptional instances, if the court determines that the lodestar figure is unreasonably low or high, it may adjust the figure upward or downward based on certain factors. *Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ.*, 827 F.2d 617, 620 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the court has considerable discretion in determining the reasonableness of professional's fees. *Gates v. Duekmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). It is appropriate for the court to have this discretion "in view of the [court's] superior understanding of the litigation and the desirability of avoiding frequent appellate review of what essentially are factual matters." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437.

## **FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED**

### **Fees and Costs**

Applicant seeks compensation for the following unanticipated work: (1) defend against a motion for relief from the automatic stay, (2) file a motion to transfer property, (3) defend a motion to dismiss case, (4) negotiate stipulation for release of insurance proceeds, (5) file motion to sell property. Applicant provides a task billing analysis and supporting evidence for the services provided at the hourly rate of \$325.00/hour. Applicant reduced fees to \$2,500.00.

Total Hours: 45.25 hours in attorney services.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$2,500.00
Costs	\$0.00

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a statement of nonopposition. Dkt 107.

A review of the application shows that the services provided by Applicant related to the estate enforcing rights and obtaining benefits. The court finds the services were beneficial to the Client and bankruptcy estate and reasonable. The court notes that the applicant reduced fees from \$13,731.25 to \$2,500.00.

The court shall issue an order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the



Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Mary Ellen Terranella ("Applicant"), Attorney for the Chapter 13 Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, Mary Ellen Terranella is allowed the fees in the amount of \$2,500.00 as a professional of the Estate.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on May 3, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

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

**The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.**

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that

A. The plan fails the chapter 7 liquidation analysis. Debtors non-exempt equity totals \$17,120.50, however the plan proposes to pay unsecured creditors a 0% dividend.

The debtor filed a response addressing the Trustee's concerns and outlining that under the plan, unsecured creditors will receive approximately 17% of their claims, or \$4,335, whereas in a chapter 7, unsecured creditors would receive only \$2,874.

The Trustee replied to the debtor's response indicating that the objection had been satisfied. The Trustee no longer opposes confirmation.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on March 20, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*

5. [17-21208](#)-C-13 LOUIS BROWN  
DPC-1 Mary Ellen Terranella

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO  
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY DAVID  
P. CUSICK  
4-11-17 [[17](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on April 11, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

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

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

A. The plan will not complete until 176 months after confirmation. Debtor's plan provides that mortgage arrears will be paid after the first year of the plan unless a loan modification is obtained. Debtor's plan does not propose a payment increase to cover the arrearages.

B. The plan relies upon two motions to avoid lien.

C. Debtor's name is misspelled on the petition and schedules. Apparently debtor's first name is spelled Lewis not Louis. Debtor had a prior case where the debtor's name is spelled Lewis Brown.

D. Trustee requested that the debtor provide a copy of the Louis (sp) and Dorothy Brown Trust, yet debtor has failed to comply with the trustee's

request.

E. Plan may fail liquidation analysis where debtor's non-exempt equity totals \$0, debtor is proposed 0% dividend to unsecured creditors, but debtor reports interest in a pending lawsuit for foreclosure, fraud, elder abuse with an estimated value of \$100,000.00. The plan may fail liquidation if the lawsuit is settled while the plan is pending. Trustee requests that a provision be provided that any non-exempt portion of the lawsuit realized within the life of the plan will be paid to the Trustee as an additional payment.

#### **DEBTOR'S OPPOSITION**

Debtor alleges that the Trustee's objections have been fixed. The motions to avoid lien have been granted by the court. The spelling of the debtor's name has been amended and fixed where applicable. Debtor provided the trustee with a copy of the Trust. The debtor has agreed to hand over any non-exempt funds obtained as a result of the pending litigation.

The debtor alleges that an Order Confirming Plan correctly provides for payments to secured creditors such that the plan will complete in 60 months. The Order Confirming Plan states that if the debtor does not receive a refinance within 1 year, the debtor will increase plan payments to provide for the curing of arrears. The debtor does not introduce a declaration indicating how the debtor will be able to make such payments. Nor does the debtor indicate why, if the debtor has such additional disposable income, that income is not being used to provide for unsecured creditors where the \$58,229.00 in unsecured claims is receiving a dividend of 0%.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the proposed Chapter 13 Plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 21, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Confirm plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The plan is not the debtor's best effort.
- B. The plan has not been proposed in good faith.

In both cases, the Trustee objects to the debtor's buying of a new vehicle with the insurance proceeds gained from the totaling of her previous car.

**DEBTOR'S RESPONSE**

Debtor responds that she did not borrow any new money to fund the purchase and was unaware that she needed permission to replace the vehicle.

**DISCUSSION**

Debtor purchased a vehicle using the insurance proceeds from debtor's vehicle, claimed as exempt at the filing of the petition. Debtor disclosed this event and provided evidence of the bill of sale, sales price, accident report, and notice from insurance company. The debtor did not incur post-

confirmation debt of any kind. There is nothing to evidence any bad faith by the debtor.

The court is unclear what the Trustee's argument concerning debtor's best effort is. If the Trustee believes that the debtor can make more payments towards the plan, the Trustee is free to file a Motion to Modify the debtor's payments. There is no evidence that the insurance proceeds from the debtor's totaled car would be available to be disbursed to creditors.

The debtor disclosed the purchase, and did not incur debt.

The court finds that the debtor's modification is proposed in good faith. There is no evidence that the modification is not the debtor's best effort. As a result, the motion to modify will be granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 21, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

7. [17-21511](#)-C-13 COLETTE MONTGOMERY  
DPC-1 George Burke

OBJECTION TO DISCHARGE BY DAVID  
P. CUSICK  
4-26-17 [[24](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 26, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Objection to Discharge has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1) and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4003(b). The failure of the Debtor and other parties 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 Debtor and the other parties in interest are entered, the matter will be resolved without oral argument and the court shall issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Objection to Discharge is sustained.**

Chapter 13 Trustee ("Objector"), filed the instant Objection to Debtor's Discharge on April 26, 2017. Dckt. 24.

The Objector argues that the Debtor is not entitled to a discharge in the instant bankruptcy case because the Debtor previously received a discharge in a Chapter 7 case.

The Debtor filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy case on October 29, 2015. Case No. 15-28418. The Debtor received a discharge on February 29, 2016.

The instant case was filed under Chapter 13 on March 8, 2017.

11 U.S.C. § 1328(f) provides that a court shall not grant a discharge if a debtor has received a discharge "in a case filed under chapter 7, 11, or 12 of this title during the 4-year period preceding the date of the order for relief under this chapter." 11 U.S.C. § 1328(f)(1).

Here, the Debtor received a discharge under 11 U.S.C. § 727 on February 29, 2016, which is less than four-years preceding the date of the filing of the instant case. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1328(f)(1), the Debtor is not eligible for a discharge in the instant case.

Therefore, the objection is sustained. Upon successful completion of the instant case (Case No. 17-21511), the case shall be closed without the entry of a discharge and Debtor shall receive no discharge in the instant case.



The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Discharge filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee, having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to Discharge is sustained.

IT IS ORDERED that, upon successful completion of the instant case, Case No. 17-21511, the case shall be closed without the entry of a discharge.

\*\*\*\*\*

Thru #9

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 1, 2017. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.**

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

Trustee filed an opposition to the plan modification due to the fact that the debtor had disposed of an adversary proceeding through a sealed compromise. The debtor provided the Trustee with the compromise, and the Trustee dropped its objection. As a result, the plan will be confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated  
in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtors having been presented to  
the court, and upon review of the pleadings,  
evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause  
appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtors' Chapter 13 Plan filed on May 1,

2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*

9. [15-24912](#)-C-13 CHRISTOPHER/WENDY THOMAS  
[17-2001](#) Scott Shumaker  
THOMAS ET AL V. OCWEN LOAN  
SERVICING, LLC ET AL  
SS-3

MOTION TO COMPROMISE  
CONTROVERSY/APPROVE SETTLEMENT  
AGREEMENT WITH WELLS FARGO  
BANK, N.A. AS TRUSTEE FOR  
SOUNDVIEW HOME LOAN TRUST  
2007-OPTI  
5-18-17 [[20](#)]

\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion for Approval of Compromise was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 18, 2017. 21 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a)(3), 21 day notice.)

The Motion for Approval of Compromise was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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.

<b>The Motion For Approval of Compromise is granted.</b>
--

Christopher and Wendy Thomas, the Chapter 13 debtors, ("Movant") requests that the court approve a compromise and settle competing claims and defenses with Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Settlor"). The claims and disputes to be resolved by the proposed settlement are confidential.

Movant and Settlor has resolved these claims and disputes, subject to approval by the court on the terms outlined on the confidential compromise.

#### DISCUSSION

Approval of a compromise is within the discretion of the court. *U.S. v. Alaska Nat'l Bank of the North (In re Walsh Construction)*, 669 F.2d 1325, 1328

(9th Cir. 1982). When a motion to approve compromise is presented to the court, the court must make its independent determination that the settlement is appropriate. *Protective Committee for Independent Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414, 424-425 (1968). In evaluating the acceptability of a compromise, the court evaluates four factors:

1. The probability of success in the litigation;
2. Any difficulties expected in collection;
3. The complexity of the litigation involved and the expense, inconvenience and delay necessarily attending it; and
4. The paramount interest of the creditors and a proper deference to their reasonable views.

*In re A & C Props.*, 784 F.2d 1377, 1381 (9th Cir. 1986); *In re Woodson*, 839 F.2d 610, 620 (9th Cir. 1988).

### **Probability of Success**

Probability of success was unknown, even after extensive discovery there were questions as to the extent of the bank's conduct. It is unclear if plaintiffs would have obtained money damages.

### **Difficulties in Collection**

No issue in collection.

### **Expense, Inconvenience and Delay of Continued Litigation**

The case was not exceptionally complex, however as with any litigation the cost of prosecuting the matter would have been burdensome on all parties.

### **Paramount Interest of Creditors**

Money damages would not have been significant, and there would not have been any likelihood of disbursement to creditors. The matter does not involve any creditors.

Upon weighing the factors outlined in *A & C Props* and *Woodson*, the court determines that the compromise is in the best interest of the creditors and the Estate. The motion is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Approve Compromise filed by Christopher and Wendy Thomas, Chapter 13 debtors, ("Movant") having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion to Approve Compromise between Movant and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. ("Settlor") is granted and the respective rights and interests of the parties are settled on the Terms set forth in the executed Settlement Agreement filed as confidential.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 21, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. Debtor may not be able to make plan payments. HSBC Bank USA filed a Notice of Mortgage Change for a property not listed on Debtor's schedules.

**DEBTOR'S RESPONSE**

Debtor responded with a declaration alleging that the property is in a trust, and that the debtor does not have an interest in the property. Debtor requests leave to amend the plan to list the property as a Class 3 surrender property. Debtor does not pay the mortgage and does not occupy the property.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the

Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 21, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*



11. [17-23018](#)-C-13 JEFFREY/RHIANNON CLEMENT  
TLA-1 Thomas Amberg

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF  
FLAGSHIP CREDIT ACCEPTANCE, LLC  
5-9-17 [[10](#)]

Thru #12

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 9, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<b>The Motion to Value secured claim of Flagship Credit Acceptance, LLC, "Creditor," is granted.</b>
--

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of a 2009 Toyota Highlander. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$16,500.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

#### **TRUSTEE'S OPPOSITION**

Trustee opposes the motion on the grounds that debtor has not provided specific information of style of vehicle.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The court notes that no response has been filed by Flagship Credit

Acceptance, LLC. The debtor has provided adequate information regarding the vehicle.

As a result, the court finds that the lien on the vehicle's title secures a purchase-money loan with a balance of approximately \$26,284.00. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$15,675.00. See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Value Collateral filed  
by Debtors, having been presented to the  
court, and upon review of the pleadings,  
evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause  
appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) the claim of Flagship Credit Acceptance, LLC. secured by a purchase-money loan secured against the Debtors' 2009 Toyota Highlander, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$16,500.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 9, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<b>The Motion to Value secured claim of the Internal Revenue Service, "Creditor," is granted.</b>
---

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Internal Revenue Services holds a lien on property of the debtor. Debtor is the owner of some unencumbered personal property. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a replacement value of \$5,580.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The lien on the property has a balance of approximately \$49,420.00, although this is disputed by the parties and is not used here as proof of the court's finding that this is the correct value of the claim. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a lien on the asset's title is under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$5,580.00. *See* 11 U.S.C. § 506(a). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The Trustee filed a response indicating that there was no basis to object to the motion. The IRS has filed a proof of claim indicating that the secured portion of its claim is \$5,580.00.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of the Internal Revenue Service secured by a loan secured by debtor's personal property, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$5,580.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 20, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. The plan fails to plead with particularity the grounds upon which the requested relief is based. The motion and declaration does not give a summary of the plan, purpose for amendment and alleges no significant factual matters.
- B. Debtors have some discrepancy in their schedules concerning the amount spent on medical/dental expenses and insurance.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause

appearing,

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

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on May 3, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

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

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that

- A. Debtor failed to appear to the first meeting of creditors.
- B. Debtor is delinquent \$790.00 and has made 0 payments to the plan to date.
- C. Debtor has failed to provide the Trustee with a tax transcript of her Federal Income Tax Return.
- D. Debtor has failed to provide the Trustee with her Employer Payment Advices.
- E. The plan calls for \$23,700.00 in payments, yet proposes to pay 100% of unsecured creditors estimated at \$56,786.00.
- F. Debtor failed to list all prior Chapter 13 filings on the petition.
- G. Petition fails to disclose all other names debtor has had in the past 8

years.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is sustained and the proposed chapter 13 plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*



15. [12-29130](#)-C-13 THADD/ELAINE BLIZZARD  
SDB-4 W. Scott de Bie

MOTION TO VALUE COLLATERAL OF  
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.  
4-25-17 [[55](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 25, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Motion to Value has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<b>The Motion to Value secured claim of Bank of America, N.A., "Creditor," is granted.</b>
--

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 391 Lanfranco Circle, Sacramento, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$389,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. *See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

The first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$583,188.00. Bank of America, N.A.'s second deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$198,435.21. Therefore, the respondent creditor's claim secured by a junior deed of trust is completely under-collateralized. The creditor's secured claim is determined to be in the amount of \$0.00, and therefore no payments shall be made on the secured claim under the terms of any confirmed Plan. *See 11 U.S.C. § 506(a); Zimmer v. PSB Lending Corp. (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1997). The valuation motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted.

The chapter 13 Trustee does not oppose motion.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of Collateral filed by Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) is granted and the claim of Bank of America, N.A., secured by a second deed of trust recorded against the real property commonly known as 391 Lanfranco Circle, Sacramento, California, is determined to be a secured claim in the amount of \$0.00, and the balance of the claim is a general unsecured claim to be paid through the confirmed bankruptcy plan. The value of the Property is \$389,000.00 and is encumbered by senior liens securing claims which exceed the value of the Property.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 8, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Motion to Extend Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Extend the Automatic Stay is granted.**

Debtor seeks to have the provisions of the automatic stay provided by 11 U.S.C. § 362(c) extended beyond thirty days in this case. This is Debtor's second bankruptcy case within the last twelve months. Debtor's first bankruptcy case (No. 15-28553) was filed on November 3, 2015 and dismissed on April 13, 2017, for Debtor's failure to make plan payments. Therefore, pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(2)(A), the provisions of the automatic stay end as to Debtor thirty days after filing.

Upon motion of a party in interest and after notice and hearing, the court may order the provisions extended beyond thirty days if the filing of the subsequent petition was filed in good faith. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B). The subsequently filed case is presumed to be filed in bad faith if Debtor failed to file documents as required by the court without substantial excuse. 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(C)(i)(II)(aa). The presumption of bad faith may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence. *Id.* at § 362(c)(3)(c).

In determining if good faith exists, the court considers the totality of the circumstances. *In re Elliot-Cook*, 357 B.R. 811, 814 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2006); see also Laura B. Bartell, *staying the Serial Filer - Interpreting the New Exploding Stay Provisions of § 362(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code*, 82 Am. Bankr. L.J. 201, 209-210 (2008). Courts consider many factors - including those used to determine good faith under §§ 1307 and 1325(a) - but the two basic issues to determine good faith under 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) are:

1. Why was the previous plan filed?

2. What has changed so that the present plan is likely to succeed?

Elliot-Cook, 357 B.R. at 814-815.

In the debtor's prior case, the state of California cut her IHSS income for four months due to a glitch in the system. This caused her to miss plan payments. The error has been rectified and the debtor is prepared to make payments on this plan.

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a response indicating that it had no basis to oppose the motion.

Debtor has sufficiently rebutted the presumption of bad faith under the facts of this case and the prior case for the court to extend the automatic stay.

The motion is granted and the automatic stay is extended for all purposes, unless terminated by further order of this court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Extend the Automatic  
Stay the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor  
having been presented to the court, and upon  
review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments  
of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted and the automatic stay is extended  
pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(B) for all  
purposes, unless terminated by further order  
of this court.

\*\*\*\*

17. [12-33836](#)-C-13 JIM/CAROL NICOL  
PGM-2 Peter Macaluso

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO NOTICE  
OF MORTGAGE PAYMENT CHANGE  
1-26-17 [[64](#)]

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment Change has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on January 26, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. This requirement was met.

The Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment Change has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

**The court's decision is to overrule the Objection.**

Debtors object to the Notice of Mortgage Payment Change filed by Nationstar Mortgage, LLC. The Notice of Mortgage Payment filed on November 28, 2016 increased the escrow payment on the property after an Escrow Analysis from \$685.21 to \$1,121.72. A different Notice of Mortgage Payment Change, filed on December 30, 2016, adjusted the "current escrow payment" from \$685.21 to \$829.27. Debtor asserts that no basis exists to support either of these alleged increases. Both reference an expense labeled "BORR PAID MI" which shows a "current annual disbursement" that is neither property taxes nor insurance and thus an inappropriate expense. Debtor additionally requests attorney's fees in the amount of \$1,575.00.

**Trustee's Response**

Trustee responds that the expense for "BORR PAID MI" is likely mortgage insurance which is likely required by contract.

**Creditor's Response**

Creditor, Nationstar Mortgage LLC, filed a response to Debtors' objection indicating that the additional expense is indeed mortgage insurance which is required by the underlying contract. Creditor is being treated in the plan in Class 4 and as a result the debtors may not modify the Creditor's claim. The contract provides for the mortgage insurance and the mortgage insurance needs to be paid.

### **Debtors' Reply**

Debtor focuses on the Creditor's assertion that the county taxes are \$4,613.70. Debtors assert that the property taxes were \$2,434.82 and have jumped to \$4,613.70 without any evidence from the Creditor.

### **Creditor's Declaration**

Creditor filed two declarations and two exhibits in support of its opposition on March 20, 2017 one day before the hearing. The declaration of Constantine Pavlakis asserted that after the first Notice of Mortgage Payment Change and the debtors' subsequent objection, the creditor filed an Amended Notice of Mortgage Payment Change showing the new monthly escrow payment to be \$829.27. The creditor additionally filed a Taxbill Detail for Assessment that shows that the anticipated annual tax amount due is \$4,774.02 paid in two installments.

### **Discussion**

The court notes that the increase in taxes is supported by exhibits filed by the creditor on March 20, 2017. Accordingly, the court finds that the annual tax due for 2016 was \$4,613.70 and the anticipated tax due for 2017 is \$4,774.02. Additionally, the true and correct amount of escrow payments is \$829.27. The court told the parties that no telephone appearance would be allowed at the hearing. The debtor objected that there was no basis for the increase in escrow payments. The basis for the escrow payment is in the county taxes, hazard insurance, and mortgage insurance, which totals an anticipated \$9,951.22 for 2017. That translates to a payment of \$829.27 per month.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment  
having been presented to the court, and upon  
review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of  
counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Objection to Notice  
of Mortgage Payment is overruled and the escrow  
payment is determined to be \$829.27 per month.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 4, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented  
to the court, and upon review of the  
pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and  
good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on  
April 17, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for  
the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order  
confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the  
proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for  
approval as to form, and if so approved, the

Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed  
order to the court.

\*\*\*\*



19. [16-22838](#)-C-13 CHARLES/HARU GARRETT  
ALF-1 Ashley Amerio

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF  
BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.  
12-8-16 [[24](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 3007-1 Objection to Claim - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection to Claim and supporting pleadings were served on the Creditor, Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on December 8, 2016. 44 days' notice is required. (Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007(a) 30 day notice and L.B.R. 3007-1(b)(1) 14-day opposition filing requirement.) That requirement is met.

The Objection to Claim has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3007-1(b)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(b)(1)(A) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

**The Objection to Proof of Claim Number 6-1 of Bank of America, N.A. is overruled.**

Debtors request that the court reduce the arrearage portion of Bank of America's claim number 6-1 to \$0 as the debtors are currently paying the arrears outside of the plan. The debtors assert that the original arrears amount of \$1,413.09 has been paid off in the amount of \$1,339.11 leaving just \$73.98 which will be paid off in February 2017.

Bank of America responded to the objection and requests that the court overrule the objection on the basis that it is entitled to its arrears.

The court is mindful that arrears must be paid off and that amending the claim to reflect \$0 in arrears is improper at this time. As a result, the court continued this hearing until April 4, 2017 to see if the arrears have been paid off.

At the April 4, 2017 hearing, the court again continued the matter to

see if arrears have been paid.

Bank of America has filed a notice of payment change that appears to correct the arrears amount down to \$0. As a result, the objection will be overruled as moot in light of the change filed by Bank of America.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Claim of Bank of America, N.A., Creditor filed in this case by the Debtors having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the objection to Proof of Claim Number 6-1 of Bank of America, N.A. is overruled.

\*\*\*\*\*

20. [17-21540](#)-C-13 DANIEL WEISS AND ELENA MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN  
DSW-3 FREIDMAN-WEISS 4-11-17 [[45](#)]  
Daniel Weiss

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 11, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 11, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for

approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

21. [15-23846](#)-C-13 JAMES BARRY  
EJS-1 Eric Schwab

CONTINUED MOTION TO AVOID LIEN  
OF NORTHERN CA COLLECTION  
SERVICE, INC.  
3-28-17 [[24](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 28, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement is met.

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered.

**The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien is denied.**

A judgment was entered against the Debtor in favor of Northern CA Collection Service Inc. for the sum of \$8,625.00. The abstract of judgment was recorded with Shasta County on May 12, 2006. That lien attached to the Debtor's residential real property commonly known as 8561 Oak Terrance Lane, Millville, California.

According to the Debtor's Schedule A, the subject real property has an approximate value of \$205,000.00 as of the date of the petition. The unavoidable consensual liens total \$225,825.00 on that same date according to Debtor's Schedule D. The Debtor claimed an exemption pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 704.730 in the amount of \$1.00 in Schedule C. The respondent holds a judicial lien created by the recordation of an abstract of judgment in the chain of title of the subject real property. After application of the arithmetical formula required by 11 U.S.C. § 522(f)(2)(A), there would be no equity to support the judicial lien. Therefore, using the debtor's valuation, the fixing of this judicial lien would impair the Debtor's exemption of the real property and its fixing would be avoided subject to 11 U.S.C. § 349(b)(1)(B).

The Trustee filed a response alleging that he had searched Zillow.com and

found that the property had been valued at \$430,000.00 on January 1, 2016.

The court continued the hearing to June 6, 2017 to allow the debtor an opportunity to provide further evidence of valuation. Such evidence shall be submitted to the court in the form of a supplementary reply or declaration by May 30, 2017 so as to give the Trustee and court time to review such evidence.

No evidence of valuation has been submitted by the debtor. As a result, the motion to avoid judicial lien is denied.

#### **ISSUANCE OF A MINUTE ORDER**

An order substantially in the following form shall be prepared and issued by the court:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 522(f) filed by the Debtor(s) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion to Avoid Judicial Lien is denied.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Value was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**  
-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 23, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Value was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). The Debtor, 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.

<b>The Motion to Value secured claim of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., "Creditor," is denied.</b>
--

The motion is accompanied by the Debtor's declaration. The Debtor is the owner of the subject real property commonly known as 1110 Bunker Ct., Fairfield, California. The Debtor seeks to value the property at a fair market value of \$1,100,000.00 as of the petition filing date. As the owner, the Debtor's opinion of value is evidence of the asset's value. See Fed. R. Evid. 701; see also *Enewally v. Wash. Mut. Bank (In re Enewally)*, 368 F.3d 1165, 1173 (9th Cir. 2004).

Wells Fargo's first deed of trust secures a loan with a balance of approximately \$1,442,040.62. However, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) states that a plan may "modify the rights of holders of secured claims, other than a claim secured by a security interest in real property that is the debtor's principal residence. . ." The debtor may not bifurcate a mortgage on a primary residence, nor may a debtor strip off a primary mortgage lien on her primary residence if the debt is not wholly unsecured. Courts have held

that wholly unsecured liens on a debtor's primary residence may be "stripped off," however, all courts agree that the plain language of § 1322(b)(2) blocks a debtor from avoiding a lien or bifurcating a claim that arises from a lien secured on the debtor's primary residence where the lien is not wholly unsecured. See *Zimmer v. PBS Lending Corporation (In re Zimmer)*, 313 F.3d 1220 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lam v. Investors Thrift (In re Lam)*, 211 B.R. 36 (9th Cir. BAP 1997).

As a result, the motion will be denied.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of  
Law are stated in the Civil Minutes  
for the hearing.

The Motion for Valuation of  
Collateral filed by Debtor having been  
presented to the court, and upon review of the  
pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and  
good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion to  
Value is denied.

\*\*\*\*\*



Thru #24

\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Objection to Plan was properly set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the Debtor, 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.

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. If there is opposition presented, the court will consider the opposition and whether further hearing is proper pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2)(iii).**

-----

Local Rule 9014-1(f)(2) Motion.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor and Debtor's Attorney on March 1, 2017. Fourteen days' notice is required.

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

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

The Chapter 13 Trustee opposes confirmation of the Plan on the basis that:

- A. Debtor is delinquent \$1,716.00 to date and debtor has paid \$0 into the plan.
- B. Debtor lists \$500.00 monthly assistance from his girlfriend but the debtor has not provided any declaration indicating an intention and ability to pay.
- C. The plan contemplates a lump sum payment in month 6 from the sale of debtor's residence or from proceeds of debtor's personal injury action. The debtor has not clearly identified his interest in the real property.
- D. The continued meeting of creditors is set for April 27, 2017 so the Trustee requests that this be continued to May 16, 2017.

Since the hearing on April 4, 2017, the Trustee has filed a status report indicating that although some of the issues were resolved, there are still issues regarding debtor's ability to make a large lump sum payment 6 months after plan confirmation.

Debtor filed a status report acknowledging the outstanding issues, and stating that the debtor does not oppose denial of confirmation as he will be filing an Amended Plan.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Objection to confirmation of the Plan is sustained and the plan is not confirmed.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm Termination or Absence of Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 14, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm Termination or Absence of Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). The defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

<b>The Motion to Confirm Termination or Absence of Stay is granted with respect to the Debtor and denied with respect to the estate.</b>
--

Golden 1 Credit Union moves for an order of the court confirming termination of the automatic stay pursuant to § 362(c)(3) with respect to the real property commonly known as 1516 Park Blvd., West Sacramento, California.

Prior to the filing of this case, debtor filed case number 16-26647 on October 5, 2016 which was dismissed on January 25, 2017 for failure to make plan payments. Pursuant to § 362(c)(3)(A) the automatic stay expires after 30 days with respect to the debtor.

Movant asserts that the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel has held that after the automatic stay expires pursuant to § 362(c)(3)(A), the automatic stay expires with respect to both the estate and the debtor. *Reswick v. Reswick (In re Reswick)*, 446 B.R. 362 (9th Cir. BAP 2011). As *Reswick* points out, while the minority does take this approach, the majority of

courts agree that the plain language of § 362(c)(3)(A) does not provide for the automatic stay terminating with respect to the estate. *Reswick*, 446 B.R. 366; *Rinard v. Positive Investments, Inc. (In re Rinard)*, 451 B.R. 12 (C.D. California 2011); *Vitalich v. Bank of New York Mellon*, 2016 WL 4205691 (N.D. California 2016).

Debtor has been attempting to pay the arrears to creditor. This does not affect the analysis of the Motion to Confirm Termination of the Automatic Stay. The movant is not moving for relief from the automatic stay under § 362(d). The status of the arrears is not at issue. The stay has been terminated with respect to the debtor pursuant to § 362(c)(3)(A).

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm Termination or Absence of Stay filed by the creditor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion to Confirm Termination or Absence of Stay is granted with respect to the debtor and denied with respect to the estate.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 8, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

- A. Debtors have paid ahead \$274.00 into the plan under the terms of the modified plan.
- B. Debtors' plan fails to include the debtors' tax refunds.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

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

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 11, 2017. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.**

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated  
in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtors having been presented to  
the court, and upon review of the pleadings,  
evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause  
appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtors' Chapter 13 Plan filed on April  
11, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors  
shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the  
Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the  
Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if  
so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the  
proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 24, 2017. 35 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(2), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 3015(g). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Modified Plan is granted.**

11 U.S.C. § 1329 permits a debtor to modify a plan after confirmation. Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Modified Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322, 1325(a), and 1329, and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated  
in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtors having been presented to  
the court, and upon review of the pleadings,  
evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause  
appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtors' Chapter 13 Plan filed on April  
22, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtors  
shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the  
Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the  
Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if  
so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the  
proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*



\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 24, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 24, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 14, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. Debtor is delinquent in plan payments in the amount of \$1,200.00.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

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

\*\*\*\*\*

30. [15-22668](#)-C-13 MONA ANES  
MET-2 Mary Ellen Terranella

MOTION FOR COMPENSATION FOR  
MARY ELLEN TERRANELLA, DEBTOR'S  
ATTORNEY  
5-1-17 [[42](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling: No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.**  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, Committee of Creditors Holding General Unsecured Claims/ or creditors holding the 20 largest unsecured claims, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 1, 2017. 28 days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 *Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion for Allowance of Professional Fees is granted.**

Mary Ellen Terranella, the Attorney for Debtor, ("Applicant") for Mona Anes, ("Client"), makes an Additional Request for the Allowance of Fees and Expenses in this case.

The period for which the fees are requested is for the period September 9, 2016 through November 14, 2016. Applicant requests fees in the amount of \$2,437.50.

#### **STATUTORY BASIS FOR PROFESSIONAL FEES**

Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(3),

In determining the amount of reasonable compensation to be awarded to an examiner, trustee under chapter 11, or professional person, the court shall consider the nature, the extent, and the value of such services, taking into account all relevant factors, including-

(A) the time spent on such services;

(B) the rates charged for such services;

(C) whether the services were necessary to the administration of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of, a case under this title;

(D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task addressed;

(E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and

(F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation charged by comparably skilled practitioners in cases other than cases under this title.

Further, the court shall not allow compensation for,

(I) unnecessary duplication of services; or  
(ii) services that were not--

(I) reasonably likely to benefit the debtor's estate;

(II) necessary to the administration of the case.

11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A). The court may award interim fees for professionals pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 331, which award is subject to final review and allowance pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330.

### **Benefit to the Estate**

Even if the court finds that the services billed by an attorney are "actual," meaning that the fee application reflects time entries properly charged for services, the attorney must still demonstrate that the work performed was necessary and reasonable. *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc. (In re Puget Sound Plywood)*, 924 F.2d 955, 958 (9th Cir. 1991). An attorney must exercise good billing judgment with regard to the services provided as the court's authorization to employ an attorney to work in a bankruptcy case does not give that attorney "free reign [sic] to run up a [professional fees and expenses] without considering the maximum probable [as opposed to possible] recovery." *Id.* at 958. According the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, prior to working on a legal matter, the attorney, or other professional as appropriate, is obligated to consider:

(a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?

(b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?

(c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

*Id.* at 959.

In this District the Local Rules provide consumer counsel in Chapter 13 cases with an election for the allowance of fees in connection with the services required in obtaining confirmation of a plan and the services related thereto through the debtor obtaining a discharge. Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 provides, in pertinent part,

"(a) Compensation. Compensation paid to attorneys for the representation of chapter 13 debtors shall be determined according to Subpart (c) of this Local Bankruptcy Rule, unless a party-in-interest objects or the attorney opts out of Subpart (c). The failure of an attorney to file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys, shall signify that the attorney has opted out of Subpart (c). When there is an objection or when an attorney opts out, compensation shall be determined in accordance with 11 U.S.C. §§ 329 and 330, Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 2016, and 2017, and any other applicable authority."

...

(c) Fixed Fees Approved in Connection with Plan Confirmation. The Court will, as part of the chapter 13 plan confirmation process, approve fees of attorneys representing chapter 13 debtors provided they comply with the requirements to this Subpart.

(1) The maximum fee that may be charged is \$4,000.00 in nonbusiness cases, and \$6,000.00 in business cases.

(2) The attorney for the chapter 13 debtor must file an executed copy of Form EDC 3-096, Rights and Responsibilities of Chapter 13 Debtors and Their Attorneys.

(3) If the fee under this Subpart is not sufficient to fully and fairly compensate counsel for the legal services rendered in the case, the attorney may apply for additional fees. The fee permitted under this Subpart, however, is not a retainer that, once exhausted, automatically justifies a motion for additional fees. Generally, this fee will fairly compensate the debtor's attorney for all preconfirmation services and most postconfirmation services, such as reviewing the notice of filed claims, objecting to untimely claims, and modifying the plan to conform it to the claims filed. Only in instances where substantial and unanticipated post-confirmation work is necessary should counsel request additional compensation. Form EDC 3-095, Application and Declaration RE: Additional Fees and Expenses in Chapter 13 Cases, may be used when seeking additional fees. The necessity for a hearing on the application shall be governed by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(a) (6)."

The Order Confirming the Chapter 13 Plan expressly provides that Applicant is allowed \$3,500.00 in attorneys fees, the maximum set fee amount under Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1 at the time of confirmation. Applicant prepared the order confirming the Plan.

If Applicant believes that there has been substantial and unanticipated legal services which have been provided, then such additional fees may be requested as provided in Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(3). He may file a fee

application and the court will consider the fees to be awarded pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 329, 330, and 331. In the Ninth Circuit, the customary method for determining the reasonableness of a professional's fees is the "lodestar" calculation. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th Cir. 1996), *amended*, 108 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 1997). "The 'lodestar' is calculated by multiplying the number of hours the prevailing party reasonably expended on the litigation by a reasonable hourly rate." *Morales*, 96 F.3d at 363 (citation omitted). "This calculation provides an objective basis on which to make an initial estimate of the value of a lawyer's services." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). A compensation award based on the lodestar is a presumptively reasonable fee. *In re Manoa Fin. Co.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988).

In rare or exceptional instances, if the court determines that the lodestar figure is unreasonably low or high, it may adjust the figure upward or downward based on certain factors. *Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ.*, 827 F.2d 617, 620 n.4 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the court has considerable discretion in determining the reasonableness of professional's fees. *Gates v. Duekmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1398 (9th Cir. 1992). It is appropriate for the court to have this discretion "in view of the [court's] superior understanding of the litigation and the desirability of avoiding frequent appellate review of what essentially are factual matters." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 437.

## **FEES AND COSTS & EXPENSES REQUESTED**

### **Fees and Costs**

Applicant seeks compensation for the following unanticipated work: (1) defend motion to dismiss and (2) file a modified plan. Applicant provides a task billing analysis and supporting evidence for the services provided at the hourly rate of \$325.00/hour.

Total Hours: 7.5 hours in attorney services.

Applicant is allowed, and the Chapter 13 Trustee is authorized to pay, the following amounts as compensation to this professional in this case:

Fees	\$2,437.50
Costs	\$0.00

The Chapter 13 Trustee filed a statement of nonopposition. Dkt 47.

A review of the application shows that the services provided by Applicant related to the estate enforcing rights and obtaining benefits. The court finds the services were beneficial to the Client and bankruptcy estate and reasonable.

The court shall issue an order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion for Allowance of Fees and Expenses filed by Mary Ellen Terranella ("Applicant"), Attorney for the Chapter

13 Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, Mary Ellen Terranella is allowed the fees in the amount of \$2,437.50 as a professional of the Estate.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 31, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented  
to the court, and upon review of the  
pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and  
good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on  
March 31, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for  
the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order  
confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the  
proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for  
approval as to form, and if so approved, the



Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed  
order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 17, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the respondent and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The Motion to Confirm the Amended Plan is granted.**

The court will approve a plan that complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). Debtors have filed evidence in support of confirmation. No opposition to the Motion was filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee or creditors. The Plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a) and is confirmed.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13  
Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented  
to the court, and upon review of the  
pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and  
good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Motion is  
granted, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on  
March 2, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for  
the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order  
confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the  
proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for  
approval as to form, and if so approved, the

Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed  
order to the court.

\*\*\*\*

33. [16-22681](#)-C-13 KRISTINE SCHARER  
HDR-3 Harry Roth

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF ECMC  
SERVICING CORPORATION, CLAIM  
NUMBER 3-1  
4-13-17 [[104](#)]

**\*CONTINUED PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER ENTERED 5/25/17 DCKT. 110 TO JUNE 27, 2017 AT  
2:00 P.M.\***

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 21, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to grant the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. Debtor is delinquent on plan payments.

Debtor filed a series of exhibits intended to prove payment to the Trustee. The court will tentatively grant confirmation of the plan, unless the funds have not been successfully transferred to the Trustee.

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Objection is overruled, Debtor's Chapter 13 Plan filed on April 20, 2017 is confirmed, and counsel for the Debtor shall prepare an appropriate order confirming the Chapter 13 Plan, transmit the proposed order to the Chapter 13 Trustee for approval as to form, and if so approved, the Chapter 13 Trustee will submit the proposed order to the court.

\*\*\*\*\*

35. [16-22388](#)-C-13 PATRICIA HALL  
PBL-2 Pauldeep Bains

OBJECTION TO NOTICE OF  
POSTPETITION MORTGAGE FEES,  
EXPENSES, AND CHARGES  
4-21-17 [[41](#)]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Final Ruling:** No appearance at the June 6, 2017 hearing is required.  
-----

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

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Objection and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, respondent creditor, and Office of the United States Trustee on April 21, 2017. Twenty-eight days' notice is required.

The Objection to Notice of Postpetition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and Charges has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *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 Law Offices of David A. Boone v. Derham-Burk (In re Eliapo)*, 468 F.3d 592, 602 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the non-responding parties and other parties in interest are entered. Upon review of the record there are no disputed material factual issues and the matter will be resolved without oral argument. The court will issue its ruling from the parties' pleadings.

**The court's decision is to sustain the Objection.**

Debtor objects to a Notice of Post-Petition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and Charges filed by Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. on August 2, 2016. The claim included fees and was to be used in accordance with FRBP 3002.1 which applies to claims that are provided for under § 1322(b)(5). Debtor is not curing a delinquency through the Chapter 13 plan as she was current upon the filing of the case. Therefore, the notice does not apply. Debtor filed an Objection to Claim of Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company, Inc. for mortgage arrears which was sustained by the court.

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are  
stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.

The Objection to Notice of Mortgage Payment  
having been presented to the court, and upon  
review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of  
counsel, and good cause appearing,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the Objection to Notice  
of Postpetition Mortgage Fees, Expenses, and  
Charges is sustained.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tentative Ruling:** The Motion to Confirm the Plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(1), 9014-1(f)(1), and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(b). The failure of the respondent and other parties 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 to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

Oral argument may be presented by the parties at the scheduled hearing, where the parties shall address the issues identified in this tentative ruling and such other issues as are necessary and appropriate to the court's resolution of the matter.

**Below is the court's tentative ruling.**

-----  
Local Rule 9014-1(f)(1) Motion - Hearing Required.

Correct Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Chapter 13 Trustee, all creditors, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on March 19, 2017. Forty-two days' notice is required. That requirement was met.

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

**The court's decision is to deny the Motion to Confirm the Plan.**

The Trustee opposes confirmation on the basis that:

A. Plan will exceed 60 months as the plan does not appear to provide for Solano DCSS which filed a priority claim in the amount of \$20,683.29.

B. Debtor appears to be delinquent in post petition payments to the State Board of Equalization and it does not appear that debtor can make the payments required.

The court continued the hearing in order to allow the debtor time to make the necessary changes and payments. The court does not have evidence that the plan currently complies with §§ 1322 and 1325(a).

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

The court shall issue a minute order substantially in the following form holding that:

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law are stated in the Civil Minutes for the hearing.



The Motion to Confirm the Chapter 13 Plan filed by the Debtor having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

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

\*\*\*\*\*