

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California**

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
Robert T. Matsui U.S. Courthouse
501 I Street, Sixth Floor
Sacramento, California

PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS COVER SHEET

DAY: TUESDAY

DATE: June 30, 2026

CALENDAR: 1:00 P.M. CHAPTER 13

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

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

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

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

Orders: Unless the court specifies in the tentative or final ruling that it will issue an order, the prevailing party shall lodge an order within seven (7) days of the final hearing on the matter.

=/

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
Eastern District of California

Honorable Christopher D. Jaime
Chief Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

June 30, 2026 at 1:00 p.m.

1.	<u>23-22000</u> -B-13 JEFFERSON/KRISTINE <u>DPC</u> -3 AGUIRRE Thomas L. Amberg	MOTION TO DISMISS CASE 4-29-26 [<u>73</u>]
----	---	---

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss case.

The Chapter 13 Trustee moves to dismiss case on grounds that Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$14,487.00 with as additional payment of \$3,628.00 due prior to the hearing. This is an unreasonable delay that is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Debtor filed a response stating that she has filed an amended plan and amended Schedule I and J. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan was scheduled for June 16, 2026 and was granted by the court. This resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

2. [24-21500](#)-B-13 NATASHA JACKSON MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
 [LGT](#)-2 Jennifer B. Reichhoff 5-5-26 [[162](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to denied without prejudice the motion to dismiss case.

The Chapter 13 Trustee moves to dismiss case on grounds that Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$21,108.41 with two additional payments of \$5,197.31 coming due prior to the hearing.

Debtor filed a response stating that she has filed an amended plan and amended Schedule I and J. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for August 11, 2026. This resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED without prejudice for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

3. [25-26500](#)-B-13 MAURO ESQUIBEL BAHENA MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[DPC](#)-2 Mohammad M. Mokarram 5-19-26 [[40](#)]

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a notice of withdrawal of its motion, the motion is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041. The matter is removed from the calendar.

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee ("Trustee") moves to dismiss this case on the basis Debtors Gordon and Heidi Allen ("Debtors") are delinquent \$5,400.00 in plan payments in month 63 of their 60-month plan. The motion to dismiss is supported by evidence of the delinquency.

Debtors filed an opposition in which they assert they have made all plan payments or, alternatively, request an evidentiary hearing to determine the amount of plan payments they have not made and/or any delinquency.

The court has reviewed and considered the motion, opposition, and all related documents. The court has also reviewed and considered the docket in this case. See Fed. R. Evid. 201(c)(1). Oral argument is not necessary and will not assist in the decision-making process. See Local Bankr. R. 1001-1(f), 9014-1(h).

The problem here is that the opposition is not supported by any evidence- none at all. It consists only - and entirely - of counsel's statements in the opposition which are not evidence and have no evidentiary value. *Singh v. INS*, 213 F.3d 1050, 1054 n.8 (9th Cir. 2000). So not only have the Debtors failed to refute the Trustee's evidence of delinquency - as to both existence and amount - they have altogether failed to raise a disputed factual issue making an evidentiary hearing unnecessary. *In re Henderson International Land, LLC*, 2024 WL 4046016, *8 (Bankr. D. Nev. Sept. 4, 2024) ("An evidentiary hearing is appropriate if the bankruptcy court cannot readily determine from the record any disputed and material factual issues, but where ... the core facts are not disputed, the bankruptcy court is authorized to determine contested matters ... on the pleadings and arguments of the parties, drawing necessary inferences from the record.") (cleaned up).

Nevertheless, the Debtors shall have until July 14, 2026, to pay the remaining delinquency identified by the Trustee. If payment is not timely received by the Trustee, the Trustee may submit an ex parte application to dismiss-and an order dismissing-this case.

The motion to dismiss is CONDITIONALLY GRANTED for the reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

5. [24-22307](#)-B-13 JESSICA/JOHN BILLECCI MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[DPC](#)-1 Seth L. Hanson 5-14-26 [[26](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to **conditionally grant the motion to dismiss and continue to July 7, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.**

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

Movant seeks dismissal of the case on the basis that Debtor is \$2,950.00 delinquent in plan payments, with two additional payments of \$1,475.00. Failure to make plan payments is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

The debtors have filed opposition stating that there was an error with their autopay set up and that they will cure the delinquency by June 24, 2026. This does not remedy the cause for dismissal as the delinquency still exists.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. However, the Debtors will be provided an opportunity to cure their default. Either all outstanding issues must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Chapter 13 Trustee by July 3, 2026, or this case may be dismissed on the Trustee's ex parte application.

The motion is ORDERED CONDITIONALLY GRANTED and continued to July 7, 2026 at 1:00 p.m., for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

6. [25-24809](#)-B-13 JOHN SARHADI MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[LGT](#)-3 Pauldeep Bains 5-14-26 [[57](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on April 7, 2026. A review of the docket shows that Debtor has not yet filed a new plan or a motion to confirm a plan. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

7. [25-20312](#)-B-13 RAOUL ALEXIS MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[DPC](#)-1 Teresa T.H. Hung-Nguyen 5-19-26 [[55](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss case.

Debtor has failed to commence making payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4). Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$5,138.06 with two additional monthly plan payments of \$3,836.09 that will come due prior to the hearing.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

8. [25-26415](#)-B-13 NORNETTA PHILLIPS
[DPC](#)-2 Pro Se

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
6-1-26 [[53](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss case.

Debtor has failed to commence making payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4). Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$3,727.05 with an additional monthly plan payment of \$745.41 that will come due prior to the hearing.

Additionally, Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on April 28, 2026. A review of the docket shows that Debtor has not yet filed a new plan or a motion to confirm a plan. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

9. [22-21817](#)-B-13 GARY SPARKS MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
 [DPC](#)-9 Mary Ellen Terranella 5-14-26 [[162](#)]
DEBTOR DISMISSED: 12/18/25

Final Ruling

The case having previously been dismissed, the motion is dismissed as moot.

The motion is ORDERED DISMISSED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

10. [26-21118](#)-B-13 IRENE SILVA-PREJEAN AND MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[LGT](#)-2 ROOSEVELT PREJEAN 5-14-26 [[27](#)]
Pro Se
DEBTORS DISMISSED: 05/27/26

Final Ruling

The case having previously been dismissed, the motion is dismissed as moot.

The motion is ORDERED DISMISSED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

11. [26-20419](#)-B-13 ADAM JACOBS
[LGT](#)-2 Pro Se
DEBTOR DISMISSED: 06/04/26

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-14-26 [[79](#)]

Final Ruling

The case having previously been dismissed, the motion is dismissed as moot.

The motion is ORDERED DISMISSED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

12. [25-25920](#)-B-13 JAIME/RHONDA MCPHEE
[LGT](#)-2 David Foyil

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-22-26 [[77](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss case.

The Chapter 13 Trustee moves to dismiss case on grounds that Debtor is delinquent \$1,050.00 with an additional two payments of \$1,050.00 due prior to the hearing. This is an unreasonable delay that is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Debtors filed a response stating that they made several payments and as of June 17, 2026, debtors state they are current.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied without prejudice and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

13. [25-25325](#)-B-13 JUAN ALVAREZ
[LGT](#)-2 Pro Se

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
4-2-26 [[122](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss case.

Debtor has failed to commence making payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4). Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$2,740.00 with two additional monthly plan payments of \$1,370.00 that will come due prior to the hearing.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

14. [25-26934](#)-B-13 JOSE LOPEZ
[LGT](#)-2 David C. Johnston

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-28-26 [[30](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on March 12, 2026. A review of the docket shows that Debtor has not yet filed a new plan or a motion to confirm a plan. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

15. [26-20637](#)-B-13 RAHINA BUKSH
[LGT](#)-2 Eric John Schwab

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-1-26 [[30](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss case.

The Chapter 13 Trustee moves to dismiss case on grounds that Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$4,420.00 with an additional two payments of \$2,210.00 due prior to the hearing. This is an unreasonable delay that is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Debtor states that they will be current by June 30, 2026. The Trustee's office has confirmed delinquency has been cured.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED without prejudice for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

16. [25-24738](#)-B-13 JUAN PEREZ
[LGT](#)-3 Peter G. Macaluso

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
6-1-26 [[73](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss case.

Debtor has failed to commence making payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4). Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$8,220.00 with an additional monthly plan payment of \$4,110.00 that will come due prior to the hearing.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

17. [26-21438](#)-B-13 DONALD/ALLISON HAMPTON MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[LGT](#)-2 Peter G. Macaluso 5-27-26 [[19](#)]

Final Ruling

The case having been voluntarily converted to one under chapter 7 on June 24, 2026, the motion to dismiss case is denied as moot.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

18. [26-21546](#)-B-13 LUIS/CHRISTINA FIALLOS
[LeGT](#)-1 Colby D. LaVelle

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
5-8-26 [[16](#)]

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. See Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). No written reply has been filed to the objection.

Because the plan is not confirmable and the objection is not one that may be resolved in the confirmation order, further briefing is not necessary. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(2)(C). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the objection. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers. No appearance at the hearing is necessary.

The court's decision is to sustain the objection and deny confirmation of the plan.

First, the debtor has failed to propose a plan that will provide for the full amount of priority claims as filed with the court. Debtors' proposed plan provided \$6,257.04 towards priority claims; however, a proof of claim filed by the Internal Revenue Service states that Debtors owe \$26,219.83 in priority debt. As such, the plan is not feasible and should be denied. 11 U.S.C. §1322(a).

Second, Debtors have failed to scheduled all debts required to be scheduled pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 521(a). The trustee has received a proof of claim from the Franchise Tax Board in the amount of \$2,546.08. Debtors' plan and Schedule E/F fail to list this debt. The trustee requests amended schedules that properly reflect the debtors' debts.

Third, the Debtors stated at the section 341 Meeting of Creditors that they have not filed all required tax returns for all taxable period prior to the petition filing date. Mrs. Fiallos stated she did not file tax returns for 2021 and 2025. Mr. Fiallos stated that he did not file tax returns for 2022 and 2023. The court notes that there is an additional year that the trustee lists, but due to a typo the court cannot determine which year it is. Regardless, the Debtor has not complied with 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A)(i).

Fourth, the trustee has requested the following documentation from the debtors: 1) verification of insurance for 2023 Nissan Rouge and 2018 Dodge Grand Caravan, as listed in Schedule A/B; and 2) amended Schedule I to remove domestic support obligations payroll deduction of \$27.23, per debtor's testimony he no longer pays domestic support.

Fifth, the trustee requests the proper Disclosure of Compensation of Attorney form be filed. The current form filed does not match the standardized form provided on the Eastern District of California court's website.

Last, Schedule I indicates that the Debtor has \$105.33 withheld monthly for repayment of a retirement loan. Trustee requests documentation and verification of the Debtor's retirement loan, including the latest statement.

As such, the objection to confirmation will be sustained.

The plan filed March 20, 2026, does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the plan is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

19. [25-26648](#)-B-13 RAMON RAMIREZ
[LGT](#)-2 Jessica A. Dorn

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-14-26 [[34](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss.

Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on March 19, 2026. This is an unreasonable delay that is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Debtor has filed opposition stating that he will have an amended plan filed by the hearing date. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for August 4, 2026. This resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED without prejudice for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to conditionally deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss.

The Chapter 13 Trustee has moved to dismiss the case because Debtor has failed to commence making payments under 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(4). Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$1,382.01 with two additional monthly plan payments of \$693.00 that will come due prior to the hearing.

Debtor has filed opposition admitting the delinquency and states that they expect to be current by the hearing. However, debtor asks if they are not current by the hearing that a short continuance to July 10, 2026, be granted to allow her to become current. Debtor is in the 53 month of her 60 month plan.

Provided that the delinquency is cured or an amended plan is filed, set and served by 5:00 p.m. on July 10, 2026, the motion to dismiss case will be denied. If Debtor fails to cure the delinquency or file, set, and serve an amended plan, the motion to dismiss case will be granted upon an ex parte application to dismiss-and an order dismissing-this case by the trustee.

The motion is conditionally denied.

The motion is ORDERED CONDITIONALLY DENIED without prejudice for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

21. [26-21355](#)-B-13 NERY LIMON
[SKI](#)-1 David C. Johnston

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY
AMERICREDIT FINANCIAL SERVICES,
INC.
4-29-26 [[22](#)]

Final Ruling

CONTINUED TO 7/28/26 AT 1:00 P.M. TO BE HEARD AFTER THE CONTINUED MEETING OF CREDITORS
SET FOR 7/16/26.

22. [26-22864](#)-B-13 PAUL RUMANO
Pro Se

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE - FAILURE
TO PAY FEES
6-2-26 [[15](#)]

DEBTOR DISMISSED: 06/08/26

Final Ruling

The case having previously been dismissed, the motion is dismissed as moot.

The motion is ORDERED DISMISSED AS MOOT for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

THE MESA LAGUNA RIDGE, LP
VS.

Final Ruling

The Mesa Laguna Ridge, LP ("Lessor") moves for relief from the automatic stay of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) to commence and/or continue state court unlawful detainer proceedings to recover possession of - and to remove Debtor Amari Davidson ("Debtor") from - real property located at 10371 Bruceville Road, Unit 224, Elk Grove, California ("Property"). Debtor filed an opposition.

The court has reviewed the motion, opposition, and all related documents. The court has also reviewed and takes judicial notice of the dockets in this Chapter 13 case and in the Debtor's prior Chapter 7 case, No. 25-27067. See Fed. R. Evid. 201(c)(1). Oral argument is not necessary and will not assist with the decision-making process. See Local Bankr. R. 1001-1(f), 9014-1(h).

The court's decision is to grant the motion, terminate the automatic stay, and allow Lessor to commence and/or continue with state court unlawful detainer proceedings.

On May 1, 2024, Debtor entered into a one-year residential lease agreement ("Lease") with Lessor to rent the Property with monthly payments of \$2,580.00. There is no evidence the Lease was extended in writing beyond its original one year term so it expired by its own terms on April 30, 2025. See Docket 24, Ex. A at ¶ 3. Tenancy thereafter became - and by all accounts remains - a month-to-month tenancy. Id.

When the Debtor apparently failed to pay rent, on October 6, 2025, Lessor served the Debtor with a three-day notice to pay rent or quit/surrender (the "Notice"). Payment required by the Notice was not made so, on October 22, 2025, Lessor filed an unlawful detainer action against the Debtor in the Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, case number 25UD005921 (the "UD Action"). The Debtor filed an answer in the UD Action on November 13, 2025.

The Debtor filed the prior Chapter 7 case on December 16, 2025, causing the UD Action to be stayed. The Debtor received a Chapter 7 discharge on March 30, 2026, and the Chapter 7 case was closed on April 3, 2026. The Debtor filed this Chapter 13 case five days later, on April 8, 2026.

Having terminated on April 30, 2025, the Lease terminated by its own terms before this Chapter 13 case was filed on April 8, 2026, and before the Chapter 7 case was filed on December 16, 2025. There is therefore no longer a Lease the Debtor can assume and no tenancy other than month-to-month. Coupled with the Debtor's nonpayment of rent (and complete failure to contact Lessor since this case was filed, dkt., 37 at 2:19-20), these circumstances provide sufficient cause for the court to terminate the automatic stay under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) so that Lessor may take any and all action necessary to recover possession of - and remove the Debtor from - the Property through state court unlawful detainer proceedings.¹ *In re Acorn Investments*, 8 B.R. 506, 510 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1981) (finding cause to lift the automatic stay where the lease had been terminated pre-petition); *Matter of Escondido W. Travelodge*, 52 B.R. 376, 378 (S.D. Cal. 1985) (holding that there was sufficient cause to lift the automatic stay where a lease had been terminated pre-petition).

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for the reason stated in the minutes.

The court will prepare an order.

¹To the extent the UD Action is based on the nonpayment of rent that appears to have been discharged in the Chapter 7 case, Lessor may want to consider dismissing the UD Action and beginning anew. See 11 U.S.C. § 524(a).

24. [26-20775](#)-B-13 NICHOLAS/CHRISTINA BILYEU MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
[LGT](#)-2 Candace Y. Brooks 5-4-26 [[20](#)]

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to deny the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

First, Movant seeks dismissal of the case on the basis that Debtor is \$8,000.00 delinquent in plan payments, with two additional payments of \$8,000.00 coming due prior to the hearing. Failure to make plan payments is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Second, the movant states that debtor must file amended Schedules A, B, D and an Amended Statement of Financial Affairs.

Debtor has responded by stating they have filed a motion to confirm an amended plan and have filed all amended schedules and statements requested by the trustee. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for August 4, 2026. This along with the amended schedules resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

25. [25-27077](#)-B-13 KRISTOPHER COOPER
[LGT](#)-1 David C. Johnston

CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS
CASE
3-9-26 [[21](#)]

Final Ruling

The hearing on the Chapter 13 Trustee's ("Trustee") motion to dismiss was continued from May 26, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. to June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. to provide Debtor Kristopher Cooper ("Debtor") with an opportunity to become current with all required payments and resolve all unresolved issues with the Trustee.

The Debtor was ordered to file a status report by June 23, 2026. No status report was filed.

The Chapter 13 Trustee's motion to dismiss is CONDITIONALLY GRANTED. By July 14, 2026, the Trustee shall either:

(1) file a notice of withdrawal of the motion to dismiss if the Debtor is current with all required payments and all unresolved issues have been resolved; or

(2) submit an ex parte application for dismissal and upload an order dismissing this case.

The court will prepare an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss.

Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on March 10, 2026. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Debtor has filed opposition stating that he will have an amended plan filed by the hearing date. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for August 11, 2026. This resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED without prejudice for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

First, Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on April 9, 2026. A review of the docket shows that Debtor has not yet filed a new plan or a motion to confirm a plan. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Second, Movant seeks dismissal of the case on the basis that Debtor is \$5,350.00 delinquent in plan payments, with two additional payments of \$2,675.00 coming due prior to the hearing. Failure to make plan payments is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Last, Debtor has not provided the Chapter 13 Trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition as required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv). The debtor has failed to provide the trustee with pay advices for income received for In Home Supportive Services. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

First, Movant states that Debtor did not appear at the Meeting of Creditors held pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 341. Attendance is mandatory. 11 U.S.C. § 343. Failure to appear at the Meeting of Creditors is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors and cause to dismiss the case. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1).

Second, Movant argues that Debtor did not commence making plan payments and is \$408.00 delinquent in plan payments, with an additional monthly payment of \$408.00 coming due prior to the hearing. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(4) permits the dismissal or conversion of the case for failure to commence plan payments. Debtor presented no opposition to the defaults asserted by Movant.

Third, Debtor has not provided the Chapter 13 Trustee with employer payment advices for the 60-day period preceding the filing of the petition as required by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1)(B)(iv). Also, the Movant argues that the Debtor did not provide to the Chapter 13 trustee either a tax transcript or a federal income tax return with attachments for the most recent pre-petition tax year for which a return was required. See 11 U.S.C. § 521(e)(2)(A); Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4002(b)(3). This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. § 1307(c)(1). In addition, the debtor has not provided the trustee with a copy of an original valid picture ID, proof of debtors social security number, or the domestic support obligation checklist.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Opposition was filed.

The court has determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the motion. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers.

The court's decision is to deny without prejudice the motion to dismiss case.

The Chapter 13 Trustee moves to dismiss case on grounds that Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$1,108.36 with two additional monthly plan payments of \$2,218.00 prior to the hearing. Trustee also argued that an amended plan has not been filed, set, and served since the first plan was denied.

Debtor filed a response stating that he has filed an amended plan and amended Schedule I and J. A review of the court's docket shows that the confirmation hearing for the amended plan is scheduled for July 7, 2026. This resolves the motion to dismiss case at this time.

Cause does not exist to dismiss this case. The motion is denied and the case is not dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

30. [26-20092](#)-B-13 STANLEY/JANELLE ORR
[LGT](#)-3 Douglas B. Jacobs
WITHDRAWN BY M.P.

MOTION TO DISMISS CASE
5-13-26 [[44](#)]

Final Ruling

The Chapter 13 Trustee having filed a notice of withdrawal of its motion, the motion is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041. The matter is removed from the calendar.

Final Ruling

The motion has been set for hearing on 28-days notice. 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)(B) is considered to be the equivalent of a statement of nonopposition. *Cf. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). No opposition was filed. The matter will be resolved without oral argument. No appearance at the hearing is required.

The court's decision is to grant the motion to dismiss.

This motion has been filed by the Chapter 13 Trustee ("Movant"). Movant asserts that the case should be dismissed based on the following grounds.

First, Movant argues that Debtor did not file a Plan or a Motion to Confirm a Plan following the court's denial of confirmation to Debtor's prior plan on April 23, 2026. A review of the docket shows that Debtor has not yet filed a new plan or a motion to confirm a plan. Debtor offers no explanation for the delay in setting the Plan for confirmation. This is unreasonable delay which is prejudicial to creditors. 11 U.S.C. §1307(c)(1).

Second, the movant states that Debtor has failed to accurately file Schedules A/B and D. Amended schedules must be filed to allow the trustee to determine feasibility. Additionally, the debtor's Official Form 122C-1 also needs to be amended to properly account for debtors income.

Cause exists to dismiss this case. The motion is granted and the case is dismissed.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

32. [23-20704](#)-B-13 PEGGY/JOHNNY BOYNTON
[MKM](#)-1 Michael K. Moore

CONTINUED MOTION TO WAIVE
SECTION 1328 CERTIFICATE
REQUIREMENT, CONTINUE CASE
ADMINISTRATION, SUBSTITUTE
PARTY, AS TO JOINT DEBTOR
6-6-26 [[46](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 50, granting the motion, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The objection is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 50.

The court will issue an order.

33. [25-26509](#)-B-13 RICARDO MENDEZ
[MRL](#)-1 Candace Y. Brooks

CONTINUED MOTION FOR
COMPENSATION BY THE LAW OFFICE
OF LIVIAKIS LAW FIRM FOR
CANDACE Y. BROOKS, DEBTORS
ATTORNEY(S)
5-12-26 [[16](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow counsel to file supplemental documentation for compensation by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Applicant has filed a declaration and exhibits supplementing the motion for compensation. This is a first interim request for the allowance of \$4,000.00 in fees and \$400.00 in expenses. The period for which the fees are requested is for October 9, 2025 through June 24, 2026.

Section 330(a) of the Bankruptcy Code authorizes "reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services" rendered by a trustee, examiner or professional person employed under § 327 or § 1103 and "reimbursement for actual, necessary expenses." 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1). Reasonable compensation is determined by considering all relevant factors. See *id.* § 330(a)(3).

Here, Applicant's services in the relevant period included: (1) legal advice and rendering legal services to debtor, (2) drafting and filing the chapter 13 plan, and (3) reviewing debtors financial information and schedules. Dkt. 29. The court finds that the compensation sought is reasonable, actual, and necessary, and the court will approve the motion.

The \$4,000.00 has been received by the applicant from debtor's legal insurance company "Met Life" with no attorney's fees to be paid by the debtor through the chapter 13 plan. The firm seeks approval of the payment from a third party for the services provided to the debtor in this case pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 2016-1(c)(1)(A)(ii). The court will approve of the third party payment of the attorney's fees in this case. The applicant is allowed fees in the amount of \$4,000.00 from MetLife and \$400.00 in expenses as received from the debtor to file the case.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for fees of \$4,000.00 and costs and expenses of \$400.00.

The court will issue an order.

34. [26-21914](#)-B-13 RAZEL RAVELO
[LGT](#)-1 Peter G. Macaluso

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
5-21-26 [[25](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 34, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 34.

The court will issue an order.

35. [26-22020](#)-B-13 CHRISTOPHER BURIEL-TORREZ CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
[LGT](#)-1 AND KLARISSA CRUZ CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
Gregory J. Smith G TSANG
5-22-26 [[14](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 35, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 35.

The court will issue an order.

36. [26-22042](#)-B-13 AARON BETTINGER
[LGT](#)-1 Mikalah Liviakis

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
5-26-26 [[12](#)]

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 15, sustaining the objection, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 15.

The court will issue an order.

37. [26-21970](#)-B-13 AMARI DAVISON
[LGT](#)-1 Pro Se
See Also #23

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
5-22-26 [[30](#)]

Final Ruling

The objection was properly filed at least 14 days prior to the hearing on the motion to confirm a plan. See Local Bankr. R. 3015-1(c)(4) & (d)(1) and 9014-1(f)(2). Parties in interest may, at least 7 days prior to the date of the hearing, serve and file with the court a written reply to any written opposition. Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(1)(C). No written reply has been filed to the objection.

Because the plan is not confirmable and the objection is not one that may be resolved in the confirmation order, further briefing is not necessary. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(f)(2)(C). The court has also determined that oral argument will not assist in the decision-making process or resolution of the objection. See Local Bankr. R. 9014-1(h), 1001-1(f). This matter will therefore be decided on the papers. No appearance at the hearing is necessary.

The court's decision is to SUSTAIN the objection and deny confirmation of the plan.

First, the Debtor has failed to provide evidence that the plan is mathematically feasible. The plan provides a monthly payment of \$250.00 over 36 months. The current plan payment proposal causes the plan to take 51 months to fund. Based on the claims that have been filed to date, the Debtor's monthly plan payment will need to be at least \$354.49 in order for the plan to be feasible as proposed. 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Second, the Debtor is delinquent in the amount of \$250.00. An additional two payments of \$250.00 will be due by the date of the hearing on this matter. The Debtor does not appear to be able to make plan payments proposed and has not carried the burden of showing that the plan complies with 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(6).

Third, Debtor has failed to sign the petition, Declaration About an Individual Debtor's Schedules, and the Statement of Financial Affairs.

The plan filed April 22, 2026, does not comply with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322 and 1325(a). The objection is sustained and the plan is not confirmed.

The objection is ORDERED SUSTAINED for reasons stated in the minutes.

The court will issue an order.

38. [26-21888](#)-B-13 WILLIAM GANAWAY
[LGT](#)-1 Pro Se
See Also #28

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY LILIAN
G. TSANG
5-21-26 [[16](#)]

Final Ruling

CONTINUED TO 7/28/26 AT 1:00 P.M. TO BE HEARD AFTER THE CONTINUED MEETING OF CREDITORS
SET FOR 7/16/26.

The court will issue an order.

39. [21-90496](#)-B-13 SUZANNE NIETO
[NAR](#)-1 Natali A. Ron

CONTINUED MOTION TO SET ASIDE
DISMISSAL OF CASE
5-29-26 [[86](#)]

DEBTOR DISMISSED: 05/14/26

Final Ruling

This matter was continued from June 23, 2026, to allow any party in interest to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 26, 2026. Nothing was filed. Therefore, the court's conditional ruling at dkt. 96, granting the motion, shall become the court's final decision. The continued hearing on June 30, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. is vacated.

The motion is ORDERED GRANTED for reasons stated in the minutes at dkt. 96.

The court will issue an order.