

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Ronald H. Sargis

Chief Bankruptcy Judge

Sacramento, California

July 2, 2019 at 1:30 p.m.

1. [19-23340](#)-E-13 **ANTOINE FEHER**
Pro Se

STATUS CONFERENCE RE:
VOLUNTARY PETITION
5-24-19 [1]

The Status Conference is XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

The Debtor in this case has repeatedly filed multiple requests for extensions of time to file the Schedules, Statement of Financial Affairs, and other basic documents necessary to prosecute this case. The Debtor has been faxing the requests for extensions of time to the U.S. Trustee and has not been filing them with the court.

At the Status Conference XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**PROVIDENT FUNDING
ASSOCIATES, LP VS.**

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 2, 2019 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor’s Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on May 29, 2019. By the court’s calculation, 35 days’ notice was provided. 28 days’ notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen 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) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party’s failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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 for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.

Provident Funding Associates, L.P. (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Thomas James Ivers’s (“Debtor”) real property commonly known as 8610 Pershing Avenue, Fair Oaks, California (“Property”). Movant has provided the Declaration of Patricia Kha to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property.

The Patricia Kha Declaration states that there are four post-petition defaults in the payments on the obligation secured by the Property, with a total of \$7,218.16 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration ¶ 8, Dckt. 68.

TRUSTEE’S RESPONSE

The chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick (“Trustee”) filed a Response on June 17, 2019 indicating nonopposition. Dckt. 77.

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the total debt secured by this property is determined to be \$422,217.67 (including \$225,823.94 secured by Movant's first deed of trust), as reflected on Schedule D and the Proofs of Claim filed in this case. The value of the Property is determined to be \$608,000.00, as stated in Schedules A and D.

Trustee filed a Response indicating non-opposition to the Motion. Debtor has not filed any opposition or response.

Whether there is cause under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1) to grant relief from the automatic stay is a matter within the discretion of a bankruptcy court and is decided on a case-by-case basis. *See J E Livestock, Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (In re J E Livestock, Inc.)*, 375 B.R. 892 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2007) (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. 137, 140 (B.A.P. 10th Cir. 2003)) (explaining that granting relief is determined on a case-by-case basis because "cause" is not further defined in the Bankruptcy Code); *In re Silverling*, 179 B.R. 909 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 1995), *aff'd sub nom. Silverling v. United States (In re Silverling)*, No. CIV. S-95-470 WBS, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4332 (E.D. Cal. 1996). While granting relief for cause includes a lack of adequate protection, there are other grounds. *See In re J E Livestock, Inc.*, 375 B.R. at 897 (quoting *In re Busch*, 294 B.R. at 140). The court maintains the right to grant relief from stay for cause when a debtor has not been diligent in carrying out his or her duties in the bankruptcy case, has not made required payments, or is using bankruptcy as a means to delay payment or foreclosure. *W. Equities, Inc. v. Harlan (In re Harlan)*, 783 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986); *Ellis v. Parr (In re Ellis)*, 60 B.R. 432 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1985). The court determines that cause exists for terminating the automatic stay, including defaults in post-petition payments that have come due. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1); *In re Ellis*, 60 B.R. 432.

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Movant, and its agents, representatives and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Property, to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, at the nonjudicial foreclosure sale to obtain possession of the Property.

Request for Attorneys' Fees

In the Motion, almost as if an afterthought, Movant requests that it be allowed attorneys' fees. The Motion does not allege any contractual or statutory grounds for such fees. No dollar amount is requested for such fees. No evidence is provided of Movant having incurred any attorneys' fees or having any obligation to pay attorneys' fees. Based on the pleadings, the court would either: (1) have to award attorneys' fees based on grounds made out of whole cloth, or (2) research all of the documents and California statutes and draft for Movant grounds for attorneys' fees, and then make up a number for the amount of such fees out of whole cloth. The court is not inclined to do either.

If grounds had been shown and evidence provided, the court could have easily made such determination and granted fees (assuming there is a contractual or statutory basis). If an amount of such fees had been included in the motion and prayer, the court and all parties in interest would fairly have been put on notice of the upper limit of such amounts, and the court could have taken the non-opposition and non-response as defaults.

While the court could consider the award of attorneys' fees as a post-judgment motion (Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54 and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 7054, 9014), the otherwise unnecessary cost and expense of Movant having to file a motion for an award of attorneys' fees for the unopposed Motion in which it made reference to wanting attorneys' fees would well exceed any attorneys' fees that the court would award for a motion such as this. Movant's strategic decision not to provide the court with grounds for and evidence of attorneys' fees has rendered it useless to proceed with a post-judgment motion that would cost more in unawarded (as in unnecessary and unreasonable fees) attorneys' fees.

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests, for no particular reason, that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court. With no grounds for such relief specified, the court will not grant additional relief merely stated in the prayer.

Movant has not pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is not granted.

Request for Prospective Injunctive Relief

Movant makes an **additional request stated in the prayer**, for which no grounds are clearly stated in the Motion. Movant's further relief requested in the prayer is that this court make this order, **as opposed to every other order issued by the court**, binding and effective despite any conversion of this case to another chapter of the Code. Though stated in the prayer, no grounds are stated in the Motion for grounds for such relief from the stay. The Motion presumes that conversion of the bankruptcy case will be reimposed if this case were converted to one under another Chapter.

As stated above, Movant's Motion does not state any grounds for such relief. Movant does not allege that notwithstanding an order granting relief from the automatic stay, a stealth stay continues in existence, waiting to spring to life and render prior orders of this court granting relief from the stay invalid and rendering all acts taken by parties in reliance on that order void.

No points and authorities is provided in support of the Motion. This is not unusual for a relatively simple (in a legal authorities sense) motion for relief from stay as the one before the court. Other than referencing the court to the legal basis (11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(3) or (4)) and then pleading adequate grounds thereunder, it is not necessary for a movant to provide a copy of the statute quotations from well known cases. However, if a movant is seeking relief from a possible future stay, which may arise upon conversion, the legal points and authorities for such heretofore unknown nascent stay is necessary.

As noted by another bankruptcy judge, such request (unsupported by any grounds or legal authority) for relief of a future stay in the same bankruptcy case:

[A] request for an order stating that the court's termination of the automatic stay will be binding despite conversion of the case to another chapter unless a specific

exception is provided by the Bankruptcy Code is a common, albeit silly, request in a stay relief motion and does not require an adversary proceeding. Settled bankruptcy law recognizes that the order remains effective in such circumstances. Hence, the proposed provision is merely declarative of existing law and is not appropriate to include in a stay relief order.

Indeed, requests for including in orders provisions that are declarative of existing law are not innocuous. First, the mere fact that counsel finds it necessary to ask for such a ruling fosters the misimpression that the law is other than it is. Moreover, one who routinely makes such unnecessary requests may eventually have to deal with an opponent who uses the fact of one's pattern of making such requests as that lawyer's concession that the law is not as it is.

In re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897, 907 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009) (citing *Aloyan v. Campos (In re Campos)*, 128 B.R. 790, 791–92 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1991); *In re Greetis*, 98 B.R. 509, 513 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1989)).

As noted in the 2009 ruling quoted above, the “silly” request for unnecessary relief may well be ultimately deemed an admission by Provident Funding Associates, L.P. and its counsel that all orders granting relief from the automatic stay are immediately terminated as to any relief granted Provident Funding Associates, L.P. and other creditors represented by counsel, and upon conversion, any action taken by such creditor is a *per se* violation of the automatic stay.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Provident Funding Associates, L.P. (“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 automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Provident Funding Associates, L.P., its agents, representatives, and successors, and trustee under the trust deed, and any other beneficiary or trustee, and their respective agents and successors under any trust deed that is recorded against the real property commonly known as 8610 Pershing Avenue, Fair Oaks, California, (“Property”) to secure an obligation to exercise any and all rights arising under the promissory note, trust deed, and applicable nonbankruptcy law to conduct a nonjudicial foreclosure sale and for the purchaser at any such sale to obtain possession of the Property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is not waived for cause.

Attorney's fees and costs, if any, shall be requested as provided by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54 and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 7054 and 9014. No other or additional relief is granted.

3. [19-20484-E-13](#) **DAVE LEYTO**
[PLC-1](#) **Eric Vandermey**

**MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
6-4-19 [16]**

GREEN POINT LAND COMPANY VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 2, 2019 hearing is required.

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

Sufficient Notice Provided. The Proof of Service states that the Motion and supporting pleadings were served on Debtor, Debtor's Attorney, Chapter 13 Trustee, creditors, and Office of the United States Trustee on June 4, 2019. By the court's calculation, 28 days' notice was provided. 28 days' notice is required.

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). Failure of the respondent and other parties in interest to file written opposition at least fourteen 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) (upholding a court ruling based upon a local rule construing a party's failure to file opposition as consent to grant a motion). 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.

<p>The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.</p>

Green Point Land Company ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to the real property commonly known as 2136 Fox Glen Dr. Fairfield, California ("Property"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Randy Wardlaw to introduce evidence as a basis for Movant's contention that Dave Hester Calivara Leyto ("Debtor") does not have an ownership interest in or a right to maintain possession of the Property. Movant presents evidence that it is the owner of the Property. Movant asserts it purchased the Property at a pre-petition Trustee's Sale on January 4, 2019. Declaration ¶ 2, Dckt. 18. Based on the evidence presented, Debtor would be at best a tenant at sufferance.

Movant seeks relief from stay to continue an unlawful detainer action.

TRUSTEE'S RESPONSE

The Chapter 13 Trustee, David Cusick ("Trustee") file a Response on June 17, 2019. Dckt. 22. Trustee states that Debtor's confirmed Plan provides for Nationstar Mortgage in Class 1 regarding the property in question with a monthly payment of \$2,356.74. Trustee has disbursed a total of 4 mortgage payments totaling \$9,426.96 to Nationstar Mortgage pursuant to the terms of the confirmed Plan, and three of the four checks issued have been cashed at the time of the filing.

DISCUSSION

Movant has presented a colorable claim for title to and possession of this real property. As stated by the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel, relief from stay proceedings are summary proceedings that address issues arising only under 11 U.S.C. Section 362(d). *Hamilton v. Hernandez (In re Hamilton)*, No. CC-04-1434-MaTK, 2005 Bankr. LEXIS 3427, at *8-9 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. Aug. 1, 2005) (citing *Johnson v. Righetti (In re Johnson)*, 756 F.2d 738, 740 (9th Cir. 1985)). The court does not determine underlying issues of ownership, contractual rights of parties, or issue declaratory relief as part of a motion for relief from the automatic stay in a Contested Matter (Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014).

The court shall issue an order terminating and vacating the automatic stay to allow Green Point Land Company, and its agents, representatives and successors, to exercise its rights to obtain possession and control of the real property commonly known as 2136 Fox Glen Dr., Fairfield, California, including unlawful detainer or other appropriate judicial proceedings and remedies to obtain possession thereof.

Request for Waiver of Fourteen-Day Stay of Enforcement

Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) stays an order granting a motion for relief from the automatic stay for fourteen days after the order is entered, unless the court orders otherwise. Movant requests that the court grant relief from the Rule as adopted by the United States Supreme Court because "the foreclosure sale has not been challenged."

Movant has not pleaded adequate facts and presented sufficient evidence to support the court waiving the fourteen-day stay of enforcement required under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3), and this part of the requested relief is not granted.

Request for Prospective Injunctive Relief

Movant makes an **additional request stated in the prayer**, for which no grounds are clearly stated in the Motion. Movant's further relief requested in the prayer is that this court make this order, **as opposed to every other order issued by the court**, binding and effective despite any conversion of this case to another chapter of the Code. Though stated in the prayer, no grounds are stated in the Motion for grounds for such relief from the stay. The Motion presumes that conversion of the bankruptcy case will be reimposed if this case were converted to one under another Chapter.

As stated above, Movant's Motion does not state any grounds for such relief. Movant does not allege that notwithstanding an order granting relief from the automatic stay, a stealth stay continues in existence, waiting to spring to life and render prior orders of this court granting relief from the stay

invalid and rendering all acts taken by parties in reliance on that order void.

No points and authorities is provided in support of the Motion. This is not unusual for a relatively simple (in a legal authorities sense) motion for relief from stay as the one before the court. Other than referencing the court to the legal basis (11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(3) or (4)) and then pleading adequate grounds thereunder, it is not necessary for a movant to provide a copy of the statute quotations from well known cases. However, if a movant is seeking relief from a possible future stay, which may arise upon conversion, the legal points and authorities for such heretofore unknown nascent stay is necessary.

As noted by another bankruptcy judge, such request (unsupported by any grounds or legal authority) for relief of a future stay in the same bankruptcy case:

[A] request for an order stating that the court's termination of the automatic stay will be binding despite conversion of the case to another chapter unless a specific exception is provided by the Bankruptcy Code is a common, albeit silly, request in a stay relief motion and does not require an adversary proceeding. Settled bankruptcy law recognizes that the order remains effective in such circumstances. Hence, the proposed provision is merely declarative of existing law and is not appropriate to include in a stay relief order.

Indeed, requests for including in orders provisions that are declarative of existing law are not innocuous. First, the mere fact that counsel finds it necessary to ask for such a ruling fosters the misimpression that the law is other than it is. Moreover, one who routinely makes such unnecessary requests may eventually have to deal with an opponent who uses the fact of one's pattern of making such requests as that lawyer's concession that the law is not as it is.

In re Van Ness, 399 B.R. 897, 907 (Bankr. E.D. Cal. 2009) (citing *Aloyan v. Campos (In re Campos)*, 128 B.R. 790, 791–92 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1991); *In re Greetis*, 98 B.R. 509, 513 (Bankr. S.D. Cal. 1989)).

As noted in the 2009 ruling quoted above, the “silly” request for unnecessary relief may well be ultimately deemed an admission by Green Point Land Company and its counsel that all orders granting relief from the automatic stay are immediately terminated as to any relief granted Green Point Land Company and other creditors represented by counsel, and upon conversion, any action taken by such creditor is a *per se* violation of the automatic stay.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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 Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Green Point Land Company (“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 automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Green Point Land Company and its agents, representatives and successors, to exercise and enforce all nonbankruptcy rights and remedies to obtain possession of the property commonly known as 2136 Fox Glen Dr., Fairfield, California.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is not waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

4. [18-26585](#)-E-13 **JULIAN PEREZ**
[JCW-1](#)

**CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
3-13-19 [53]**

**MIDFIRST BANK VS.
WITHDRAWN BY M.P.**

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 2, 2019 hearing is required.

<p>The Motion for Relief From Automatic Stay is dismissed without prejudice.</p>

MidFirst Bank (“Creditor”) having filed a Notice of Dismissal, which the court construes to be an Ex Parte Motion to Dismiss the pending Motion on June 7, 2019, Dckt. 96; no prejudice to the responding party appearing by the dismissal of the Motion; Creditor having the right to request dismissal of the motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041; and the dismissal being consistent with the opposition filed by Julian Perez (“Debtor”); the Ex Parte Motion is granted, Creditor’s Motion is dismissed without prejudice, and the court removes this Motion from the calendar.

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 Relief From Automatic Stay filed by MidFirst Bank (“Creditor”) having been presented to the court, Creditor having requested that the Motion itself be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014 and 7041, Dckt. 96, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion for Relief From Automatic Stay is dismissed without prejudice.