

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Michael S. McManus

Bankruptcy Judge

Sacramento, California

July 5, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

THIS CALENDAR IS DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS. THEREFORE, TO FIND ALL MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS SET FOR HEARING IN A PARTICULAR CASE, YOU MAY HAVE TO LOOK IN BOTH PARTS OF THE CALENDAR. WITHIN EACH PART, CASES ARE ARRANGED BY THE LAST TWO DIGITS OF THE CASE NUMBER.

THE COURT FIRST WILL HEAR ITEMS 1 THROUGH 6. A TENTATIVE RULING FOLLOWS EACH OF THESE ITEMS. THE COURT MAY AMEND OR CHANGE A TENTATIVE RULING BASED ON THE PARTIES' ORAL ARGUMENT. IF ALL PARTIES AGREE TO A TENTATIVE RULING, THERE IS NO NEED TO APPEAR FOR ARGUMENT. HOWEVER, IT IS INCUMBENT ON EACH PARTY TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER ALL OTHER PARTIES WILL ACCEPT A RULING AND FOREGO ORAL ARGUMENT. IF A PARTY APPEARS, THE HEARING WILL PROCEED WHETHER OR NOT ALL PARTIES ARE PRESENT. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE HEARING, THE COURT WILL ANNOUNCE ITS DISPOSITION OF THE ITEM AND IT MAY DIRECT THAT THE TENTATIVE RULING, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN OR AS AMENDED BY THE COURT, BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE HEARING AS THE COURT'S FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

IF A MOTION OR AN OBJECTION IS SET FOR HEARING PURSUANT TO LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3015-1(c), (d) [eff. May 1, 2012], GENERAL ORDER 05-03, ¶ 3(c), LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 3007-1(c)(2) [eff. through April 30, 2012], OR LOCAL BANKRUPTCY RULE 9014-1(f)(2), RESPONDENTS WERE NOT REQUIRED TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION TO THE RELIEF REQUESTED. RESPONDENTS MAY APPEAR AT THE HEARING AND RAISE OPPOSITION ORALLY. IF THAT OPPOSITION RAISES A POTENTIALLY MERITORIOUS DEFENSE OR ISSUE, THE COURT WILL GIVE THE RESPONDENT AN OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN OPPOSITION AND SET A FINAL HEARING UNLESS THERE IS NO NEED TO DEVELOP THE WRITTEN RECORD FURTHER. IF THE COURT SETS A FINAL HEARING, UNLESS THE PARTIES REQUEST A DIFFERENT SCHEDULE THAT IS APPROVED BY THE COURT, THE FINAL HEARING WILL TAKE PLACE AUGUST 8, 2016 AT 1:30 P.M. OPPOSITION MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY JULY 25, 2016, AND ANY REPLY MUST BE FILED AND SERVED BY AUGUST 1, 2016. THE MOVING/OBJECTING PARTY IS TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE DATE AND TIME OF THE CONTINUED HEARING DATE AND OF THESE DEADLINES.

THERE WILL BE NO HEARING ON ITEMS 7 THROUGH 16 IN THE SECOND PART OF THE CALENDAR. INSTEAD, THESE ITEMS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF AS INDICATED IN THE FINAL RULING BELOW. THAT RULING WILL BE APPENDED TO THE MINUTES. THIS FINAL RULING MAY OR MAY NOT BE A FINAL ADJUDICATION ON THE MERITS; IF IT IS, IT INCLUDES THE COURT'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. IF ALL PARTIES HAVE AGREED TO A CONTINUANCE OR HAVE RESOLVED THE MATTER BY STIPULATION, THEY MUST ADVISE THE COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK PRIOR TO HEARING IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE COURT VACATE THE FINAL RULING IN FAVOR OF THE CONTINUANCE OR THE STIPULATED DISPOSITION.

IF THE COURT CONCLUDES THAT FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(d) REQUIRES AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, UNLESS OTHERWISE ORDERED, IT WILL BE SET ON JULY 11, 2016, AT 2:30 P.M.

July 5, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.

- Page 1 -

Matters to be Called for Argument

1. 16-23837-A-13 JOHN BERTSCH MOTION TO
RDW-1 CONFIRM TERMINATION OR ABSENCE OF
STAY
6-21-16 [13]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the creditor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the other creditors, the debtor, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted in part.

This is the debtor's third bankruptcy case. His first case was a chapter 13 petition (case no. 16-22141) filed on April 4, 2016 and dismissed on June 2, 2016. It was dismissed because he failed to file timely schedules, statements and a proposed plan. The second case (case no. 16-23215) was filed under chapter 7 on May 17, 2016. It was dismissed on June 6, 2016 because the debtor failed to file timely schedules and statements. It bears mention that no schedules, statements or proposed plan have been filed in this most recent case.

A review of the docket in this case reveals the debtor has filed no motion to extend or impose the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3) or (c)(4). Therefore, because the debtor filed two prior cases that were dismissed within the year prior to the filing of this third case, the court confirms the absence of the automatic stay pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(j).

The request to waive the 14-day stay of Fed. R. Bankr. P. 4001(a)(3) will be denied. That stay only is applicable to orders on motion for relief from the automatic stay. There is no automatic stay in this case from which the court can grant relief. Hence, the 14-day stay is not applicable. There is nothing to waive.

2. 12-20840-A-13 ANTOINETTE WADE MOTION TO
SDB-2 APPROVE LOAN MODIFICATION
6-13-16 [40]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: Because less than 28 days' notice of the hearing was given by the debtor, this motion is deemed brought pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(2). Consequently, the creditors, the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, and any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or

The motion will be granted. The debtor is authorized but not required to enter into the proposed modification. To the extent the modification is inconsistent with the confirmed plan, the debtor shall continue to perform the plan as confirmed until it is modified.

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Third, the debtor has failed to fully and accurately provide all information required by the petition, schedules, and statements. The debtor failed to schedule an IRA and disclose a \$200,000 securities sale within the two years prior to the filing of this case. This nondisclosure is a breach of the duty imposed by 11 U.S.C. § 521(a)(1) to truthfully list all required financial information in the bankruptcy documents. To attempt to confirm a plan while withholding relevant financial information from the trustee is bad faith. See 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(3).

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

July 5, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.
- Page 3 -

any other parties in interest were not required to file a written response or opposition to the motion. If any of these potential respondents appear at the hearing and offers opposition to the motion, the court will set a briefing schedule and a final hearing unless there is no need to develop the record further. If no opposition is offered at the hearing, the court will take up the merits of the motion. Below is the court's tentative ruling, rendered on the assumption that there will be no opposition to the motion. Obviously, if there is opposition, the court may reconsider this tentative ruling.

The motion will be granted.

This is the second chapter 13 case filed by the debtor. The debtor's earlier chapter 13 case was dismissed within one year of the most recent petition.

11 U.S.C. § 362(c)(3)(A) provides that if a single or joint case is filed by or against a debtor who is an individual in a case under chapter 7, 11, or 13, and if a single or joint case of the debtor was pending within the preceding one-year period but was dismissed, the automatic stay with respect to a debt, property securing such debt, or any lease terminates on the 30th day after the filing of the new case.

Section 362(c)(3)(B) allows a debtor to file a motion requesting the continuation of the stay. A review of the docket reveals that the debtor has filed this motion to extend the automatic stay before the 30th day after the filing of the petition. The motion will be adjudicated before the 30-day period expires.

In order to extend the automatic stay, the party seeking the relief must demonstrate that the filing of the new case was in good faith as to the creditors to be stayed. For example, in In re Whitaker, 341 B.R. 336, 345 (Bankr. S.D. Ga. 2006), the court held: "[T]he chief means of rebutting the presumption of bad faith requires the movant to establish 'a substantial change in the financial or personal affairs of the debtor . . . or any other reason to conclude' that the instant case will be successful. If the instant case is one under chapter 7, a discharge must now be permissible. If it is a case under chapters 11 or 13, there must be some substantial change."

Here, the first case was dismissed because the debtor failed to file timely all schedules, statements and a plan. The debtor failed to meet the deadline to file the documents because she was dealing a serious personal situation involving her teenage son. That situation has now been dealt with and all required documents have been filed in this case. This is a sufficient change in circumstances rebut the presumption of bad faith.

5. 15-20273-A-13 CONCETTA MANZANO
EJS-3

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
5-27-16 [62]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

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

First, no modified plan has been filed. The court will not confirm a plan that has not been filed.

Second, the debtor has failed to make \$4,553 of payments required by the plan.

This has resulted in delay that is prejudicial to creditors and suggests that the plan is not feasible. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 1307(c)(1) & (c)(4), 1325(a)(6).

Third, even though 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) prevents the proposed plan from modifying a claim secured only by the debtor's home, 11 U.S.C. § 1322(b)(2) & (b)(5) permit the plan to provide for the cure of any defaults on such a claim while ongoing installment payments are maintained. The cure of defaults is not limited to the cure of pre-petition defaults. See In re Bellinger, 179 B.R. 220 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1995). The proposed plan, however, does not provide for a cure of the post-petition arrears owed to the Class 1 home loan. By failing to provide for a cure, the debtor is, in effect, impermissibly modifying a home loan. Also, the failure to cure the default means that the Class 1 secured claim will not be paid in full as required by 11 U.S.C. § 1325(a)(5)(B).

6. 14-28688-A-13 MARK KELLEY
ADR-3

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
5-13-16 [72]

- ☐ Telephone Appearance
- ☐ Trustee Agrees with Ruling

Tentative Ruling: The motion will be granted and the objection overruled.

The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329. The fact that the arrears on a Class 1 secured claim have been overstated is irrelevant. The claim will be paid the lesser amount demanded in the proof of claim. And, if there is a risk of overpayment, the debtor, not unsecured creditors, bears that risk inasmuch the plan requires that unsecured creditors be paid in full.

THE FINAL RULINGS BEGIN HERE

7. 16-22405-A-13 CASEY DECANT OBJECTION TO
MC-1 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
CARRINGTON MORTGAGE SERVICES VS. 6-16-16 [21]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed.

The objection is untimely. All parties in interest were served with the plan and the notice of the commencement of the case. The notice informed them that objections had to be filed and served by June 9 and set for hearing on June 27. This objection was filed on June 16 and set for hearing on July 5.

8. 16-23311-A-13 AURIEL PALOMAR MOTION TO
DJC-1 VALUE COLLATERAL
VS. PATELCO CREDIT UNION 6-4-16 [13]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$11,816 as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$11,816 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$11,816 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.

9. 16-22113-A-13 ARMAR/MARICELA WALKER MOTION TO
DBL-1 CONFIRM PLAN
5-21-16 [20]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served at the third

address listed above.

10. 15-27018-A-13 TAMISHA CLARK
RJM-1

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
5-24-16 [23]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served at the second and third addresses listed above.

11. 16-20120-A-13 RAQUEL RIOS
RLC-2

MOTION TO
CONFIRM PLAN
5-17-16 [42]

Final Ruling: The motion will be denied without prejudice.

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

12. 12-37134-A-13 DIANA HERNANDEZ
ELG-1

MOTION TO
MODIFY PLAN
5-26-16 [52]

Final Ruling: This motion to confirm a modified plan proposed after confirmation of a plan has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(d)(2) and 9014-1(f)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 3015(g). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted. The modified plan complies with 11 U.S.C. §§ 1322(a) & (b), 1323(c), 1325(a), and 1329.

13. 16-22552-A-13 BOWEN/NADINE RIDEOUT OBJECTION TO
CONFIRMATION OF PLAN
WILLIAM/DEBORAH GARDINER VS. 6-15-16 [21]

Final Ruling: The objection will be dismissed without prejudice.

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

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

This objection has no docket control number. Therefore, it is possible that documents have been filed in support or in opposition to the objection that have not been brought to the attention of the court. The court will not permit the objecting creditor to profit from possible confusion caused by this breach of the court's local rules.

14. 16-21359-A-13 ERIC/ADINA HENDERSON MOTION TO
DBL-2 CONFIRM PLAN
5-21-16 [30]

Final Ruling: The motion will be dismissed without prejudice.

Local Bankruptcy Rule 2002-1(c) provides that notices in adversary proceedings and contested matters that are served on the IRS shall be mailed to three entities at three different addresses: (1) IRS, P.O. Box 7346, Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346; (2) United States Attorney, for the IRS, 501 I Street, Suite 10-100, Sacramento, CA 95814; and (3) United States Department of Justice, Civil Trial Section, Western Region, Box 683, Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044.

Service in this case is deficient because the IRS was not served at the third address listed above.

15. 11-47478-A-13 TEODORO/BETTY ABACAN MOTION FOR
PGM-1 OMNIBUS RELIEF UPON DEATH OF
DEBTOR
6-1-16 [82]

Final Ruling: This motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 3015-1(b) and 9014-1(f) (1), and Fed. R. Bankr. R. 2002(b). The failure of the trustee, the U.S. Trustee, creditors, and any other party in interest to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f) (1) (ii) is considered

as consent to the sustaining of the objection. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the debtor, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the respondents' defaults are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The motion will be granted.

Debtor Teodoro Abacan died on July 15, 2014. Prior to his death, the debtors confirmed but have not yet completed a plan. Both debtors filed a financial management certificate on January 9, 2012. See 11 U.S.C. §§ 110, 111, 1328(g)(1) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 1007(c). The co-debtor, Betty Abacan is authorized pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 1016-1 to file the case ending documents required by Local Bankruptcy Rules 1007(c) and 5009-1. The clerk shall enter the discharge of both debtors when the co-debtor is otherwise entitled to a discharge.

16. 16-23493-A-13 MICHAEL CARPANETO
MS-1
VS. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

MOTION TO
VALUE COLLATERAL
5-31-16 [9]

Final Ruling: This valuation motion has been set for hearing on the notice required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1). The failure of the trustee and the respondent creditor to file written opposition at least 14 days prior to the hearing as required by Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014-1(f)(1)(ii) is considered as consent to the granting of the motion. Cf. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Further, because the court will not materially alter the relief requested by the moving party, an actual hearing is unnecessary. See Boone v. Burk (In re Eliapo), 468 F.3d 592 (9th Cir. 2006). Therefore, the defaults of the trustee and the respondent creditor are entered and the matter will be resolved without oral argument.

The valuation motion pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3012 and 11 U.S.C. § 506(a) will be granted. The motion is accompanied by the debtor's declaration. The debtor is the owner of the subject property. In the debtor's opinion, the subject property had a value of \$16,850.65, net of senior liens, as of the date the petition was filed and the effective date of the plan. Given the absence of contrary evidence, the debtor's opinion of value is conclusive. See Enewally v. Washington Mutual Bank (In re Enewally), 368 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir. 2004). Therefore, \$16,850.65 of the respondent's claim is an allowed secured claim. When the respondent is paid \$16,850.65 and subject to the completion of the plan, its secured claim shall be satisfied in full and the collateral free of the respondent's lien. Provided a timely proof of claim is filed, the remainder of its claim is allowed as a general unsecured claim unless previously paid by the trustee as a secured claim.