

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Ronald H. Sargis

Chief Bankruptcy Judge

Sacramento, California

July 9, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

FINAL RULINGS

1. [20-22615-E-7](#) MICHELLE MEURER MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
[JCW-1](#) George Burke AUTOMATIC STAY
6-5-20 [\[14\]](#)

UNITED FEDERAL CREDIT UNION
VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 9, 2020 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, and Chapter 7 Trustee on June 5, 2020. By the court's calculation, 34 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>

United Federal Credit Union ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2016 GMC Sierra, VIN ending in #7112 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Tammy Bundy to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon

July 9, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

Page 1 of 12

which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Michelle Lynn Meurer (“Debtor”).

Movant also provides evidence that there are three (3) pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$2,424.00. Declaration, Dckt. 16.

The Tammy Bundy Declaration also seeks to introduce evidence establishing the Vehicle’s value. Though the NADA Valuation Report is attached as an Exhibit, it is not properly authenticated.

Though the court will *sua sponte* take notice that the NADA Valuation Report can be within the “market reports and similar commercial publications” exception to the hearsay rule (Federal Rule of Evidence 803(17)), it does not resolve the authentication requirement. FED. R. EVID. 901. In this case, and because no opposition has been asserted by Debtor, the court will presume the Declaration of Tammy Bundy to be that she obtained the NADA Valuation Report and is providing that to the court under penalty of perjury. Movant and counsel should not presume that the court will provide *sua sponte* corrections to any defects in evidence presented to the court.

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$24,204.60 (Declaration, Dckt. 16). Debtor valued the Vehicle at \$22,500.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor, which is less than the retail value as stated on the NADA Valuation Report. The NADA Report shows a clean retail value of \$25,200.00. Exhibit 3, Dckt. 18.

The Debtor’s Statement of Intention provides for the surrender of the Vehicle. Dckt. 7.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

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.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C.

§ 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass'n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

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 Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

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.

Furthermore, a claim for attorney's fees and related nontaxable expenses must be made by motion unless the substantive law requires those fees to be proved at trial as an element of damages. FED. R. CIV. P. 54(d)(2)(A); FED. R. BANKR. P. 7054, 9014.

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.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by United Federal Credit Union ("Movant") having been presented to the court, and upon review of

the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2016 GMC Sierra, VIN ending in #7112 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

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.

EXETER FINANCE, LLC VS.

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 9, 2020 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 7 Trustee, parties requesting special notice, and Office of the United States Trustee on June 8, 2020. By the court's calculation, 31 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.
--

Exeter Finance, LLC ("Movant") seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to an asset identified as a 2013 BMW 5 Series 535i Sedan 4D, VIN ending in #5020 ("Vehicle"). The moving party has provided the Declaration of Nancy Wafer to introduce evidence to authenticate the documents upon which it bases the claim and the obligation owed by Reece Ventura and Rodina Cordero Ventura ("Debtor").

Movant argues Debtor has not made approximately eleven (11) post-petition payments, with a total of \$9,804.56 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 311.

Movant has also provided a copy of the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report for the Vehicle. The Report has been properly authenticated and is accepted as a market report or commercial publication generally relied on by the public or by persons in the automobile sale business. FED. R. EVID. 803(17).

TRUSTEE'S STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION

Chapter 7 Trustee, Geoffrey Richards, has no opposition to the relief requested. Trustee's June 10, 2020 Docket Entry Statement.

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$28,150.41 (Declaration, Dckt. 311). Debtor values the Vehicle at \$12,000.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor, while the Kelley Blue Book Valuation Report submitted by Movant values the Vehicle at \$11,713.00.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(1): Grant Relief for Cause

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.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property’s value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass’n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Vehicle for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Vehicle is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

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 Vehicle, to repossess, dispose of, or sell the asset pursuant to applicable nonbankruptcy law and their contractual rights, and for any purchaser, or successor to a purchaser, to obtain possession of the asset.

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.

Movant has 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 granted.

No other or additional relief is granted by the court.

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

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

The Motion for Relief from the Automatic Stay filed by Exeter Finance, LLC (“Movant”) having been presented to the court, and upon review of the pleadings, evidence, arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED the automatic stay provisions of 11 U.S.C. § 362(a) are vacated to allow Movant, its agents, representatives, and successors, and all other creditors having lien rights against the Vehicle, under its security agreement, loan documents granting it a lien in the asset identified as a 2013 BMW 5 Series 535i Sedan 4D, VIN ending in #5020 (“Vehicle”), and applicable nonbankruptcy law to obtain possession of, nonjudicially sell, and apply proceeds from the sale of the Vehicle to the obligation secured thereby.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the fourteen-day stay of enforcement provided in Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 4001(a)(3) is waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.

**LAKEVIEW LOAN SERVICING, LLC
VS.**

Final Ruling: No appearance at the July 9, 2020 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, and Chapter 7 Trustee on June 8, 2020. By the court’s calculation, 31 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.

Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC (“Movant”) seeks relief from the automatic stay with respect to Shawn Allan Myers’ (“Debtor”) real property commonly known as 140 Melsher Lane, Valley Springs, California (“Property”). Movant has provided the Declaration of Aaron Angelilli (Dckt. 44) to introduce evidence to authenticate the Note, Deed of Trust and Assignment of the Deed of Trust stated to secured the Note upon which it bases the claim and the obligation secured by the Property.

Movant argues Debtor has not made five (5) post-petition payments, with a total of \$14,191.35 in post-petition payments past due. Declaration, Dckt. 44. Movant also provides evidence that there are twelve (12) pre-petition payments in default, with a pre-petition arrearage of \$33,648.48. *Id.*

CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE’S STATEMENT OF NON-OPPOSITION

Chapter 7 Trustee, J. Michael Hopper, has no opposition to the relief requested. Trustee’s June 16, 2020 Docket Entry Statement.

Judicial Notice

In the Motion, Movant also requests that the court take “judicial notice” of copies of Debtor’s Schedules A and D filed as Exhibit 1 (Dckt. 47) for the Debtor’s admissions of value for the property securing Movant’s claim. Federal Rule of Evidence 201 governs (and allows) judicial notice of certain adjudicative facts. That rule specifies the court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it (1) is generally known within the trial court's territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. FED. R. EVID. 201(b).

Here, it is not clear what “fact” the court is being requested to take judicial notice of. If the “fact” is the value of the property, such is not generally known or that it can be readily known from a source (the Debtor?) whose accuracy cannot be reasonably questioned.

One treatise describes the two categories of facts not subject to reasonable dispute as follows:

The first category of adjudicative facts subject to judicial notice are facts which are "generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court." **This category requires that the fact to be noticed be of general notoriety in the geographical area of the court, but not of the United States as a whole.** It is also not necessary that the fact be universally known within the territorial jurisdiction, since such a requirement would seem to eliminate the category, no fact being so well known by every inhabitant within the jurisdiction as to be truly "universal."

This category is also limited to facts presently generally known within the jurisdiction. Obviously, as time passes, the character of a jurisdiction in terms of its occupations, etc., will change. Accordingly, what a court might properly take judicial note of in the year 1800 might not be a proper subject of judicial notice in the year 2000.

The combined result of these limitations is that many facts judicially noticed in this category may not seem obvious to an observer from another place and another time. Stated differently, facts judicially noted in this subsection of the Rule may often appear somewhat parochial. Since the standard is somewhat less objective than the standard in the second subcategory, this subcategory may be viewed as more subjective.

Facts judicially noticed which fit within this subcategory are of breathtaking variety. The following are examples of that variety: bingo was largely a senior citizen pastime; major hijacking gangs had preyed on interstate and international commerce at Kennedy Airport; credit cards play vital role in modern American society; newspaper was New Jersey's only statewide newspaper, as well as its largest; incubation period of measles; British authorities in Hong Kong had not undertaken any persecution of persons because of race, religion, or political opinion; method for canning baked beans in New England; most establishments that sell beer also sell tobacco products; escape of ammonia gas from refrigeration coils ordinarily does not happen if coil is properly manufactured and installed;

calendars have long been affixed to walls by means of a punched hole at the top of the calendar; the Ohio River is navigable.

The following are some examples of similar facts which have been judicially noticed by state courts: passenger trains and freight trains are customarily separated; specific locations deemed valuable sources of gold; Texas cattle fever is a contagious disease; Connecticut River not navigable at specific location; proper season for the planting of cotton seed; existence of the Great Depression.

The second subcategory of adjudicative facts are those facts "which are capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned."

In this subcategory are facts which, while not generally known to persons within the jurisdiction, nonetheless **are of such nature that they can be definitively established by reference to the appropriate sources**. Within this category are facts capable of being determined precisely by astronomical and mathematical calculations, such as the times of sunrise and sunset, moonrise and moonset, the phases of the moon, what day of the week a given date was, and standard actuarial and life expectancy tables. Facts in this subcategory can also often be introduced as information in learned treatises pursuant to Rule 803(17) of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

The following are examples of facts in this subcategory which have received judicial notice: August 6, 1976, was neither Sunday nor a Federal legal holiday; Father's Day, 1979, was June 17; closing stock prices on a specific date; life expectancy tables to calculate damages in persona injury case; present value table; time of sundown on specific date.

60 AM. JUR. PROOF OF FACTS 3d 175 (Originally published in 2001)(emphasis added).

The Federal Rules of Evidence permit courts to take judicial notice of **facts**, not documents. It is not a tool to be used for when counsel wants to shortcut the filing of documents as exhibits along with a declaration authenticating and explaining the documents. Fed. R. Evid. 901.

What Movant's counsel actually asks here is that the court review documents that have already been filed with this court in this court's file. The court may consider such documents. In Schedules A/B and D, Debtor has made statements, in this bankruptcy case, under penalty of perjury as to debtor's opinion, as the owner of the property, of the value.

DISCUSSION

From the evidence provided to the court, and only for purposes of this Motion for Relief, the debt secured by this asset is determined to be \$488,417.51 (Declaration, Dckt. 44), while the value of the Property is determined to be \$425,000.00, as stated in Schedules A/B and D filed by Debtor.

11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2)

A debtor has no equity in property when the liens against the property exceed the property's value. *Stewart v. Gurley*, 745 F.2d 1194, 1195 (9th Cir. 1984). Once a movant under 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2) establishes that a debtor or estate has no equity in property, it is the burden of the debtor or trustee to establish that the collateral at issue is necessary to an effective reorganization. 11 U.S.C. § 362(g)(2); *United Sav. Ass'n of Texas v. Timbers of Inwood Forest Assocs. Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365, 375–76 (1988). Based upon the evidence submitted, the court determines that there is no equity in the Property for either Debtor or the Estate. 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)(2). This being a Chapter 7 case, the Property is *per se* not necessary for an effective reorganization. *See Ramco Indus. v. Preuss (In re Preuss)*, 15 B.R. 896 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 1981).

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 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.

Movant has 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 granted.

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 Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC (“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 Movant, 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 140 Melsher Lane, Valley Springs, 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 waived for cause.

No other or additional relief is granted.