

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

Eastern District of California

Honorable Robert S. Bardwil
Bankruptcy Judge
Sacramento, California

July 10, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-HEARING DISPOSITIONS

1. Matters resolved without oral argument:

Unless otherwise stated, the court will prepare a civil minute order on each matter listed. If the moving party wants a more specific order, it should submit a proposed amended order to the court. In the event a party wishes to submit such an Order it needs to be titled 'Amended Civil Minute Order.'

If the moving party has received a response or is aware of any reason, such as a settlement, that a response may not have been filed, the moving party must contact Nancy Williams, the Courtroom Deputy, at (916) 930-4580 at least one hour prior to the scheduled hearing.

- 2. The court will not continue any short cause evidentiary hearings scheduled below.**
- 3. If a matter is denied or overruled without prejudice, the moving party may file a new motion or objection to claim with a new docket control number. The moving party may not simply re-notice the original motion.**
- 4. If no disposition is set forth below, the matter will be heard as scheduled.**

1.	18-21702-D-13	QUENDELIN LAWSON-NASH	MOTION TO SELL
	MC-1		6-5-18 [28]

Final ruling:

The matter is resolved without oral argument. The court's records indicate that no timely opposition has been filed and the relief requested in the motion to sell 2011 Volvo automobile is supported by the record. As such the court will grant the motion and authorize the sale under Section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

2.	17-28208-D-13	ALFREDO/VERONICA LACESTE	MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
	AF-4		5-4-18 [75]

3. 17-24412-D-13 JEANINE DAVIS MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
PGM-3 5-19-18 [112]

4. 17-27513-D-13 MARVIN NASH MOTION TO SELL
MC-1 6-5-18 [24]

Final ruling:

The matter is resolved without oral argument. The court's records indicate that no timely opposition has been filed and the relief requested in the motion to sell 2011 Volvo automobile is supported by the record. As such the court will grant the motion and authorize the sale under Section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

5. 18-21214-D-13 JOSE PATINO MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
PGM-1 5-19-18 [23]

6. 16-20617-D-13 CHARLES/ANNA MCKINLEY MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
MC-3 5-26-18 [67]

Final ruling:

This is the debtors' motion to confirm a second modified chapter 13 plan. On June 22, 2018, the debtors filed a third modified plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the third modified plan, this motion is moot. The motion will be denied as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

7. 18-21320-D-13 JOHN SERNA
PJE-1

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
5-9-18 [22]

Final ruling:

This is the debtor's motion to confirm an amended chapter 13 plan. The motion will be denied for the following reasons: (1) the moving party failed to serve any of the creditors filing claims in this case at the addresses on their proofs of claim, as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(g), and it appears some were not served at all, as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b); (2) the moving party failed to serve any of the creditors filing requests for special notice at their designated addresses, as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(g); (3) the moving party failed to serve the Internal Revenue Service at its address on the Roster of Governmental Agencies, as required by LBR 2002-1(c); (4) the motion and notice of motion are not signed by the debtor's attorney; and (5) the proofs of service do not include the caption of the case or the docket control number, as required by LBR 9004-2(b) (5) and 9014-1(e) (3).

As a result of these service and other procedural defects, the motion will be denied and the court need not reach the issues raised by the trustee at this time. The motion will be denied by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

8. 15-20427-D-13 OSCAR WILLS
JHW-1
FORD MOTOR CREDIT COMPANY
VS.

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
AUTOMATIC STAY
5-18-18 [117]

Final ruling:

This matter is resolved without oral argument. This is Ford Motor Credit Company's motion for relief from automatic stay. The court's records indicate that no timely opposition has been filed. The motion along with the supporting pleadings demonstrate that there is no equity in the subject property and debtor is not making post petition payments. The court finds there is cause for relief from stay, including lack of adequate protection of the moving party's interest. As the debtor is not making post-petition payments and the creditor's collateral is a depreciating asset, the court will also waive FRBP 4001(a)(3). Accordingly, the court will grant relief from stay and waive FRBP 4001(a)(3) by minute order. There will be no further relief afforded. No appearance is necessary.

9. 18-20131-D-13 DIANA AVILA-DURAN
RDG-2

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF SANTANDER
CONSUMER USA INC., CLAIM NUMBER
6-1
5-25-18 [28]

Tentative ruling:

This is the objection of Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC ("Lakeview") to confirmation of the debtor's proposed chapter 13 plan. The trustee has also filed an objection to confirmation, which is also on this calendar. The debtor has filed a combined reply to the two objections. For the following reasons, the court intends to sustain Lakeview's objection and overrule the trustee's objection as moot.

Lakeview's objection is that the plan fails to provide for the pre-petition arrears due Lakeview on a loan Lakeview contends is secured by a deed of trust against the debtor's residence. Lakeview also contends the debtor does not have sufficient funds to cure the arrears within the 36-month term of the plan. In fact, the plan does not provide for a claim of Lakeview at all - the debtor's Schedules A and D indicate he owns the property free and clear of liens.

At the initial hearing, the debtor's counsel stated the debtor does not believe Lakeview holds a proper deed of trust against the property; counsel acknowledged he had not yet filed an objection to Lakeview's claim. The court stated its view that this issue would need to be resolved before the debtor could go forward with confirmation of a plan. The debtor's counsel requested a 60-day continuance so he could get an objection to claim on file and heard.

The debtor has not filed an objection to Lakeview's claim. Instead, seven weeks after the date of the original hearing, he filed a reply in which he states that Lakeview has taken a position in a pending state court action that is inconsistent with the position underlying its proof of secured claim. According to the debtor, Lakeview takes the position in the state court action that its deed of trust, as well as the grant deed by which the debtor purportedly took title to the property, contained an incorrect legal description. Thus, in the debtor's view, "[Lakeview's] own moving papers in the civil court action [indicate] the subject property is not properly secured and should not be deemed as such in this case." Debtor's Reply, DN 35, at 2:13-15. The debtor even goes so far as to suggest that Lakeview is seeking to have the deed of trust declared void. Id. at 1:23-24.

This is clearly inaccurate. The debtor filed as an exhibit a copy of Lakeview's state court complaint, in which Lakeview asserts that the legal description in the grant deed and deed of trust "was incorrect and did not comply with the intentions of the parties." Debtor's Exhibits, DN 36, Lakeview's complaint, at 3:19. The alleged error was that those instruments referred to a map entitled "Louise Park Terrace" whereas the map is actually entitled "Louis Park Terrace." Accordingly, Lakeview, far from seeking to void the deed of trust, seeks an order reforming the grant deed and deed of trust "to reflect the correct legal description." Id. at 5:9. Lakeview's purpose is to "confirm its security under the Deed of Trust, and so Defendants and each of them can confirm their respective rights, obligations, title and interest in the Subject Property and Deed of Trust." Id. at 5:4-6.

The court is surprised, to say the least, that the debtor and/or his counsel would argue that Lakeview's proof of secured claim in this case should be overlooked

and its objection to confirmation overruled based on the fact that Lakeview is seeking to reform a deed of trust containing what, at first glance at least, appears to be an inadvertent error that does not reflect the intention of any of the parties - neither the seller who transferred title to the debtor (whom Lakeview named as a co-defendant), nor Lakeview who loaned the debtor the money to buy the property, nor the debtor himself. Most important, however, is that the debtor has submitted no evidence to overcome the prima facie validity afforded Lakeview's proof of claim under Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3001(f). Therefore, because the plan fails to provide for Lakeview's secured claim, the objection will be sustained.

The court will hear the matter.

11.	18-20932-D-13	RICHARD SANDOVAL	CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
	RDG-1		CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL
			D. GREER
			4-16-18 [19]

Tentative ruling:

This is the trustee's objection to confirmation of the debtor's proposed chapter 13 plan. The debtor has filed a reply, which he combined with a reply to the objection of Lakeview Loan Servicing, LLC ("Lakeview"), also on this calendar. Because the court will sustain Lakeview's objection, the court intends to overrule the trustee's objection as moot.

The court will hear the matter.

12.	18-22736-D-13	MAX RASCON	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
	NLL-1		PLAN BY WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.
			6-13-18 [13]

Final ruling:

This is Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.'s objection to confirmation of the debtor's proposed chapter 13 plan. On July 2, 2018, the debtor filed an amended plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the amended plan, this objection is moot. The objection will be overruled as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

13.	17-23837-D-13	FRANCISCO/MARIA PADILLA	CONTINUED MOTION TO DISMISS
	JB-1		CASE AND/OR MOTION TO CONVERT
			CASE FROM CHAPTER 13 TO CHAPTER 7
			1-30-18 [89]

14. 17-23837-D-13 FRANCISCO/MARIA PADILLA CONTINUED MOTION TO CONFIRM
PGM-4 PLAN
2-13-18 [105]

15. 18-21737-D-13 ANGELO/CRYSTAL KNIGHT MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
JCK-2 5-14-18 [35]

Tentative ruling:

This is the debtors' motion to confirm an amended chapter 13 plan. The second page of the PACER matrix is not attached to the proof of service; as a result, it appears the debtors' car lender, Westlake Financial Services, was not served. (Westlake filed a proof of claim 11 days before the motion was served, using an address different from the one listed on the debtors' Schedule D. Westlake was not served at either address or at all.) If the moving parties' counsel brings a corrected proof of service to the hearing, ready for filing, the court will hear the matter. If the moving parties do not establish by sufficient proof that the plan and the moving papers were in fact served on Westlake, the court will entertain a request to continue the hearing to allow for such service.

The court will hear the matter.

16. 18-20638-D-13 BRIAN/JESSICA CAMPOS CONTINUED MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
JCK-4 4-12-18 [50]

17. 16-21939-D-13 LARY/NENA ULEP MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
NLL-1 AUTOMATIC STAY
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. VS. 5-30-18 [34]

Final ruling:

Motion withdrawn by moving party. Matter removed from calendar.

18. 18-22241-D-13 LEYNE FERNANDEZ
RDG-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER
6-11-18 [26]

19. 18-22241-D-13 LEYNE FERNANDEZ
TGM-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL
TRUST COMPANY
5-18-18 [18]

20. 18-22741-D-13 MICHAEL/ORINA WHITE
JHW-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY FORD MOTOR CREDIT
COMPANY LLC
5-25-18 [20]

Tentative ruling:

This is the objection of Ford Motor Credit Company, LLC, to confirmation of the debtors' proposed chapter 13 plan. The debtors have filed a reply in which they state that Ford Motor Credit wants an interest rate of 4.75%, whereas the plan calls for interest on Ford's claim at 5%. The debtors state, "[i]f the creditor prefers to be paid 4.75%, debtors are happy to place this language in the Order Confirming."

The debtors have misread the objection. The objection states that the national prime rate is 4.75% as of May 24, 2018. The objection specifically identifies two risk factors of the sort described in Till v. SCS Credit Corp., 541 U.S. 465, 478-79 (2004), and requests an increase of one percentage point over and above the prime rate for each risk factor. Thus, Ford Motor Credit "objects to any proposed Plan which fails to pay [its] secured claim with at least 6.75% interest." As the debtors have failed to address the actual objection, the court intends to sustain the objection unless the debtors increase the interest rate to prime plus 1.5%, or 6.25%.

The court will hear the matter.

21. 17-28046-D-13 JAMES AZEVEDO
FF-1

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF CAPITAL
ONE BANK (USA), N.A.
5-29-18 [53]

Final ruling:

This is the debtor's motion to avoid a judicial lien held by Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. (the "Bank"). The motion will be denied because the moving party failed to serve the Bank in strict compliance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h), as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014(b). The moving party served the Bank by first-class mail (1) through the attorneys who obtained the Bank's abstract of judgment; (2) through Corporation Service Company as the Bank's agent for service of process; and (3) to the attention of "An Officer and only an Officer."

The first method was insufficient because, unless the institution has appeared in the action by its attorney, which has not occurred here, service on an FDIC-insured institution, such as the Bank, must be to the attention of an officer, whereas there is no indication an officer of the Bank is likely to be found at the law firm that obtained the Bank's abstract of judgment. The second method was insufficient because service on an FDIC-insured institution must be to the attention of an officer, not an agent for service of process. The third method (as well as the first and second) was insufficient because service on an FDIC-insured institution must be by certified mail, not first-class mail. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h).

As a result of this service defect, the motion will be denied by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

22. 17-28046-D-13 JAMES AZEVEDO
FF-2

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF CAPITAL
ONE BANK (USA), N.A.
5-29-18 [59]

Final ruling:

This is the debtor's motion to avoid a judicial lien held by Capital One Bank (USA), N.A. (the "Bank"). The motion will be denied because the moving party failed to serve the Bank in strict compliance with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h), as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9014(b). The moving party served the Bank by first-class mail (1) through the attorneys who obtained the Bank's abstract of judgment; (2) through Corporation Service Company as the Bank's agent for service of process; and (3) to the attention of "An Officer and only an Officer."

The first method was insufficient because, unless the institution has appeared in the action by its attorney, which has not occurred here, service on an FDIC-insured institution, such as the Bank, must be to the attention of an officer, whereas there is no indication an officer of the Bank is likely to be found at the law firm that obtained the Bank's abstract of judgment. The second method was insufficient because service on an FDIC-insured institution must be to the attention of an officer, not an agent for service of process. The third method (as well as the first and second) was insufficient because service on an FDIC-insured institution must be by certified mail, not first-class mail. See Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7004(h).

As a result of this service defect, the motion will be denied by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

23. 17-28046-D-13 JAMES AZEVEDO
FF-2

MOTION TO AVOID LIEN OF
PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES,
LLC
5-29-18 [65]

Final ruling:

The matter is resolved without oral argument. The court's records indicate that no timely opposition has been filed and the relief requested in the motion is supported by the record. The court finds the judicial lien described in the motion impairs an exemption to which the debtor is entitled. As a result, the court will grant the debtor's motion to avoid the lien. Moving party is to submit an appropriate order, which order shall specifically identify the real property subject to the lien and specifically identify the lien to be avoided. No appearance is necessary.

24. 17-28046-D-13 JAMES AZEVEDO
FF-4

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
5-25-18 [47]

Final ruling:

This is the debtor's motion to confirm an amended chapter 13 plan. The motion will be denied for the following reasons: (1) the moving party failed to serve Perfection Collection, listed on his Schedule E/F, at all, as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002(b); (2) the moving party failed to serve the Franchise Tax Board at its address on the Roster of Governmental Agencies, as required by LBR 2002-1(b); and (3) the plan proposes to pay \$0 on two secured claims of Capital One Bank (USA), N.A., whereas the court is, by final rulings on this calendar, denying the debtor's motions to avoid the Bank's judicial liens. As a result, the debtor has not complied with LBR 3015-1(i).

For the reasons stated, the motion will be denied and the court need not reach the other issues raised by the trustee at this time. The motion will be denied by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

25. 17-21547-D-13 DAVID JARRETT
EAT-1

CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM AUTOMATIC STAY
4-10-18 [61]

26. 13-32850-D-13 FAY/A POLLINO
PGM-4

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
5-25-18 [67]

27. 18-22250-D-13 RUSSELL/SHIRLEY SMITH

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY TECHNOLOGY CREDIT UNION
6-12-18 [27]

Final ruling:

This is Technology Credit Union's objection to confirmation of the debtors' proposed chapter 13 plan. On July 5, 2018, the debtors filed an amended plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the amended plan, this objection is moot. The objection will be overruled as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

28. 18-22053-D-13 JULIE WALLNER
RDG-2

OBJECTION TO DEBTOR'S CLAIM OF
EXEMPTIONS
5-24-18 [13]

Final ruling:

This is the trustee's objection to the debtor's claim of exemptions. The objection was brought on the ground the debtor had failed to file a spousal waiver to permit her to claim the exemptions provided by Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 703.140(b). On June 28, 2018, the debtor filed a spousal waiver that appears to be signed by herself and her spouse. As a result of the filing of the spousal waiver, this objection is moot. The objection will be overruled as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

29. 18-20855-D-13 WALTER/SHIRLEY SAUNDERS
TAG-1

CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF
U.S. BANK, N.A., CLAIM NUMBER 5
4-25-18 [50]

Final ruling:

This is the debtors' objection to the claim of U.S. Bank, N.A. (the "Bank"), Claim No. 5 on the court's claims register. On July 3, 2018, the debtors filed a purported withdrawal of the objection. The debtors were not free to unilaterally withdraw the objection at that time because the Bank had earlier filed opposition. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1) and (2), incorporated herein by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7041 and 9014(c). However, the court concludes from the purported withdrawal that the debtors do not wish to contest the Bank's opposition; thus, the objection will be overruled by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

30. 18-21657-D-13 ROBERT/JENNIFER WILLIAMS CONTINUED OBJECTION TO
RDG-3 CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL
D. GREER
5-11-18 [32]

Final ruling:

This is the trustee's objection to confirmation of the debtors' proposed chapter 13 plan. The hearing will be continued to July 24, 2018, at 10:00 a.m., to be heard with the debtors' motion to confirm the same plan (DC No. AOE-3) and the debtors' motions to avoid junior liens (DC Nos. 60 and 61, both identified as DC No. AOE-2). The hearing will be continued by minute order. No appearance is necessary on July 10, 2018.

31. 17-27960-D-13 CRAIG GILMORE OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF INTERNAL
GMW-2 REVENUE SERVICE, CLAIM NUMBER 4
5-25-18 [91]

Final ruling:

The matter is resolved without oral argument. The court's record indicates that no timely opposition/response to the objection has been filed and the objection is supported by the record. Accordingly, the court will issue a minute order sustaining the debtor's objection to claim and the claim will be disallowed in any amount over and above \$2,107 priority and any amount over and above \$3,084 general unsecured. No appearance is necessary.

32. 17-27960-D-13 CRAIG GILMORE MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
GMW-3 6-5-18 [100]

33. 18-21260-D-13 SHARON ADAMS-KENDRICK MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
PGM-2 5-19-18 [35]

34. 17-27468-D-13 RYAN KLASSEN
JCK-3

OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF JPMORGAN
CHASE BANK, N.A., CLAIM NUMBER 10
5-14-18 [35]

Final ruling:

This is the debtor's objection to the claim of JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (the "Bank"), Claim No. 10 on the court's claims register. The moving party served the Bank at the address on its proof of claim but not at the different address listed on the debtor's Schedule E/F, as required by LBR 3007-1(c). The moving party also failed to serve the attorneys who had, several weeks earlier, filed a request for special notice on behalf of the Bank and who also signed and filed the proof of claim that is the subject of the objection. Although service on the attorneys was not technically required, parties who file requests for special notice generally do so to ensure they are kept apprised of activity in the case, including, presumably, activity relating to them.

As such, in order to ensure the Bank is fully apprised of the objection, the court will continue the hearing to August 7, 2018 at 10:00 a.m., the moving party to file a notice of continued hearing and serve it, together with the objection and supporting declaration, (1) at the address listed on the debtor's schedules; and (2) pursuant to the request for special notice. Time is hereby shortened so that if the notice of continued hearing and other documents are served no later than July 10, 2018, the hearing may be held on August 7, 2018. The notice of continued hearing shall be a notice pursuant to LBR 3007-1(b) (2) (no written opposition required). The hearing will be continued by minute order. No appearance is necessary on July 10, 2018.

35. 18-21171-D-13 EVERETT MARSHALL AND
KWS-1 LYNETTE HASAN-MARSHALL

MOTION TO CONFIRM PLAN
5-23-18 [54]

Final ruling:

This is the debtors' motion to confirm a first amended chapter 13 plan. On June 27, 2018, the debtors filed a purported withdrawal of the motion. The debtors were not free to unilaterally withdraw the motion at that time because the trustee had earlier filed opposition. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1) and (2), incorporated herein by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7041 and 9014(c). However, on June 26, 2018, the debtors filed a second amended plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the second amended plan, this motion is moot. The motion will be denied as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

36. 17-20173-D-13 ANA FRENES
LRR-2

MOTION TO MODIFY PLAN
5-1-18 [45]

37. 18-22287-D-13 MARCOS DOMINGUEZ CRUZ AND OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
RDG-1 IRES DOMINGUEZ PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER
6-11-18 [13]

Final ruling:

This is the trustee's objection to confirmation of the debtors' proposed chapter 13 plan. On June 18, 2018, the debtors filed an amended plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the amended plan, this objection is moot. The objection will be overruled as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

38. 17-21791-D-13 PATRICIA BROWN CONTINUED MOTION FOR RELIEF
MET-1 FROM AUTOMATIC STAY AND/OR
CORNERSTONE CAPITAL MOTION TO CONFIRM TERMINATION
INVESTMENTS, LLC VS. OR ABSENCE OF STAY
5-18-18 [113]

39. 17-21796-D-13 ARMANDO COVARRUBIAS MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
BTM-1 AUTOMATIC STAY
VOLVO FINANCIAL SERVICES VS. 6-12-18 [85]

40. 17-27397-E-13 GEVORG/ARMINE POLADYAN MOTION TO DISMISS ADVERSARY
18-2014 PLC-2 PROCEEDING
TRIVEDI V. POLADYAN ET AL 6-11-18 [34]

Final ruling:

The hearing on this motion is continued to July 31, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. to be heard by the Hon. Ronald H. Sargis. No appearance is necessary.

41. 18-20601-D-13 KENNY BUCHMILLER
PGM-1

CONTINUED MOTION TO CONFIRM
PLAN

5-7-18 [19]

42. 18-23708-D-13 STANLEY ASBURY AND
GSJ-1 KATHRINE STEWART ASBURY

MOTION TO EXTEND AUTOMATIC STAY
6-22-18 [11]

43. 18-22534-D-7 DENNIS HUNDLEY
RDG-2

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER
6-18-18 [30]

Final ruling:

This case was converted to a Chapter 7 case on June 18, 2018. As a result the objection will be overruled by minute order as moot. No appearance is necessary.

44. 18-22736-D-13 MAX RASCON
RDG-1

OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF
PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER
6-18-18 [17]

Final ruling:

This is the trustee's objection to confirmation of the debtor's proposed chapter 13 plan. On July 2, 2018, the debtor filed an amended plan and a motion to confirm it. As a result of the filing of the amended plan, this objection is moot. The objection will be overruled as moot by minute order. No appearance is necessary.

45.	18-22741-D-13 RDG-1	MICHAEL/ORINA WHITE	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER 6-18-18 [28]
46.	18-22750-D-13 RDG-2	MICHAEL JONES AND PAOLA SAAVEDRA	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER 6-18-18 [23]
47.	18-22750-D-13	MICHAEL JONES AND PAOLA SAAVEDRA	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY EXETER FINANCE, LLC 6-20-18 [28]
48.	18-20855-D-13 RDG-2	WALTER/SHIRLEY SAUNDERS	CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER 4-16-18 [35]

49.	18-20855-D-13 AP-1	WALTER/SHIRLEY SAUNDERS	CONTINUED OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION 4-17-18 [41]
50.	18-22673-D-13 RDG-1	RONALD/MAFFIE DIOSO	OBJECTION TO CONFIRMATION OF PLAN BY RUSSELL D. GREER 6-18-18 [17]
51.	18-20881-D-13 HWW-4	ANSEL CLIATT	MOTION TO RECONSIDER 6-26-18 [51]